

1 Tuesday, 11 December 2012
 2 (10.00 am)
 3 (Proceedings delayed)
 4 (10.09 am)
 5 MEIRION JONES (recalled)
 6 MR POLLARD: Meirion, thanks for coming back for part 2. We
 7 have a fair amount to get through today. Most of the
 8 questioning, again, done by Mr Maclean and I think
 9 a couple of repeat housekeeping points from Mr Spafford
 10 first.
 11 MR SPAFFORD: Yes, thank you very much, Meirion.
 12 Just to confirm that obviously we have the
 13 transcripts as before. There will probably be breaks on
 14 a regular basis to give them a short rest. Obviously
 15 the transcript will be provided to you and/or Mark this
 16 evening for any typographical errors.
 17 One further point, obviously you have signed
 18 confidentiality agreements. Today's proceedings are
 19 still subject to those agreements; is that all right?
 20 **A. Yes, absolutely.**
 21 MR SPAFFORD: Thank you. Okay.
 22 Questions by MR MACLEAN
 23 MR MACLEAN: Mr Jones, can I just summarise where I think we
 24 got to last time in terms of the people that you spoke
 25 to about the Newsnight story?

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 Q. You obviously had a number of discussions with
 3 Peter Rippon at different times. I want to ask you in
 4 a moment about what you have said in a timeline that you
 5 supplied to Tom Giles on 8 October about a discussion on
 6 29 November. Remember, last time we touched on the
 7 29th, which is an important stage in the story from
 8 Mr Rippon's perspective.
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. You obviously spoke to Rippon on a number of occasions.
 11 Leave him to one side for the moment.
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. You spoke to Steve Mitchell once, I think, in
 14 September 2012?
 15 **A. I now think, because I have subsequently come across --**
 16 **I remember you said to me "Are there no emails linked to**
 17 **that?" and it was odd. There is an email from 29 August**
 18 **from me to Steve Mitchell. I would not normally have**
 19 **sent that, so I now suspect that meeting must have been**
 20 **on 29 August. I said at the time I was not sure about**
 21 **the date.**
 22 Q. Right.
 23 **A. Because what I didn't know -- it was obviously in**
 24 **reaction --**
 25 Q. I'm not worried about the date, if it helps, I'm not

1 worried about the date. I'm just trying to establish
 2 how many times you spoke to various people and who those
 3 people were. So for present purposes I don't care
 4 whether it was end of August or beginning of September.
 5 But you spoke to Mr Mitchell once?
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. Around about the end of August, beginning of September?
 8 **A. Yes, I think it is 29 August now, yes.**
 9 Q. You spoke to Ken MacQuarrie in October --
 10 **A. October 16th, was it?**
 11 Q. -- once.
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. You spoke to David Jordan, didn't you, on, I think,
 14 4 October.
 15 **A. The 4th, yes. Yes.**
 16 Q. You attempted to speak, on your account, to Mr Entwistle
 17 on 16th --
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. -- and he declined.
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 Q. You didn't speak to Helen Boaden at any stage --
 22 **A. No.**
 23 Q. -- and you didn't speak to Mark Thompson at any stage.
 24 **A. No.**
 25 Q. So leaving aside Liz MacKean and Hannah Livingston and

1 the people who were working either with you or, as it
 2 were, below you in the food chain --
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. -- who else did you speak to at any stage within the BBC
 5 about the story?
 6 **A. At what stage because it develops over time?**
 7 Q. Let's take September. Did you have a discussion with
 8 BBC lawyers then, for example?
 9 **A. Before he died?**
 10 Q. No, no.
 11 **A. You mean this time round?**
 12 Q. Yes.
 13 **A. Sorry. September.**
 14 Q. Or early October?
 15 **A. Not that I'm aware of, no.**
 16 Q. You see, I noticed when I read your transcript last
 17 time -- and it was something that, at that stage in our
 18 process, I am afraid I wasn't as up to speed on as
 19 I think I am now -- you said on a number of occasions,
 20 by reference to Nadia Banno --
 21 **A. Sorry -- you mean Litigation. I spoke to Litigation.**
 22 Q. I put something to you saying "Here they are asking you
 23 to cough up all the documents".
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. You, a couple of times, including at page 172 said:

1 "No, no, no, no, no, we are in constant contact with
 2 Nadia and then Nicola from about 1 October."
 3 **A. Yes, that is correct.**
 4 MR STEPHENS: Do we have that somewhere?
 5 MR MACLEAN: Do you have what somewhere?
 6 MR STEPHENS: The transcript that you are referring to.
 7 **A. I have it online.**
 8 MR POLLARD: You can have mine, if that would be useful.
 9 MR SPAFFORD: We can get a spare one.
 10 MR STEPHENS: Thank you. I think it will just make it
 11 easier for the witness and me to follow.
 12 MR MACLEAN: We're not short on paper but that's the one
 13 thing we don't have.
 14 So what was the nature of that discussion, what was
 15 the spark for that? That was obviously the day before
 16 the blog was put up.
 17 **A. Yes. Um, I'm trying to think whether it came from us or
 18 whether it came from Litigation.**
 19 Q. Did you have a face-to-face meeting with somebody?
 20 **A. No. I don't think so, not at that stage. I did at some
 21 stage, I think, in that week, but not, I think, on the
 22 1st.**
 23 Q. So at some point in early October you had a face to face
 24 meeting with the --
 25 **A. But just so say, "Look -- Hi Nadia, I'm giving you --**
 Page 5

1 **these are the things we have found already, we will give
 2 more later", it was that sort of meeting, not a sit down
 3 formal meeting.**
 4 Q. Not an attempt to download from you what your version of
 5 the facts was?
 6 **A. No, no, a physical download of, "I've got one of the
 7 tapes now" or "I've got" -- something physical like
 8 that.**
 9 Q. Was there a meeting at which a note was taken which you
 10 saw later --
 11 **A. No.**
 12 Q. -- involving BBC lawyers, as far as you are aware?
 13 **A. No, nothing like that, no.**
 14 Q. Do you remember having a meeting with a BBC lawyer at
 15 which you explained that there had only been one person
 16 on film?
 17 **A. No, no.**
 18 Q. Are you sure about that?
 19 **A. Yes, fairly sure.**
 20 Q. I think Mr Entwistle told us that he had been told, at
 21 a later stage --
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 Q. -- that you had been spoken to or interviewed, if you
 24 like, by BBC lawyers and the message he had was that you
 25 had said that there had only been one person on film.
 Page 6

1 **A. No, certainly not interviewed. I mean there might have
 2 been a phone call. I mean, the confusion there could
 3 have been that if they -- at that point we were looking
 4 for stuff for the police. So if somebody had said to me
 5 "Do you have -- what do you have of victims on film?"
 6 I would have said "We have one interview with a victim
 7 on film". So there is plenty of room for confusion
 8 there.**
 9 Q. You were distinguishing between [redacted] being on
 10 film, because she was a victim, and [redacted]
 11 who wasn't, were you?
 12 **A. What I'm saying --**
 13 Q. Hang on, is that right?
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 Q. Despite the fact that you earlier -- we saw this last
 16 time -- you yourself had referred to the second victim
 17 on camera as an inaccurate reference to
 18 [redacted]
 19 **A. No, you've got that wrong. What that comes from is we
 20 were originally told by [redacted] that [redacted] was
 21 a horrible girl, but that she was a victim. So we had
 22 been told that she was a victim. So before we
 23 interviewed her, she had been referred to in an email as
 24 a victim because potentially she was a victim. Once we
 25 had interviewed her, it was absolutely clear that she**
 Page 7

1 **wasn't a victim.**
 2 Q. Right. Let me get this entirely correct. It is
 3 important for Mr Entwistle because one of the things
 4 which he says led him, frankly, not to trust anyone to
 5 be giving him the proper picture here is that one of the
 6 things that he understood the BBC's lawyers had
 7 uncovered was that you had told him that there was one
 8 victim on camera --
 9 **A. That's true.**
 10 Q. -- or one interview.
 11 **A. No, no, what you say is absolutely true. If they asked
 12 me about victims, I would have said one victim on
 13 camera, yes.**
 14 Q. Do you remember precisely what you were asked and what
 15 you said?
 16 **A. No, because we didn't have some sort of formal meeting.
 17 There was no formal meeting like this.**
 18 Q. They didn't you give you a note. They didn't say,
 19 "Thanks for coming Mr Jones, this is what we are going
 20 to send to George"?
 21 **A. Absolutely not, no. What happens to you in this
 22 process, starting on 1 October, the Monday -- I can't
 23 remember if it comes from me, whether I'm saying we
 24 should be handing over stuff or whether they get in
 25 contact with us or how it works, but I start getting**
 Page 8

1 together everything I can, because it is obvious that we
 2 are going to hand over stuff either for an inquiry or
 3 police or whatever and from about the Monday I'm talking
 4 to Nadia on the phone.
 5 Q. Did you produce -- for example, here is the timeline
 6 that you sent to Tom Giles on 8 October --
 7 **A. I would say, by the way, the 8 October, that was**
 8 **something that had just been done hurriedly overnight,**
 9 **there will be massive things missing from that and so**
 10 **on.**
 11 Q. I will come to that.
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. Apart from, as it were, handing over historic material,
 14 stuff from 2011, did you put pen to paper afresh for the
 15 Nadia Banno exercise?
 16 **A. No, but there were emails going back and forth where I'm**
 17 **saying this is the list of people that we have -- there**
 18 **is constant -- I am sure you have seen -- there are**
 19 **emails going back and forth --**
 20 Q. I wouldn't bank on it. That's why I'm asking you the
 21 question.
 22 **A. Okay, there are emails going back and forth where we're**
 23 **trying to find -- the key thing we're trying to do is --**
 24 Q. I'm not trying to trap you. I'm trying to understand
 25 a process which -- last time you were here I didn't know

Page 9

1 this process was take place. Now I know it happened but
 2 I don't know much about it, so I'm asking you for your
 3 view.
 4 **A. The key thing we're trying to find is how many of the**
 5 **girls at the time who were victims are now prepared to**
 6 **talk to the police. So I'm listing ones that have**
 7 **subsequently, because of Exposure then, have come out in**
 8 **the open, those we know would be okay about it -- I'm**
 9 **trying to ring women to see if they would be happy to**
 10 **talk to the police so I can pass their numbers and names**
 11 **on. That discussion is going on between us and**
 12 **initially Nadia.**
 13 MR POLLARD: Apologies if I have missed this in what you are
 14 saying, could you just be more specific about how that
 15 process started? Was it an approach to you out of the
 16 blue, as it were, by BBC Legal?
 17 **A. It would be a normal thing in a situation like this.**
 18 **Obviously nothing is quite like this.**
 19 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 20 **A. But in a situation where there might be an inquiry or**
 21 **a legal problem or a police inquiry --**
 22 MR POLLARD: Sure, sure, I understand --
 23 **A. So what has happened --**
 24 MR POLLARD: How did it start; not how would it start, how
 25 did it start?

Page 10

1 **A. I'm not sure if I would have rung Nadia, or Nadia might**
 2 **have rung me. It would be an informal approach at the**
 3 **start and we started putting the stuff together. It is**
 4 **done in a very friendly way. It is later on it becomes**
 5 **quite more hostile.**
 6 MR POLLARD: I understand. It just seems unlikely, unless
 7 I'm wrong, that you would have said "What I'm going to
 8 do now is call the BBC legal department and offer them
 9 a load of stuff".
 10 **A. I'm not sure how unlikely that is.**
 11 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 12 **A. It is just a normal thing to do in those situations.**
 13 **Where something happens, afterwards you get everything**
 14 **together and you talk and you try to find everything you**
 15 **can for them.**
 16 MR POLLARD: I absolutely get that but your position is you
 17 can't remember --
 18 **A. I genuinely can't remember.**
 19 MR POLLARD: -- whether you approached them or they
 20 approached you to start with?
 21 **A. If you want me to have a look, I can see what the first**
 22 **email is from them on the week of the 1st. I have my**
 23 **in-tray it there.**
 24 MR MACLEAN: Let's not take time to do that now. But we
 25 might ask you to do that later.

Page 11

1 **A. Thank you.**
 2 Q. Let me just ask you then about the approach to
 3 Mr Entwistle on the 16th. We had the discussion last
 4 time, you saying you wanted an off-the-record discussion
 5 and he said no.
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. You didn't say to him "Let's have an on-the-record
 8 discussion".
 9 **A. No.**
 10 Q. When he gave you, as it were, the brush off then, he
 11 made sure that a BBC lawyer called you up pretty soon
 12 after that, didn't he?
 13 **A. I don't know. I can't remember. So many things have**
 14 **happened. I mean if you have something tell me and**
 15 **I will tell you if I remember it.**
 16 Q. We asked him, obviously, "Why did Mr Jones wait outside
 17 the lift for you, why didn't you speak to him when he
 18 was waiting?"
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. He said -- this is what he said in his transcript:
 21 "The way I dealt with it was that I went straight
 22 back to my office rang BBC Legal and said:
 23 "Call Meirion Jones now" --
 24 **A. That may well have happened.**
 25 Q. -- "he clearly has something to tell me, please find

Page 12

<p>1 out what it is rather than me having to do it myself and 2 run the risk about whether he thinks it is in confidence 3 or not or the basis on which a conversation is taking 4 place. It is clear that he has something that we ought 5 to know, please phone him now ...' 6 "Which they did on the 16th: 7 "... and the get him to tell you what it is.' 8 "They phoned him and he [that's you] said: 9 "I'm not sure I'm prepared to have that 10 conversation with you and it didn't happen that day'. 11 Is that right? 12 A. It's possible, very possible. 13 Q. Can you remember? 14 A. I can't remember, no. But it is entirely possible, 15 though. 16 Q. It is right, isn't it, that you, having made this 17 approach to Mr Entwistle to have an off-the-record 18 discussion, whatever it was you were going to speak 19 about -- 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. -- you didn't in fact speak about, whether to 22 Mr Entwistle or somebody else; is that right? 23 A. Um -- 24 Q. A conversation never took place, is that what you are 25 saying?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Q. I'm trying to get a sense -- 2 A. Yes, I know. 3 Q. -- of whether there was an occasion when somebody other 4 than Ken MacQuarrie, David Jordan -- 5 A. No. 6 Q. -- I think only Ken MacQuarrie or David Jordan at that 7 stage -- 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. -- whether there was anybody who, as it were, sat you 10 down and said -- 11 A. No. 12 Q. -- "Look Meirion, tell us what the hell went on here". 13 A. No. That doesn't happen. 14 Q. That didn't happen? 15 A. No. Can I stop you for a second because I think it is 16 important? You have to realise that, by this stage, 17 Litigation had had for a week all my emails which had 18 all the evidence trail in them. So they had had that. 19 Q. "By this stage" being -- 20 A. By the time of the 16th -- 21 Q. -- by the second week in October? 22 A. By the time of the 16th Litigation already had the stuff 23 I needed to talk to George, they had all that. 24 Q. Right. 25 A. So they came into the Panorama office, where I had Karen</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 A. No. What then happened was Peter Horrocks got in touch 2 with me and I then did a brief for George on the 3 Friday -- 4 Q. Ahead of the committee? 5 A. -- on whatever it was, the 19th. 6 Q. The weekend must have been -- 7 A. It was the 19th. 8 Q. Yes. That's right. 9 A. What I was trying to do in approaching George was to 10 get -- cut through -- I thought the advice he was 11 getting from Litigation and from his lieutenants was the 12 problem, and there was no point taking to Litigation at 13 that point. I just didn't see what the point was of 14 talking to Litigation. 15 Q. So this discussion that I have been asking you about 16 earlier -- 17 A. Yes, this -- 18 Q. Hang on. Hang on. Had that taken place by this stage? 19 A. Which discussion? 20 Q. The discussion that I was talking about earlier with 21 Nadia Banno. That had taken place, I think you said, in 22 the first week of October. 23 A. Yes, but in terms of -- I'm just talking about me going 24 to her office to speed things up to give her a tape, you 25 know, quickly having a chat and going off again.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 in the week of the 8th to go through all my emails, my 2 inbox and my sent box because I thought somebody else 3 should do it, not me. 4 MR POLLARD: Karen? 5 A. Karen Wightman, who is the Deputy Editor of Panorama. 6 She had gone through that and selected everything that 7 was Savile related in any way. At the end of that week 8 Nicola Cain came in and collected all those emails, so 9 she collected copies of everything. So by the time we 10 got to the 12th Litigation already had everything. 11 MR MACLEAN: Let me just press you a bit further on what 12 Mr Entwistle told us. So we have had his account about 13 the 16th: you approached him, "Can we have 14 an off-the-record chat -- 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. -- essentially, "No, we can't", he says. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. So you don't have a discussion with him. 19 A. No. 20 Q. He says he went back and got Legal to ring you up. 21 A. That is entirely possible. 22 Q. You say you can't remember. He said that the message he 23 got from Legal was that you had effectively refused to 24 discuss things with them. Now -- 25 A. What I'm saying to is because that they already had all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

1 **the information, they had everything.**
 2 Q. All right. Then he says, Mr Entwistle told us, that
 3 there was another point in his mind when he encountered
 4 you on the 16th. He said:
 5 "According to my intelligence from BBC Litigation,
 6 [you] had given them an account -- this was in the
 7 process of finding out what Newsnight had got in
 8 relation to getting it to the police -- in which there
 9 was only one taped interview. I had been told there
 10 were noted -- a noted conversation between Meirion and
 11 somebody in Litigation in which he said 'There is only
 12 one interview on tape'. So when I, on the night of the
 13 12th said 'There is only one interview on tape' ..."
 14 Which I think is something he said publicly.
 15 A. **The 12th, yes, I am sure it was.**
 16 Q. "... I was taking that from Litigation's account of
 17 an interview with Meirion."
 18 A. **Well, there is no interview with me.**
 19 Q. Did such an interview take place?
 20 A. **No, there was no interview with me. But they might be**
 21 **referring to a hurried telephone conversation or**
 22 **something. As I say, if the question they had asked me**
 23 **was "How many victims have we got on tape", the answer**
 24 **would have been "One".**
 25 Q. I want to be --

Page 17

1 A. **Yes.**
 2 Q. It is very important that --
 3 A. **No, no, no, sure.**
 4 Q. -- we are completely clear. You say there might have
 5 been a hurried conversation. An interview can take
 6 face-to-face or on the telephone. Was there any time
 7 when you understood the BBC lawyers to be trying to get
 8 your version of the facts.
 9 A. **Absolutely not. No, I would have remembered that,**
 10 **definitely would have remembered that. There was**
 11 **nothing like that.**
 12 MR POLLARD: Sorry, I might be missing something here. If
 13 you are downloading to them emails from the time --
 14 A. **Yes.**
 15 MR POLLARD: -- and tapes, and so on --
 16 A. **All that stuff, yes.**
 17 MR POLLARD: -- that is then getting from you a version of
 18 what has happened, isn't it?
 19 A. **Absolutely, yes. They get all that. Yes. But what**
 20 **they don't do is we don't sit there and, as I did with**
 21 **MacQuarrie, say, or David Jordan, and take them through**
 22 **it, showing them particular things. I never do that.**
 23 MR POLLARD: But you may have talked to them on the phone,
 24 might you, to say "That email of the 25th, that says
 25 such and such, I'm going to send you the" --

Page 18

1 A. **No, we didn't get into that sort of stuff at all.**
 2 MR POLLARD: Okay. I know it sounds like dancing on the
 3 head of a pin, but --
 4 A. **No, we didn't have that type of conversation at any**
 5 **stage.**
 6 MR POLLARD: So the relationship or the activity between you
 7 and legal was effectively you copying them the emails,
 8 sending them a tape of --
 9 A. **Both tapes, but at various stages. The important thing**
 10 **is the original tapes --**
 11 MR MACLEAN: You sent the [redacted] tape first and the other one
 12 later.
 13 A. **Because both tapes have gone down to the Panorama edit**
 14 **suite to be digitised. The [redacted] one came back**
 15 **first, we sent that to them. It was also sent to**
 16 **somebody to do a full transcript. So we sent them the**
 17 **full transcript. We then got -- the [redacted]**
 18 **one came back and then what happened was that was on the**
 19 **10th or -- what day of the week are we talking about --**
 20 **the 11th.**
 21 Q. Right.
 22 A. **That was the day that I stumbled into the Newsnight**
 23 **office when that sort of revolt was going on and what**
 24 **happens then is Peter rules out using anything that was**
 25 **broadcast on Exposure.**

Page 19

1 Q. Yes.
 2 A. **So either myself or Liz say "Well, what about the**
 3 **[redacted] She wasn't on Exposure". They are**
 4 **in Television Centre at that point. I go back to**
 5 **Broadcasting House, get them the tape, get the tape to**
 6 **Newsnight on the 11th. I then find transcript of it and**
 7 **send them the full transcript of the tape.**
 8 MR POLLARD: To Newsnight or to Legal?
 9 A. **No, to Sara Afshar in Newsnight and to Liz MacKean from**
 10 **Newsnight.**
 11 MR MACLEAN: You have jumped from sending things to
 12 Newsnight to sending things to BBC --
 13 A. **Yes.**
 14 Q. -- to Legal. I don't quite understand why there is
 15 a need for an email exchange or some sort of
 16 communication exchange with them. If what they say is
 17 "Send us all the stuff you had", you can do that in one
 18 go, can't you?
 19 A. **No, it takes times. It takes time to find all the bits**
 20 **and give them everything we can. We are digging out**
 21 **stuff. I'm going through notebooks which -- remember,**
 22 **we are in the process of moving from one office to**
 23 **another and I have half a tonne of stuff I had to put in**
 24 **a back room at home because there is no storage in the**
 25 **new place. You are going through stuff finding**

Page 20

<p>1 everything you can for them. So it took quite a while, 2 getting over all the bits and pieces. 3 Q. So just to be completely clear then -- 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. -- insofar as Mr Entwistle told us, as he clearly did, 6 that there was it a noted conversation between you, in 7 which you said "There is only one interview on tape", 8 that's not a description you would give? 9 A. No, there is no noted interview that I know of at all. 10 MR STEPHENS: Would it be helpful to put the note of the 11 conversation to Meirion? 12 MR MACLEAN: If we had it, we would. 13 MR STEPHENS: I'm sorry, I just assumed that you were 14 putting something that existed. 15 MR MACLEAN: Well, Mr Entwistle tells us it exists. 16 A. He was going on what he was told by Litigation. 17 MR MACLEAN: Yes, precisely. 18 MR STEPHENS: I'm sorry, okay. 19 A. You also have to remember that, by that time, Litigation 20 were being quite hostile to me. So I was getting emails 21 from them where they said "Can you send us the scripts" 22 and they put "the scripts" in invert the commas. You 23 know, they are starting to be quite hostile. 24 Q. I've tried to explain, I'm not trying to play games to 25 you. If I had the information, I would put it to you --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 I thought I had argued him round." 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. It is quite important, from our point of view, to 4 understand when Mr Rippon started to get cold feet. So 5 how secure is your recollection of -- 6 A. The reason that's -- 7 Q. Can I just finish? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. How secure is your recollection of the discussion with 10 Peter Rippon on 29 November? 11 A. It's not secure. That's why, when we talked about it 12 last time, I said to you that the email on the 30th from 13 Peter -- 14 Q. Yes. 15 A. -- gives the impression that we'd had a discussion the 16 previous night. 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. It says "After pondering this overnight", the 19 implication of that is we had a discussion the previous 20 night. I said to you I have no specific memory of that, 21 but I think there may have been such a discussion the 22 night before, but I can't remember it. 23 Q. Right. 24 A. So I kept distinguishing when we were going through 25 that, saying -- you kept saying, "Had you had any</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 MR STEPHENS: I didn't understand that you didn't have it, 2 that was the point. 3 MR MACLEAN: I thought I made that clear earlier. 4 We asked you last time about 29 November -- 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. -- which is an important stage -- 7 A. Crucial. 8 Q. -- in the story for Mr Rippon? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Last time, I'm not sure we had quite focused on this 11 timeline that you sent to Mr Giles on 8 October. 12 A. That would be very incomplete. It would not be as 13 reliable as the full one. 14 Q. But I noticed that in it you referred to, under the 15 heading of "29 November", you quoted Mr Rippon's email, 16 do you remember the one where he said he had: 17 "... a helpful chat with you. I won't mention 18 anything to programmes until you are ready for me to do 19 so." 20 A. That is Jo Mathys' email. 21 Q. Yes, about Impact and so on. 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Then you say: 24 "Later that day I had a chat with Peter and it was 25 obvious he was starting to get cold feet although</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 discussion up to this point?" I was saying "I am sure 2 we hadn't up to the afternoon of the 29th, I'm not sure 3 about the evening of the 29th", because the tone of that 4 implies to me that we had already had some sort of 5 inconclusive discussion of some sort. 6 Q. Is this fair: you can't remember whether there was 7 a conversation on the 29th -- 8 A. No. 9 Q. -- but, as it were, reconstructing from the email of the 10 30th -- 11 A. Exactly. 12 Q. -- you think might have been? 13 A. Yes, that's exactly right. But I don't know that. 14 Q. Equally there might not have been? 15 A. Exactly, exactly. 16 Q. So if I was to ask you whether you can help us any 17 further with that conversation, the answer is that you 18 can't? 19 A. No, I can't. 20 Q. Right, okay, fine. 21 MR POLLARD: May I just jump in again? Apologies, if I'm 22 misunderstanding it. Is the point of your timeline to 23 Tom Giles, written in October of this year -- you 24 suggest in that timeline that you thought he was getting 25 cold feet. So your view in, if you like, October this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

1 year was that your recollection that, in the second half
 2 of November 29th, he was getting cold feet? That's
 3 slightly different from what --
 4 **A. No, and that -- that's what I'm trying to say. That**
 5 **Panorama desperately needed something very fast, and**
 6 **I just rattled through as quickly as I could and working**
 7 **from that email on the 30th I -- you know, I thought it**
 8 **looks like there must have been a discussion the night**
 9 **before. But, you know, that -- the reason why that is**
 10 **so unreliable as a document is that it is something**
 11 **that's not been checked through. It is very quickly,**
 12 **you know, lashed together. The main point of that was**
 13 **to put in the email -- the key emails -- and if you look**
 14 **through it you will see that's the main point of that**
 15 **timeline.**
 16 MR MACLEAN: So one might say, might one, that your timeline
 17 to Tom Giles was a chain of events that had been put
 18 together petty quickly to the best of your recollection.
 19 **A. Yes, yes. Very fast, yes.**
 20 Q. A bit like Mr Rippon's chain of events to Mr Mitchell,
 21 with all the attendant difficulties of doing something
 22 at speed from recollection?
 23 **A. I don't quite remember the chain of events one that you**
 24 **are talking about.**
 25 Q. You remember, he wrote a chain of events on 2 October
 Page 25

1 which then -- he then went away and wrote the blog.
 2 **A. Okay.**
 3 Q. I'm simple pointing out that is a slight irony, one
 4 might think, in you telling us now -- which I am sure is
 5 right -- that the timeline to Tom Giles was written
 6 quickly to the best of your recollection and under some
 7 pressure of time and that's precisely what Mr Rippon
 8 might say about the circumstances in which the blog came
 9 to be produced.
 10 **A. Yes, but with respect, his email to Steve was about**
 11 **15 lines. That's about 15 pages covering over a year,**
 12 **scribbled out as fast as I can.**
 13 Q. Well, we can count the number of lines. I think it was
 14 more than 15, but anyway.
 15 **A. It certainly was not 15 pages or whatever it was. That**
 16 **is one of perhaps 20 timelines. I kept evolving that**
 17 **timeline again and again and again, as I tried to go**
 18 **through it, correct things, you know, work things out.**
 19 Q. You spoke to Mr Jordan on 4 October, is that right?
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 Q. The catalyst for speaking to Mr Jordan was that he had
 22 done -- well, you tell me, what was the catalyst?
 23 **A. Well, it was -- it was part of an ongoing frustration**
 24 **that week that I thought the BBC was putting out a line**
 25 **which was going to make them come a cropper. That had**
 Page 26

1 **gradually been building all week and that morning, on**
 2 **the 4th, I heard David Jordan -- who, as I said last**
 3 **time, I trusted -- coming on The Today Programme and**
 4 **saying a load of stuff which was completely untrue.**
 5 **After that, I think, is the email between me and Fergal,**
 6 **which I think you pointed out last time, Fergal Keane --**
 7 Q. Management lies? The management lies email?
 8 **A. -- yes, and also me saying, "I'm almost at the end of my**
 9 **tether, I don't know what to do". I can't remember the**
 10 **exact phrase but I say something like that.**
 11 Q. I will show you, bundle A8/200. That one.
 12 **A. Yes, exactly.**
 13 Q. Fergal Keane had sent you an email --
 14 **A. "I don't know what to do or who to talk to" is the key**
 15 **phrase in there.**
 16 Q. I see, yes. So you sent that at 8.32 in the morning,
 17 having just heard Mr Jordan on the radio, is that right?
 18 **A. Yes, exactly.**
 19 Q. You say:
 20 "After hearing David Jordan, not his fault, he knows
 21 nothing about it and wasn't involved, defending
 22 management lies this morning, I'm really considering my
 23 options."
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. The "management lies" were his mischaracterisation of
 Page 27

1 what your story was about --
 2 **A. Yes, exactly.**
 3 Q. -- is that right?
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. So you then email Mr Jordan, the same day, page 420 of
 6 the same bundle, and you sent him this script.
 7 **A. No, um --**
 8 Q. You had had a discussion with him?
 9 **A. First of all, I ring him and say "Look, can I come and**
 10 **see you? I'm very worried by what you said this**
 11 **morning, I think you have been misinformed". We arrange**
 12 **to meet initially at 11.45, it ends up being at 12**
 13 **o'clock.**
 14 Q. It took place at 12 o'clock?
 15 **A. We then have a half hour long meeting at 12 o'clock.**
 16 Q. Right, and then you sent him an email.
 17 **A. Then, when I get back to the office, I send him the**
 18 **email with the script, and he says, you know, "I will**
 19 **now reflect on what you have told me".**
 20 Q. Yes. So you say you took your timeline, this is your
 21 statement now:
 22 "I took my timeline with me and went to see him at
 23 about 12 o'clock. Explained everything right from the
 24 start of the Savile investigation. I then sent him
 25 a copy of the script we had sent to Peter Rippon and the
 Page 28

1 lawyer, Roger Law, on 29 November."
 2 Now --
 3 **A. I think "timeline" at that stage would have been**
 4 **an assembly of all the key emails in date order. I'm**
 5 **not sure whether I had anything written beyond that.**
 6 Q. Now, your email to Mr Jordan on the 4th at 14.16, was
 7 headed "CONFIDENTIAL", wasn't it?
 8 **A. Yes.**
 9 Q. Why was that? What's the message you are sending to
 10 Mr Jordan by heading it "CONFIDENTIAL" in capital
 11 letters?
 12 **A. That it is not to go everywhere.**
 13 Q. It's not to go anywhere.
 14 **A. No, not to go everywhere, I think. I am sending him**
 15 **a script and I've talked to him because I want him to**
 16 **stop doing interviews that are not true, saying things**
 17 **that are not true. I'm hoping that if he's in**
 18 **a management meeting where they are discussing what to**
 19 **do that he will say, you know, I think we need to find**
 20 **out exactly what happened. I'm not expecting him to say**
 21 **"I have had a chat with Meirion this morning", or**
 22 **whatever, but I am expecting to input, you know, what**
 23 **I have given to him into the process.**
 24 Q. Have you any reason to think that Mr Jordan didn't keep
 25 this exchange that you had with him confidential?

Page 29

1 **A. I don't know. I have no reason to think that he didn't,**
 2 **no.**
 3 Q. But you didn't, did you?
 4 **A. Um, well, I -- the process, if you want to take it from**
 5 **there, is it ceases to be confidential the following**
 6 **Tuesday, obviously.**
 7 Q. Because?
 8 **A. Because the following day I take -- I escalate it to**
 9 **George Entwistle on the 5th.**
 10 Q. You sent the email on Friday the 5th --
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. -- which he finally gets on the 8th --
 13 **A. The 8th.**
 14 Q. -- through no fault of your own?
 15 **A. No. He then asked me to see Ken MacQuarrie on the 9th**
 16 **and to MacQuarrie I then have to -- I then start by**
 17 **explaining that I have gone to Peter, that I have gone**
 18 **to David Jordan, and that -- it was only after that,**
 19 **that I went to George, and that's the starting point**
 20 **that we start from. It ceases to be confidential really**
 21 **at that point. Now, I have no wish for it to be public,**
 22 **but it's not confidential after that stage.**
 23 Q. The only people who knew that you had sent the script to
 24 Mr Jordan were you and he, weren't they?
 25 **A. No, sadly not, if you are talking about the Private Eye,**

Page 30

1 **sadly that's not the case.**
 2 Q. When you sent it to Mr Jordan at 14.16 --
 3 **A. Exactly.**
 4 Q. -- the only people that knew were you and he?
 5 **A. Absolutely right.**
 6 Q. The script doesn't turn up, but the reference to the
 7 fact that you had sent to script to Mr Jordan turns up
 8 in Private Eye, doesn't it?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. Mr Jordan was rather exercised about that, wasn't he?
 11 **A. It is -- two weeks later, it turns up in Private Eye.**
 12 Q. So one or other of you and Mr Jordan must have broken
 13 that confidence, mustn't you?
 14 **A. Well, it depends what you mean. Essentially, long, by**
 15 **that stage, all my emails including that email had been**
 16 **handed over to Panorama. They had all those emails.**
 17 **They had the entire chain. My understanding for what it**
 18 **is worth, is that somebody at [REDACTED]**
 19 **[REDACTED] gave that information to**
 20 **Private Eye.**
 21 Q. Private Eye quotes a Newsnight insider saying "I warned
 22 Rippon of the risk of reputational damage to the BBC".
 23 **A. That is obviously from me. That is obviously from me.**
 24 **That is me talking to somebody else and somebody else**
 25 **has reported that to Private Eye.**

Page 31

1 Q. Who?
 2 **A. I believe it is the same person [REDACTED]**
 3 Q. Who?
 4 **A. I'm not going to say who.**
 5 Q. Why not?
 6 **A. Because -- you know, I'm not going to do that.**
 7 Q. If you tell us who it is, we can ask them.
 8 **A. I'm not going to do that.**
 9 Q. It was you, wasn't it --
 10 **A. It wasn't me.**
 11 Q. -- that gave it to Private Eye?
 12 **A. It certainly wasn't, absolutely wasn't. That's why --**
 13 **you know, if, well, if I -- if I was -- you know, it was**
 14 **unhelpful for that to be leaked to Private Eye at that**
 15 **point. We were making the Panorama. The Panorama is**
 16 **going out on -- that would have been leaked, where are**
 17 **we? The Panorama is going out the following Monday,**
 18 **I have absolutely no desire for something like that to**
 19 **appear in Private Eye, it doesn't help in any way.**
 20 Q. Let me show you under 14, Mr Jones, please, page 134.
 21 134 is an email we have just been looking at from
 22 Mr Jordan?
 23 **A. Yes. -**
 24 Q. When he saw Private Eye, he sent you an email on the
 25 17th at 16.20, didn't he?

Page 32

1 **A. Yes.**
 2 Q. "As you will see, this email is marked confidential by
 3 you. Nonetheless, I read that you sent the script to me
 4 in the latest Private Eye as only you and I know it was
 5 sent to me and I have told no one, because that's my
 6 understanding of the word 'confidential'. Perhaps you
 7 can explain to me how an account of you sending it to me
 8 arrived in Private Eye."
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. Let's just look at your response, which is also headed
 11 "CONFIDENTIAL" in capital letters:
 12 "No, I can't."
 13 So you didn't offer him any explanation.
 14 **A. No.**
 15 Q. But then said:
 16 "That paragraph reads as if it has come from someone
 17 I have talked to. It sound like me but I have certainly
 18 not talked to anyone in Private Eye. I have told
 19 a number of people in the BBC about the general
 20 situation and the quotes from me could conceivably have
 21 come from one of those conversations but I have told
 22 almost no one about the five scripts or the script sent
 23 to you."
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. "I told Ken and George but neither of them had any

Page 33

1 interest in leaking them. It has obviously come from
 2 someone who thinks they are helping me by leaking that."
 3 So at this stage, you are proceeding on the basis
 4 that the Private Eye leak is thought to be helpful to
 5 what is going on from your perspective, right?
 6 **A. No, no. The person who has leaked it thinks that. It**
 7 **doesn't mean it is helpful to me at all.**
 8 Q. Then you go on to talk about the briefing against you by
 9 management about --
 10 **A. Yes, which is a separate issue.**
 11 Q. -- [REDACTED]
 12 **A. Yes.**
 13 Q. I come back to the question: it must be the case,
 14 mustn't it, that one of you and Mr Jordan revealed to
 15 somebody the fact that, in confidence, you had sent him
 16 the script?
 17 **A. No.**
 18 Q. It can only --
 19 **A. No --**
 20 Q. However it gets to Private Eye is another matter, but
 21 the original confidence between you and Jordan must have
 22 been breached by one of you --
 23 **A. No.**
 24 Q. -- because the only people who knew about it were you
 25 and him?

Page 34

1 **A. No, it's not true.**
 2 Q. Why is it not true, who else knew about it?
 3 **A. Because all my emails, including that, had been handed**
 4 **over by that stage to the Panorama office, who were**
 5 **using it to make a programme, and to Litigation. What**
 6 **was significant about this was it said "Script 5". That**
 7 **was very specific. That couldn't have been got from**
 8 **a general conversation.**
 9 MR POLLARD: It would be, I suppose, your choice to hand
 10 that email to Panorama?
 11 **A. No, well. On that basis, I would have had to go through**
 12 **everything saying "What do I hand over, what don't**
 13 **I hand over?"**
 14 MR POLLARD: Only on the basis that that one was
 15 a confidential email between you and another BBC person.
 16 **A. I could have applied that approach to all of the emails**
 17 **and taken out all sorts of emails but I thought it was**
 18 **essential that I give complete access to everything, and**
 19 **in any case, by that stage, as I say, it was no longer**
 20 **confidential between us because Ken and George would**
 21 **already have known about it as well.**
 22 MR MACLEAN: I don't understand that, Mr Jones. I don't
 23 understand why the fact that you had a discussion with
 24 Ken MacQuarrie, for example --
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 35

1 Q. -- blows the confidence of a discussion you had had with
 2 Mr Jordan.
 3 **A. Because it's no longer just the two of us who know about**
 4 **it, is what I'm trying to say. What I'm not trying to**
 5 **say here is that it was good that it appeared in**
 6 **Private Eye or that it should have appeared in**
 7 **Private Eye; it shouldn't have done.**
 8 Q. It was very helpful up for the upcoming Panorama, wasn't
 9 it, a perfect little trail for Panorama?
 10 **A. I don't think it was. I think we wanted that stuff all**
 11 **to come out in one go.**
 12 Q. But just as ITV had trailed their programme, Panorama
 13 wanted to trail their programme, didn't it?
 14 **A. It was also --**
 15 Q. Didn't it?
 16 **A. I don't know. There is also something going on here**
 17 **though, that I had passed that information onto David**
 18 **and no action had been taken on that. The BBC was still**
 19 **putting it out --**
 20 Q. Let me ask you about that. Mr Jordan -- we asked --
 21 Mr Jordan --
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 Q. -- about what the consequences were of your discussion
 24 with him.
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 36

1 Q. I will show you exactly what he says about it in
 2 a moment. But the burden of what he told us was that,
 3 at the end of the conversation with you, he said, "Well,
 4 Meirion, what do you want me to do?" and you didn't say
 5 that you wanted him to do anything.
 6 **A. Yes, I mean --**
 7 Q. Is that right?
 8 **A. No. It's not quite right. But it's not a million miles**
 9 **from the truth either. What I -- I mean, when you have**
 10 **a conversation like that with somebody, you expect them**
 11 **to act on it, but you don't expect them to act on it in**
 12 **terms of saying "I have had a conversation with Meirion"**
 13 **or "I know this, or I know that", but you do expect that**
 14 **then to feed in that the email trail shows that the**
 15 **version being put forward is not true.**
 16 I would have expected them at the very least to have
 17 said -- he to assert at his next meeting with other
 18 management people to have said "We need to get to the
 19 bottom of this, we really -- there is something here
 20 that is not right". I would have expected him to have
 21 stopped doing interviews, putting out a line which he
 22 knew might well be completely false.
 23 Q. He said that -- tell me what you --
 24 **A. He did say something about, "Do you want to escalate**
 25 **it?" He didn't say "Do you want me to do nothing?"**
 Page 37

1 Q. Let me read you exactly what he said.
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. Nick said to him:
 4 "I just want to pick up the story then and perhaps
 5 take the end of meeting and what Meirion had been hoping
 6 you would do with the information he had given you
 7 then."
 8 Nick said to Mr Jordan:
 9 "What happened afterwards?"
 10 He said:
 11 "Well, I specifically asked him what he wanted me to
 12 do. I asked him that at the end of the meeting because
 13 I thought he might want me to do something about
 14 something, so I specifically said, notwithstanding we
 15 had agreed at the outset it was going to be
 16 confidential, 'Do you want me to do anything with the
 17 information?' to which his answer was 'No, at any rate
 18 not for the moment', words to that effect. Neither of
 19 us took a contemporaneous note so I don't have
 20 a contemporaneous note, but it was words to that effect:
 21 'No, nothing at the moment'.
 22 Is that right?
 23 **A. No, it's not quite right but it's not totally wrong**
 24 **either. You know, I wasn't asking him for a specific**
 25 **action. I --**
 Page 38

1 MR POLLARD: I was going to say, part of the reason for that
 2 meeting, if I'm right, was for you to try to make sure
 3 that if he was doing more interviews --
 4 **A. Absolutely.**
 5 MR POLLARD: -- in future --
 6 **A. Absolutely.**
 7 MR POLLARD: -- he would have at least your information on
 8 it.
 9 **A. And that he would know that the line that was being put**
 10 **out, there were very serious questions about it and**
 11 **therefore hopefully that would then be raised. I wasn't**
 12 **expecting him to say "I have just had a conversation**
 13 **with Meirion", et cetera and if you see by his email**
 14 **response to my -- when I send him the script where he**
 15 **says "I will think about this further" or whatever he**
 16 **says, he is thinking about "What do I about it?"**
 17 MR MACLEAN: Mr MacQuarrie had interviewed you the week
 18 before, I think, on the 8th or the 9th.
 19 **A. A week before what, exchange?**
 20 Q. No, sorry. This exchange --
 21 **A. MacQuarrie is the 9th.**
 22 Q. He's appointed by Mr Entwistle on the 8th.
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. When Mr Entwistle gets -- he gets your email on the 5th.
 25 **A. Liz's, which neither of us knew until later that day,**
 Page 39

1 **that we had both sent them.**
 2 Q. Mr Entwistle makes the point, and he's correct, isn't
 3 he, that your email sent on the 5th doesn't actually
 4 complain about the blog at all.
 5 **A. Absolutely true.**
 6 Q. It's Liz MacKean's email of the 8th that really raises
 7 the issue.
 8 **A. Does she send on the 8th or does she send it on the 5th?**
 9 Q. No, on the 8th.
 10 **A. On the 8th, okay.**
 11 Q. Take it from me it's on the 8th. It was the MacKean
 12 email in particular that hit Mr Entwistle and led to the
 13 MacQuarrie process.
 14 **A. Remember, the problem I'm dealing with at the time is**
 15 **the BBC are briefing that the story was not**
 16 **substantiated, and that's why I'm saying -- and that the**
 17 **story was about the CPS or police prosecution. The**
 18 **email I sent him on the 5th says very simply, "No,**
 19 **I produced that, I can tell you the story was about, you**
 20 **know, Jimmy Savile, paedophile". It's a very quick one**
 21 **liner to grab his attention and say "Look, this is what**
 22 **matters".**
 23 Q. Yes, and the MacQuarrie process of Mr MacQuarrie
 24 interviewing you and Liz MacKean --
 25 **A. Yes, Liz MacKean first.**
 Page 40

<p>1 Q. -- and I think nobody else, so far as I'm aware --</p> <p>2 A. We thought he was interviewing Peter Rippon, I don't</p> <p>3 know whether we got that impression or not. I don't</p> <p>4 know.</p> <p>5 Q. Given what you know now, I have to reason to think that</p> <p>6 Mr MacQuarrie spoke to anybody else, have you?</p> <p>7 A. I have seen the notes, obviously, and the notes -- there</p> <p>8 are handwritten notes of conversations with the two of</p> <p>9 us.</p> <p>10 Q. He produces a one page document --</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. -- which only refers to you and Liz MacKean --</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. -- which goes to Mr Entwistle.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. So that interview with Mr MacQuarrie, bundle 11 at 191,</p> <p>17 this is the draft file note, isn't it, 11/191?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, that is right.</p> <p>19 Q. Is that right?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. It is sent, I think, under the cover of -- well, if you</p> <p>22 look at 237 you will see when it gets to Mr Entwistle,</p> <p>23 same bundle.</p> <p>24 A. Yes, from Sarah Jones in Litigation.</p> <p>25 Q. Yes, at 7 o'clock on the 10th. So these interviews have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 Q. You had discussions with The Guardian, didn't you, which</p> <p>2 led to them running the story about MacQuarrie, his</p> <p>3 process, on the 11th?</p> <p>4 A. I don't think so. Which -- which story is this?</p> <p>5 Q. The story about the Ken MacQuarrie process, which was</p> <p>6 run in The Guardian on Thursday, the 11th?</p> <p>7 A. I don't know. I don't think so.</p> <p>8 Q. You remember the piece in The Guardian?</p> <p>9 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>10 Q. It caused some consternation, not least for Mr Rippon,</p> <p>11 if you look at page 407. Do you see there is an email</p> <p>12 there, 11 October, 20.49 from Karen Rosine?</p> <p>13 A. Do we have The Guardian piece?</p> <p>14 Q. I'm going to show you the piece in just a second.</p> <p>15 A. Right.</p> <p>16 Q. 11 October, Karen Rosine, there's the link to</p> <p>17 The Guardian piece:</p> <p>18 "Am just about to talk to Steve M."</p> <p>19 Says Paddy Feeney. And Helen Deller:</p> <p>20 "So you know Pete is v upset. Have done best to</p> <p>21 calm down. This is MJ and LM."</p> <p>22 You are "MJ" and Liz MacKean is "LM", obviously.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. So that is Helen Deller's view. If you go to 289, this</p> <p>25 is a piece by Dan Sabbagh. You know Dan Sabbagh, don't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 taken place on the 10th, probably.</p> <p>2 A. The 9th.</p> <p>3 Q. The 9th or the 10th.</p> <p>4 A. On the 9th.</p> <p>5 Q. You see at 239 that Mr Entwistle says he will have</p> <p>6 a read through it tonight and discuss it with --</p> <p>7 A. Where is that?</p> <p>8 Q. 239, which is the next one in the chain.</p> <p>9 MR STEPHENS: No, it says 238.</p> <p>10 A. Yes, sure, sure.</p> <p>11 MR MACLEAN: Were there any afters with Mr MacQuarrie, so</p> <p>12 far as you are concerned?</p> <p>13 A. No. The only thing that did happen --</p> <p>14 Q. He only spoke to you once?</p> <p>15 A. The only thing that did happen was that I left my mobile</p> <p>16 phone in the room where he was and that evening was the</p> <p>17 leaving do for Caroline Thomson, so I met him there and</p> <p>18 he handed over the phone. I mean, I wasn't invited to</p> <p>19 the do but I knew he was going to be there and he handed</p> <p>20 the phone over to me. That was the end of my dealings</p> <p>21 with him.</p> <p>22 Q. Right. So whatever discussion Mr Entwistle had with</p> <p>23 Kenny in the morning didn't lead to anybody coming back</p> <p>24 to you at any stage?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 you?</p> <p>2 A. The first time I saw his name was on 1 October, when he</p> <p>3 wrote that piece on 1 October. I have not been aware of</p> <p>4 him at all and I didn't talk to him before that piece on</p> <p>5 1 October.</p> <p>6 Q. "Ken MacQuarrie to examine circumstances surrounding</p> <p>7 last minute decision to drop film revealing sexual abuse</p> <p>8 claims.</p> <p>9 "The BBC has set up an informal investigation to</p> <p>10 examine the circumstances surrounding the decision by</p> <p>11 Newsnight last year to abort an investigation into</p> <p>12 allegations into sexual abuse by Jimmy Savile."</p> <p>13 A. That clearly doesn't come from us, does it?</p> <p>14 Q. Hang on a minute:</p> <p>15 "Ken MacQuarrie, a corporation veteran with overall</p> <p>16 responsibility ... has been asked to speak to</p> <p>17 journalists angry with the decision to suddenly drop the</p> <p>18 film that would have exposed the celebrity", and so on.</p> <p>19 Over the page:</p> <p>20 "MacQuarrie will report to the Director General",</p> <p>21 and so on.</p> <p>22 Then, go to 291 --</p> <p>23 A. Right.</p> <p>24 Q. "Two BBC sources close to the investigation say</p> <p>25 Newsnight collected evidence unknown to the police at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

1 the time of filming. That contrasted with remarks made
 2 by Rippon in the blogpost last week: 'Did we withhold
 3 evidence from the police? No, we are confident all the
 4 women we spoke to had contacted the police independently
 5 already.'
 6 That is a quote from the blog. [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 **A. I don't know. Okay, have a look at the start of this**
 9 **article --**
 10 Q. What's the answer to the question, first, before we go
 11 back to the start of the article?
 12 **A. Well, I don't know.**
 13 Q. You were one of the sources for this article, weren't
 14 you?
 15 **A. I don't know. I tell you why, because it is totally**
 16 **misinformed. It is written on 11 October, two days**
 17 **after we have seen Mr MacQuarrie.**
 18 Q. Two days after, yes?
 19 **A. Two days after we have seen him, it says:**
 20 **"He has been asked to speak to journalists angry**
 21 **with [it] ... he is also [taking] complaints about the**
 22 **accuracy ..."**
 23 Q. You were a journalist who was angry with it, weren't
 24 you?
 25 **A. Plainly if he had talked to us he would have known that**
 Page 45

1 **we had already seen MacQuarrie. It is obvious that he's**
 2 **not talked to us, I would have thought, from that. What**
 3 **is earth is he doing writing a piece on the Thursday**
 4 **saying that MacQuarrie has not seen us?**
 5 Q. I'm suggesting to you that you were one of the two BBC
 6 sources referred to at page 291. You may not have been
 7 the only source of this article. He may have spoken to
 8 other people at other times, but it is, to us use your
 9 word, obvious, isn't it, that you are one of the two BBC
 10 sources that Sabbagh is referring to?
 11 **A. When did I say it was obvious?**
 12 Q. I am just choosing your word --
 13 **A. By using the word "obvious"?**
 14 Q. I'm suggesting to you that it is obvious.
 15 **A. It is not obvious at all, is it? If he had talked, if**
 16 **he had talked to either of us, he would have known that**
 17 **we had already talked to -- we had already talked to**
 18 **MacQuarrie. It doesn't make any sense. It sounds like**
 19 **it is second -- it sounds like secondhand stuff going**
 20 **down the chain from somebody who is not very well**
 21 **informed or they would have had known we had talked**
 22 **about it. This is presumably what David Jordan was**
 23 **referring to that I didn't understand in his email.**
 24 Q. What is what David Jordan is referring to?
 25 **A. David Jordan says something like -- where are we?**
 Page 46

1 **"That would explain how entirely confidential**
 2 **conversations with Ken MacQuarrie also came to find**
 3 **their way into the national print."**
 4 Q. Yes.
 5 **A. Well, I had never seen any evidence of that.**
 6 Q. You are referring now to Mr Jordan's email to you on the
 7 17th --
 8 **A. Yes.**
 9 Q. -- back in bundle 14?
 10 **A. That was total news to me. I had not seen any**
 11 **conversations with Ken MacQuarrie in any of the print.**
 12 Q. Let us just look at Mr Jordan's email.
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. This is bundle 14, page 133:
 15 "I confess to being astonished by [your] concept of
 16 confidentiality. To me it means telling no one. To you
 17 it seems to mean telling almost no one. Presumably the
 18 almost no one seems to be busy briefing the entire
 19 national press on a daily basis. That would explain how
 20 entirely confidential conversations with Ken MacQuarrie
 21 also came to find their way into the national print. It
 22 is difficult to believe that none of this has occurred
 23 without your sanction, particularly as some of the words
 24 used in the report, as you acknowledge, bear an uncanny
 25 resemblance to words I have heard you use."
 Page 47

1 You then refer to Private Eye.
 2 **A. Um-hm.**
 3 Q. Then you say:
 4 "The quote, I accept, sounds exactly like what
 5 I said to you."
 6 That is Private Eye:
 7 "I have not seen any of my conversations with
 8 Ken MacQuarrie in the papers."
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. "Although I was interviewed by him on Tuesday at
 11 2 o'clock, I kept it to myself. We didn't even reveal
 12 the fact that we'd met, so much so that George told
 13 Nick Higham at the press conference the following Friday
 14 that we had not been interviewed by MacQuarrie yet.
 15 There was no intended breach of trust."
 16 So you say that when you sent that email you had not
 17 seen the piece in The Guardian and didn't know what
 18 Mr Jordan was talking about?
 19 **A. No, I didn't. But looking at it, looking at that, it is**
 20 **a very badly informed piece. It doesn't look like he**
 21 **has talked to either of us to me.**
 22 MR POLLARD: It could be said that he had, but he just
 23 talked to you a couple of days earlier and he then
 24 assumed that --
 25 **A. So he has talked to somebody on the Monday, and then he**
 Page 48

1 has deliberately waited until the Wednesday to write the
 2 piece. Surely he would have written the piece on the
 3 Monday. There was an absolute frantic mayhem here going
 4 on, everybody was trying to get stories before each
 5 other. It doesn't make sense. That sounds like
 6 a second or third-hand story that has gradually got out.
 7 MR MACLEAN: Can you think, Mr Jones, of who the two BBC
 8 sources close to the investigation referred to at
 9 page 291 might be [REDACTED]
 10 **A. For a start, we know how journalists operate in**
 11 **situations like this.**
 12 Q. How is that?
 13 **A. They try and blur sources in every possible way.**
 14 Q. What, they don't tell the truth, you mean?
 15 **A. They blur sources. He has been told stuff he has put**
 16 **out that's wrong, actually.**
 17 Q. Do you blur sources, Mr Jones? Did you blur sources to
 18 Peter Rippon about how many women had spoken to the
 19 police, for example?
 20 **A. No, because why would I do that?**
 21 Q. Well, Mr Rippon got the clear impression from you that
 22 all the women had spoken to the police.
 23 **A. No, he didn't get that impression at all. Later on he**
 24 **claimed he had, repeatedly we told him the opposite.**
 25 Q. If you had blurred sources that might explain why he had
 Page 49

1 got that impression, might it not?
 2 **A. No. He has actually got an email from me in February**
 3 **where I spell it out, you know, in -- you know in**
 4 **detail, word by word.**
 5 Q. So your explanation -- back to The Guardian -- for this
 6 is that you can't think of two BBC sources other than
 7 [REDACTED] is that right?
 8 **A. I can think of hundreds. No, Dan Sabbagh would have**
 9 **hundreds of sources in the BBC.**
 10 Q. Yes, but who would be saying this? Who would know what
 11 evidence had been collected at the time of filming? The
 12 only people who knew were you --
 13 **A. No, no, for a start, the whole of Panorama knew that at**
 14 **that time. I'm not saying it's from them at all. Loads**
 15 **of people knew that. By that stage, a lot of people**
 16 **know that we have -- that we have, um -- that we had**
 17 **evidence unknown to the police at the time of filming.**
 18 **In fact, the whole of Newsnight had known that from the**
 19 **start, pretty much.**
 20 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask --
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 MR POLLARD: -- it can could go on a long time, is it your
 23 position that at no stage from, say, the end of the
 24 Newsnight investigation on 9 December last year, all the
 25 way through late December/January/February and onwards
 Page 50

1 to October this year, that at no stage either directly
 2 or indirectly did you steer a story to the press?
 3 **A. No. That's not my position.**
 4 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 5 **A. My position is very, very clear. It's that, in**
 6 **particular, I did not speak to Miles Goslett at any**
 7 **stage until he wrote that [REDACTED] piece. I did not talk**
 8 **to --**
 9 MR POLLARD: Which piece are you talking about?
 10 **A. The one on 21 October.**
 11 MR MACLEAN: The one about your aunt?
 12 **A. Yes, yes.**
 13 Q. Yes.
 14 **A. I had never spoken to the man. I didn't talk to any --**
 15 MR POLLARD: Sorry, just before you tell me what you didn't
 16 do, I think you were suggesting that the answer to the
 17 question is that you did.
 18 **A. Yes. Yes.**
 19 MR POLLARD: Tell us those occasions.
 20 **A. No, no. I mean that's my -- well, with respect, I think**
 21 **you need to hear it in this context --**
 22 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 23 **A. -- because it then becomes clear because it develops.**
 24 **What happens is I didn't talk to any of these media**
 25 **journalists before the Exposure stuff sort of broke over**
 Page 51

1 **whatever it was, the 29th/30th/1st --**
 2 MR POLLARD: Sorry to interrupt, I hope this is not breaking
 3 up the flow. For instance, with the first Miles Goslett
 4 enquiry, which I think was 21 December --
 5 **A. Apparently so.**
 6 MR POLLARD: -- 2011, twelve days after the story had been
 7 dropped, no dispute, I think, that you and Liz MacKean
 8 were very cross about that --
 9 **A. Yes, absolutely true.**
 10 MR POLLARD: -- and he approached the BBC then with the
 11 bones of a story which was, you would have to say --
 12 **A. Yes, I think so.**
 13 MR POLLARD: -- extremely well informed.
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 MR POLLARD: Are you saying that that had absolutely nothing
 16 to do with you or, as far as you know, with Liz MacKean
 17 either? It seems a hell of a coincidence otherwise.
 18 **A. Essentially, I can only speak for myself at the end of**
 19 **the day and say, categorically, it had nothing to do**
 20 **with me and I note -- and it is probably worth throwing**
 21 **this in here -- there is an email from Liz Gibbons on**
 22 **1 January to the press office and Peter Rippon. I mean,**
 23 **do you know the one I mean?**
 24 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 25 MR MACLEAN: Go on.
 Page 52

1 A. Essentially, it says that she has been told by somebody
 2 on Newsnight that The Times are going to run the story
 3 and she says they say the source [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED] She says, "I bet I know
 5 who that was". It's plain that she thinks it's
 6 [REDACTED] or whoever has told her thinks
 7 it's [REDACTED] who is the source of that.
 8 I'm not saying that [REDACTED] is, but I'm saying that puts
 9 somebody else as another possibility in there.
 10 But, you know, I have it thought about this and what
 11 can I do? It is very difficult to prove a negative.
 12 I'm not prepared to hand over all my phone records, but
 13 if the Inquiry wants to nominate somebody, not BBC, to
 14 go through and look for Miles Goslett's number or
 15 anything like that, I am perfectly happy to do that.
 16 I'm happy to do that with my home number as well.
 17 Because, you know, I did not talk to -- speak to him at
 18 any stage until after the Exposure thing.
 19 MR POLLARD: Okay. I interrupted what you were going so
 20 say.
 21 A. So what I was going to say is -- and I didn't talk to
 22 any media journalists. Obviously I will have talked to
 23 journalists about other things, and so on, over that
 24 time, mainly investigative journalists who I have worked
 25 with on various papers, and so on, et cetera. Until --
 Page 53

1 I start getting called by them on the week -- as I say,
 2 on the week of the 1st.
 3 MR POLLARD: Of?
 4 A. October, this year.
 5 MR POLLARD: Right. So your position is nothing that
 6 appeared in the press of any sort before 1 October is
 7 anything to do with you.
 8 A. Absolutely, 100 per cent.
 9 MR POLLARD: Okay, and you are obviously close friends with
 10 Mark Williams-Thomas --
 11 A. Well, friends, yes, definitely.
 12 MR POLLARD: It was clear, at some stage during the first
 13 part of 2012, that he was working on an ITV documentary.
 14 A. Yes. I didn't know ITV but -- I didn't know who it
 15 would be for, but yes --
 16 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 17 A. -- somebody non-BBC.
 18 MR POLLARD [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 A. [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]
 Page 54

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]
 5 MR POLLARD: Yes. I think you were going to mention from
 6 1 October --
 7 A. I was going to say from 1 October -- I think I said last
 8 time, about lunchtime on 1 October somebody handed out
 9 my number to loads of journalists who I had never heard
 10 of and I got bombarded with calls from people. Um, and,
 11 for that first week I didn't really cooperate with
 12 those, and my attitude changed -- you know, after
 13 I couldn't -- with the BBC constantly putting out a line
 14 which was false, eventually I got point that I was
 15 saying to people, "No, that's not true". I still
 16 didn't -- I still didn't leak emails or anything like
 17 that at any time --
 18 MR MACLEAN: Are you sure about that?
 19 A. Absolutely 100 per cent sure, yes.
 20 Q. 100 per cent sure?
 21 A. Yes, 100 per cent sure. Then it developed further.
 22 Once it got to the week where I was smeared I then felt
 23 that I had to talk to journalists at that point. I had
 24 to know what they had, what they were going to write
 25 about me so there was another change from the -- the
 Page 55

1 weekend of the 20th/21st.
 2 MR POLLARD: That was when you identified the smearing by
 3 the --
 4 A. Yes.
 5 MR MACLEAN: So after that it was open season, so far as you
 6 were concerned?
 7 A. No, not open season, but, whereas previously if somebody
 8 had rung me I would not ring them back, it was only if
 9 they called me or whatever that I would talk to people,
 10 I would then ring them back because I had made the
 11 mistake of not ringing back the Sunday Times on the
 12 Saturday night and, had I rung them back, I think
 13 I could have done something about that.
 14 Q. You had some contact with Mr Webster at The Times,
 15 didn't you?
 16 A. I'm not going to into exactly who I talked to and when,
 17 sorry. I've given you what I think is a helpful general
 18 picture of who have I talked to, et cetera.
 19 Q. You had some contact with Mr Webster at The Times,
 20 didn't you?
 21 A. I may have done.
 22 Q. Did you have some contact with Mr Webster at The Times?
 23 A. My answer to that is: I may have done.
 24 Q. That's not a very satisfactory answer, Mr Jones.
 25 A. Okay, but it's the answer you are going to get.
 Page 56

<p>1 Q. You provided Mr Webster with confidential BBC emails, 2 didn't you?</p> <p>3 A. Now, that I can give you a very satisfactory answer to, 4 which is: I categorically did not.</p> <p>5 Q. Let me show you bundle 14, page 258. It should be one 6 of the ones which is open. Mr Webster was one of those 7 who was sending a large number of enquiries and queries 8 to the press office in this period in October, wasn't 9 he?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I imagine that's true, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. He was, shall we say, tenacious in his pursuit of 12 answers to his questions.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. In particular, he was trying to get some questions put 15 under Mr Rippon's nose and wanted some answers. So if 16 you look at page 259, bundle 14:</p> <p>17 "I have seen an email from Helen Deller to 18 Peter Rippon and others dated 7 December which cast 19 doubt on the BBC's stated reason for cancelling the 20 Newsnight report. The email says Newsnight had been 21 focusing on allegations of abuse and not, as 22 subsequently claimed by the BBC, on an alleged failure 23 by police to investigate Savile properly. The email 24 appears to contradict the explanation given by senior 25 figures at the BBC, including David Jordan, for the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 vital that this chain did not get out.</p> <p>2 Q. Was it really? Wasn't it absolutely vital to those 3 pursuing a campaign against Peter Rippon's view that it 4 did get out, because it was grist to their mill?</p> <p>5 A. No. I was concerned, I looked then at it and I found 6 that that email was not there, and I looked back and saw 7 that that email was between me and Peter and nobody else 8 was copied into that email about reputation. Um, no, 9 I was surprised and alarmed, alarmed by that and, 10 categorically I did not give any emails to Ben Webster 11 or anyone from The Times or anyone else.</p> <p>12 Q. You are absolutely clear about that?</p> <p>13 A. The only people who got emails from me were Panorama, 14 categorically -- oh, and Litigation. Panorama and 15 Litigation.</p> <p>16 Q. And yourself, of course, when you sent a bunch of emails 17 to your home email address, you remember: 18 "amazing.meirion@" whatever it was?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. The reason you sent those emails was so that you could 21 then safely provide them to other journalists?</p> <p>22 A. No, it was in case emails conveniently disappeared from 23 the BBC system. You have seen yourselves how some 24 things get redacted. I was concerned they might do. To 25 add to my offer from before, I'm absolutely happy for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 cancellation of the Newsnight report."</p> <p>2 He gets a brush off from Paddy Feeney, essentially, 3 saying "We will pick this up", he may be playing for 4 time, I don't know. Then at 258 he says:</p> <p>5 "Is Rippon uncontactable too? To help you here is 6 the email."</p> <p>7 Then he sets out the full email that somebody has 8 served up to him from Helen Deller to you and 9 Peter Rippon, copied to Karen Rosine, Liz Gibbons and 10 Liz MacKean, which is headed "Confidential".</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. My suggestion is that that confidence was broken by you.</p> <p>13 A. It is a perfectly reasonable question and it is 14 a perfectly reasonable suspicion to have, but 15 categorically that -- I did not do that. I was 16 concerned, very concerned, when I saw the paper. 17 Extremely concerned about --</p> <p>18 Q. Saw what paper?</p> <p>19 A. The Times, the next day.</p> <p>20 Q. Concerned because?</p> <p>21 A. Because that was part of an email chain which ends up 22 with the -- I think it's the -- hang on, let me just 23 check which email it is. Yes, it is part of the email 24 chain which ends up with my warning to Peter saying, er, 25 "serious damage to the reputation of the BBC". It was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 someone to go through my home account, "amazing.meirion" 2 in the same way, on the same basis, that -- the record 3 not being given to anybody but to go through and see 4 whether any of those emails were forwarded to anyone in 5 the press, very happy to do that.</p> <p>6 Q. Did you know that Mr Rippon had got a message over the 7 weekend of 20/21 October from newspapers with 8 an allegation -- let me see which journalists, the 9 Sunday Times journalists, I think it is -- an allegation 10 that he had dropped the story because:</p> <p>11 "I felt the girls were not that young at the time 12 anyway."</p> <p>13 A. No, I don't know about this story at all.</p> <p>14 Q. You remember that that was something which Ms MacKean 15 had suggested in her email to Mr Hughes --</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. -- do you remember?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. No, no, no, and which she had then also reported 19 to me --</p> <p>20 Q. But she had forwarded you the email.</p> <p>21 A. -- but it was not something that I was part of.</p> <p>22 Q. Just to get the chronology right, I will show you the 23 email if you like, bundle 4, page 19.</p> <p>24 A. Yes. It's the one which says -- yes, I know the one you 25 mean.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1 Q. You know the one?
 2 **A. Yeah, no, I do, yes.**
 3 Q. So she sends her friend Mr Hughes an email --
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. -- saying:
 6 "When we rebut his points, he resorts to saying:
 7 well, it was forty years ago ... the girls were
 8 teenagers, not too young ... they weren't the worst kind
 9 of sexual offences etc."
 10 I think we touched on this last time.
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. She forwarded that to you on 8 October this year, didn't
 13 she --
 14 **A. I think so, yes.**
 15 Q. -- and she had not forwarded it to you until 8 October
 16 this year?
 17 **A. Yes.**
 18 Q. Then coincidentally 12 days later Mr Rippon gets
 19 a voicemail message from a Sunday Times journalist
 20 making precisely this point, and the obvious inference
 21 is that you had furnished him with that information,
 22 isn't it?
 23 **A. It's not the most obvious, is it?**
 24 Q. It seems pretty obvious?
 25 **A. It's not the most obvious inference, is it?**

Page 61

1 Q. But that is in fact what happened, isn't it?
 2 **A. No, it isn't. It is absolutely categorically not what**
 3 **happened.**
 4 Q. It happened because by this time certainly --
 5 **A. Let me challenge something. You are saying "it happened**
 6 **because", it didn't happen. No emails went from me to**
 7 **anyone in the press at any stage, categorically. As**
 8 **I say, I'm quite happy for somebody to look at my home**
 9 **email account, my work account. I'm absolutely happy**
 10 **for people to do that on that basis.**
 11 Q. Let us look at one email that definitely did go from
 12 you --
 13 **A. A leaked email, to somebody?**
 14 Q. Let me finish, Mr Jones. Just keep calm. Let me show
 15 you one email that we did look at last time --
 16 **A. Right.**
 17 Q. -- which is your email to Mary Wilkinson, do you
 18 remember?
 19 **A. Yes, absolutely, yes.**
 20 Q. I think that is bundle 4, page 44, if I remember
 21 correctly. Now, we looked at this last time, didn't we?
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 Q. Do you accept that an allegation that BBC News pulls
 24 a piece of investigative journalism in order to protect
 25 the audience for a Christmas Special is a particularly

Page 62

1 toxic allegation to level against BBC News?
 2 **A. Yes, if I was making it outside, it would be, yes, but**
 3 **this is an email to somebody I know within the BBC who**
 4 **I think might be in a position to have some influence.**
 5 Q. Let me just pick you up on that. It doesn't matter
 6 whether it's made inside or outside. I'm not asking you
 7 who you make the allegation to, I'm suggesting to you
 8 that levelling an allegation that a piece of
 9 investigative journalism is pulled in order to protect
 10 the audience for a Christmas Special is a particularly
 11 toxic allegation to make against BBC News.
 12 **A. That's not what it says though, is it?**
 13 Q. Never mind what it says. Just listen to the question.
 14 We will get on a little quicker --
 15 **A. The question you are asking is "pulled". It doesn't say**
 16 **"pulled", does it?**
 17 Q. Let me ask my question and then we will come to the
 18 email.
 19 **A. Okay.**
 20 Q. Do you accept or do you not accept that an allegation
 21 that a BBC piece of investigative journalism is pulled
 22 or not run or not proceeded with in order to protect the
 23 audience for a Christmas Special is a particularly toxic
 24 allegation to level against BBC News. Do you accept
 25 that or not?

Page 63

1 **A. I accept it, but nobody has ever said that.**
 2 Q. So do you accept that any such allegation should only be
 3 made on the basis of proper evidence?
 4 **A. No, you -- I mean you -- these are informal emails you**
 5 **are sending amongst people that you talking about. You**
 6 **are talking about what you perceive to be the situation.**
 7 **I mean -- no, it's a different situation. Going back to**
 8 **this --**
 9 MR POLLARD: How is that email different from what
 10 Mr Maclean put to you?
 11 **A. If you read it, it says:**
 12 **"Meanwhile I'm dealing with a BBC that doesn't want**
 13 **to put out a piece about Jimmy Savile."**
 14 **There is nothing in there about it being pulled.**
 15 **There is absolutely nothing in there about it being**
 16 **pulled. It hasn't been pulled at that stage, it is**
 17 **pulled on the 9th.**
 18 MR MACLEAN: You told us last time we had a long discussion
 19 about how dead the story was on the 30th, how dead it
 20 was at various times.
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 Q. You were pretty certain that this story was being
 23 resisted by the BBC.
 24 **A. Yes, absolutely.**
 25 Q. You are saying in this email in terms that the BBC

Page 64

1 doesn't want to put out a piece --
 2 **A. Exactly, exactly right.**
 3 Q. -- and we might add in parentheses "and did not put out
 4 the piece", close brackets --
 5 **A. I couldn't say that at that stage, could I?**
 6 Q. -- about Jimmy Savile being investigated because it
 7 might damage the audience for the Jim'll Fix It
 8 Christmas Special.
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. All I'm trying to do at the moment is to get you to
 11 agree or disagree, and if you do disagree to explain
 12 why. That is a particularly toxic allegation.
 13 **A. I don't think that is not toxic thing to put out there.**
 14 **What you said might be, but that isn't, clearly.**
 15 Q. The difference is what?
 16 **A. I'm saying, to somebody who was a special adviser to the**
 17 **Director General, she isn't at this particular time, but**
 18 **she has been very recently, she knows people in places,**
 19 **I'm saying the BBC doesn't want to put out this piece**
 20 **about investigating sexual offences against 13, 14 and**
 21 **15 years old because it might damage an audience for the**
 22 **Jim'll Fix It Christmas Special.**
 23 Q. Has Mr Lomax ever been a special adviser to the Director
 24 General?
 25 **A. No, absolutely not.**

Page 65

1 Q. What was his position last year?
 2 **A. He was an ex-BBC employee.**
 3 Q. So the email to him was not inside, was it?
 4 **A. No, it wasn't, I thought of it as inside, but it wasn't,**
 5 **it was outside because --**
 6 Q. You thought of it as inside?
 7 **A. Yes, because he had never walked for anyone else, you**
 8 **know, you think of him very much as BBC family.**
 9 Q. That was a family email was it? The one to Mr Lomax?
 10 **A. No, it was to a friend, actually, but as I explained**
 11 **yesterday it was very much somebody who was a sort of**
 12 **mentor to me when I was on the programme.**
 13 Q. Do you accept, Mr Jones, that making allegations,
 14 whether to Mr Lomax or to Mary Wilkinson or to anybody
 15 else was the height of irresponsibility?
 16 **A. No.**
 17 Q. Why not? What was the basis for saying that they didn't
 18 want to put out the piece because it might damage the
 19 audience --
 20 **A. As --**
 21 Q. Hold on. At this stage, you had only spoken up the
 22 chain, as we established at the beginning of this
 23 discussion, to Peter Rippon, hadn't you?
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. Peter Rippon had never suggested to you -- he had never

Page 66

1 even used the word "bosses", had we? We established
 2 that last time.
 3 **A. He had suggested to me he didn't use the words "bosses".**
 4 **Remember, he said I won't go to the wall for this one.**
 5 **You know, he'd done -- he'd distanced himself from the**
 6 **whole thing.**
 7 Q. You had absolutely no basis for what is written in this
 8 email to Mary Wilkinson, did you?
 9 **A. Well, I think I had good basis for doing that.**
 10 Q. You explain what the basis was and where you got it
 11 from.
 12 **A. My perception of what was happening was exactly what is**
 13 **reflected in the email from Peter to Steve on the 9th.**
 14 **You know, I persuaded Meirion to agree to stop pursuing**
 15 **this story, that we were being told to stop pursuing the**
 16 **story, and that that was going up the chain.**
 17 Q. Focus on the words that you wrote, Mr Jones, please --
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. -- rather than answering the question you wished I would
 20 ask you.
 21 This email talks about:
 22 "The BBC doesn't want to put out a piece about
 23 Jimmy Savile being investigated by police about sexual
 24 offences against 13, 14 and 15-year olds, including
 25 interviews with victims, because it might damage the

Page 67

1 audience for the Jim'll Fix It Christmas Special."
 2 Full stop. You had no basis for that at all, did
 3 you?
 4 **A. No, I -- I think you have to look at the whole thing in**
 5 **the context there. You don't get stories like that that**
 6 **go on careering on towards broadcast and they are**
 7 **suddenly turned around like that. That doesn't happen.**
 8 **There was no journalistic reason to stop that programme.**
 9 **I had every reason to think that there were**
 10 **non-journalistic reasons for that programme being**
 11 **pulled.**
 12 Q. The reason to think it was?
 13 **A. Well, for a start, that no journalistic reason was given**
 14 **for not going ahead with it. No attempt was made to**
 15 **examine the evidence. You know, if somebody says to**
 16 **me -- well, if Peter -- if Peter thought that the**
 17 **evidence was not strong enough, then we were -- and when**
 18 **we said "Look at this the evidence", he would have**
 19 **looked at the evidence and said "It isn't good enough**
 20 **for these reasons". He didn't look at the evidence.**
 21 Q. The journalistic reason was that the key part of the
 22 story, which was going to stand it up or not stand it
 23 up, namely whether the CPS had not proceeded with the
 24 investigation because Jimmy Savile was old and infirm,
 25 that chicken could not be brought home to roost.

Page 68

<p>1 A. That was a new barrier that was brought home on the 2 morning of the 30th. That had never been a barrier 3 before. It wasn't on the 25th when it was go for 4 transmission. It wasn't when it was put up it the 5 board. It wasn't when the budget was given to us. It 6 wasn't when the rest of the BBC said "We are howling for 7 this story". That was never a problem. 8 Q. We will have a break, I think, in a minute or two, but 9 just let me show you, you wrote to Mr Rippon on 10 1 October of this year -- the reference is bundle 7, 11 page 10 -- 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. -- at 10.45 in the morning. This was a day before you 14 produced a briefing note, then it is the day before the 15 blog was produced: 16 "Peter, I'm happy to accept the line that the 17 Newnight Savile paedophile investigation was dropped 18 for editorial reasons, even if I strong strongly 19 disagreed with that decision as I made clear." 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Is that sentence true or false? 22 A. That is true. 23 Q. Have you always been happy to accept that the line that 24 the Newnight Savile paedophile investigation was 25 dropped for editorial reasons?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 you to make those calls and decide which stories should 2 be prioritised." 3 Q. That last sentence is irreconcilable, isn't it, with 4 your email to Mary Wilkinson and the one to David Lomax? 5 A. With one? Do you want to go through them one by one, 6 because I don't see how that is irreconcilable? 7 Q. You say you don't know what happened to change his mind. 8 You accepted it was dropped for editorial reasons, 9 whereas you tell Mary Wilkinson, without any -- 10 A. I don't know what happened to change his mind. 11 Q. You tell Mary Wilkinson, without any qualification, that 12 you were dealing with a BBC which didn't want to put out 13 a piece because it might damage the audience for the 14 Jim'll Fix It Christmas Special. 15 A. Yes, but I don't know what had happened to change his 16 mind. I know it wasn't for journalistic reasons. 17 I don't know what has happened to change his mind. 18 I believe it was because he was pressured. 19 MR POLLARD: Is it fair to say that -- the inference of the 20 Mary Wilkinson and -- 21 A. Yes. 22 MR POLLARD: -- the Lomax interviews are absolutely clear, 23 that you believe very strongly the story was dropped to 24 protect the Christmas programmes. 25 A. Yes, absolutely.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 A. As I explained to you last time, editorial reasons just 2 means that the editor thinks so. If the editor thinks 3 runs around the table, that's -- he's done that for 4 editorial reasons. That's why I use the phrase 5 "journalistic" to distinguish from that. There is a big 6 difference, an editorial reason, at the end of day, just 7 means that the editor wants to do it and at the end of 8 the day, he's my editor, he can do whatever he likes. 9 Q. So you didn't draw that distinction between editorial 10 and journalistic to Mr Rippon, did you? 11 A. I go on to, in effect. 12 Q. Do you? 13 A. Yes: 14 "You made the decision that we had enough to TX once 15 we had confirmation that the police had investigated 16 him, on top of victim interviews, which we had already 17 done. Excellent, pull together TX. For whatever reason 18 you changed your mind the next day and insisted it was 19 only a story that Jimmy Savile was a paedophile if we 20 could show that the CPS had let him off because he was 21 an old, sick man. 22 "I don't know what happened to change your mind. 23 I thought that was a bizarre discussion but I accepted 24 that you decided to drop the story for editorial reasons 25 because, ultimately, you are the editor and it is up to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 MR POLLARD: Is it right to say that that was an assumption 2 and that you don't have any evidence of that? 3 A. I have no evidence of what happened above. 4 MR POLLARD: Yes. 5 A. I have evidence of what happened at my level happened 6 for no journalistic reason. 7 MR POLLARD: It is evidence by absence, if you like. It 8 assumption by evidence, I'm not trying to -- 9 A. No, no. 10 MR POLLARD: -- your view is that there is no and could be 11 no logical editorial reason that would justify the 12 dropping of the story in those circumstances, therefore 13 it must have been something else and that is the most 14 likely reason. 15 A. Yes, because no -- no reason -- no journalistic reason 16 was given for not running it. You know, what happens is 17 on the 25th is "Excellent, go for transmission". That 18 night the BBC starts running its campaign for Christmas, 19 which is, um, everyone, including Shane Richie, giving 20 out the sweets while they are sing "Consider yourself 21 one of the family". Huge family Christmas is launched 22 other that weekend. 23 On the 29th, the BBC finalises its Christmas 24 schedule and gives it out to the press, which has all 25 the tributes in it. I think on the 29th -- and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

1 I thought so at the time -- that somebody becomes aware
 2 that the two things are irreconcilable. I don't know
 3 who that is, but the impression I'm getting from my
 4 arguments with Peter is that he's being told by people
 5 above him in the chain, I am assuming Steve and Helen
 6 but I don't really know, that the two are
 7 irreconcilable.
 8 MR POLLARD: But he never invokes, does he, the issue of
 9 Christmas Specials in any of those conversations?
 10 A. No, we invoke it with him all the time, though. As you
 11 know, I refer to it in that red flag memo, which is
 12 a record of some of the things I'm saying. I'm saying
 13 to him and Liz is saying to him, "This is because of the
 14 Christmas Specials, this is because it is going to be
 15 embarrassing. You know, we have to pull those specials.
 16 With what we've got on him, we have to pull those, we
 17 can't run that stuff".
 18 MR MACLEAN: When did you say that?
 19 A. During those discussions that go on from the 30th
 20 through -- right the way through. As I said the red
 21 flag, I think, is written on the 30th or 1st. I think
 22 it is the 1st. You will see that is in there in that
 23 memo. Obviously it doesn't go to anyone but it is
 24 a record of what I'm thinking at that time.
 25 Q. I'm going to take you back to the red flag email.

Page 73

1 MR POLLARD: We will take a little pause --
 2 MR MACLEAN: One second.
 3 You didn't suggest to Mr Rippon, did you, that there
 4 is a distinction between editorial reasons and
 5 non-journalistic reasons?
 6 A. When?
 7 Q. Well, at all.
 8 A. Sorry, so when are you talking about?
 9 Q. He told us that you didn't complain to him at any stage
 10 about non-journalistic reasons for pulling the story.
 11 A. No, absolutely. We -- Liz and myself constantly said
 12 this is not being done for journalistic reasons -- on
 13 journalistic grounds.
 14 Q. You see, we asked him --
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. -- I said:
 17 "You might not have seen this, I don't know, but
 18 just look at that very short email from Meirion Jones on
 19 5 Jan. Mr Jones, it would seem, is pretty steamed up
 20 about what he considers to be the non-journalistic
 21 reasons ..."
 22 A. Is that the Bridget Osborne?
 23 Q. That's right, exactly:
 24 "Mr Jones it would seem is pretty steamed up over
 25 what he considers to be the non-journalistic reasons for

Page 74

1 [the expression you used in this email] why the story
 2 didn't appear."
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. "Was he suggesting to you in these weeks after the final
 5 decision not to run this story that there were
 6 non-journalistic reasons?
 7 "Answer: No. He never suggested that to me at all
 8 and I think as we -- the point we got to in the last
 9 session we had [ie us] was that the final meeting I had
 10 with him I think on 9 December when the CPS letter came
 11 through he sat down in my office and said quite firmly
 12 to me that he accepted my decision and he accepted it
 13 was for editorial reasons."
 14 A. Right, well --
 15 Q. That is Mr Rippon's account.
 16 A. Okay. Certainly at many of those meetings we had said
 17 to him "This is not being done on journalistic grounds.
 18 You're not looking at the evidence, you're not doing
 19 that ..." We had said that again and again to him.
 20 Q. Let's focus on what Mr Rippon says --
 21 A. Well, the question you ask him gives him a big get-out
 22 anyhow, doesn't it?
 23 Q. Never mind the question --
 24 A. Because the question says "did he talk to you after the
 25 process about that" and I didn't talk to him after the

Page 75

1 process.
 2 Q. Never mind my question --
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. What he said was:
 5 "I think on 9 December when the CPS letter came
 6 through he sat down in my office and said quite firmly
 7 to me that he accepted my decision and he accepted it
 8 was for editorial reasons."
 9 Now did that happen or not?
 10 A. What I would have said to him and I am sure I did say to
 11 him --
 12 Q. Right.
 13 A. -- is, you know, because as I say by that point I had
 14 come to the conclusion I had to either walk or accept it
 15 and I said "Okay, I'm accepting your decision as editor.
 16 You have made an editorial decision. I'm going to have
 17 to accept that decision."
 18 Q. But you didn't --
 19 A. So that's not -- that is pretty close to what he's
 20 saying.
 21 Q. But you didn't in fact accept that decision at all, did
 22 you?
 23 A. I accepted that he had made an editorial decision and
 24 that we would not be able to progress that story.
 25 Q. You didn't --

Page 76

1 **A. I had agreed not to pursue.**
 2 Q. You had agreed not to pursue the story, so you then
 3 started emailing people inside and outside the BBC --
 4 **A. No, most of those emails are before that, aren't they?**
 5 Q. The one to Bridget Osborne is after, isn't it?
 6 **A. That's after. She is someone who already knows from**
 7 **Hannah exactly what has happened. I'm just saying to**
 8 **her, just confirming to her, that it was not Hannah's**
 9 **fault. It was not that Hannah didn't do a good job, she**
 10 **did do a good job. But Bridget already knows exactly**
 11 **what has happened from her.**
 12 Q. You see you told Mr Rippon on 9 December you accepted
 13 his decision and accepted it was for editorial reasons,
 14 but in fact as a matter of substance you didn't --
 15 **A. No, that is slightly -- that is subtly different but**
 16 **it's not that different from what I would have said to**
 17 **him, which is that, you know, I accepted his editorial**
 18 **decision to do it.**
 19 MR MACLEAN: Thank you, we will have a break.
 20 MR POLLARD: Ten minutes break, thanks.
 21 (11.32 am)
 22 (A short break)
 23 (11.45 am)
 24 MR MACLEAN: Mr Jones, Mr Jordan told us in his evidence
 25 that -- let me just give you a quote from what he said:
 Page 77

1 "In investigations the editor decides what the
 2 investigation is going to be about. If he wants to
 3 pursue a particular angle, if he wants it to be about
 4 this rather than about that, then he or she has the
 5 final say in the matter."
 6 Do you agree with that?
 7 **A. Ultimately that's the case. That's what I said,**
 8 **ultimately you walk away or you accept it.**
 9 Q. So ultimately it is the responsibility of the editor, to
 10 use a verb that somebody used to us at one point, to
 11 nose or re-nose the story and decide what the nose is
 12 going to be?
 13 **A. Ultimately, they could do that, yes.**
 14 Q. That's all that happened here, isn't it? That the story
 15 at the end of -- or as November went on, was re-nosed to
 16 focus -- it hadn't initially been the focus, but to
 17 focus on the CPS reasons for not pursuing Jimmy Savile.
 18 And when that focus didn't come to fruition, that was
 19 the end of the story and that was done for perfectly
 20 sensible journalistic or editorial reasons that you
 21 might disagree with, but nonetheless perfectly sensible
 22 reasons?
 23 **A. I have never come across a situation where an editor**
 24 **describes a story as excellent, where the rest of the**
 25 **BBC gears up to make it the main story, and then the**
 Page 78

1 editor says "That's not a strong enough story", and
 2 suggests something totally different, really. I have
 3 never come across that, ever.
 4 MR POLLARD: I'm sorry, I was just going to jump in. This
 5 is obviously an important issue for us because it goes
 6 right to the heart of why the story was dropped.
 7 I just wanted your comment on one thing. We have
 8 looked, as you would imagine, exhaustively at all the
 9 emails that changed hands and the documents that were
 10 written and the sort of reports and notes and so on.
 11 I know it is your view that effectively that what if you
 12 like we'll call the second half the police angle, the
 13 fact of the old and infirm line and the potential letter
 14 was never that important.
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 MR POLLARD: But do you accept that it was referred to
 17 frequently through --
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 MR POLLARD: -- many of the emails?
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 MR POLLARD: And in particular that Peter Rippon did
 22 consistently express an interest in that line and chase
 23 it up and "what's the progress on that?"
 24 The implication being that I think your suggestion
 25 that it was suddenly plucked from the air as a barrier
 Page 79

1 to the story right at the last minute is a little
 2 unfair, isn't it?
 3 **A. No, it wasn't plucked from the air. I will totally give**
 4 **you that, and throughout I have made clear in my**
 5 **submission and so on the points at which that has come**
 6 **on and so on et cetera.**
 7 **As a barrier, yes, that was new. That was**
 8 **completely new that that would be a barrier to putting**
 9 **the story out.**
 10 MR POLLARD: But isn't it his right to decide that that's
 11 a barrier? Or that that is an important part of the
 12 story that needs to be stood up before the whole story
 13 gets stood up?
 14 **A. He was already at a stage where he had the best story**
 15 **that he had got in the time that he had been editor of**
 16 **Newsnight. He is -- on the morning of 30th, he's**
 17 **looking forward to lunch at the end of the week with two**
 18 **of the favourites to become Director General and he has**
 19 **a choice of going ahead with a great story**
 20 **[REDACTED]**
 21 **[REDACTED]**
 22 **[REDACTED] or of finding a reason**
 23 **not to. And I think -- I -- obviously I don't know when**
 24 **he met Helen Boaden and what was said, but judging what**
 25 **we are told was said by George, this barrier of him**
 Page 80

1 being alive was raised and I think that was -- it being
 2 treated as if he was alive -- and I think that has an
 3 influence on him.
 4 I think there is an email when it comes back round
 5 this time from him to Helen which is very interesting on
 6 that, if I can find it.
 7 MR MACLEAN: Give us a date and we will find it for you.
 8 A. I'm just trying to find it here. Okay, it's 29 August
 9 this year, I think.
 10 Q. That will be in bundle 5.
 11 A. The one where he talks about influencing Chris Shaw and
 12 ITN?
 13 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 14 A. I know where it is on my file, but I don't know where it
 15 is on yours.
 16 MR MACLEAN: There are emails from Peter Rippon towards the
 17 back of this file.
 18 A. Actually, if I dig it out on my thing here, I can find
 19 it for you.
 20 Q. Do you know what time it is?
 21 A. If I pull it out from here, I can give you the exact
 22 number. It is called PRI/104. That's the start. It is
 23 headed "Anna Bolton-News" from Helen Deller, 29
 24 August --
 25 Q. The one you mentioned last time, isn't it?
 Page 81

1 A. I don't know whether I did.
 2 MR POLLARD: 357 would get us there, I think.
 3 A. 357 is right, exactly. Yes.
 4 MR MACLEAN: Yes, it's the one you mentioned last time
 5 because we compared notes, remember, and I had marked
 6 a slightly different part of this?
 7 A. No, no, that's a different one.
 8 Q. All right.
 9 A. That's the one about -- that was the one about her being
 10 a key witness.
 11 Q. All right. So what do you want to say about the 29th?
 12 A. Well, this is Peter to Helen Boaden:
 13 "I dropped it because we were unable to establish
 14 any institutional failures of any party so we were left
 15 with very old allegations that were more sexual
 16 harassment than assault made by women [presumably] whose
 17 evidence would have been undermined in a court because
 18 of their known character."
 19 That refers back to that test of him being alive.
 20 There was no court: he's dead. The question is do we
 21 believe them or not? You know, those people are dead.
 22 We have to believe that they are telling the truth, but
 23 if we believe that they are telling the truth, that's
 24 the test. There is no test about court. It doesn't
 25 matter whether they will be undermined in court because
 Page 82

1 they went to an approved school.
 2 Q. The point you are now is that if an insofar as
 3 Helen Boaden had said to Peter Rippon --
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. -- let's assume she said --
 6 A. It could be quite innocently.
 7 Q. Let's assume she said fairly firmly that you should
 8 apply the same standards as you would if Jimmy Savile
 9 was still alive?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Let's assume she said that for the moment?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. You disagree that that would be an appropriate
 14 threshold, is that right?
 15 A. Well, two things. One, that seems to have lodged in his
 16 mind, because here he is a year later putting that up as
 17 if that was a key test; and two, yes, it's not the key
 18 test when somebody is dead. You have to believe it is
 19 true, you don't want to put out tittle-tattle or
 20 whatever, and if you believe what they are saying is
 21 true then you no longer have to worry about libel.
 22 MR POLLARD: I understand that point. I think I would just
 23 say it is fair to say, though, isn't it, reading that --
 24 and in a way we're judging a lot of people's state of
 25 mind, including yours to be fair, by snapshots of what
 Page 83

1 they have written at a particular time --
 2 A. Yes.
 3 MR POLLARD: -- but you wrote a note, didn't you, where you
 4 expressed some doubt about some of the women quite early
 5 on because of their background, some of them having --
 6 A. It was an email to Mark Williams-Thomas.
 7 MR POLLARD: Some of them having a criminal record.
 8 A. -- where I said "These are the problems" and I gave
 9 a list of problems.
 10 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 11 A. And I think one you picked out was "manipulative" and
 12 I said just in my view only applied to [redacted] but some of
 13 the others applied to several of them, criminal
 14 backgrounds et cetera.
 15 MR POLLARD: Yes. I was just drawing a comparison between
 16 that note that you wrote and this.
 17 A. That's true, but all I'm saying is that it is
 18 interesting that it pops up as one of the criteria for
 19 dropping it.
 20 MR MACLEAN: I was just about to take you, Mr Jones, to your
 21 red flag memo.
 22 A. I'm sorry, yes.
 23 Q. If you keep that open and go to your red flag memo in
 24 bundle 3, because as Nick said says there is quite
 25 a striking similarity, one might think, between what
 Page 84

1 Mr Rippon says here -- go to page 268, please -- 268 is
 2 the cover page of your red flag email?
 3 **A. Right.**
 4 Q. Right? So there's the long title of the docx document?
 5 **A. Yes, it is just about the first sentence here --**
 6 Q. Exactly. Then if you go over the page to 269 that is
 7 the red flag email, right?
 8 **A. Yes.**
 9 Q. Just a couple of points. First of all, I think we
 10 touched on this last time, at page 270 --
 11 **A. 217?**
 12 Q. 270, yes, under the heading "BBC covered up paedo
 13 Sir Jimmy Savile to fix Xmas ratings."
 14 **A. Are you sure it is 217?**
 15 Q. 270.
 16 **A. Sorry, my fault.**
 17 Q. "Why do I think it will come out? One, victims. We
 18 know that the victims believe that the police and CPS
 19 covered up for Savile. All they know is that they were
 20 interviewed, told what happened and then a year later
 21 they were told that he was too old to press charges. We
 22 know that they risked libel suits by posting on Friends
 23 Reunited before he died."
 24 And so on. Then:
 25 "Seven of them have had long and detailed
 Page 85

1 conversations with us about how they were abused by
 2 Savile since his death. We interviewed one of them,
 3 [REDACTED] on camera, November 14th."
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 Q. So your email reads as though [REDACTED] was one of those who
 6 had been in contact with the police, doesn't it?
 7 I think we touched on that last time. Because you start
 8 the paragraph by "victims", in the plural, who
 9 believe -- and the inference is that they all believe --
 10 that the police and CPS covered up for Savile? Right?
 11 Just as a matter of English?
 12 **A. Let me just quickly check here before I -- over the page
 13 it says "when we rang the victims those who had talked
 14 to the police subsequently had been called by" --**
 15 Q. I'm coming to over the page.
 16 **A. All right.**
 17 Q. But do you accept that just as a matter of the language
 18 that the link between the word "victims" in the first
 19 line under heading "1" and then "one of them" further
 20 down, means that this document at page 270 at least
 21 reads as though [REDACTED] was one of those victims who
 22 believed that the police and CPS had covered up for
 23 Savile?
 24 **A. But you've got the next page gives you a different --
 25 different meaning to that --**
 Page 86

1 Q. Let's just take this page first of all.
 2 **A. Then you are taking it out of context, aren't you?**
 3 Q. I am just trying to look at how messages are put at
 4 different times. Because clearly Mr Rippon at some
 5 stage picked up the message -- or didn't, rather, pick
 6 up the message -- that [REDACTED] had not been to the
 7 police as clearly as he might.
 8 I completely accept that you sent the email to him
 9 in February and, believe me, I have that point well in
 10 mind.
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. I'm just looking at this document that you wrote and I'm
 13 simply suggesting to you that there is perhaps
 14 a slightly imprecision in the language at page 270?
 15 **A. Yes, total imprecision. As you know, this was just a
 16 first draft that went to nobody. I would have gone
 17 through it and made sense of it before sending it to
 18 anybody.**
 19 Q. Let's go over the page to 271?
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 Q. "When we rang the victims those who had talked to the
 22 police had subsequently been called by [REDACTED]"
 23 We discussed that last time?
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. You might say that that indicates that not all of the
 Page 87

1 victims had talked to the police.
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. I understand that. Then 3:
 4 "Other journalists. I can't be the only journalist
 5 with evidence of Savile's activities who was waiting for
 6 him to die because the victims were vulnerable and would
 7 not stand up well in a libel hearing."
 8 **A. Absolutely.**
 9 Q. That is the same point --
 10 **A. No.**
 11 Q. Hang on. That is the same or a very similar point to
 12 the point Mr Rippon is making in his email of 29 August.
 13 The only difference is that you don't accept that you
 14 don't accept that the test is the same when Savile is
 15 dead as it was when he was alive?
 16 **A. No, no. In 3, I'm saying these are people who would not
 17 stand up in a libel hearing; now he's dead, that's all
 18 changed. He's saying he's dead but he's still saying it
 19 would have been undermined in a court because of their
 20 known character. It is the opposite. What I'm saying
 21 on this point is because he's dead the libel thing has
 22 gone, therefore that is no longer a test.**
 23 Q. I am sure it is my fault. That was the point I was
 24 trying to explore a bit.
 25 **A. If that is the point you are making, I accept it.**
 Page 88

<p>1 Q. Mr Jones, not all of the questions I ask you are 2 designed to be hostile. Believe it or not, not always 3 am I trying to trip you up, indeed I'm not at all trying 4 to trip you up. I'm trying to understand what is going 5 on and I'm trying to explore with you what you say about 6 Mr Rippon's email that you take exception to and compare 7 it with what you say to yourself -- 8 A. I didn't say I'm taking exception to it. 9 Q. Hold on, please. I'm trying to explore where the real 10 difference is between you and Peter Rippon. So let's 11 just take it in stages if we can, all right? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. So all I'm suggesting to you is that from page 271 the 14 point about vulnerability and not standing up well in 15 a libel hearing is a point that you make and a point 16 that Peter Rippon makes; is that right? 17 A. Yes, absolutely. 18 Q. Your point is that it is inappropriate for Mr Rippon to 19 be making the point in the context that he does, because 20 Savile being dead there is not going to be a court 21 hearing and so concerns about them not standing up in 22 court have fallen away because the guy is dead? 23 A. And because he starts the sentence by saying "I dropped 24 it because", and then goes on to say "women whose 25 evidence would have been undermined in the court because <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p> </p>	<p>1 level where we say unless those victims would survive 2 a libel court, we're not going to put them on the 3 screen". In those circumstances that is not an 4 appropriate journalistic response. 5 Q. But the question of a libel court might be some slight 6 shorthand for -- 7 A. Right. 8 Q. -- the editorial threshold that is to be applicable? 9 A. Right. 10 Q. It might be. It might be that all that Mr Rippon is 11 saying and all that Helen Boaden is saying: forget about 12 a libel; of course if the guy is dead he can't sue you 13 for libel -- 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. -- that's one less problem you have to worry about -- 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. -- you are not going to get a libel writ so you are not 18 going to have to deal with that? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. But leaving aside the libel writ, as a matter of 21 journalistic standards one might take the view that -- 22 might do -- that the fact that somebody is dead 23 shouldn't lead to a lowering of the editorial or 24 journalistic standards that are applicable in running 25 this story? <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p> </p>
<p>1 of their ..." it was not a reason for dropping it. 2 Q. Just go back to what Helen Boaden might have said to 3 Peter Rippon and on the assumption that she said what 4 I said to you a couple of minutes ago she might have 5 said? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. You might take a different view as to whether it was an 8 inappropriate place to set the editorial bar -- 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. -- but what is unambiguously true, isn't it, is that if 11 Helen Boaden had that discussion with Peter Rippon -- 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. -- it was a journalistic editorial discussion? It was 14 not some inappropriate management pressure discussion. 15 It was simply saying "Look, Peter, here is where the 16 editorial, or if you like journalistic, bar should be 17 set"? 18 A. No, because I don't -- you know, I don't think anyone 19 would argue that was an appropriate journalistic bar 20 when you are dealing with somebody who we have a police 21 investigation saying they are a paedophile -- into 22 whether they are a paedophile or not; we have victims 23 making these allegations and so on, including on BBC 24 premises. It is not appropriate journalistically to say 25 "We are going to close down all of that and set a new <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p> </p>	<p>1 A. It is not lowering of standards. It is just you don't 2 have to worry about that particular problem which is 3 only a problem really in British law. 4 Q. But if the subject of the story is still alive -- 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. -- then you do need to worry about vulnerability and 7 standing up in a libel case? 8 A. Even if you know that person is a paedophile, you might 9 find yourself in a position where you could not run the 10 story because of British libel law. 11 Q. It might be thought, Mr Jones, that what this really 12 comes to is that when you look at this email which 13 I think you more than once have drawn to our attention, 14 and compare it to the red flag email, the real nub of 15 the debate between you and Mr Rippon and you and perhaps 16 others in BBC management, what it boils down to is that 17 you, no doubt strongly and sincerely, believe that the 18 editorial bar was pitched in the wrong place, and others 19 take a different view. 20 But that's a debate about journalistic standards or 21 thresholds. It is nothing to do with protecting 22 Christmas specials or anything Vision is doing, it's 23 just a fundamental disagreement among journalists about 24 what the correct approach is? 25 A. For a start, this was never put to us that the -- that <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p> </p>

1 a decision had been taken that it should be on the
 2 grounds that he was still alive or whatever. That would
 3 not have been put to us because it would have been
 4 laughable.
 5 Q. Just take it from Peter Rippon's point of view for
 6 a moment. The story starts off as an investigation into
 7 Jimmy Savile --
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. -- and whether he's a paedophile?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. And one of the problems which Mr Rippon recognises here
 12 and which you recognise in the red flag email, one of
 13 the problems is that the victims were vulnerable --
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. -- and also, as you say, in the email to
 16 Mark Williams-Thomas, because of the background of being
 17 at Duncroft in the first place --
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. -- that is, as it were, a bad start?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. Right. And that vulnerability means that there needs to
 22 be something else in this story, a second part of this
 23 story, to prop up the first part, if you like.
 24 Now what you ended up with -- hang on -- what you
 25 ended up with was you had an interview with [REDACTED]

Page 93

1 which you considered to be a strong and persuasive
 2 interview, right?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. You had some accounts from some other former Duncroft
 5 girls?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. About all of whom you all had reservations. We saw last
 8 time Hannah Livingston described [REDACTED] as being the most
 9 sorted and you came to the view that that wasn't
 10 particularly correct?
 11 A. As I explained to you at the time -- well, if you are
 12 going to use these things you have to remember what
 13 I said to that, which is that she was the most sorted --
 14 apart from [REDACTED] who Hannah had not spoken to -- in the
 15 sense that she had phone numbers, all these sorts of
 16 things. She was not the most reliable.
 17 Q. And Liz MacKean came to the same conclusion. So you
 18 have [REDACTED] you have some other people not on
 19 camera --
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. None of them a victim on camera. All of whom you have
 22 grounds to have reservations about, if I can put it like
 23 that?
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. And then you have, as it were, rather separate to that,

Page 94

1 the question of the police and the investigation which
 2 was carried out into Savile?
 3 A. And you have the Klunk Click footage which puts them in
 4 a BBC studio with the perpetrators at the right time.
 5 Q. Yes. All I'm saying is that given these vulnerabilities
 6 and these difficulties with the story, once you do apply
 7 the standard that should be -- once you do approach it
 8 on the basis that the threshold is the same whether
 9 Savile is alive or dead -- I know you don't agree that
 10 is correct --
 11 A. All right.
 12 Q. -- but once you do that then the journalistic conclusion
 13 that Peter Rippon comes to, given the failure to dig up
 14 the CPS letter, starts to make more sense, doesn't it?
 15 A. So are you saying that as of the 30th he had come to
 16 that conclusion, that we should --
 17 Q. I'm not saying anything. I'm just asking you a question
 18 and asking for your observations.
 19 A. If he had thought that, presumably he would have put
 20 that point to us. He would have said "I've decided that
 21 this should be done on the basis that, as if he was
 22 alive, can we run the story?" and I would have said,
 23 "No, on that basis we can't. But we're going to have to
 24 pull the specials because we have loads of evidence that
 25 the guy is a paedophile and we are going to have to pull

Page 95

1 all that. We are going to have to do that now. You
 2 want to set that standard but there are consequences: we
 3 have to pull the specials."
 4 Q. I think we touched on this last time --
 5 A. Instead of that he says I'm now only going to run it if
 6 the CPS say to us that he was too old and that's why
 7 they dropped the charges --
 8 Q. Right.
 9 A. -- which was never likely to happen.
 10 Q. I don't want to go over the same ground again.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. But you didn't know -- no reason why you should have
 13 done, I think -- you didn't know what discussions Rippon
 14 had had with others about the implications --
 15 A. No.
 16 Q. -- if any for Vision?
 17 A. Exactly. The first thing I heard about that was when
 18 George said it at the Select Committee and I went "Ah".
 19 Q. Right, how many discussions did you have with [REDACTED]
 20 after 14 November --
 21 MR STEPHENS: Before you go on, can I just intervene because
 22 there is a possibility which your questions don't,
 23 admit, which is that the bar has been raised but not for
 24 journalistic reasons, but for collateral reasons, and
 25 the question then is: if you are not doing it for

Page 96

1 journalistic reasons, what actions were taken with the
 2 information? Is that not a relevant issue for the
 3 tribunal?
 4 MR MACLEAN: What actions were taken with what information?
 5 MR STEPHENS: In the sense that, institutionally, the BBC
 6 essentially knew at that point in time that there were
 7 serious allegations, credible allegations from a number
 8 of sources that abuse had taken place on BBC premises.
 9 So the question I think is -- it's more nuanced than the
 10 way you have put it. I understand why you made the
 11 questions about the journalistic endeavour, but there is
 12 also, you have to admit, the possibility that the change
 13 in standard was motivated by collateral reasons and you
 14 have not explored that. I just make the point because
 15 it may be helpful to the Inquiry, ultimately.
 16 MR MACLEAN: You should rest assured that we have explored
 17 this point obviously with others. The there is a limit
 18 to how far we can press it with Mr Jones given his role
 19 in the drama, the setting of the bar, who set the bar
 20 and why they set the bar is not something that Mr Jones
 21 can help us with, because he was not involved in setting
 22 it.
 23 If what are you saying is that occurred to us to
 24 raise these points with other people and what their
 25 motivations were, then the answer is yes, it has. Is
 Page 97

1 that what --
 2 MR STEPHENS: It is not for me to ask the questions, I'm not
 3 counsel to the Inquiry.
 4 MR MACLEAN: If you think that we are visiting some
 5 unfairness on Mr Jones, please say that now.
 6 MR STEPHENS: I feel you have asked half the question that
 7 is relevant because there are two reasons why this
 8 didn't happen. One is that there was a journalistic
 9 standard and genuine journalistic reasons, and clearly
 10 one needs to explore that, but there is also the
 11 possibility that there were collateral reasons that this
 12 didn't happen, this bar was raised, and I'm not sure
 13 that you have explored that fully. But it is your
 14 Inquiry --
 15 MR POLLARD: I think we have. But we have obviously tried
 16 to cover areas with each witness that is relevant to
 17 their knowledge, hence the questions to Mr Jones about
 18 the emails in which he says his view quite clearly was
 19 that the story was dropped to protect the Christmas
 20 programmes of some sort. We have been trying to get to
 21 the point of whether that is evidence or assumption, and
 22 I think you addressed that in your answers, have you
 23 not?
 24 **A. Yes. Yes. I don't know what happened above. All**
 25 **I know is what happened that I can see and the key thing**
 Page 98

1 **there is we keep saying "You can't run the specials, you**
 2 **can't run the tributes" --**
 3 MR MACLEAN: Now --
 4 **A. -- but they still run.**
 5 Q. So we did go through this last time --
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. -- that you had no visibility of what was going on --
 8 **A. No.**
 9 Q. -- up the line --
 10 **A. Except what we're hearing from Peter and impressions**
 11 **he's giving, et cetera, and that's it.**
 12 Q. So you had no involvement or direct knowledge of
 13 precisely what bar had been set, either by Mr Rippon or
 14 set for him by others --
 15 **A. Well, he told us that the bar was now the CPS had to say**
 16 **it was too old. That was the knowledge which we had.**
 17 Q. He told you that was what was going to stand the story
 18 up or not, by the end of November --
 19 **A. Yes.**
 20 Q. -- and the pondering overnight, even?
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 Q. That's where he had got to by the 30th?
 23 **A. Yes, and then he sticks with that.**
 24 Q. Your point is that that was a rather different position
 25 to be in than the position he had adopted on the 25th
 Page 99

1 where it was all systems go?
 2 **A. If you had been in a position where the rest of the BBC,**
 3 **like Impact and so on, are saying, you know what, this**
 4 **is a middling story, and he says, "Right, let's raise**
 5 **the bar, then, you have to deliver more, it needs to be**
 6 **a better story", that is understandable. Every other**
 7 **journalist he has gone to has looked at this story -- in**
 8 **the BBC -- has gone "This is a fantastic story it's**
 9 **going to be a huge story".**
 10 Q. That was not Liz Gibbons' view. I think she supported
 11 the decision that Rippon took.
 12 **A. I don't know if she ever read the scripts or whatever.**
 13 Q. You have seen emails months later where she and Rippon
 14 are agreeing with each other that they made the right
 15 decision not to run the story.
 16 **A. Those emails --**
 17 Q. So he wasn't the only one.
 18 **A. No, but with respect those emails were delusional.**
 19 **Those emails where Liz Gibbons is saying I never booked**
 20 **the editing, you know, Peter saying "I'm going to throw**
 21 **shit around". It is not people with a clear memory of**
 22 **what happened.**
 23 Q. We went over that last time.
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 MR POLLARD: I think to be fair, you made the point about
 Page 100

1 other journalists having a view and I accept they do.
 2 Two points, I suppose: one is they didn't have the
 3 detail of the story that you would have or Liz MacKean
 4 would have or, I think, Peter --
 5 **A. No, no, no. They had what Peter had.**
 6 MR POLLARD: The second point is that it is not editing by
 7 committee, is it?
 8 **A. Absolutely not.**
 9 MR POLLARD: When an editor is deciding whether he wants to
 10 run a story or not, he doesn't take a straw poll of
 11 other people who might know a bit about it or have
 12 an opinion. For better or for worst, he takes
 13 a decision himself.
 14 **A. I don't know if I've said this before but nearly always**
 15 **when you deal with editors you might disagree but they**
 16 **are pretty marginal calls, they are 40/60s all the time.**
 17 **This one is way, way over, it is not even close. I will**
 18 **disagree with an editor about a decision whether to run**
 19 **or not run but frankly they are quite close calls either**
 20 **way. They are arguable. This was not close.**
 21 MR POLLARD: Could I just put a slightly alternative view
 22 of, if you like, the Helen Boaden influence on this?
 23 I think it is fair to say that she doesn't recognise
 24 this suggestion that, I think, was floated that she said
 25 to Peter Rippon:

Page 101

1 "The proof has got to be absolutely the same as if
 2 he was alive."
 3 In other words, the equivalent of proof in a libel
 4 court.
 5 **A. Yes.**
 6 MR POLLARD: I think her recollection of this is more along
 7 the lines of "Just because Jimmy Savile is dead, doesn't
 8 give us carte blanche to run a story without substantial
 9 proof", and that, I think, is the way he took it.
 10 So I think the issue of the equivalence of proof in
 11 a libel action isn't the way she saw it. I guess the
 12 suggestion of that, "Just because he's dead doesn't mean
 13 that the BBC should be skimping on its proof", you would
 14 accept that that would be a reasonable thing to do?
 15 **A. Absolutely, no, totally agree. You shouldn't put out**
 16 **tittle-tattle about people just because they are dead.**
 17 **But in this case the very fact that he had been**
 18 **investigated on paedophile charges by the police would**
 19 **have been front page in its own right. That in itself**
 20 **would have been a story and would have been a very good**
 21 **reason for the BBC to ask extremely serious questions**
 22 **about running the tributes, even if we hadn't go [REDACTED]**
 23 **even if we didn't have the Klunk Click and we didn't**
 24 **have the corroboration.**
 25 MR MACLEAN: But it is implicit in that answer, I think,

Page 102

1 that it was not ever going to be enough to have
 2 [REDACTED] and then the anonymous notes of the other
 3 vulnerable women. There had to be something else to the
 4 story.
 5 **A. Because they had claimed they had gone -- some of them**
 6 **claimed they had gone to the police, we had have to have**
 7 **police statement, we had to have it --**
 8 Q. There had to be a something else. We discussed last
 9 time that where you get off the train, if you like, is
 10 once you get confirmation that there was a police
 11 investigation, you explained to us last time, there you
 12 are then, there is your story, with enough aspects to
 13 run --
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 Q. -- and Peter Rippon says "Well, hang on a minute".
 16 **A. No, no, he doesn't. What does he say when I tell him**
 17 **that?**
 18 Q. Peter Rippon's position is then -- let me put it that
 19 way -- that it is not enough to know that there was
 20 a police investigation, it is not enough that the police
 21 sent some papers to the CPS, that what is going to make
 22 the difference between the story having enough
 23 journalistic legs to run and not is whether the CPS had
 24 decided not to the proceed because Savile was aged and
 25 infirm.

Page 103

1 The difference, in your position, journalistically
 2 from Peter Rippon's may be very important but actually
 3 it is fairly narrow, isn't it?
 4 **A. But that isn't his decision, is it, when I tell him**
 5 **about we have got police -- that is categorically not**
 6 **his position when I tell him we have police**
 7 **confirmation.**
 8 Q. Isn't it, why not?
 9 **A. His response is "Excellent, prepare for transmission".**
 10 **He writes "Jimmy Savile" up on the board on 7 December**
 11 **for transmission on his wall. That is his reaction to**
 12 **that.**
 13 Q. I see, so you say that --
 14 **A. There is no question about what his reaction is.**
 15 Q. I'm trying to understand what your position is. Your
 16 position is that you and he, so far as you could tell,
 17 are on the same page on the 25th.
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. You don't believe that when he then adds another wheel
 20 to the coach on the 30th, that that was a genuine
 21 journalistic, as it were, further condition to apply to
 22 the story. That's what it comes to, isn't it?
 23 **A. I believe that, either through external pressure or**
 24 **because of something in his mind, he changes his mind.**
 25 **Now, if it is in his mind, he now doubts the women or**

Page 104

1 whatever --
 2 Q. You had always all had doubts about the women?
 3 **A. It depends what you mean by "doubts". Okay, if he had**
 4 **now felt, having said "Excellent, go for transmission",**
 5 **he's now thinking I'm not sure about those women, if**
 6 **that's the case then he has to look at them and decide**
 7 **whether -- whether the evidence is strong enough or not.**
 8 **You absolutely have to do that.**
 9 Q. Okay.
 10 **A. If it is an external reason -- it might not be pressure,**
 11 **it could just be that he's getting hints or whatever,**
 12 **then he doesn't have to examine that evidence, he just**
 13 **has to find a way of stopping it being broadcast.**
 14 **I would say that what we see is not compatible with**
 15 **having -- starting to have doubts or whatever, because**
 16 **you would then test the evidence, you talk to**
 17 **Mark Williams-Thomas who knows about these things, you**
 18 **go through all the notes of the conversations, you do**
 19 **that.**
 20 Q. It might be, given the way Mr Rippon approached these
 21 stories generally, but this one in particular, that it
 22 is only as he gets closer to transmission that he really
 23 begins to apply his mind to what is going on?
 24 **A. That is fair for an editor to do that.**
 25 Q. That might explain why, having been content to give the
 Page 105

1 green light on the 25th, the closer it gets to
 2 transmission, he says to himself "Hang on a minute, I'm
 3 not sure about this".
 4 **A. If you are not sure, you then go through the evidence.**
 5 **It is clear, absolutely clear, you go through that. You**
 6 **have a huge story here you are not going to just drop**
 7 **it, you are going to look at the evidence and if it is**
 8 **not good enough you are going to say either**
 9 **"I fundamentally don't believe these people, they are**
 10 **making it up" -- and that's a problem when you have**
 11 **a police investigation and so on -- or you say, "I need**
 12 **more, I want another victim on tape, I want to more**
 13 **victims on tape, whatever it might be", and you ask for**
 14 **more stuff. In the meantime, obviously, you would have**
 15 **to pull the tributes anyhow.**
 16 Q. On the pulling of tributes -- I think we went through
 17 this last time -- despite the draft of the red flag
 18 email, which I think was going to be sent to
 19 Helen Boaden and Steve Mitchell --
 20 **A. Yes, I thought about sending it to them on the 5th.**
 21 Q. You didn't and to the extent that you raised the
 22 reputational damage to the BBC, which is probably
 23 shorthand for the tribute programmes, or at least that
 24 is part of it, you raised that with Peter Rippon in that
 25 shorter email, but never with Mitchell or Boaden --
 Page 106

1 **A. Not directly, no.**
 2 Q. -- although you could have done.
 3 **A. I could have done, yes.**
 4 Q. If you were all that concerned about it, surely you
 5 would have done.
 6 **A. Except I believed, as you will see from all my**
 7 **communications with other people that he was doing**
 8 **something which he thought was necessary for the people**
 9 **above him.**
 10 Q. If you thought that Peter Rippon was the kind of person
 11 who was susceptible to pressure from above, as clearly
 12 you did --
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. -- it is rather peculiar, isn't it, that you relied on
 15 him to go into bat for the need to take away the tribute
 16 programmes?
 17 **A. No, we had this conversation last time.**
 18 Q. I'm still puzzled by it. That's why I'm asking it
 19 again.
 20 **A. There is a difference between -- yes, he might not bat**
 21 **very hard for us to go ahead with the programme, he**
 22 **might not fight back very hard, but surely he would pass**
 23 **back the message about reputational damage to the BBC.**
 24 **I think there was a distinction between those two and it**
 25 **did not occur to me that he would not be passing that**
 Page 107

1 **message up very strongly, even if he didn't believe it,**
 2 **he would be saying "They believe this".**
 3 Q. We had the discussion last time about the Managed Risk
 4 Programme List, didn't we, which you --
 5 **A. I don't really know the detail of that. My**
 6 **understanding was that it was put on there and at some**
 7 **point it vanished. But that's not well sourced.**
 8 Q. Not for you anyway?
 9 **A. Yes, for me. It's not well sourced for me.**
 10 Q. Believe me, it is well sourced for us.
 11 Now, how many times did you talk to [REDACTED] after
 12 the interview on 14 November. I think she was going
 13 [REDACTED] wasn't she, shortly after that?
 14 **A. Yes, but she had not gone by the time it was pulled.**
 15 **I had talked to her a number of times.**
 16 Q. How many times?
 17 **A. I'm trying to remember if I can remember any of the**
 18 **specifics of any of them. I had certainly had**
 19 **a conversation with her about the [REDACTED] thing,**
 20 **because -- I think we talked about this last time.**
 21 **I think Hannah may have had a conversation with her**
 22 **where she said she thought [REDACTED] was the woman who**
 23 **was -- had sex with [REDACTED] I then went back to**
 24 **check whether -- how confident she was. So I definitely**
 25 **had a conversation with her about that and by then she**
 Page 108

1 was saying "I have had a thought about it and it's not
 2 her".
 3 Q. Is there a note of that conversation?
 4 A. No, there isn't a note of that conversation.
 5 Q. Why not?
 6 A. I don't know, is the honest answer. That would have
 7 been -- well, there are emails from Hannah saying "It
 8 looks like it is her", and then it is some time after
 9 that, and it is certainly before we script because
 10 obviously we would have loved to have that for the
 11 script. If we could have had for the script that we
 12 know who this person is, that would have been great, but
 13 by then it had was gone.
 14 I would say we had three conversations with [REDACTED]
 15 after the 14th.
 16 Q. You didn't seek or obtain any legal input, did you, from
 17 the BBC or indeed from anyone else about the question of
 18 whether any of the information you had gathered -- by
 19 "you" I mean Newsnight -- would be or might be of use to
 20 the police?
 21 A. No, we didn't have that conversation.
 22 Q. So we went through this last time. To the extent that
 23 you and Mr Rippon and Liz MacKean agreed, you didn't
 24 agree about much, but one thing you did agree about was
 25 that you didn't have anything of any evidential value to
 Page 109

1 the police and gave that reassurance to Mr Mitchell at
 2 the beginning of October, that was just based on the
 3 three of you putting your heads together?
 4 A. Yes, I don't know whether we put our heads together on
 5 it or not --
 6 Q. It was always your view that you didn't have anything of
 7 evidential value to the police.
 8 A. Yes, but, as I said last time, I felt I had a safety net
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 Q. Was he investigating possible accomplices that Savile
 15 might have had? Let me explain: one reason why the
 16 information you had gathered about Savile himself, never
 17 mind [REDACTED] or anybody else, was obviously of
 18 potential interest at least to the police is that there
 19 might be accomplices with Savile who might still be
 20 alive?
 21 A. That is a fair point. Again, I think I thought the
 22 whole thing was going to come out and when it came out
 23 there would be far more evidence for the police to deal
 24 with. Us just going to the police with bits and bobs
 25 would be nothing compared to once it came out properly
 Page 110

1 it would get huge coverage, and so on, and you'd get
 2 lots of people coming forward.
 3 Q. The other people who were still alive, one of the
 4 reasons you advanced for not having furnished the police
 5 with the [REDACTED] information was the notion that
 6 somehow they already knew about that. But I think we
 7 established last time that there was not actually any
 8 basis for that.
 9 A. Yes, but Richard knows that I sent a note then
 10 explaining why I thought that, after our last hearing.
 11 Essentially -- in a sense, it makes no difference in
 12 terms of fact but explains why I thought that, which is
 13 that [REDACTED] says in her -- in the interview notes with
 14 [REDACTED] it says that [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED] was up to no good, and so on, et cetera,
 16 and I knew that [REDACTED] had gone to the police, and that
 17 was the thing that was vaguely in my head earlier this
 18 year when we had these conversations about it. That was
 19 where my perception was, that the police knew about
 20 [REDACTED] in this context. You will find that in the
 21 notes of Hannah and Liz's conversations with [REDACTED]
 22 MR MACLEAN: So far as others were concerned, we had the
 23 discussion last time about how you and Mr Law had agreed
 24 that you were not going to mention anybody else. But
 25 nevertheless you still had information about that
 Page 111

1 individual who --
 2 A. [REDACTED]
 3 Q. -- would have been of interest to the police, as --
 4 A. Possibly, I mean, I don't know whether that would have
 5 been of interest to them or not. But, you know -- you
 6 know, in retrospect we could have done that. Had
 7 this -- had I felt this was being buried and it was
 8 never going to appear anywhere, then I would have had to
 9 have raised the issue of going to the police with Peter.
 10 But if Peter's line is that we didn't -- these people
 11 have no credibility, then I suppose he could argue that
 12 there is nothing to these allegations anyhow.
 13 Q. That doesn't make sense from your point of view?
 14 A. No, it doesn't make sense from my point of view.
 15 Q. You could, and I suggest should, have seen whether the
 16 police were interested in the material you gathered from
 17 [REDACTED] for example?
 18 A. In a sense, though, that would have been pursuing it.
 19 If I had gone to the international investigations unit,
 20 if I had gone to the police, I would have been pursuing
 21 the story, I would have been carrying on.
 22 Q. Can I go back to Mr MacQuarrie briefly at bundle 11 at
 23 237? We looked at this earlier. This is an email to
 24 Mr Entwistle?
 25 A. Yes, yes. Yes, the --
 Page 112

<p>1 Q. If you go over the page, that's the MacQuarrie note. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Now I appreciate that this is Mr MacQuarrie's note. 4 It's not your note, but it is his note of conversations 5 with you and Liz MacKean. 6 He doesn't say there that either of you suggested 7 that Mr Rippon had been improperly pressured into 8 dropping the story, does he? 9 A. No, he doesn't say that. In fact he says almost the 10 opposite, doesn't he, somewhere, I think: 11 "Neither party made allegations it had been 12 pressured into the decision." 13 Q. And that was correct so far as you are concerned. You 14 didn't make an allegation of that nature to 15 Mr MacQuarrie, did you? 16 A. That was not what the meeting was about. 17 Q. Let's just take it in stages. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. You didn't make that suggestion to Mr MacQuarrie, did 20 you? 21 A. I don't know. I don't think so. But it wasn't what the 22 purpose of the meeting was. 23 Q. So the reason you didn't was that it wasn't what the 24 meeting was about? 25 A. What we were trying to do was to get the BBC to change Page 113</p>	<p>1 MacQuarrie process. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. So you might fairly point out that it is likely the 4 discussion was about the blog. 5 A. At least primarily with hers, yes. Mine was primarily 6 about another aspect, which was the presentation in 7 general rather than just a blog. 8 Q. And that is reflected in the differences between your 9 email of the 5th which doesn't mention the blog -- 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. -- and her email of the 8th which is all about the blog. 12 Is that right? 13 A. Hers is a longer one. I was just trying to do 14 a one-liner that would explain what the problem was. 15 Q. Yes. In your email "You are not getting fed the right 16 food, George ..." 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. I forget how you put it. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. One observation. One point -- 21 A. Yes, you know the investigation was not about the CPS, 22 it was about whether he was a paedophile. Yes. 23 Q. You mentioned last time that you had had a discussion 24 with somebody at one stage in EdPol about 25 whistle-blowing policies? Page 115</p>
<p>1 its line. That was the key thing here. It wasn't 2 important in a sense: that side of it was not what was 3 important. What is important here is we are trying to 4 say: the BBC is putting out a line which is completely 5 false, we need to change that; this is the evidence that 6 it is completely false. 7 Q. So you say the reason why you didn't get into those 8 questions was because the subject matter was more 9 narrowly drawn; is that fair? 10 A. We might or might not have mentioned that stuff but that 11 was not what the purpose of the meeting was. 12 Q. As I say -- 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. -- I'm simply, as I said to somebody else, the hired 15 help asking questions here. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. You might fairly point out, Mr Jones, that the 18 MacQuarrie process had been triggered on the 8th by 19 Liz MacKean's email complaining about the blog? 20 A. Yes, and my email -- 21 Q. Mr Entwistle was less -- that had less of an impact on 22 him. 23 A. Right, okay. 24 Q. But it doesn't perhaps matter. But the MacKean email on 25 the 8th complaining about the blog gives rise to the Page 114</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And the whistle-blowing policy is available on the BBC 3 gateway site, isn't it? 4 A. Yes, but nobody knew about it, which is why Lucy 5 Adams -- after I had the conversation with David on the 6 4th -- a couple of days later Lucy Adams put an email 7 round to everyone in the BBC saying we do have 8 a whistle-blowing policy. 9 Q. But it was on gateway -- 10 A. Well, nobody knew about it. 11 Q. -- and had been at all material times, as it were? 12 A. Yeah, but nobody knew about it. That's why they had to 13 put an email round to everyone in the BBC saying we do 14 have a whistle-blowing policy. There had never been an 15 email around about that in my entire time at the BBC 16 since 1988. I mean, that's why I rang up. 17 Q. Is this right, you are not sure precisely to whom you 18 spoke in EdPol about the whistle-blowing policy? 19 A. No. No, I don't remember. 20 Q. I don't suppose you can give an explanation as to why 21 there isn't any written record at EdPol's end -- 22 A. Of course I have an explanation of that. You have two 23 records -- you have two records from EdPol from the 24 first time round, haven't you? You have Roger Mahony -- 25 Q. And the Abrahams one. Page 116</p>

1 A. -- and Phil Abrahams.
 2 Q. Yes.
 3 A. The Phil Abrahams one you have a dated, timed note for.
 4 Q. Yes.
 5 A. Roger Mahony, you haven't.
 6 Q. Yes.
 7 A. So sometimes it happened and sometimes it didn't. You
 8 can see out of those two there is only a 50/50 chance
 9 they get noted. Roger Mahony writes his account a year
 10 later, he doesn't put anything in there.
 11 Q. If I was to suggest to you that at least one person we
 12 spoke to, I think it is fair to say, cast some doubt on
 13 whether there ever was a conversation with EdPol about
 14 whistling-blowing, what would you say?
 15 A. Well, his attitude was different in the meeting that we
 16 had at 12 o'clock on 4 August, where he pretty much
 17 accepted --
 18 Q. 4 October, you mean?
 19 A. 4 October. So it is David Jordan.
 20 Q. You are referring to Mr Jordan?
 21 A. Yes. So the -- no, and he did the right thing. He
 22 immediately got Lucy Adams to put out an email telling
 23 everyone that there was a whistle-blower line. I mean,
 24 I was not overt about why I wanted the whistle-blower
 25 line and so on, because I was deliberately trying to say

Page 117

1 "Do we have one?" You know, I wasn't trying to spell
 2 out.
 3 Q. It might be thought to be odd, as an outsider, as to
 4 why -- I mean, let's assume you had the discussion about
 5 whistle-blowing?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. A whistleblower wants to blow the whistle usually in an
 8 anonymous way --
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. -- without drawing attention to themselves?
 11 A. Exactly, yes.
 12 Q. That is what you had in mind, is it?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. Why was there any need to blow the whistle anonymously?
 15 Why not take your concerns to Steve Mitchell or
 16 Helen Boaden or Mark Thompson or George Entwistle or
 17 David Jordan --
 18 A. Mark -- Mark Thompson I didn't know. I was trying to
 19 find if there was some way of getting -- of getting
 20 a message in at the top level.
 21 I mean, I should have thought more about it. It
 22 occurred to me later that Jessica Cecil, who I knew from
 23 a long time ago, was in the DG's office. I could --
 24 this time round I did think about getting a message
 25 through to Jessica before I went to David Jordan. My

Page 118

1 first thought was no, I should get a message through to
 2 Jessica Cecil.
 3 MR POLLARD: The message you wanted to get over was what,
 4 exactly?
 5 A. This is back the first time round.
 6 MR POLLARD: Sure.
 7 A. The message I wanted to get through was that there
 8 serious to the reputation -- you know, damage to the BBC
 9 here.
 10 MR POLLARD: It was about the tribute programmes: they ought
 11 not to go ahead?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 MR POLLARD: Couldn't you just ring George -- you know
 14 George Entwistle?
 15 A. I didn't -- you know, he was sort of Acting Director of
 16 Vision or something at that stage. I was thinking that
 17 the key people would be Danny Cohen or, um,
 18 Janice Hadlow, and I didn't know them.
 19 I thought that -- you know, it didn't occur to me
 20 that George was the key person there. It occurred to
 21 me -- I was thinking about Janice and Danny Cohen.
 22 I was thinking they are the people who are involved.
 23 Yes, I should have thought more about it, perhaps.
 24 MR POLLARD: He was the boss of telly.
 25 A. Yes, he was the acting boss of telly and so on

Page 119

1 et cetera, yes.
 2 MR MACLEAN: We asked Mr Jordan, obviously, about this.
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. And he had the discussion with you on 4 October and this
 5 is one of the points you discuss?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. He told us that you had suggested that you had told
 8 Editorial Policy at some stage --
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. -- you were not clear about precisely when -- in the
 11 period since the story was stood down by Peter Rippon on
 12 Newsnight?
 13 A. It depends on when you say stood down. It would have
 14 been that week. You know, it would have been towards
 15 the end of the week. Probably the 7th or 8th, around
 16 about there it would have been.
 17 Q. December?
 18 A. Yes. Around about that time.
 19 Q. To enquire about whistle-blowing --
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. -- about the decision about which you were clearly
 22 unhappy?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. Is that broadly right?
 25 A. That is broadly right, yes.

Page 120

1 Q. And that he -- that is you, this is Jordan's evidence --
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. "And that he had called Editorial Policy and been told
 4 that there was no way of whistle-blowing on a decision
 5 of that sort?"
 6 **A. That there was no whistle-blower line or anything like**
 7 **that, yes. Yes.**
 8 Q. And that's what you were told by somebody in EdPol?
 9 **A. I was told that there was no sort of whistle-blower line**
 10 **or something that you could ring that was sort of**
 11 **separate from the BBC system.**
 12 Q. And this was not a conversation with Mr Mahony?
 13 **A. I can't -- the chances are it was with one of people**
 14 **I knew there. The chances are it was, but I don't know.**
 15 **I don't know. I genuinely can't remember.**
 16 Q. Mr Jordan said that he sits in an open plan office with
 17 14 advisers in EdPol.
 18 **A. Yes.**
 19 Q. And that there was no reason why in effect you could not
 20 have approached him or any of those advisers at any
 21 point?
 22 **A. But that was not what I was trying to do. I was trying**
 23 **to find a way of doing it without going through that**
 24 **system.**
 25 Q. But the whistle has to be heard once it is blown by
 Page 121

1 somebody, hasn't it? So who was going to hear your
 2 whistle?
 3 **A. Well, what happened when I blew the whistle with David**
 4 **Jordan on 4 October this year? Nothing happened.**
 5 Q. That is an answer, with respect, to a different
 6 question.
 7 **A. But --**
 8 Q. Who was going to hear your whistle? Who was the
 9 intended audience for it?
 10 **A. Okay, most organisations, large organisations, including**
 11 **as it turns out the BBC, have a system where if you**
 12 **think there is a problem, sort of ethical problem or**
 13 **whatever, you can ring up that line and without -- you**
 14 **know, that is then fed in at a very high level into the**
 15 **organisation that somebody has these concerns about this**
 16 **decision or this product or whatever it is, and that is**
 17 **then looked at at a high level. It is screened**
 18 **obviously, but then looked at at a high level. Almost**
 19 **all large organisations have that system.**
 20 Q. Who were you trying to blow the whistle to then?
 21 **A. Somewhere right at the top of the organisation.**
 22 Q. When you talk about an ethical helpline, that sounds to
 23 me, from what I have learned about this in the past few
 24 weeks, as essentially a description of Mr Jordan's
 25 department.
 Page 122

1 **A. No, because --**
 2 Q. That was one of its functions?
 3 **A. No, because they are intimately involved -- then why did**
 4 **Lucy Adams send us around an email about a separate**
 5 **whistleblower system, which is what she did?**
 6 Q. He said:
 7 "It is sitting on the gateway site. You would only
 8 have to put in 'whistleblowing' into our internal search
 9 ending and up it would have come."
 10 So as a resourceful investigative journalist, didn't
 11 you try that?
 12 **A. Well, I rang -- I rang Editorial Policy, which seemed**
 13 **like a much more sensible thing to do, and asked them if**
 14 **we had one. I mean, the fact is that when Lucy sent**
 15 **that email around just a few days later as a result of**
 16 **my conversation with David Jordan -- so David Jordan**
 17 **obviously thought it was essential to do that and tell**
 18 **people that there was a whistle-blower line -- that was**
 19 **the first time that anyone I knew knew anything about**
 20 **a whistle-blower system in the BBC. You probably have**
 21 **that email, I am sure.**
 22 Q. I am sure we have.
 23 **A. Yes.**
 24 Q. We have.
 25 Now, I think last time you said that the reason --
 Page 123

1 at least a reason -- why you didn't take your concerns,
 2 if I can use that fairly neutral expression, up the
 3 management chain was that to do so would undermine
 4 Mr Rippon?
 5 **A. That's part of it, yes.**
 6 Q. That strikes me as slightly curious. If the editor of
 7 the programme has come to a decision which you consider
 8 to be wrong-headed --
 9 **A. Um-hm.**
 10 Q. -- then concerns about not undermining him would seem to
 11 rather pale into insignificance. If he's made such
 12 a catastrophic error and these tribute programmes are
 13 going to run causing, you can foresee, reputational
 14 damage to the BBC on a grand scale, isn't it to say the
 15 least rather peculiar to be reluctant and indeed not to
 16 take your concerns to higher management because of
 17 concerns about undermining this wrong-headed editor?
 18 **A. That's your phrase. But if that were the only reason,**
 19 **yes, I would agree with you. But it wasn't, was it?**
 20 Q. I don't know.
 21 **A. My belief was that the policy he was following, he was**
 22 **following on the orders of his immediate superiors.**
 23 Q. That would be Mitchell and Boaden?
 24 **A. Yes, and therefore there was very little point in me**
 25 **going to them. As I said last time, I still regret**
 Page 124

1 I didn't send a version of that red flag email anyhow,
 2 but I think there would have been very little purpose in
 3 doing it. And my explanation last time was that if
 4 I tried to go above his head my expectation is that what
 5 would happen is they would get in touch with Peter and
 6 they would say "Look, Peter is going to have another
 7 meeting with you" and it would happen that way.
 8 Q. So it might be a suggested that you had developed
 9 somewhat of a conspiracy theory here as to what had gone
 10 on with this story which led you not to take some really
 11 rather obvious steps which might -- at least might --
 12 have established whether there was a conspiracy, and
 13 might have led to a greater understanding at a much
 14 earlier stage as to where the real differences between
 15 the various players lay. What do you say to that?
 16 A. Well, I assumed at the very least the script had been
 17 passed up. I think anyone who saw the script would
 18 immediately know there was big grounds for concern here
 19 and so on. I assumed that sort of thing had gone up
 20 through the chain and the decision had been taken, you
 21 know, based on that, that this was still the right thing
 22 to do.
 23 Q. When you say "passed up", you mean above Peter Rippon to
 24 somebody else?
 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. So the first staging post would be Steve Mitchell?
 2 A. Yes. I assumed -- I assumed -- that at least that would
 3 have gone up through the chain. And that if they were
 4 not worried after that and were still happy for it not
 5 to go out, for the tributes to go out and so on, then
 6 really I didn't have a chance.
 7 You know, I was trying to explain this thing about
 8 this BBC system is very 19 Century military, you know,
 9 commanding officers type thing. That if I go above
 10 Peter, the way in which I'm undermining him is he is
 11 obviously running a bad ship if his team are going above
 12 him in the, er -- you know in the bureaucracy.
 13 Obviously it would reflect badly on me, but it would
 14 also reflect badly on him if I tried to short circuit
 15 things.
 16 Q. Go back to your emails to Mary Wilkinson and
 17 David Lomax.
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. It might be said that sending those emails undermines
 20 Mr Rippon. It doesn't do it directly to his bosses --
 21 A. No.
 22 Q. -- but it is the sort of act which does undermine
 23 Peter Rippon?
 24 A. I think there is a distinction between the two. The
 25 Wilkinson one, one of the factors in there was that she

1 had been an adviser to the Director General. There was
 2 a chance by telling her that maybe that she might
 3 respond and say "What's going on here?", you know
 4 "Can I help?" or something. The Lomax one is in
 5 a different category.
 6 Q. You told us you didn't know Mark Thompson at all?
 7 A. No.
 8 Q. You never, I think, worked with Mark Thompson?
 9 A. No.
 10 Q. You had no reason to think that Mark Thompson was
 11 involved in some attempt to support these tribute
 12 programmes, did you?
 13 A. But, again you know --
 14 Q. Did you?
 15 A. Even this time around when I knew George when I tried to
 16 approach him, he said "The answer is no, we can't talk".
 17 Q. Never mind --
 18 A. There's not an open door there.
 19 Q. Never mind George for the moment --
 20 A. No, but I'm saying there is not an open door to the
 21 Director General's office.
 22 Q. But he has a telephone, hasn't he?
 23 A. Not one that you can get through on. You would have to
 24 go through somebody else and it would then be fed back
 25 through the chain and you would end up in a meeting with

1 Peter again.
 2 Q. So you surmise?
 3 A. That's so I surmise, yes.
 4 Q. So you surmise?
 5 A. Yes, yes.
 6 Q. But you had no reason to think that Mark Thompson was
 7 one of the, as it were, conspirators?
 8 A. No. No, I had -- no, I didn't know where it went to,
 9 but I had no reason to think it was, no.
 10 Q. And you had no reason to think that Danny Cohen or the
 11 Director of Vision --
 12 A. No, I had no reason to think that, no.
 13 Q. -- was in on any of this either?
 14 A. But I don't know any of them, either.
 15 Q. Apart from George Entwistle who you did know --
 16 A. Yes, which I did know and it didn't occur to me really
 17 to go to him.
 18 Q. It might be thought to strike one as a bit odd that you
 19 go to the trouble of writing down the red flag email
 20 setting these points out in some detail?
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. You never press "send" to Mitchell or to Boaden?
 23 A. No.
 24 Q. You never attempt to go and talk to the
 25 Director General?

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. You never attempt to go and talk to EdPol, or certainly
 3 not David Jordan in 2011?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. And yet you feel incredibly passionately that Mr Rippon
 6 has just made the most catastrophic blunder?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. And apart from venting your position to Wilkinson and
 9 Lomax --
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. And you say not to anybody else and let's assume that is
 12 right for the moment --
 13 A. Well, Helen Weaver, you put that conversation to me as
 14 well last time.
 15 Q. Which one is that?
 16 A. Helen Weaver from the Impact team.
 17 Q. The Impact people, yes.
 18 A. You say that she has put in a statement saying that she
 19 had a conversation with me about that time on a similar
 20 basis.
 21 Q. You are quite right. Apart from those, it might be
 22 thought to be rather strange that you don't actually
 23 shove this information under somebody important's nose.
 24 A. We're certainly going on about it and not as a direct --
 25 you know, not as a direct result of what I'm -- sorry,

Page 129

1 not as a direct result of my prompting but Caroline
 2 Hawley then goes to see the Director General and she
 3 takes advantage of the opportunity that she has been
 4 invited to drinks with him on the 20th and puts it to
 5 the Director General. So the message does get through
 6 to the Director General.
 7 Q. After the discussion with the Director General, remind
 8 me, how did you hear about the Hawley/Thompson
 9 discussion?
 10 A. I didn't know about it until February the next year.
 11 Liz knew about it at the time. I didn't know about it
 12 until February.
 13 Q. And you discovered about it from?
 14 A. The Oldie article.
 15 Q. I think we mentioned the last time Emil Petrie, didn't
 16 we?
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. I think Nick asked you some questions about Emil Petrie.
 19 A. Nick could remember his surname and I couldn't.
 20 Q. I noted that yesterday. This is in bundle 5 at
 21 page 180.
 22 Just remind me who Mr Petrie is, in the BBC?
 23 A. He's a producer in Current Affairs, I think. I'm not
 24 sure exactly which bit he was in at that time.
 25 Q. This came to you out of the blue, did it?

Page 130

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. Did you know him?
 3 A. Yes, I know Emil, yes. I mean, he's not a close friend
 4 but I know him. He's one of the sort of people if you
 5 bumped into him in the foyer you might sit down and have
 6 a coffee with.
 7 Q. You reply, I think we looked at briefly, over the page
 8 at 181:
 9 "I think the official line is that we didn't find
 10 enough evidence and therefore the story wasn't
 11 squashed."
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. "And that therefore the story ..." I think that should
 14 be "was squashed". I see, wasn't squashed, you mean --
 15 A. Yes, yes.
 16 Q. -- wasn't improperly squashed?
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. And he got the message, didn't he, that your reference
 19 to "official line" was tongue-in-cheek?
 20 A. Yes. We sit down and he asks me if we can go through
 21 what I've got and we go through everything that I've
 22 got. He doesn't actually watch the tapes but he sees
 23 the notes, the script, he sees all that sort of stuff.
 24 He gets some sort of -- he sees quite a lot of what
 25 we've got because he's trying then to, you know, place

Page 131

1 it elsewhere in the BBC and he's saying "Do you mind if
 2 I try and place it somewhere?" and I say "Fine". You
 3 know, I just want it out there.
 4 Q. At least one person has made the point to us that it is
 5 a bit odd, all right Newsnight has decided not to run
 6 the story --
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. -- but why wasn't it then served up to some other part
 9 of the BBC? Why not taken to Panorama, for example?
 10 A. Because we were told -- I was being told not to pursue.
 11 I wasn't being told we haven't got the resources or
 12 anything like that; I was being told to close it down.
 13 Q. By Peter Rippon?
 14 A. Yes, absolutely.
 15 Q. But he's only the editor of Newsnight.
 16 A. And my belief was that that was coming from higher up
 17 the machine.
 18 Q. So again that was surmise --
 19 A. We know that he sends an email to Steve Mitchell now --
 20 we obviously didn't know that at the time but I believe
 21 that is what was going on -- where Steve Mitchell says
 22 fine, good. So that --
 23 Q. In December?
 24 A. Yes, December 9th. He sends an email to --
 25 Q. The one that says "Meirion has accepted my decision"?

Page 132

1 A. Yes. And then Steve replies "Fine", or whatever, to
 2 that. He doesn't say "Oh, I've got Panorama under me as
 3 well. I also run Panorama. You know, we could send it
 4 to Panorama."
 5 Far from that. He's the guy who is in charge of
 6 Panorama to some -- in the BBC you have matrix
 7 management so everyone has about ten different managers,
 8 but he's one of the people in the Panorama line of
 9 management.
 10 Q. But you didn't make any effort to farm the story out to
 11 any other part of the BBC after 9th December, did you?
 12 A. Because as far as I was concerned it was -- we were
 13 being told to stop. On 1 December he says "Stop working
 14 on other things". By the 9th I'm quite clear that this
 15 is not -- nothing more is supposed to happen on this.
 16 No more witnesses, no more evidence.
 17 January, I am -- I have bronchitis at the start of
 18 it and then I crack some ribs. This stage where we are
 19 in February --
 20 Q. Yes.
 21 A. -- this stage where we are in February is pretty much
 22 when I'm back at full speed working again and pretty
 23 much the first thing that happens then is that Emil is
 24 interested in the story and wants to try to pursue it.
 25 MR POLLARD: There is actually a Christmas break for
 Page 133

1 Newsnight, is there?
 2 A. Yes. A Christmas break of, I think it was about two
 3 weeks.
 4 MR POLLARD: Yes.
 5 A. Then shortly after I got back to work I had bronchitis.
 6 And then I got back to work again and shortly after that
 7 managed to crack two ribs. So this is pretty much --
 8 this is pretty soon after I'm back at full working level
 9 again.
 10 And, you know, Emil Petrie comes to me and I say
 11 "Yes, please do". You know, he's saying "Do you want
 12 any credit?" and I said "No, just if you can put it
 13 somewhere, we want it out there."
 14 MR MACLEAN: By this time Mr Williams-Thomas had gone off
 15 and was trying to work the story up somewhere else,
 16 wasn't he?
 17 A. Yes, definitely.
 18 Q. And it turns out to be ITV?
 19 A. As far as I knew it could have been ITV or Channel 4.
 20 You know, I just didn't know where it was going to go.
 21 Q. [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 A. [REDACTED]
 24 in terms of Susie Thompson, for instance, when she
 25 contacted me --
 Page 134

1 Q. You passed that on?
 2 A. I passed -- she said "I want this to go somewhere".
 3 I said "It's not going to go anywhere here". I passed
 4 that on.
 5 MR POLLARD: Could I just ask a question, not precisely on
 6 this period?
 7 Do you have a view about when in that period, which
 8 would presumably be somewhere between, say, late 29
 9 November and 9 December -- the story was sort of killed
 10 off in stages. As one of the participants at the time,
 11 when do you think the story was really, shall we say,
 12 terminally wounded? Clearly by 9 December it was dead.
 13 29 November you would say it was pretty flourishing.
 14 A. I think 1 December, I would say.
 15 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 16 A. So the 30th you have the CPS barrier. The 1st is "Stop
 17 working on all other elements". At the time I didn't
 18 interpret it as that, but looking back that is clearly
 19 a "kill it".
 20 MR POLLARD: So not necessarily the "having pondered
 21 overnight CPS is the key", but the following day when it
 22 was "Stop work on other elements"?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 MR POLLARD: I think you said this before. Through that
 25 period of November 30 and up to the 9th, there were
 Page 135

1 a lot of conversations.
 2 A. Yes.
 3 MR POLLARD: We can't put a number on them, but you were
 4 still pushing the story very --
 5 A. Very aggressively, yes.
 6 MR POLLARD: Very hard. Sometimes you, sometimes you and
 7 Liz --
 8 A. Sometimes Liz on her own. All three options, yes.
 9 MR POLLARD: Okay. And Peter never really budged from his
 10 view, did he, that he was now of the view that without
 11 the CPS line, with or without the letter --
 12 A. Yes.
 13 MR POLLARD: -- the story wasn't going to run?
 14 A. Yes, that's true.
 15 MR STEPHENS: There also appears to be a bit in this which
 16 we don't appear to have covered today which is about the
 17 fact that Peter doesn't seem to have looked at the
 18 material or asked for it to be worked up. I don't know
 19 whether we're coming to that.
 20 MR MACLEAN: We have interviewed Peter Rippon more than once
 21 and we have covered what he did and didn't do.
 22 MR STEPHENS: Okay.
 23 MR MACLEAN: We know what he says he saw and didn't see.
 24 And I don't think there is any dispute actually as to
 25 what he saw --
 Page 136

1 MR POLLARD: I think we have covered with Mr Jones the issue
 2 of "Did he offer to look at it? Did you, to be blunt,
 3 drag him into a cutting room to have a look at the
 4 material?" and it's clear he didn't see it.
 5 **A. The one thing he did see was when we got the thing
 6 through about Klunk Click, and we had the television
 7 footage and we had the stills from Duncroft, that was
 8 the one thing he did see. But that was before we got
 9 to -- that was probably late teens.**
 10 MR MACLEAN: You had the picture of the girls on the wall on
 11 the one hand and then you had the same girls in the BBC
 12 studio in Klunk Click, is that right?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 MR POLLARD: Which is a very short clip, four seconds or
 15 something?
 16 **A. Yes, it was a very short clip. That's the one thing
 17 that I know he did see.**
 18 MR POLLARD: On a laptop or something?
 19 **A. Well, the viewing screens in the corner, yes.**
 20 MR POLLARD: Okay, fine.
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 MR MACLEAN: So Susan Thompson emailed Newsnight, I think.
 23 A Newsnight email address?
 24 **A. Newsnight investigations, yes.**
 25 Q. And you then passed that on to Mark Williams-Thomas?
 Page 137

1 **A. I talked to her first and she said she was desperate,
 2 you know, for her story to get out, whatever, and I then
 3 passed her on.**
 4 Q. Just take bundle 7 for a moment, please, and turn to
 5 page 11. Now at the bottom of page is an email actually
 6 I showed you earlier, the same email from a different
 7 reference --
 8 **A. Yes.**
 9 Q. -- we had a discussion about that a little bit earlier.
 10 I think we may have shown you this last time. This was
 11 a draft reply from Rippon to you, what he wanted to say
 12 to you?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. He didn't send it to you, he sent it to Steve Mitchell
 15 instead --
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. -- and then Steve Mitchell's advice was to:
 18 "Talk to him [that is you] because emails seem more
 19 prone to leak."
 20 We can infer what Steve Mitchell was getting at.
 21 **A. Did you ask him whether any emails had ever leaked?**
 22 Q. I can't remember precisely what we asked Steve Mitchell.
 23 **A. None had.**
 24 Q. I'm not sure that is relevant.
 25 **A. It is relevant to me.**
 Page 138

1 Q. I understand what you say. Let's look at Mr Rippon's
 2 draft response:
 3 "The truth is I was always conflicted about the
 4 editorial strength of the story, as were Liz and
 5 Shaminder who I discussed it with [at length].
 6 "As you will recall when you first mentioned it,
 7 I said I did not think it was a Newsnight type story.
 8 When, as is your job, you pushed and discovered the
 9 police investigation and the woman claiming the police
 10 had dumped it because he was too old, I was interested
 11 again. My response you mentioned when you confirmed the
 12 police investigation reflects that interest.
 13 "However, in the final judgment, when we were told
 14 in terms [that should be 'that', I think] the old sick
 15 man allegation was not true and we could not establish
 16 any clear institution failure, I decided on balance it
 17 was not editorially strong enough for us to run."
 18 Assume Mr Rippon had sent you that email with that
 19 paragraph in it, what precisely in that paragraph do you
 20 take issue with as Mr Rippon's account of his own mental
 21 process?
 22 **A. Obviously, I can't answer to whether he was conflicted
 23 or not. That's, you know, what things go on in his
 24 brain, I don't know about that. The third sentence:
 25 "As you will recall when you first mentioned it,
 Page 139**

1 **I said I did not think it was a Newsnight type story."**
 2 **Actually what happened was on 31 October we had
 3 an initial chat, where he was vaguely interested but
 4 was not at all committed. I then sent him that first
 5 email, which is [redacted] story with [redacted] in
 6 it, and so on.**
 7 Q. The web memoir?
 8 **A. He was then very interested, and that was when we
 9 started working on it. So I don't remember
 10 a conversation where he said it was not a Newsnight
 11 story.**
 12 Q. When you say "we started working on it", in fact, those
 13 early couple of weeks, I think, you were not really
 14 working on it because you were in --
 15 **A. Once I had -- I think I explained to you before --**
 16 Q. You did, I don't want to go over it in detail --
 17 **A. I what I nail -- what I think I have to nail is
 18 [redacted] get her. Because of my unique position --
 19 because I believe a lot of what she's saying, because
 20 I saw it happening -- once I've got her in the can, yes,
 21 then effectively I'm not very involved --**
 22 Q. You had persuaded and cajoled her into doing --
 23 **A. I didn't cajole her, no, that is completely untrue.**
 24 Q. She, I think, later complained about this --
 25 **A. Yes.**
 Page 140

1 Q. The circumstances don't matter, but she later, as
 2 a matter of fact, later complained about the
 3 circumstances in which she had been persuaded to give
 4 the interview, didn't she?
 5 A. She says various things yes.
 6 Q. Which maybe you don't accept?
 7 A. No.
 8 Q. I'm just picking up on the "We started working". In
 9 fact neither you nor Peter Rippon did anything on this
 10 story immediately after 31 October, you because you were
 11 in the United States and because he was the editor of
 12 the programme and Liz MacKean and Hannah Livingston were
 13 there.
 14 A. Obviously I had briefed them, showed them the stuff and
 15 had [REDACTED] booked, and so on but then yes, after
 16 that, I then take a back seat on that -- once I have set
 17 it up and got it moving, I take a back seat.
 18 Q. Yes. To continue the "back seat" analogy, on
 19 25 November when he sends the "Excellent, let's get the
 20 transmission date" email, Mr Peter Rippon at that stage,
 21 he was still in the back seat, wasn't he, on the 25th?
 22 A. No. He wasn't, no.
 23 Q. Because he hadn't done anything, had he, that you could
 24 put your finger on in terms of contributing to the story
 25 at that stage?

1 A. No, but remember we had gone through various stages by
 2 then. After the 14th when we do [REDACTED] we come back on
 3 the 15th into the office. We tell him what we have,
 4 he's very enthused, that is when you have the
 5 Liz MacKean email -- I think it's the 15th -- saying,
 6 you know, the mood's -- so he's very enthused at that
 7 point, he knows what [REDACTED] is saying and he's very
 8 enthused. Then either the end of that week or the
 9 beginning of the next week that we then get the
 10 Klunk Click stuff through which shows that they were in
 11 the studio with these people, and we show him that and
 12 he's very enthused by that and then on the 25th we get
 13 through the thing about the police. So he's not
 14 completely from it, not at all.
 15 MR POLLARD: Just paint a little picture of that 15 October
 16 meeting? You have done the [REDACTED] interview and we
 17 know what comes out of that meeting is the Liz MacKean
 18 note saying --
 19 A. Yes.
 20 MR POLLARD: You were in that discussion --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 MR POLLARD: -- you and Liz had a discussion with Peter --
 23 A. Yes.
 24 MR POLLARD: -- and Liz Gibbons or --
 25 A. I don't remember. I know we definitely had a chat,

1 definitely had a chat with Peter, but I can't remember
 2 if anybody else was in there.
 3 MR POLLARD: Tell us how that went.
 4 A. Essentially, he wanted to know what we'd got. As he
 5 would. You are the editor, you want to know "What have
 6 you got?" and we come back very enthusiastic saying, you
 7 know, "It's really good stuff, yes, she said
 8 [REDACTED] um, you know all -- all
 9 this stuff, abuse by Savile, we basically tell the story
 10 and say that we think -- we think she's telling truth".
 11 MR POLLARD: You have had many years of investigations,
 12 pitching stories to editors and briefing them.
 13 A. Yes.
 14 MR POLLARD: Taking those years of experience into account,
 15 how enthusiastic at that meeting is Peter Rippon then on
 16 a scale of 1 to 10?
 17 A. I would say about 7 or 8. He's very -- he's very
 18 excited about it, and so on. It's very strong at that
 19 point.
 20 MR POLLARD: To be scrupulously fair, is he expressing any
 21 reservations?
 22 A. He's not saying we're there. Absolutely not, he's not
 23 saying that.
 24 MR POLLARD: Sure but what he is saying about "I think we
 25 need to firm up X factor", excuse the pun?

1 A. Um, I can't specifically remember. But I am sure he
 2 would be saying, you know, we need to get more
 3 corroboration. You know, would he be saying all that
 4 sort of stuff, I'm sure.
 5 MR POLLARD: Because at that time you also have how many
 6 written accounts? Whether they are anonymous or --
 7 A. Remember, I'm not -- on that day, I'm not really across
 8 that process, but --
 9 MR POLLARD: Presumably Liz --
 10 A. Yes, Liz would be and so on and probably about a half
 11 a dozen I suppose, something like that, and we're
 12 gradually getting more and more out of them as well.
 13 Remember some of them don't say much the first time,
 14 they tell us a bit more. So it is a gradual process --
 15 MR MACLEAN: Mr Jones, I'm not very far off from being
 16 finished, but I'm not going to finish before we break,
 17 but I will use lunch time to see if I can thin out the
 18 material I have to cover. There is no point in going
 19 over the same ground again.
 20 A. Do you want any of that stuff in terms of the legal
 21 stuff from the first week or not? That we were talking
 22 about. Do you want me to get that stuff ready for you
 23 or not?
 24 MR POLLARD: Can we talk about that at lunch time?
 25 A. Yes.

1 MR MACLEAN: I am sure Mark will be able to explain to you
 2 that there is a question of privilege that arises. But
 3 we will --
 4 MR STEPHENS: I think it is fair to say that some of the
 5 stuff I have looked at doesn't look like it is
 6 privileged, it looks like it is embarrassing --
 7 MR POLLARD: We're aware of that.
 8 MR STEPHENS: -- and has been redacted for that reason, and
 9 that troubles me.
 10 MR POLLARD: We were aware of that as an issue.
 11 MR MACLEAN: We raised with Mr Jones last time about who had
 12 done the redactions to his documents and it wasn't him,
 13 we understand.
 14 **A. I think the stuff I'm talking about, I can't see any**
 15 **reason why it should be privileged. It's just**
 16 **organisational stuff.**
 17 MR POLLARD: We will have a discussion in the lunch break.
 18 MR MACLEAN: Okay, what time Richard?
 19 MR SPAFFORD: 2.00 pm.
 20 (1.05 pm)
 21 (The short adjournment)
 22 (2.00 pm)
 23 MR POLLARD: One procedural point about the emails you
 24 mentioned, first.
 25 MR SPAFFORD: Mark, you mentioned that by comparing

1 Meirion's unredacted emails with the redacted ones that
 2 you had seen, you felt maybe that some of the redactions
 3 were not necessarily appropriate in terms of the
 4 privilege test. I think if you have such documents, the
 5 best thing for your to do is to give them to me. I will
 6 then pass them onto the BBC and ask for their comment as
 7 to whether, on reflection, they feel they are privileged
 8 or not. So if you are happy to do that, I would propose
 9 that that is the way to deal with the issue.
 10 MR STEPHENS: I'm not convinced it is. I think there is
 11 a wider issue which probably lies at the root of this
 12 and I think it needs to be dealt with more systemically.
 13 I think -- or holistically. I think that if what we're
 14 dealing with is -- I suspect that the issues in relation
 15 to Meirion's case will not be isolated and therefore for
 16 the integrity of the Inquiry I feel it is essential that
 17 at least junior counsel go through, on behalf of the
 18 Inquiry to satisfy themselves. But, you know, that
 19 is --
 20 MR SPAFFORD: Obviously, if you give them to me, I will make
 21 sure that I am aware of them.
 22 MR STEPHENS: But that deals with one isolated area, as
 23 opposed to what I believe to be a broader problem.
 24 I have no proof of that.
 25 MR SPAFFORD: What is the basis for your view that it is

1 a broader problem?
 2 MR STEPHENS: Well, presumably the same standards have been
 3 applied to all redactions throughout.
 4 MR POLLARD: Do you want to just say what our policy about
 5 checking redactions has been?
 6 MR SPAFFORD: Obviously, redactions has been an issue that
 7 we have discussed at length with the BBC for obvious
 8 reasons. The procedure that we have is that for every
 9 redaction there has to be certification given by
 10 a lawyer, so we have not simply accepted the BBC's
 11 redaction. We came across a couple of issues where we
 12 thought that there may have been over-redaction early
 13 on. That prompted us to talk to the BBC and put in
 14 place a process whereby every redaction was certified by
 15 a lawyer.
 16 Therefore, we're concerned if you feel that you have
 17 documents that aren't properly privileged and I would
 18 say that the best way to deal with those is for you to
 19 give them to me and I will take it further forward with
 20 the BBC.
 21 MR STEPHENS: Certainly in relation to Meirion's, I think we
 22 can go through and review those again after today.
 23 MR SPAFFORD: Great.
 24 MR STEPHENS: But I do flag the wider concerns that we have.
 25 MR POLLARD: It obviously needs to be done pretty quickly.

1 **A. Cutting in for a second: you raised one, for instance,**
 2 **with me last time --**
 3 MR MACLEAN: Yes.
 4 **A. -- in which there appeared to be no logical reason for**
 5 **a redaction.**
 6 MR MACLEAN: The one about the numbers?
 7 MR SPAFFORD: Can I just say, without going into great
 8 detail, that there were some documents where we too
 9 received different copies, some redacted and some not
 10 redacted, and that gave us the opportunity, obviously,
 11 sensibly to check.
 12 On a few occasions we had some concerns and we
 13 raised those with the BBC, which is what led to this
 14 process of certification, where the BBC felt that
 15 an error perhaps had been made, perhaps someone had been
 16 overfastidious in their masking procedure, they were
 17 happy immediately to agree that a document was not
 18 privileged. So I think there has been quite a lot of
 19 discussion about this, some progress has been made.
 20 If there are still documents out there that you,
 21 having looked at them, Mark, feel are not privileged, we
 22 would be very keen to see them, I think as Nick says, as
 23 quickly as possible, because obviously time is tight.
 24 **A. Can I raise one very small thing related to that?**
 25 MR POLLARD: Sure.

1 **A. The MacQuarrie handwritten notes of the conversation**
 2 **with Liz MacKean. A keyline in there -- and it is in**
 3 **the draft that he writes but in the handwritten notes it**
 4 **seems to have gone out -- he says something like**
 5 **'[REDACTED] has never gone to the police'. The word**
 6 **"police" is not there. I just wondered whether**
 7 **something odd had happened there or not. This is the**
 8 **handwritten note of the MacKean -- mine are numbered**
 9 **differently to yours.**
 10 MR MACLEAN: Yes. There is the typed --
 11 **A. Then you have the handwritten.**
 12 MR MACLEAN: The typed note --
 13 **A. Which does mention it.**
 14 MR MACLEAN: -- at 11.191 so the paragraph [REDACTED] had
 15 not been in contact with the police".
 16 **A. Yes. But on the handwritten -- there is probably**
 17 **a totally innocent explanation --**
 18 Q. Do you have the reference?
 19 **A. Mine have different references, but I will see if I can**
 20 **find it.**
 21 Q. It will be the day before, the 9th.
 22 **A. Yes, it will be the 9th.**
 23 Q. This is it, I think. It just says "MacQuarrie/Jones" so
 24 I must be quite close. So the notes of your, I think,
 25 meeting are at A10/223.

Page 149

1 **A. I think hers --**
 2 Q. So hers must be there or thereabouts. There we go,
 3 210-ish, I think.
 4 **A. Okay. If you go halfway down the page --**
 5 Q. 210?
 6 **A. It says:**
 7 **"She not been contacted by the ..."**
 8 **It is obviously police. It is just odd that it is**
 9 **not there. If you are giving a handwritten note you**
 10 **might miss out some of the other words: "She not**
 11 **contacted police" --**
 12 MR STEPHENS: Not at the end of the paragraph, it looks like
 13 the whole of the end of the sentence has gone.
 14 **A. It just looks very strange, that is all I was going to**
 15 **point out. I just noticed that the other day when I was**
 16 **looking at it.**
 17 MR MACLEAN: I understand.
 18 Can I tell you what we have been talking about over
 19 lunch? We have been furnished some more information
 20 from the BBC and I was taxing you earlier with the
 21 meeting where Mr Stephens said "If you have the note why
 22 don't you put it to him", which was a fair point, to
 23 which there was a comprehensive answer, namely that
 24 I didn't have it.
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 150

1 Q. I was taxing you with what meeting there would have
 2 been, must have been, was with BBC Legal, essentially on
 3 the basis of something that Mr Entwistle had told us,
 4 and I read you the passage from his evidence about the
 5 noted meeting with Mr Jones.
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. What we have been told is that, although there were
 8 meetings with one or two other people, the BBC have told
 9 us:
 10 "Mr Jones and Ms MacKean were not spoken to at this
 11 time [which is in September] by BBC Legal. The first
 12 contact Legal, in the shape of Nadia Banno, had with
 13 Mr Jones was on 3 October 2012 when he emailed her
 14 regarding the safe-keeping and collation of the
 15 Newsnight material for the purpose of assisting the
 16 police. In respect of Ms MacKean, the first contact
 17 Legal had was some time later."
 18 **A. I found exactly the same, I should say, if that helps.**
 19 **I say that I have already been doing that. I have**
 20 **already been putting stuff -- I have been putting stuff**
 21 **together probably on Tuesday the 2nd, or whatever. On**
 22 **the Wednesday, it becomes formal, Nadia sends me a note**
 23 **and I send her a note back.**
 24 Q. What it comes to is that we have not been furnished with
 25 a note of any the interview that you had with legal, so

Page 151

1 I think I can show it to you, and you said to me earlier
 2 you didn't record or remember having an interview that
 3 was noted?
 4 **A. No, no. I mean, stronger than that.**
 5 Q. Right.
 6 **A. I might've -- you know, I dropped off tapes and said**
 7 **"hi", that type of thing, a one liner type of thing,**
 8 **I definitely did not have any meeting.**
 9 Q. I'm not in a position to show you a note --
 10 **A. Of course.**
 11 Q. -- and it may be that there isn't one.
 12 **A. Thank you.**
 13 Q. Okay. Now --
 14 MR STEPHENS: That does explain why there is no further
 15 document.
 16 MR MACLEAN: It gives me a cast iron reason, you might
 17 think.
 18 MR STEPHENS: It does.
 19 MR MACLEAN: Can I just ask you about one or two other
 20 points, Mr Jones?
 21 If you take bundle 14, please. I think we touched
 22 on this last time but before I give you a page, we
 23 didn't get into it in very much detail. Your
 24 secondment, if that is right word and it may not be, to
 25 Panorama --

Page 152

<p>1 A. Yes, that is a fair word --</p> <p>2 Q. -- was approved by Steve Mitchell?</p> <p>3 A. -- and Peter Rippon, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Right. I think the description of your role on Panorama</p> <p>5 changed at some stage, is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>7 Q. It changed from what to what?</p> <p>8 A. Initially, I was part of a production team. Obviously</p> <p>9 I furnished them with timelines updated, but I was</p> <p>10 ringing up the women, ██████ and people like that. At</p> <p>11 some point there was an agreement with presumably the</p> <p>12 News bosses or whatever that that was inappropriate, and</p> <p>13 that I should then be treated as a whistle-blower and</p> <p>14 a -- an interviewee, but I should not be part of the</p> <p>15 production process, and I could see the logic in that.</p> <p>16 Q. So you go from being on the programme making side of</p> <p>17 things to being a programme contributing --</p> <p>18 A. Although I was always the other, as well, if you see</p> <p>19 what I mean. I was both programme maker and programme</p> <p>20 contributor.</p> <p>21 Q. That was my next question. Although the description of</p> <p>22 your role changed, the substance of it never really</p> <p>23 changed, did it?</p> <p>24 A. No, it did. It did, and I will tell you why --</p> <p>25 MR POLLARD: What date do you think it changed?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 153</p>	<p>1 Q. The 22nd?</p> <p>2 A. So then large amounts of extra resources are put into</p> <p>3 the show at that point. Essentially Tom, you know,</p> <p>4 calls a vote of hands, "This could be a very difficult</p> <p>5 programme for people, it might not be good for your</p> <p>6 careers, and so on, who wants to volunteer to work round</p> <p>7 the clock on this and not sleep for the next week?"</p> <p>8 Q. The chain of command, if you like, was Giles to, was it</p> <p>9 Peter Horrocks?</p> <p>10 A. It changes. Initially it -- it is the immensely</p> <p>11 complicated BBC system of control. You have --</p> <p>12 Clive Edwards is in charge of Panorama, but so is</p> <p>13 Steve Mitchell, in different bits. One in Current</p> <p>14 Affairs, one in News.</p> <p>15 Q. Um-hm.</p> <p>16 A. At the start of that week Steve Mitchell is there, but</p> <p>17 he's dragged out around about there. He and Helen are</p> <p>18 dragged out from anything to do with Savile. Initially,</p> <p>19 there is nobody doing the job, but by about the 16th,</p> <p>20 I think, or the 17th, around about there Peter Horrocks</p> <p>21 is very definitely doing that job and he's manager for</p> <p>22 that of Panorama.</p> <p>23 Q. Nick asked you if you could identify a date when you</p> <p>24 role changed?</p> <p>25 A. I would say about the beginning of the second week,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 155</p>
<p>1 A. I think there is some record of that. Essentially</p> <p>2 I moved there on the 8th. For the first week or so, I'm</p> <p>3 working as production really. I think by about the</p> <p>4 beginning of the second week, um, essentially I -- Tom</p> <p>5 and Karen go out with me and we grab a bite to eat at</p> <p>6 lunch and they explain to me that the situation should</p> <p>7 change and it changes. So about a week in my time</p> <p>8 there.</p> <p>9 MR MACLEAN: When you cease to have the production role,</p> <p>10 presumably somebody else fulfilled that role thereafter.</p> <p>11 A. No, remember there was already a big team there of</p> <p>12 people working on it already. So Andrew Bell would</p> <p>13 always have been the lead producer on this.</p> <p>14 Q. Right.</p> <p>15 A. So I was part of that production team.</p> <p>16 Q. So there was no -- nobody came off the bench to replace</p> <p>17 you?</p> <p>18 A. No, but what then happens is on -- on the 15th,</p> <p>19 Maria Miller does her thing in Parliament. George then</p> <p>20 says "I'm going to go to the Select Committee on the</p> <p>21 23rd", or it becomes apparent that it will be the 23rd,</p> <p>22 I think, on the Tuesday.</p> <p>23 Q. Right.</p> <p>24 A. Panorama then decides to do a rush programme for the</p> <p>25 Monday night, the night before he goes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 154</p>	<p>1 about the 15th.</p> <p>2 Q. So after your role changed, let's assume it was the</p> <p>3 15th, what was your function in terms of putting</p> <p>4 together Panorama?</p> <p>5 A. Providing information if they wanted information, not</p> <p>6 ringing up contributors or anything like that or chasing</p> <p>7 people. So I didn't go out to any of the people's</p> <p>8 houses or anything like that. I was also not able to be</p> <p>9 part of the editing process. It is a long time since</p> <p>10 I have done a long form film. The last time I did one</p> <p>11 was 2003. I would very much have been interested in</p> <p>12 being part of that. Obviously, I could not be part of</p> <p>13 that process.</p> <p>14 Q. But you were contributing bits to the story other than</p> <p>15 your own interview were you or not? You were simply</p> <p>16 going to be a contributor as an interviewee?</p> <p>17 A. Around about then, yes. There are some people who are</p> <p>18 still ringing me back from calls I put -- so, for,</p> <p>19 instance I rang every ambulance chaser -- sorry,</p> <p>20 apologies, every sort of tort lawyer in the business, in</p> <p>21 the first week --</p> <p>22 Q. No need to apologies to me, Mr Jones.</p> <p>23 A. -- in the first week, and there are about 20 firms that</p> <p>24 you know the Savile story is likely to come to. So most</p> <p>25 of those are dealt with but some of them are still</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 156</p>

1 coming back to me, so I'm only just dealing with people
 2 who are coming back to me, I'm not initiating anything
 3 new.
 4 Q. I'm trying to get a sense of how real this change of
 5 role was.
 6 A. It was real because I, for instance, had no input or
 7 knowledge of the script for Panorama. I knew nothing
 8 about what the script was.
 9 Q. Right.
 10 A. I was excluded completely from the production process.
 11 Q. After your role changed?
 12 A. They might still be saying to me "Do you have a number
 13 for [REDACTED] or something -- they might still be
 14 asking me that sort of thing, but I'm not allowed to
 15 talk to other contributors or anything else, basically,
 16 at that stage.
 17 Q. So this change of role came about because somebody --
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. -- had identified that there was potentially
 20 a problem --
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. -- with you wearing too many hats, and you recognised
 23 that as a genuine concern.
 24 A. I thought that was fair enough, yes. At the start of
 25 that process, remember, we are not planning to go out
 Page 157

1 for three or four weeks at that stage. Suddenly there
 2 is an acceleration as well, at the same time.
 3 Q. What difference does that make?
 4 A. I suppose those things were not that urgent, and so on,
 5 suddenly it became urgent for them to make a decision
 6 about that, I suppose.
 7 Q. That doesn't affect your role.
 8 A. No, but in terms of being clear cut as to what my role
 9 is then, at that point, because, you know, you are going
 10 to be writing scripts tomorrow, those things are not
 11 distant things, they are now immediate things.
 12 Q. I'm trying to pin this down. I don't have a proper
 13 sense of this.
 14 A. Sorry.
 15 Q. We know that your role changes from X to Y and you have
 16 explained very clearly what your role was in Y as
 17 a contributor to the programme, and you may still have
 18 numbers that you can furnish people with and so on, but
 19 essentially you are out of the programme production
 20 process.
 21 A. Exactly.
 22 Q. Then you explained again very clearly that when
 23 Mr Entwistle is going to go to the committee, suddenly
 24 it was all hands to the Panorama pump to produce
 25 a programme by the Monday night?
 Page 158

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. What impact, if any, does that "All hands to the pump,
 3 let's get on with this", what impact did that have on
 4 your role?
 5 A. What I'm saying is then suddenly instead of, say,
 6 a script being a week away from being done, a script has
 7 to be done now. So it is very important that if the
 8 decision is that I should not be involved in scripting
 9 or things like this, or control over what goes into the
 10 programme, that decision had to be made.
 11 Q. It was made?
 12 A. Yes, it was made.
 13 Q. By the 15th?
 14 A. It could have been the end of the previous -- I think it
 15 was about the 15th, in effect.
 16 Q. Okay. Do you know who Sarah Green is.
 17 A. No. Who is Sarah Green?
 18 Q. Let me show you. In bundle 14, if you go to page 232.
 19 A. First page, 232?
 20 Q. 232. If you go on beyond that one, you should find one
 21 numbered 232.001; do you see?
 22 A. Yes, that one.
 23 Q. Now, there is an email there in the middle of the page?
 24 A. Yes, I know who Sarah Green is now.
 25 Q. Sarah Green sent you an email on 18 October --
 Page 159

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. -- at 17.26, and she works for something called the EVAW
 3 Coalition, and that acronym stands for End Violence
 4 Against Women.
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. She sent you an email. At the bottom of the page there
 7 is a press release dated 18 October --
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. -- saying:
 10 "The following letter has been sent by five leading
 11 UK women's organisations to BBC Director General, George
 12 Entwistle, today regarding the two Inquiries into
 13 Jimmy Savile's alleged abuse of children."
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. The letter asks that:
 16 "... the Inquiries work with sexual violence experts
 17 and look at whether institutional sexism was part of
 18 what provided the context where abuse could happen."
 19 Then it refers, do you see, at the top of 002 to:
 20 "... whether the Newsnight editor's decision to drop
 21 the programme was related to prejudicial attitudes which
 22 minimise abuse of women and girls, seeing it as having
 23 no news value in and of itself."
 24 Then there was a letter sent to various people,
 25 including Nick and Dame Janet and the Prime Minister and
 Page 160

<p>1 the Deputy Prime Minister and the Leader of the 2 Opposition. Then there is a long letter headed "Dear 3 Mr Entwistle". Then if you go to 002, this letter -- 4 which I appreciate is not your letter, it is Ms Green's 5 letter -- says, towards the bottom of the page: 6 "Peter Rippon's reasoning appears to be that: (1) 7 the discovery of institutional failure would have solid 8 news value and was therefore worth pursuing, but that 9 perhaps (2) the exposure of a prominent BBC Television 10 presenter's rape and sexual abuse of girls over decades 11 did not in and of itself have news value, and further 12 that this was perhaps considered merely celebrity 13 expose. If this is the case we find this deeply 14 worrying. Women have campaigned for decades to expose 15 the nature and scale of sexual violence and the media 16 has a critical roll to play in shining a light on this 17 hidden issue", and so on. 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. If you just focus on 003 for a moment? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. It wasn't Mr Rippon's view, was it, that the exposure of 22 a prominent BBC Television presenter's rape and sexual 23 abuse of girls did not in and of itself have News value. 24 That wouldn't be a fair characterisation of Mr Rippon's 25 position, would it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 161</p>	<p>1 was perhaps considered merely celebrity expose, well, he 2 does say that in the blog. They obviously looked at the 3 blog -- they have an agenda, obviously, this group. 4 They have a very strong agenda. 5 Q. They have an agenda? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. What is their agenda? 8 A. Their very strong agenda is that there is a conspiracy 9 of, you know, middle aged, middle class men who don't 10 care about what has happened to young women, and so on 11 and et cetera. That is the sort of agenda that they are 12 pursuing. 13 Q. That -- the idea that -- let's assume for the moment 14 that you are correct that that is their agenda? 15 A. It is part of their agenda, or however you want to put 16 it, but that is part of their agenda. 17 Q. All right? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. I'm not suggesting it is a definitive definition? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. But let's assume that is right? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. You knew, didn't you, that Peter Rippon was not such 24 a conspirator? That would not be a fair 25 characterisation of the editor of Newsnight, would it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 163</p>
<p>1 A. Um, give me the -- where is the quote again? 2 Q. I have just read it, 003 -- 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. -- second to bottom paragraph. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. "Peter Rippon's reasoning appears to be that: (1) the 7 discovery of institutional failure would have solid news 8 value and was therefore worth pursuing." 9 Pausing there, his view was that the institutional 10 failure would have had solid news value as a Newsnight 11 story -- 12 A. Yes, clearly, yes. 13 Q. -- but that perhaps -- perhaps -- (2): 14 "... the exposure of a prominent BBC Television 15 presenter's rape and sexual abuse of girls over decades 16 did not in and of itself have news value." 17 A. That is their characterisation of it, isn't it. 18 Q. Would you accept that that is not a fair 19 characterisation? 20 A. It is an exaggerated characterisation, I think. 21 Q. It is quite significantly exaggerated, isn't it? 22 A. Yes, if they put something like "the exposure of 23 a prominent BBC Television presenters sexual abuse of 24 girls did not in itself have enough news value", you 25 know that would be closer to it, and further that this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 162</p>	<p>1 A. I mean this is in their language. 2 Q. I'm asking -- you worked with Peter Rippon for a number 3 of years. I'm asking you to agree or disagree with my 4 suggestion that, whatever disagreements or problems you 5 may have had with Peter Rippon -- 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. -- you had no reason to think that he was such 8 a conspirator -- in other words the type of person -- 9 A. No, no. I would agree with that. 10 Q. Is that fair? 11 A. Yes, I would say that is fair. He was prone to using 12 phrases like "just the women" and all this sort of stuff 13 which, as we know, created quite a lot of kerfuffle. 14 Q. You say that the End Violence Against Women Coalition 15 had an agenda and obviously is a lobby group, that is 16 perhaps not surprising? 17 A. Yes. 18 MR STEPHENS: Or necessarily pejorative. 19 MR MACLEAN: Or necessarily pejorative, I'm not suggest it 20 is. You would expect them to have an agenda. CND has 21 an agenda, the hunting alliance has an agenda and so on. 22 There is nothing wrong with having an agenda. 23 A. No, no, exactly right. 24 Q. I accept that entirely. Look at page 001, 18 October. 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 164</p>

1 Q. Same day, indeed 9 minutes after you received this
 2 email.
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. You send an email to Andrew Bell, who I think you say
 5 you just told us was the --
 6 **A. The boss effectively.**
 7 Q. -- producer of this piece, Karen Wightman, who was also
 8 working --
 9 **A. Deputy editor.**
 10 Q. -- Tom Giles, who was the editor --
 11 **A. Editor --**
 12 Q. -- Stephen Scott --
 13 **A. -- producer, very experienced, also working on it.**
 14 Q. -- and Liz MacKean.
 15 **A. Yes, I sent that to Liz, yes.**
 16 Q. The keyline is this:
 17 "So Peter Rippon's own justification for dropping
 18 the investigation is an abuse of girls by a celebrity
 19 over decades was not newsworthy. He said had they
 20 pinned down institutional failure at CPS or" --
 21 I'm afraid there is a hole through that --
 22 MR SPAFFORD: Police.
 23 MR MACLEAN: "... police, that would have been real news but
 24 the abuse of girls over years on their own was not."
 25 You sent that to the production team in Panorama,

Page 165

1 right?
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. Why?
 4 **A. Because this has just come into me. They have sent it**
 5 **to the newsroom and to me and so on.**
 6 Q. They sent it to you, I think?
 7 **A. Yes, and to the newsroom. They sent this to about 100**
 8 **different people. They sent it to every newspaper, they**
 9 **sent it to me, they sent it to the BBC newsroom, I don't**
 10 **think that Panorama have this, so I sent it to the**
 11 **Panorama team.**
 12 Q. But you extract the keyline and feed it to the producer
 13 of Panorama.
 14 **A. Yes. I'm saying that if that's the thought you want**
 15 **from a contributor, that's the thought they will**
 16 **provide.**
 17 Q. You see, it might be suggested Mr Jones, and I do
 18 suggest, that not only did the coalition have an agenda
 19 but you on 18 October had an agenda and that agenda was
 20 to, um, do the best you could to make sure that Panorama
 21 made allegations about Peter Rippon which you knew,
 22 because you had been close to these facts the year
 23 before were unsustainable.
 24 **A. Why did you pull out a different quote from that quote**
 25 **there. I don't understand why you pulled out**

Page 166

1 **a different quote? Why not pull out that quote there,**
 2 **the quote they give at the top there, that I have given**
 3 **as keyline is this? Why have you gone and looked for**
 4 **another quote, what is the point of that?**
 5 Q. Just focus on the question, if you wouldn't mind?
 6 **A. Yes.**
 7 Q. You told us a few minutes ago that by 15 October you
 8 were on the contributor side of the fence?
 9 **A. Yes.**
 10 Q. You had no role in the script?
 11 **A. Absolutely.**
 12 Q. You had no role in the production of the programme?
 13 **A. Yes.**
 14 Q. This email rather suggests that, in fact, you did still
 15 have a continuing role in the production of the
 16 programme --
 17 **A. No, it doesn't suggest that at all.**
 18 Q. -- doesn't it?
 19 **A. No, it doesn't. Why does it suggest that?**
 20 Q. Because you have been into the Sarah Green material and
 21 you have extracted the keyline, which you then serve up
 22 to the production team for them to use in their Panorama
 23 piece.
 24 **A. These are potential contributors who could go into the**
 25 **piece, who have got in touch with me. They have been in**

Page 167

1 **touch earlier on in the process, when I was working on**
 2 **the programme.**
 3 Q. Why not go back to Sarah Green and say either "I have
 4 passed your email onto Tom Giles or Andrew Bell", or
 5 perhaps better "Why don't you send your email to
 6 Andrew Bell or Tom Giles?"
 7 **A. Because this is pages of stuff. When you are in a hurry**
 8 **and working, this is of no use. What is the line that**
 9 **they will provide. I've just gone five lines in. If**
 10 **you will see that quote there is a quote from this piece**
 11 **it is not the quote you gave it is a actual quote from**
 12 **the top of this piece, from the first paragraph.**
 13 Q. You are quite right that the covering email --
 14 **A. All I have done is extracted a quote from the first**
 15 **paragraph saying "That's what they are saying, you don't**
 16 **need to bother reading the rest, that's what they are**
 17 **saying".**
 18 Q. You knew, because you have just accepted this --
 19 **A. A different quote.**
 20 Q. -- that the suggestion -- let's take that quote --
 21 **A. Yes, let's take this one.**
 22 Q. -- the suggestion that Peter Rippon's justification for
 23 dropping the investigation was that the abuse of girls
 24 by a celebrity over decades was not newsworthy was not
 25 accurate, didn't you? That is a gross distortion of

Page 168

1 Peter Rippon's position, isn't it?
 2 **A. Not a gross distortion, but it is what they are saying,**
 3 **but it is what they are saying. I have just**
 4 **summarised -- I have taken one quote out from them.**
 5 Q. You extracting this keyline, whether you get it from the
 6 covering email or the more detailed position set out,
 7 doesn't matter I suggest.
 8 **A. Then why did you take a quote that was a completely**
 9 **different quote. What was the point of that if it**
 10 **didn't matter?**
 11 Q. You are not obeying the changed circumstances in which
 12 you had, by that time, found yourself, are you?
 13 **A. How, how do you make that out?**
 14 Q. Because you are in this Panorama position?
 15 **A. Yes.**
 16 Q. In the unique position, and it might be suggested, so
 17 far as Peter Rippon is concerned, an unfair position,
 18 because you are not just a producer or a contributor or
 19 somebody who is helping out, you uniquely among all the
 20 people in the world, are in possession of the facts as
 21 to what precisely happened with Newsnight the year
 22 before.
 23 **A. I agree with you on that, yes.**
 24 Q. If I had been acting as Mr Bell's assistant or Nick had
 25 been acting as Mr Bell's assistant, one could understand

Page 169

1 why somebody might, as a journalist, extract
 2 a particular keyline from a particular email or a letter
 3 and say "Look here's the key lines, here's what these
 4 people are saying", but in your position you now knew
 5 that that keyline was a gross distortion of
 6 Peter Rippon's --
 7 **A. No, I'm not saying it is gross distortion, you are**
 8 **saying it is a gross distortion. You gave me a totally**
 9 **different quote and said "Is that a gross distortion?"**
 10 **and I said yes, that is a gross distortion.**
 11 Q. That is also a gross distortion --
 12 **A. It is not a gross distortion.**
 13 Q. -- because Peter Rippon's justification was never that
 14 abuse of girls by a celebrity over decades was not
 15 newsworthy. That was never part of the analysis, was
 16 it?
 17 **A. Well, he said it would be -- it would be newsworthy if**
 18 **there was institutional failure.**
 19 Q. No, he didn't, he said it would be a Newsnight story
 20 capable of running, if there was institutional failure.
 21 **A. Okay, newsworthy in Newsnight terms, yes.**
 22 Q. But he never gave any reason for you to think that part
 23 of his justification, still less his justification, was
 24 an abuse of girls by a celebrity over decades was not
 25 newsworthy, did he?

Page 170

1 **A. Take out the "over decades", but "abuse of girls was not**
 2 **newsworthy", I think that is a conclusion you could come**
 3 **to from the fact that he did not run the story and he**
 4 **said it would be a story if there was institutional**
 5 **failure. I think you could come to that conclusion.**
 6 **But this is their thing. I don't really understand what**
 7 **the fuss is here. I have been sent by a potential**
 8 **contributor to the programme -- I'm still getting sent**
 9 **stuff by potential contributors --**
 10 Q. The fuzz, if you put it like that, is that you are still
 11 a participant here and not merely a contributor?
 12 **A. I said to you I'm still in a position where I'm getting,**
 13 **for instance, from the ambulance chasers, et cetera,**
 14 **people are still coming back to me because I was**
 15 **originally their point of contact, and I'm just**
 16 **forwarding this on and saying "the sense of this is**
 17 **that", that if you are looking for one sentence which**
 18 **tells you what they are saying, that's the one sentence.**
 19 **As it happens, they were not interest in that, and that**
 20 **is fine.**
 21 Q. That is the soundbite that you are extracting for them?
 22 **A. I probably have not even the rest of it, to be honest.**
 23 Q. Why send it to Liz MacKean?
 24 **A. Because Liz would be very interested. I'm not sending**
 25 **it to her as part of the team, I'm sending it to there**

Page 171

1 **because obviously Liz is going to be interested that**
 2 **this group are making these claims.**
 3 Q. All right. Let me go back to your red flag email for
 4 another minute or two. Bundle 3, page 270, please.
 5 **A. That is a good point maybe I ought to raise.**
 6 MR MACLEAN: The one Mr Stephens just suggested?
 7 **A. Yes, he reminded me why that went to Liz MacKean, which**
 8 **is that that is very close to what she said Peter Rippon**
 9 **had said to her, the conversation that I did not**
 10 **witness. That's why it would be of interest to her that**
 11 **they are taking a very similar line to the line that she**
 12 **was claiming.**
 13 Q. I understand. Bundle 3, page 688 is the cover of the
 14 red flag email?
 15 **A. I don't know if you put that to Liz but/think that Liz**
 16 **might have well said that that did summarise her view of**
 17 **what was happening.**
 18 Q. I think we probably did, is the answer to that one.
 19 Now, the red flag mail at 269 --
 20 **A. Yes.**
 21 Q. -- says that:
 22 "There is a very high chance that the story will
 23 emerge before Christmas anyhow from elsewhere and if
 24 that happens the story will not be 'Police secretly
 25 investigated Jimmy Savile for child sex abuse' but 'BBC

Page 172

1 covered up paedo Sir Jimmy Savile', and if it emerges
 2 after Christmas that we sat on this the headlines will
 3 be 'BBC covered up paedo Sir Jimmy Savile to fix
 4 Christmas ratings'."

5 **A. Yes.**

6 Q. One might say that that was a rather prescient
 7 prediction of what was going to happen, might one?

8 **A. It didn't happen, did it, at that time? It did not
 9 really happen until much later.**

10 Q. It did emerge after Christmas, didn't it, and indeed to
 11 some extent with Mr Goslett on 21 December, the
 12 allegations were floating around before Christmas?

13 **A. But I didn't know that. In fact, there is more than
 14 that in that there was also the call of The Mirror to
 15 the Newsnight office on 15 December as well, I think.**

16 Q. Now, somebody has described to us the amounts and the
 17 speed, I think it was, of the briefing to the press
 18 about the Newsnight story as being astonishing.

19 **A. At what stage?**

20 Q. At an early stage, shortly after the story was canned.

21 **A. I think I would agree with that.**

22 Q. You would agree with that?

23 **A. I would agree with that. But I should say I didn't know
 24 that until The Spectator piece -- was it about a month
 25 ago? Where Miles Goslett said he had gone to them**

Page 173

1 **before Christmas, because I was astonished when I read
 2 that because it made it all the more incredible that
 3 they had actually run the tributes. You know I was
 4 absolutely startled that the press had been in touch
 5 with them before Christmas.**

6 Q. One might say that these points you make here are
 7 prescient and you might say that they have been rather
 8 borne out by subsequent events, would you?

9 **A. Expect much, much later on than I thought.**

10 Q. Another alternative that has been suggested to us is
 11 that what you say at 269 and 270 was in fact
 12 a self-fulfilling prophecy. What do you say to that, in
 13 the sense that you were instrumental in achieving these
 14 headlines which in fact subsequently transpired?

15 **A. No, I mean categorically that's not true, and anyhow, if
 16 I was going to do that, why would I -- you know, why
 17 would I create a document saying that, if I was going to
 18 leak something to Miles Goslett. It doesn't make sense.**

19 Q. If I was to suggest to you that --

20 **A. Why didn't I create this document on my own email or
 21 something, rather than creating it in the BBC system, if
 22 I was going about to do something where I was going to
 23 leak it, it just doesn't make any sense to me.**

24 Q. So if you were going to leak something, you would take
 25 care to put that on "amazing.meirion".

Page 174

1 **A. You would imagine so, wouldn't you?**

2 Q. I don't know, I have never been involved in leaking
 3 stories to the press, Mr Jones. If I was to suggest to
 4 you that this has been described as a self-fulfilling
 5 prophecy, on the basis that you set about making these
 6 headlines happen, you would say what?

7 **A. I would say it is completely false, utterly false. As
 8 I said, I have made offers for -- it is quite irritating
 9 actually, when you are trying to answer a question, the
 10 person turns to talk to somebody else when you are
 11 trying to answer it, especially when it is a really
 12 important question like this.**

13 **I'm extremely concerned about this -- it may be
 14 funny, but what then happens is the press office start
 15 writing emails within days of this saying that they are
 16 going to drip poison about me. So not only is a false
 17 allegation being made against me, it then starts
 18 a process where poison is dripped about me.**

19 Q. This may --

20 **A. I don't know what else I can -- I have offered to let
 21 you get somebody to go through my, you know, phone
 22 calls, through my home email, whatever you want to do to
 23 try to find -- you know, to find an answer to this.**

24 Q. I'm just putting to you what we have been told --

25 **A. Yes.**

Page 175

1 Q. -- that others take a different view of your red flag
 2 email --

3 **A. Yes.**

4 Q. -- and it has been suggested to us that it was
 5 a self-fulfilling prophecy.

6 **A. Yes.**

7 Q. I asked you what you thought about that.

8 **A. It is totally false and then you are laughing about it.**

9 Q. I am not laughing about anything.

10 **A. You're not now, no.**

11 Q. I wasn't laughing at all, actually.

12 MR STEPHENS: Actually, it was your junior.

13 MR MACLEAN: If you have some point to make, then make it
 14 now on the transcript, Mr Jones.

15 MR STEPHENS: It was your junior that laughed.

16 MR MACLEAN: The reason I turned to Mr Blakely was to see
 17 whether there were any more questions for you after this
 18 one. You ought really to be directing your answers to
 19 Mr Pollard. It is perfectly usual to turn around and
 20 see what is going on but if it put you off, I apologise.
 21 Would you like me to put the question again?

22 **A. Yes, please do.**

23 Q. What I suggested to was: if I was to suggest to that
 24 this has been described to us by somebody else as
 25 a self-fulfilling prophecy, on the basis that you set

Page 176

1 about making these headlines happen -- that is the
 2 suggestion -- you would say what?
 3 **A. I would say that is completely and utterly false, I did**
 4 **not have any communication of any sort with**
 5 **Miles Goslett until October this year, er, and I did not**
 6 **have any contact with any of the media journalists or**
 7 **any other journalists who had anything to do with this**
 8 **story at any point over that -- well, nearly a year.**
 9 Q. That would include the Sunday Mirror?
 10 **A. Absolutely.**
 11 Q. Telegraph?
 12 **A. Absolutely.**
 13 Q. The Mail?
 14 **A. Yes.**
 15 Q. Times?
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. Mr Webster?
 18 **A. Over that period, yes.**
 19 Q. Mr Sabbagh at The Guardian?
 20 **A. Yes, the first time I even heard of him was when he**
 21 **wrote that piece on October 1. I never talked to any of**
 22 **those people before that.**
 23 **Can I put on the record -- also reiterate my**
 24 **offer --**
 25 Q. Just forgive me --

1 **A. -- to help in any way at all to go through any of my**
 2 **communications to see if you can find anything there.**
 3 Q. Just forgive me one moment.
 4 **A. Sorry, can I add one thing to that, which I think is**
 5 **really important? There are at least two other people**
 6 **who are as centrally involved in this as I was, in**
 7 **exactly the same position as I was, and yet for some**
 8 **reason the management seem to have decided that I have**
 9 **leaked this stuff. I have not, and I'm very categorical**
 10 **about that.**
 11 Q. So if I were to suggest to you that we had heard that
 12 you had "form" for leaking --
 13 **A. Then I would love to hear what that form was. I hope it**
 14 **was not just rumours. I hope there were clear facts**
 15 **given to you.**
 16 **Questions by MR POLLARD**
 17 MR POLLARD: Can I just ask a few questions about sort of
 18 the work of Newsnight and investigations and so on?
 19 I should probably sort of preface them by saying a lot
 20 of water has flowed under the bridge and these are not,
 21 shall we say, normal times, but, if you like, try to set
 22 that apart and rolling the clock back a year or so
 23 before the Savile story came about.
 24 I'm just interested in, first of all, your view of
 25 how easy or difficult it was to get investigations up

1 and running and on the air. I suppose I'm thinking in
 2 terms of a squeeze on resources, which everybody knows
 3 that there has been, on the one hand, and I suppose
 4 possibly any sort of change of attitude towards the
 5 importance of investigations in relation to other
 6 programme elements.
 7 **A. I think unquestionably, partly for financial reasons,**
 8 **there has been a drive towards turning it into more of**
 9 **a talk show. It is much cheaper and it is not just**
 10 **investigations, it is films as well. You cut the number**
 11 **of films, you cut the number of investigations, you fill**
 12 **more of the airtime with as many guests as possible in**
 13 **the studio. It is massively cheaper.**
 14 MR POLLARD: Do you think that is wrong?
 15 **A. I think it is. I think it is very important -- I could**
 16 **give you a list as long as your arm of investigations**
 17 **that Newsnight has done, some not including me.**
 18 **One that did not include me, for instance, was the**
 19 **first information we had that the leader of the London**
 20 **bombers was under MI5 surveillance throughout. That was**
 21 **completely Newsnight story. The whole secret policemen**
 22 **stories that started about two years ago they all came**
 23 **out of our investigations for Newsnight. All these**
 24 **sorts of stories that have come out, one story alone**
 25 **recouped £10 million for the taxpayer, which is more**

1 **than the cost of all the investigations we have done and**
 2 **we will recoup about 50 million for the NHS.**
 3 **So the other importance to that is once you have**
 4 **that machine there, it means when stories come like A4E**
 5 **or whatever, you have the capability there --**
 6 MR STEPHENS: (Overspeaking) which is why he looked at me.
 7 MR MACLEAN: What is A4E?
 8 **A. They were the companies that running work fair**
 9 **programmes for the Government. There was a huge row**
 10 **about it earlier this year.**
 11 **It means that when things come along, people are**
 12 **likely to give you inside documents, whistle-blowers are**
 13 **likely to come to you, so even on those fast turnaround**
 14 **stories (a) people will come to you and (b) you have**
 15 **a capability to deal with it, make an assessment, and**
 16 **you only get that by having a sort of investigative team**
 17 **which is capable of doing that.**
 18 **Now, there is another model for doing it which is**
 19 **perfectly good, which is that you have a centralised**
 20 **team and you then distribute that across your news**
 21 **programmes and that is also a perfectly good model, but**
 22 **without something like that, you are going to make**
 23 **terrible, terrible mistakes, as we have seen.**
 24 MR POLLARD: Setting aside the McAlpine issue, which is
 25 obviously past the point where our remit starts, as it

1 were, and if possible setting aside the events of the
 2 Savile inquiry, do you think there was a danger, or
 3 possibly is a danger, that Newsnight was reaching the
 4 point where the squeeze on resources meant that it was,
 5 shall we say, almost unwise to be doing investigations,
 6 because they weren't properly resourced?
 7 **A. I mean I think the main danger there is freelance**
 8 **operations. Putting aside what has happened, I said**
 9 **that and would have said that beforehand. There is**
 10 **a mistake in thinking that you can buy in a freelance**
 11 **operation and it won't cost you as much resources as**
 12 **doing it yourself. You still have to have**
 13 **an investigations' producer or somebody like that who**
 14 **crawls all over the story, you know, puts tens and tens**
 15 **of hours into it, standing up everything, talking to the**
 16 **interviewees, doing all that. It takes almost as much**
 17 **time as it does doing it from scratch yourself. In**
 18 **fact, I think the best use of freelance operations like**
 19 **that is when they come to you with a story you wouldn't**
 20 **have got by other means, but you still need to put**
 21 **massive resources into it.**
 22 **I think Newsnight was still doing it. It was doing**
 23 **less of them, but the ones it was doing, it was doing**
 24 **well. Um, but you know, you have to commit enough**
 25 **resources, otherwise you will have a problem.**

Page 181

1 MR POLLARD: Do you think at the time of the Savile
 2 inquiry -- and again setting aside, if possible, the
 3 passion that this has generated --
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 MR POLLARD: -- did you get the sense that there was --
 6 there had grown up something of a sort of cultural
 7 divide between what you might call the old school
 8 people -- and I suspect you would probably put yourself
 9 in that category, if you agree it exists -- much more
 10 interested in investigations and breaking stories --
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 MR POLLARD: -- and a element within the management -- and
 13 I would include probably Peter Rippon in this -- who
 14 were keener on a studio element and so on? Was that
 15 part of the cultural background at that stage?
 16 **A. I think that's true, and I think in 2010, when Peter**
 17 **tried to get out on a sabbatical, at that point, he**
 18 **pushed ahead quite quickly down the chat show path and**
 19 **it had --**
 20 MR POLLARD: Is chat show is a bit unfair?
 21 **A. I don't think so. Okay, call it a characterisation or**
 22 **something.**
 23 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 24 **A. I'm not imagining Jeremy walking down the steps with the**
 25 **flashing lights and the sort of "dum di dum" music going**

Page 182

1 on, but there is something of that about it. It is
 2 whether, in effect, people talk about an option where
 3 Newsnight could be a half hour show after the News at 10
 4 with no News or whatever on it but basically talking
 5 about -- like the Nicky Campbell 9 o'clock in the
 6 morning 5 Live show after the News that has been on the
 7 Breakfast. People talk about that as an option.
 8 We felt we were going down that route. In 2010 we
 9 went too far down that route. It had very bad effects
 10 on the programme. Peter, to his credit, realised that
 11 and pulled it back and at the beginning of 2011 we then
 12 launched a series of good investigations. We got the
 13 programme back on track a bit, audiences went up, impact
 14 went up, which is crucial. But there is a conflict
 15 between those two things.
 16 MR POLLARD: So at the time of the Savile story, it wouldn't
 17 be right to say that you felt -- again, absolutely not
 18 putting words into your mouth -- that you were fighting
 19 a rearguard action for investigations?
 20 **A. No.**
 21 MR POLLARD: You thought the programme was on a reasonably
 22 even keel?
 23 **A. It had had a bad year and been criticised heavily in the**
 24 **press, and so on.**
 25 MR POLLARD: But it was winning awards, didn't it win an RTS

Page 183

1 award?
 2 **A. Not then, but it won one earlier this year.**
 3 MR POLLARD: For 2011 effectively, yes.
 4 **A. Yes.**
 5 **To be fair on Peter, for instance, we did a long**
 6 **investigation into the Azerbaijan buying gold medals at**
 7 **the London Olympics. He put money into that and it took**
 8 **a year to come to fruition and he allowed us to go and**
 9 **film, and so on, so he did on occasion fund things which**
 10 **were quite speculative and might not have come off at**
 11 **all and, in that case took a year to come off, so I'm**
 12 **not criticising him on that basis necessarily.**
 13 **I think what you are trying to say was this a bit of**
 14 **a Hail Mary, the Savile thing, that if it came off we**
 15 **would be covered in glory --**
 16 MR POLLARD: No. It wasn't that.
 17 **A. All right.**
 18 MR POLLARD: It wasn't that. I guess what I was trying to
 19 get at was whether you had, for any reason, sort of
 20 imbued that story with maybe more personal passion than
 21 you should have done.
 22 **A. It is possible. It is possible. I can't speak to that,**
 23 **really. Only other people could tell you that really.**
 24 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 25 I suppose I -- one of the things that I'm keen to

Page 184

1 get at, if I possibly can, is a sense of the
 2 relationship that you had with Peter through that
 3 period. I mean, I'm assuming that beforehand the
 4 relationship seemed to be fine --
 5 **A. Um-hm.**
 6 MR POLLARD: -- and I think you worked on Newsnight and you
 7 did some investigations for Peter's editorship after the
 8 Savile story finished, but clearly the relationship was
 9 deteriorating at the end of November/early December,
 10 because of the fundamental disagreement over the story,
 11 was it?
 12 **A. It did. But once, on 9 December, I had agreed not to go**
 13 **on with that, when we got back into action again he gave**
 14 **me just as strong stories to do. Stories that, um --**
 15 **you know, there has been a suggestion that he didn't**
 16 **trust me after that, but if that was the case he should**
 17 **not have put me in charge of things like the**
 18 **metal-on-metal hip story, we are we were -- we had**
 19 **a \$60 billion turnover a year company, you know, Johnson**
 20 **& Johnson, in the target. If we got it wrong it was**
 21 **going to cost -- it did cost them, you know, hundreds of**
 22 **millions of dollars, that story. If we had got that**
 23 **wrong, we would have been sued for everything we had.**
 24 **So you know, there was story after story, A4E, again**
 25 **intensely litigious, all these sort of stories coming**

Page 185

1 **our that year. I was given all those stories to do,**
 2 **there was no question about that and, as you know, after**
 3 **I had got the first Julian Assange interview, Peter told**
 4 **Caroline Hawley that I was the jewel in the crown of the**
 5 **BBC. So I didn't think that. To be fair, I didn't want**
 6 **him booted out of his job or anything. I didn't want**
 7 **him to leave the programme or anything. You know,**
 8 **I wasn't campaigning to get rid of him or anything of**
 9 **that sort.**
 10 MR POLLARD: Do you think you and Peter Rippon are
 11 fundamentally completely different types of journalists.
 12 I'm not saying it is a good thing for a bad thing, but
 13 I just want to hear about your view of it.
 14 **A. I don't know. I was never quite clear what he was that**
 15 **interested in. I don't know what it was that, you know,**
 16 **I don't know what it is that particularly interests him**
 17 **in the News sense, or whatever.**
 18 MR POLLARD: Explain what you mean by that.
 19 **A. I think a lot of editors are very clear they want this**
 20 **type of story, they want that type of story. You know,**
 21 **they come in saying, "What about this, we need to jump**
 22 **on that, what about that report that is coming out next**
 23 **month? Somebody go and get that report, let's get**
 24 **a leak of that report", whatever it might be. I didn't**
 25 **have a sense of any purpose really, but then, as you**

Page 186

1 say, it may be that he had just a different way -- maybe
 2 he's more interested in talking about the news of the
 3 day and that sort of thing and doing the best possible
 4 discussion that you could do on that.
 5 MR POLLARD: [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 **A. I think he did a good job on radio, and I think --**
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 **He would probably have been perfectly okay**
 15 **journalistically and so on, [REDACTED]**
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 **I mean, it took me a year when I moved to**
 18 **television. For a year, I couldn't understand why other**
 19 **people were doing much better stuff than I was, and it**
 20 **made no sense to me, but I couldn't get to grips with it**
 21 **for a year [REDACTED]**
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 MR POLLARD: Okay, thank you.
 24 Further questions by MR MACLEAN
 25 MR MACLEAN: I just have a couple of points arising out of

Page 187

1 Nick's questions and one that doesn't.
 2 That last point you just made, obviously the
 3 difference between radio and television to an ignorant
 4 lay person like me is that one has pictures and one
 5 hasn't. What is it that is difficult to get to grips
 6 with, if one moves from being a radio editor to
 7 a television editor?
 8 **A. The great thing about radio is that it is very easy to**
 9 **switch to something to get something -- something**
 10 **happens somewhere, you know, you just get somebody on**
 11 **a phone from Addis Ababa. You can just -- you can do**
 12 **things incredibly fast, incredibly easily.**
 13 **With television, everything is multiplied by 10. It**
 14 **is just so much slower to get the material in. If you**
 15 **are making a package you have to edit it together, it**
 16 **takes forever -- the classic thing you would say in**
 17 **telly is an hour's shooting gets you a minute's footage,**
 18 **and then an hour's editing of that gets you a minute's**
 19 **stuff on air. It is massively more difficult to do.**
 20 **Q. In terms of the Savile story, if you think about your**
 21 **ROUGHSAVILE 5?**
 22 **A. Okay.**
 23 **Q. In fact, the piece, if it had ever been put on**
 24 **Newsnight, it could have gone on some programme on**
 25 **Radio 4.**

Page 188

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. It was not something that depended on pictures.
 3 A. Although --
 4 Q. I appreciate you had an interview on camera on
 5 Newsnight, but you could equally have had them on tape
 6 on the radio?
 7 A. Although I would have felt, as an editor, even if I was
 8 editing a radio programme I would have wanted to see
 9 her, but it could have gone out, the product could have
 10 gone out, I agree.
 11 Q. That is a different question, we have covered all of
 12 that.
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. We understand all of that.
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. But when you say getting to grips with telly takes
 17 a while if you have come from radio, I just want to go
 18 from that general proposition to the particular, because
 19 it seems to me, as a layman, that your story could, with
 20 almost, perhaps, but not quite the same impact, have
 21 gone out on the radio --
 22 A. It would have done.
 23 Q. -- with Liz MacKean saying "Here's what we have",
 24 Mark Williams-Thomas comes on and says "It has all been
 25 hushed up", and then playing a tape of [REDACTED]

Page 189

1 A. That is true.
 2 Q. So there is nothing particularly about this story which
 3 meant that Peter Rippon did not have the tools in his
 4 toolkit; is that a fair way of putting it?
 5 A. Except -- except that he would have known, if he was
 6 more naturally involved in television he would have
 7 known the importance of watching it. That is much
 8 stronger than just hearing somebody. Watching somebody
 9 is much, much stronger, even if you finally just put the
 10 thing out just as radio. If you think televisually, you
 11 know that pictures are every bit as important as the
 12 sound in terms of the message you are getting and you
 13 would want to watch her and see what she's like. That's
 14 the only thing, otherwise I agree with you.
 15 Q. I want to just go back, hopefully for the last time, to
 16 the CPS letter.
 17 A. Yes.
 18 Q. When Peter Rippon made that the key point on, let's
 19 assume, 30 November --
 20 A. Morning of the 30th, yes, yes.
 21 Q. -- none of you knew whether that CPS letter was going to
 22 turn up or not, did you?
 23 A. I thought it was highly unlikely. That's why I argued
 24 about it. I thought it was highly unlikely.
 25 Q. I think you told us last time the reason you thought it

Page 190

1 was highly unlikely -- tell me if this is fair, but it
 2 is my reading of the transcript -- was not so much that
 3 that might not have been the reason but more that the
 4 CPS would not have been dumb enough to write it down, is
 5 that right?
 6 A. Exactly. Yes, yes. I had no view one way or the other
 7 whether it was the reason or not, but I did not think
 8 they would be dumb enough -- I think it is also the
 9 30th, I'm trying to look at it in my thing -- I send
 10 an email to Mark Williams-Thomas, which -- I'm trying to
 11 find my note of it in here. I send a note to him where
 12 I talk about what we've got, and that's the one where
 13 I make the point about one of the women says she was
 14 interviewed under caution, but I doubt this. I don't
 15 think that is likely.
 16 MR MACLEAN: That was almost certainly rubbish, wasn't it?
 17 A. Yes, and that is [REDACTED] So by that stage I'm becoming
 18 sceptical of her and she's the only person who is
 19 claiming -- I think it is the 30th.
 20 Q. I think I know the one you mean.
 21 A. In fact, you used almost the same words I did last time
 22 we were talking about this, without me referring to that
 23 letter because I had forgotten about the actual letter.
 24 Q. We will find it.
 25 A. Anyhow, the point is that by that stage I thought it

Page 191

1 very unlikely that there was a letter that said that.
 2 Q. But if you had been wrong and the letter had turned up,
 3 then the story would have run, wouldn't it?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. So if there was some conspiracy from BBC management for
 6 good reason or bad reason to -- to spike this story, it
 7 was contingent upon that conspiracy, if there was one,
 8 and the letter not turning up --
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. -- because if it had turned up, then the conspirator's
 11 bluff would have been called, if you like.
 12 A. Yes, but you could then have come up with some other
 13 reason. There is nothing to stop you coming up with
 14 another reason at that point. But it was vanishingly
 15 unlikely, I thought by then, that any such letter that
 16 said that existed.
 17 Q. Then just to come back to the discussion you had with
 18 Nick -- I paraphrase -- you said you had not really, as
 19 it were, fallen with Peter Rippon, I think is the burden
 20 of what you were saying.
 21 A. Yes, yes.
 22 Q. Of course, the focus of your frustration, anger if you
 23 like, about this story not running, has never been
 24 Peter Rippon. You have always seen or assumed or
 25 surmised that the problem lay higher up the food chain?

Page 192

1 **A. Yes, BBC management as a -- you know, as a chunk really,**
 2 **rather than being specifically Peter, yes.**
 3 Q. In fact, specifically not Peter because your working
 4 assumption is that Peter was lent on by somebody from
 5 above.
 6 **A. But any of the other editors I have worked for would**
 7 **have resisted any pressure in those sort of**
 8 **circumstances, I believe. On occasions, where I have**
 9 **seen that, they have resisted.**
 10 Q. The pressure you have seen them resist, was that
 11 editorial pressure from somebody up the chain or was it
 12 some sort of improper pressure?
 13 **A. Probably not improper pressure, no. But where I have**
 14 **been aware that there has been pressure on a story**
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 **I don't think they are going to apply that much**
 20 **pressure. You know, they make it known what they would**
 21 **like, perhaps, or whatever. If you say "No, that's not**
 22 **right", "No, treating him as if he's alive, that's not**
 23 **a fair test", I think they accept that.**
 24 Q. It is quite important this, because you are back to the
 25 original -- what I suggested to you right at the
 Page 193

1 beginning this morning that an allegation -- leave aside
 2 any allegations that you have made -- that BBC News
 3 management have not allowed BBC journalists to run
 4 a story for some greater BBC reason --
 5 **A. Right.**
 6 Q. -- is a rather toxic and serious allegation to make?
 7 **A. Yes, I agree with you, yes.**
 8 Q. Are you saying that you have got experience of such
 9 improper pressure for greater BBC reasons --
 10 **A. No.**
 11 Q. [REDACTED]
 12 A. [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 Q. This is when?
 23 **A. [REDACTED] I can dig out the emails if you**
 24 **want them?**
 25 Q. I don't want another inquiry into [REDACTED] four
 Page 194

1 years ago, if I can avoid it, but the allegation was
 2 that [REDACTED] is
 3 that right?
 4 **A. [REDACTED]**
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 [REDACTED]
 7 [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED]
 9 [REDACTED]
 10 [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 [REDACTED]
 13 [REDACTED]
 14 [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 [REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]
 20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]
 25 Q. Mr Jones, you may or may not be relieved to know that
 Page 195

1 that is all I want to ask you. Before you take your
 2 leave, is there anything else --
 3 **A. You mentioned various areas on there, didn't you --**
 4 Q. Where?
 5 **A. -- on the note you sent to me. Like the**
 6 **[REDACTED] stuff and so on. There are no more**
 7 **questions on any of that?**
 8 Q. I have asked you all the questions I want to ask you,
 9 but if you want to say something about some other topic,
 10 now is your chance.
 11 **A. The only other stuff is you started with that bit of**
 12 **relations to editorial policy discussion with**
 13 **David Jordan. As you know, in my submission, I also**
 14 **talk about the incident where he came to me and abused**
 15 **me.**
 16 Q. After the Hewlett interview?
 17 **A. Yes.**
 18 Q. I was going to ask you about that. In fact one of
 19 conversations I have been having with Mr Blakely was
 20 whether we needed to go into that and I didn't.
 21 **A. Yes.**
 22 Q. But if you want to say something about either
 23 Steve Hewlett and David Jordan.
 24 **A. I felt extremely pressured about instances like that.**
 25 [REDACTED]
 Page 196

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED] There have been quite a lot of incidents
 4 through this where I feel, you know, I have been treated
 5 as an enemy by the BBC just for resisting a false line
 6 that was being put out there, and I feel very strongly
 7 about that because I'm extremely loyal to the BBC and
 8 I just hope that doesn't happen in future if people are
 9 trying to below the whistle on, you know, on mistakes
 10 and so on that have been made.
 11 Q. One witness, I think, made the observation that lots of
 12 people who work for the BBC say they love the BBC, it is
 13 a marvellous institution, and so on.
 14 A. Yes, I think that is true.
 15 Q. Yet it seems to have a marked lack of collegiate spirit
 16 about it. Would you recognise that description --
 17 A. Yes, I think that's true.
 18 Q. -- a rather surprising lack of collegiate spirit, given
 19 how much you all love the place?
 20 A. Yes, that's true.
 21 Q. How do we account for that, do you think?
 22 A. In this case, if by collegiate spirit, you mean going
 23 along the line --
 24 Q. I mean team spirit?
 25 A. Yes but no, no, if by collegiate spirit here, they mean

Page 197

1 going along with the line, you can't go along with the
 2 collegiate line if the collegiate line is false.
 3 I think parts of it is -- especially at a time of
 4 diminishing resources, people feel they are fighting for
 5 resources with other bits of the BBC. So they may be
 6 trying to damage other bits of the BBC and so on,
 7 I think that is all very unfortunate.
 8 Q. It seems to me, if I try to put myself in your position,
 9 feeling, strongly about this story, one of the things
 10 that one might expect somebody in your position to be
 11 suggesting is that, to the extent that you didn't do
 12 what might seem to be an obvious thing of taking your
 13 complaint to Steve Mitchell, or Helen Boaden or the
 14 Director General or the Director of Vision or somebody
 15 else --
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. -- you have explained why you didn't do that --
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. -- don't you think it would be better for the BBC and
 20 for the person in your position if the next time there's
 21 a crisis like this, the person in your position feels
 22 themselves able to make those connections?
 23 A. Absolutely. I think that absolutely vital. There needs
 24 to be a change of culture at the BBC.
 25 Q. What needs to change and how do you go about it?

Page 198

1 A. There needs to be a change of culture at the BBC that it
 2 is not seen as a bad reflection on a boss if one of
 3 their underlings goes above them to raise the fire alarm
 4 on something, that it is a much more fluid structure
 5 that you can go on to people and say to them "I've got
 6 a really important message to get to you", and they
 7 don't turn around and say to you "I can't talk to you".
 8 Obviously, you don't want people going charging
 9 upstairs all the time and so on, but you do need to have
 10 a situation, a management situation, where messages can
 11 be passed on and it is not seen as disloyal to you or
 12 whatever and it is not seen as a weak manager if people
 13 go -- you know, take important messages round them.
 14 Q. I think David Jordan would say that he is such a person?
 15 A. But we saw what happened when I went to see him on
 16 4 October. He didn't even change what he said, let
 17 alone change anything else, so that didn't work.
 18 MR STEPHENS: I think is fair to say that if you look at the
 19 BBC systems compared to what one might regard as
 20 state-of-the-art systems for raising, escalating
 21 whistle-blowing, they are not, perhaps, where they could
 22 be and there may be an opportunity for this Inquiry to
 23 make suggestions for improvement which would benefit and
 24 enhance the BBC more generally.
 25 MR POLLARD: Do you think fundamentally what you are saying

Page 199

1 is a symptom of BBC management or News management, which
 2 is particularly the area you know, being out of touch?
 3 A. I think it is an old-fashioned management system. So
 4 disregarding the individuals in it, it is very much:
 5 I talk to Peter, Peter talks to Steve, Steve talks to
 6 Helen. It is a very, very long chain all the time and
 7 I think messages can get diluted. With the best will in
 8 the world a message can get very diluted going all the
 9 way up and all the way down again. You need a flatter
 10 structure, really. It doesn't necessarily mean you need
 11 less managers, you might need just as many managers, but
 12 it needs to be a flatter structure.
 13 MR POLLARD: Lord Patten used the phrase which I thought was
 14 an interesting one that the BBC is both overmanaged and
 15 undermanaged at the same time. Is that what you are
 16 getting at?
 17 A. Yes, yes exactly. So it is not our area but you could
 18 say that the DG does not have enough support. So, you
 19 know this there is a lack of management there. On the
 20 other hand the number of layers and also this matrix
 21 thing that you never know -- there are always about
 22 three different areas that are managing -- you know,
 23 Panorama is going to News management, it is going to
 24 Current Affairs. You know, everything is very, very
 25 confused in terms of who has responsibility for

Page 200

1 anything.
 2 So, yes, I hope that a lesson is learnt from this in
 3 terms of (a) people at the top saying to people, "If you
 4 have a really important message to give me, you know,
 5 get that message to me, we're open to that, hey, you
 6 know, we might even respond to emails at the weekend, it
 7 might even be possible" -- you know, all email
 8 contact ceases over the weekend. It just seems a very
 9 old finished organisation in that way. That is not
 10 criticising individuals in management, that is the
 11 actual structure, I think.
 12 MR POLLARD: Just for the sake of completeness, I just
 13 wanted to pick you up on the point you made about
 14 somebody [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED]
 17 A. Yes.
 18 MR POLLARD: Can you tell us about --
 19 A. No, it is secondhand because I wasn't there at there at
 20 the time but I was told at the time that somebody --
 21 this was probably towards the end of the first week that
 22 I was there, I was told that somebody had [REDACTED]
 23 [REDACTED]
 24 MR POLLARD: Said to whom?
 25 A. Said to somebody senior at Panorama.

Page 201

1 MR POLLARD: Right.
 2 A. [REDACTED]
 3 MR POLLARD: This is somebody [REDACTED]
 4 A. [REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]
 6 MR MACLEAN: [REDACTED]
 7 A. [REDACTED]
 8 [REDACTED] Pause)
 9 I will leave it at that on that.
 10 MR POLLARD: Clearly, from what you say, [REDACTED]
 11 [REDACTED]
 12 A. No.
 13 MR POLLARD: -- because presumably the person at Panorama
 14 wasn't in a position to do that.
 15 A. No, but it was essentially a threat that if I carried on
 16 co-operating, et cetera, that I would find myself in
 17 that position.
 18 MR POLLARD: Which was, I guess, an illustration of how
 19 fraught things were at the time.
 20 A. And how much pressure was being put on me to tow the
 21 line and accept what was being said.
 22 MR MACLEAN: You mean co-operate with Panorama, "carry on
 23 co-operating", you mean -- "If I carried on", I think
 24 you said, "co-operating".
 25 A. Yes.

Page 202

1 Q. Co-operating with whom?
 2 A. With Panorama. I would then be exposing myself to
 3 serious risk.
 4 Q. That would be a problem for you?
 5 A. Yes, yes.
 6 MR POLLARD: Okay.
 7 MR MACLEAN: All done?
 8 A. That is a point. I suppose it's -- this is out of
 9 sequence, and so on. But going back I suppose to when
 10 I was first raising with -- well, David Jordan,
 11 Peter Rippon, various people through October, these
 12 issues when I was sending scripts to people and so on,
 13 whether or not the BBC should have reacted to that in
 14 itself at that point and so on, um, and whether, you
 15 know action should have been taken as a result of that.
 16 MR POLLARD: Do you mean to correct the blog? Is that what
 17 you are talking about?
 18 A. No, I am thinking more about whether -- whether for
 19 instance, because the allegations were of abuse at BBC
 20 property and so on, if people who had not seen those
 21 allegations before should have been reacting to those as
 22 well, really. You know, even if just coming back to me
 23 and saying "Hang on, these are serious allegations,
 24 I think you need to notify the investigations unit or
 25 whatever".

Page 203

1 MR STEPHENS: One of the things that Meirion -- the reason
 2 I reminded him, was that one of things that he raised
 3 with me in the course of preparing for today was,
 4 irrespective of whether or not what happened at
 5 Newsnight, there is also a second question, it seems,
 6 about what should senior management have done with the
 7 information -- the very serious information -- that
 8 people were making allegations that abuse had taken
 9 place on BBC premises and with BBC staff. That seems to
 10 me to be --
 11 A. You mean the first time round?
 12 MR STEPHENS: It is your evidence, but it seemed to me that
 13 that was an issue that you wanted to raise and I felt
 14 that for completeness he ought to have the opportunity
 15 to do that.
 16 A. This terms of the first time around, I raised the issue
 17 of, obviously, the story should be run, in my view.
 18 I have raised the issue of tributes should be pulled,
 19 otherwise there will be reputational damage. There is
 20 also the question, having looked at the script, whether
 21 Peter or whoever the script got up to should have said
 22 there are other things we need to do with this in terms
 23 of BBC institutionally, we need to look into -- there
 24 needs to be an investigation or whatever, but, yes.
 25 MR POLLARD: Because the BBC premises line was, I think, put

Page 204

<p>1 into the draft cue on Hannah Livingston's prompting, 2 which you recognised. 3 A. And it is in the draft script as well. 4 MR POLLARD: Yes. 5 A. Although I'm not sure, I think it was -- BBC premises is 6 actually -- I think it was actually the Empire at 7 Shepherd's Bush, but it was under BBC control. 8 MR MACLEAN: We don't need to get into the real property of 9 it exactly. 10 MR POLLARD: Fair enough, thank you. 11 A. Okay, thanks. 12 MR POLLARD: Thank you very much indeed for that. 13 Nothing more from your side? Thank you, good. 14 (3.21 pm) 15 (The Inquiry concluded) 16 I N D E X 17 MEIRION JONES (recalled)1 18 Questions by MR MACLEAN1 19 Questions by MR POLLARD178 20 Further questions by MR MACLEAN187 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 205</p>	