

IN THE MATTER OF THE LEVESON INQUIRY

EXHIBIT "TM3"
TO THE
WITNESS STATEMENT OF THE RT HON THERESA MAY MP

PUBLIC STATEMENTS

6 September 2010: House of Commons Urgent Question

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm100906/debtext/100906-0001.htm#1009066000529>

5 July 2011: Evidence before the Home Affairs Select Committee

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmhaff/uc1372-i/uc137201.htm>

18 July 2011: House of Commons Answers to Oral Questions

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110718/debtext/110718-0001.htm>

6 SEPTEMBER 2010

6 Sep 2010 : Column 23

Phone Tapping

3.32 pm

Mr Tom Watson (West Bromwich East) (Lab) (*Urgent Question*): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if she will make a statement on the Metropolitan police investigation into phone hacking by the *News of the World* newspaper.

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mrs Theresa May): In December 2005, the Metropolitan police began an investigation focusing on alleged security breaches within telephone networks after concerns were raised by members of the royal household at Clarence house. That investigation resulted in the prosecution and conviction of the *News of the World* royal editor, Clive Goodman, in 2007 for unlawfully intercepting the phone messages of staff in the royal household. A private investigator, Glenn Mulcaire, was also convicted and jailed for intercepting the phones of a number of people.

That investigation has already been reviewed by the Metropolitan police, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Crown Prosecution Service, who all concluded that the investigation was proper and appropriate. The Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport also previously examined the scope and nature of the police investigation, and the previous Government updated the House on these matters in July 2009 and took no further action. Hon. Members will be aware that there have recently been allegations connected to that investigation in *The New York Times*.

Any police investigation is an operational matter in which Ministers have no role. I understand that the original investigation was complex and was informed by high-level legal advice. As a result of that investigation, as I have said, two individuals were successfully prosecuted. The police have made it clear that during the investigation there was early and regular consultation with the Crown Prosecution Service, so that the lines of inquiry followed were likely to produce the best evidence. The CPS had full access to all the evidence gathered, and the final indictment appropriately represented the criminality uncovered. The Metropolitan police have indicated that if there is further evidence, they will look at it. That is the right course of action, and it is right for the Government to await the outcome.

Mr Watson: Claim No. 1: there is no new evidence; there is. Claim No. 2: people were cleared by the Culture, Media and Sport Committee; they were not. Claim No. 3: a single, rogue reporter was responsible; he was not—the inquiry heard that a second *News of the World* reporter, Ross Hall, transcribed illegally hacked phone messages. He has not been interviewed by the police. He sent the now notorious e-mail to *News of the World* chief reporter Neville Thurlbeck, reporter No. 3, who has not been interviewed by the police. Last week, former *News of the World* reporter Sean Hoare testified that when he worked for the paper his bosses instructed him to hack into phones. He has not been interviewed by the police.

A fifth reporter, Sharon Marshall, confirmed to *The New York Times* that she witnessed phone hacking while working for the *News of the World*. As far as we

6 Sep 2010 : Column 24

know, she has not been interviewed by the police. Last week, News International confirmed that a sixth reporter has been suspended for alleged phone hacking. As far as we know, he has not been interviewed by the police.

John Yates said that he had interviewed many reporters. Well, who? How many people were on Mulcaire's target lists? How many were notified that their name was on the lists? How many phone numbers, PINs and suspected computer passwords were on the lists? What other personal and private information was recovered? Most importantly, who decided, according to what criteria and on whose authority, which victims were investigated and which were not, and who was notified?

Can the Home Secretary confirm that former Prime Minister Tony Blair has formally asked Scotland Yard whether his phone was hacked into? The integrity of our democracy is under scrutiny around the world; the Home Secretary must not join the conspiracy to make it a laughing stock.

Mrs May: I say two things to the hon. Gentleman. First, he says that there is new evidence. As far as I can see, allegations have been made in a newspaper. The Metropolitan police have made it clear that if there is fresh evidence, they will consider it. Secondly, as Home Secretary I consider it appropriate that the Government take the view that it is for the Metropolitan police to decide what is the right course of action on an operational matter. As I said in response to the urgent question, it is appropriate for this Government to wait for the outcome.

Mr John Whittingdale (Maldon) (Con): As the Home Secretary indicated, the Culture, Media and Sport Committee spent a considerable time examining this matter in the previous Parliament. We reported our conclusions to the House and we stand by them. We certainly found it very difficult to believe that Clive Goodman was the only member of the *News of the World* newsroom who was aware that phone hacking had been carried out by Glenn Mulcaire, but we found no evidence to suggest that the then editor knew of it. If there is credible new evidence, that would obviously be a matter for the police, but perhaps the Home Secretary could give an assurance that the Select Committee will be informed of the outcome of any investigation.

Mrs May: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for his intervention. It is helpful of him to put before the House what happened in the Select Committee inquiry on the matter. As I have said, it is for the Metropolitan police to consider fresh evidence, if any comes forward, and I am sure that the Select Committee will be kept informed of any developments.

Alan Johnson (Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle) (Lab): Mr Justice Gross said in the case of Mulcaire and Goodman that it was not about press freedom, but about a

"grave, inexcusable and illegal invasion of privacy."

Last year, I was assured that the Metropolitan Police Service had not received any allegations in respect of other *News of the World* journalists. I was also told that the Metropolitan police had taken all proper steps to ensure that where there was evidence of phone tapping, or any suspicion of it, the individuals concerned would be informed.

6 Sep 2010 : Column 25

The Home Secretary will be aware of the claims by *The New York Times* to have spoken to over a dozen former *News of the World* reporters, and to at least one of its former editors, who say that phone tapping was pervasive. Furthermore the hon. Member for Maldon (Mr Whittingdale), a very distinguished Chair of the Culture, Media and Sport Committee, said:

"There was simply no enthusiasm among Scotland Yard to go beyond the cases involving Mulcaire and Goodman. To start exposing widespread tawdry practices in that newsroom was a heavy stone that they didn't want to try to lift."

Does the Home Secretary agree that this stone has to be lifted, and that she must subject the actions of the Metropolitan police in this case to greater scrutiny in the light of this allegation and the new revelations from *The New York Times*? The original investigation, we are told, uncovered 2,978 mobile phone numbers of potential victims and 91 PIN codes. Can the right hon. Lady ascertain how many of the people concerned have now been informed?

When I was Home Secretary dealing with this case, there was nobody anywhere in Government who was implicated. Now there is. The Home Secretary and the Deputy Prime Minister have lectured the House many times about their perception of the surveillance state created by the previous Government. It appears that they may have their very own expert on the matter in charge of Government communications. Can she assure me that Andy Coulson will not be involved in any way in the Government's response to the latest allegations? Does she agree with her right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, who told Parliament last year that

"it is extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition, who wants to be a Prime Minister, employs Andy Coulson who, at best, was responsible for a newspaper that was out of control and, at worst, was personally implicated in criminal activity"?

"The exact parallel",

said the right hon. Member for Eastleigh (Chris Huhne),

"is surely with Damian McBride. If the Prime Minister was right to sack him, should not the Leader of the Opposition sack Andy Coulson?"-[*Official Report*, 9 July 2009; Vol. 495, c. 1132.]

I agree with those sentiments expressed by the right hon. Lady's Cabinet colleague-does she?

Mrs May: I will take first the issue that the shadow Home Secretary raised about the number of people involved who may or may not have had telephone calls intercepted. Assistant Commissioner Yates made it clear in his interview on the "Today" programme this morning that there are- [*Interruption.*] Labour Members may tut, but Assistant Commissioner Yates

was interviewed on the matter this morning and made it clear that there is often a misunderstanding between somebody's name appearing on a list and that person assuming that they have therefore had their phone intercepted. He made it clear- *[Interruption.]*

Mr Speaker: Order. The House must exercise a degree of self-restraint. I am trying to help the House by facilitating an exchange on this important matter. The responses of the Home Secretary must be heard.

Mrs May: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can quote from that interview, where Assistant Commissioner Yates said:

"There's a misunderstanding here which suggests just because your name features in a private investigator's files, you have been hacked."

6 Sep 2010 : Column 26

He went on to explain that that was not the case.

The right hon. Member for Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle (Alan Johnson) also raised the issue in relation to Mr Coulson. As my hon. Friend the Member for Maldon (Mr Whittingdale) has made clear, when the Culture, Media and Sport Committee investigated the matter, it concluded:

"We have seen no evidence that"

the then editor

"Andy Coulson, knew."

That was the decision taken by the Select Committee of the House.

As the right hon. Member for Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle said, he looked at the issue last year. He looked at what had happened and the way it had been handled, and he said that he was reassured.

Mr Adrian Sanders (Torbay) (LD): As a member of the Select Committee, I recall that we had evidence that hundreds of people who are the victims in the matter appeared on lists. They would like to know whether information was illegally gathered from them, and the Metropolitan police will not tell them. Secondly, they would like to know what information was illegally gathered and with whom that information was shared. Surely the only way of getting to the bottom of this is a proper judicial inquiry so that people are compelled to give evidence and they give that evidence on oath.

Mrs May: I say to my hon. Friend that the matter has been investigated by the Metropolitan police, who did so in very close co-operation with the Crown Prosecution Service and with leading counsel. The matter has also been looked at by the Select Committee of the House. The findings of that Select Committee are clear. The findings of the Metropolitan police at the time that they investigated the matter and then looked again at it last July are also clear.

Two individuals were prosecuted as a result of that investigation. The Metropolitan police have made it clear that if fresh evidence is there, they will look at that fresh evidence.

Frank Dobson (Holborn and St Pancras) (Lab): Does the Home Secretary agree that, in circumstances in which Members of this House may not have their telephone communications intercepted by the police or the security service, it would be totally unacceptable for their communications to be intercepted unlawfully by newspapers? Does she accept, on the evidence of what has been said in the House this afternoon, that there has been a distinct lack of zeal on the part of the Metropolitan police in looking into these accusations?

Mrs May: Far from that, the Metropolitan police investigated these matters when they were first raised. The matter was considered again in July 2009, when the then Policing Minister, on behalf of the then Home Secretary, who was absent from the House that day, came to the House in response to an urgent question and, as a result of that, indicated that the Labour Government were taking no further action in relation to the matter.

Philip Davies (Shipley) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend agree that the shadow Home Secretary let the cat out of the bag by showing that this is a rather thinly

6 Sep 2010 : Column 27

veiled attempt to try to make as much political capital as possible instead of actually trying to get to the bottom of what happened? Everything that we have heard today has been thoroughly covered in the Select Committee report; there is absolutely nothing new. We took up the concerns about the Metropolitan police's investigation at the time, when Assistant Commissioner Yates said, regarding the failure to conduct wider interviews during our Select Committee hearings:

"perhaps in 2006 it ought to have been done; I do not know, but in 2009 that is going to take us absolutely nowhere."

Can my right hon. Friend ensure that we do not waste any more time and effort on trying to make political capital out of flogging an old horse?

Mrs May: My hon. Friend has referred to the Select Committee report's findings on this matter, to which I and others have also referred. As for his initial observations about the reasons behind this issue, I simply say that those who are watching will see the nature of and manner in which some of the points are being raised by Labour Members of Parliament.

Chris Bryant (Rhondda) (Lab): The trouble is that the police have not investigated even where there is new information and new evidence. Last summer, I wrote to the Metropolitan police and asked whether, to their knowledge, from the material that they had gained from Mr Mulcaire, I was a person of interest to him. They replied that I was, and they suggested that I ring my mobile company, which then informed me that my phone had indeed been interfered with. I told the police this months ago; they have done absolutely nothing about it.

I say in all seriousness to the Home Secretary that there may well be dozens of right hon. and hon. Members whose phones have been intercepted—several people on the Government Front Bench at the moment, as well as those on the Opposition Benches. Surely the least that she could do is write to the Metropolitan police to ask them to notify every single right hon. and

hon. Member who was a subject of that investigation of the fact that they were involved, and then they can choose whether to investigate further.

Mrs May: At the time of the investigation, the Metropolitan police made it clear that those people whose phones they believed had been intercepted were contacted by members of the Metropolitan police. The hon. Gentleman has had an exchange with them on this matter. I come back to the point that I made earlier: the police have said on many occasions that if fresh evidence were to come forward they would look at it. It is not for the Government to look at that evidence; it is for the Government to await the outcome of any such investigation should that arise.

Stephen Barclay (North East Cambridgeshire) (Con): In terms of what the Metropolitan police have and have not said, can my right hon. Friend confirm that they have now made it clear, on the record, that the press department of the Metropolitan police in no way interfered with the handling of this case?

6 Sep 2010 : Column 28

Mrs May: I am grateful to my hon. Friend for that point. Last year, when Home Secretary, the shadow Home Secretary looked at the issue and the then Government were absolutely clear that there was no need to take any further action in relation to the investigation by the Metropolitan police.

Ms Gisela Stuart (Birmingham, Edgbaston) (Lab): The Home Secretary has repeatedly prayed in aid the Select Committee report in support of her decision not to take any further action. I have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and have experience of how Select Committees can go only so far. When judicial reviews are then conducted, however, all sorts of evidence suddenly comes out to which Select Committees simply have no access. I urge the Home Secretary not to take comfort from the Select Committee but to make further inquiries and force the Metropolitan police at least to take some serious action rather than hiding behind procedure.

Mrs May: As I indicated earlier, such operational matters about whether to investigate particular individuals are for the police. We should jealously guard the operational independence of the police. I say to the hon. Lady, and to any other right hon. or hon. Members on the Labour Benches who think that I as Home Secretary should take it upon myself to tell members of the police force who they should or should not investigate, that that is a very slippery slope down which neither I nor this Government intend to go.

Tony Baldry (Banbury) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend agree that the straightforward fact is that the Metropolitan police can investigate, the Crown Prosecution Service can advise that there should be a charge, and prosecuting counsel can draft an indictment only if there is supporting evidence? Does not this all turn on a simple point? If *The New York Times* or any individuals believe that they have new evidence, is it not simply a matter of their making that evidence available for the Metropolitan police to investigate and allowing the police to get on with their job?

Mrs May: A very valid point has been made. It has been made clear that if evidence comes forward, the Metropolitan police will look into it. I understand that on its website *The New York Times* is saying that it will not make new evidence available to the police.

Mr Dennis Skinner (Bolsover) (Lab): If this Government claim to be whiter than white, why did the top spinner at No. 10 Downing street learn his trade in the phone-tapping *News of the World* run by Murdoch? If this murky affair rumbles on, will the Prime Minister come and make a statement about relieving Coulson of his job?

Mrs May: I refer the hon. Gentleman to remarks that I made earlier. I simply observe that although he uses the phrase "whiter than white", it was his Government, if my memory serves me correctly, who claimed to be whiter than white.

Dr Julian Lewis (New Forest East) (Con): I am sorry that the hon. Member for Bolsover (Mr Skinner) seems to have forgotten about the existence of Alastair Campbell.

6 Sep 2010 : Column 29

Has my right hon. Friend been given any indication at all about why people have suddenly come forward now to give evidence to *The New York Times*, given that they did not see fit to come forward at the time to give evidence to the police?

Mrs May: I have seen no explanation of why the issue has suddenly come forward in *The New York Times* at this particular time. However, as I have repeated, if evidence is available, the police have made it clear that they will investigate it. I have also said in response to another hon. Member that I understand that *The New York Times* is making it clear that it will not be bringing forward new evidence.

Mr David Lammy (Tottenham) (Lab): Can the Home Secretary tell the House what meetings or conversations the Mayor of London has had with the Metropolitan police in relation to this matter?

Mrs May: Conversations held by the Mayor of London are a matter not for the Government but for the Mayor.

John Woodcock (Barrow and Furness) (Lab/Co-op): Given the seriousness of these new allegations, many in this House and across the country will be surprised that the Home Secretary has not even shown a degree of concern about potential shortcomings in the police investigation. Is she really entirely satisfied that everything is as it should have been, or is she determined not to have a view?

Mrs May: This matter was looked into. It was looked into last year by the hon. Gentleman's right hon. Friend, the then Home Secretary. The then Government decided that no further action should be taken.

Andrew Miller (Ellesmere Port and Neston) (Lab): Has the right hon. Lady any knowledge of how many of the 91 PIN codes involved were default numbers and how many were people's own selected numbers? If she does have that, the issue is much more serious than has been indicated thus far. Default PINs can be obtained from the manufacturer, but

others take sophisticated technology to obtain and only a very large operation could achieve that.

Mrs May: I will make the point that I made earlier. We are faced with a situation in which a number of allegations have been made in *The New York Times*. The Metropolitan police have made it clear that if fresh evidence is brought forward they will investigate it. As far as the Government are concerned, I believe it is appropriate for us to await the outcome.

Ian Lucas (Wrexham) (Lab): Has the Home Secretary asked whether her name is on the list?

Mrs May: No.

Chris Leslie (Nottingham East) (Lab/Co-op): Has the Home Secretary had a chance to read the report published this May by the Information Commissioner on the unlawful and widespread trade in confidential personal information, and does she agree with the

6 Sep 2010 : Column 30

Information Commissioner that there should now be a custodial sentence of up to two years in respect of the offences in question?

Mrs May: The hon. Gentleman raises an issue about sentencing, which of course is in the remit of the Secretary of State for Justice rather than the Home Department. As the hon. Gentleman will be aware, a review of sentencing is taking place, and I am sure that if he wishes to make representations to that review they will be welcomed.

Alan Keen (Feltham and Heston) (Lab/Co-op): As a long-serving member of the Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport, I am proud of the fact that under the previous Chair and the current respected Chair, we have worked as a team irrespective of party political views. I am delighted that I have colleagues who are taking advantage of the political aspect of this matter, but may I ask the Home Secretary to ensure that she is not tempted to go on the defensive? This issue is much more important than party politics, and it has to be tackled for the sake of our democracy. I hope that she will do that.

Mrs May: I hope that the hon. Gentleman heard the response that I gave to the question that the Chair of the Culture, Media and Sport Committee asked about its being kept informed of any developments. However, it is important that as Home Secretary I am absolutely clear about where the division of action lies between the Government—a political party—and the operational independence of the Metropolitan police or indeed any other police force in this country.

Rosie Cooper (West Lancashire) (Lab): The Home Secretary referred earlier to the comments of Assistant Commissioner Yates on the Radio 4 programme this morning. The assistant commissioner also made it clear that the police have relationships with journalists, in this case from the *News of the World*. Can the Home Secretary tell me who polices that relationship and how we know whether there is any self-interest in the lack of progress on this matter? I appreciate that the Government will not want to get into that, but should the Independent Police Complaints Commission be asked to examine that relationship to ensure that nothing interferes with police matters and with justice being seen to be done?

Mrs May: The hon. Lady refers to a lack of progress on this matter, but the position is absolutely clear. The use of phone interception by a journalist at the *News of the World* was investigated, two individuals were prosecuted as a result of that investigation and the matter was looked at again in July 2009. The Metropolitan police looked very closely at the investigation in conjunction with the Crown Prosecution Service and counsel, and in July 2009 the previous Government examined the matter and decided that no further action should be taken. As regards a lack of progress today, the police have made it absolutely clear that if fresh evidence is available, they will look at it.

Chi Onwurah (Newcastle upon Tyne Central) (Lab): As a telecommunications engineer, I have helped build such networks, so I am aware of their security gaps. That is why I am concerned that the Home Secretary

6 Sep 2010 : Column 31

does not seem to recognise the implications of the matter for everyone in the country. Such cyber-criminality could be an increasing part of all our lives, and if the police do not have the will to pursue each and every case, it is up to her to give them the tools and incentive to do so.

Mrs May: As I hoped I had made clear in response to several questions, the police have made it clear that if fresh evidence is introduced, they will look at it in relation to the case. The implicit suggestion—that somehow the police do not have the tools to examine cybercrime—is not appropriate to the matter that we are considering.

Clive Efford (Eltham) (Lab): Does the Secretary of State recall that the Mayor of London intervened in the case of the hon. Member for Ashford (Damian Green) when he received information from the Home Office? Surely, when the Secretary of State is told by an hon. Member that a phone company has told him that his phone line was compromised, but that the police had not notified him of that, she cannot be confident that the Metropolitan police have notified everybody who was subject to tapping. Surely she has a duty, on behalf of all those individuals, and for natural justice, to meet the Metropolitan police to ensure that everyone on that list is contacted and can go back and check with their phone companies.

Mrs May: The issue of contacting people who were on the list, and of whether their phones had been intercepted, was raised when the initial investigation took place and, I believe, in evidence that was given to the Select Committee and to the interviewer this morning by Assistant Commissioner Yates. The implication from several Opposition Members is that the Metropolitan police somehow failed in their duty on the matter, but they investigated the issue, people were prosecuted and they have made it clear that they will look into any further evidence that comes forward.

Mrs Madeleine Moon (Bridgend) (Lab): Last year, an elderly BBC journalist made a statement in a magazine that he had assisted in the death of a partner some years previously. The police investigated that statement. Now, several journalists and at least one Member of the House have made new statements, yet we are told that there is no new evidence. At what point will the Watergate scandal that is encompassing British politics be investigated?

Mrs May: I suggest that the hon. Lady listen a little more carefully to what I have said, which is absolutely clear. I have said that, if fresh evidence is brought forward—

Mrs Moon: It has been brought forward.

Mrs May: The hon. Lady says that fresh evidence has been brought forward. Allegations have been made in *The New York Times*, which has made it clear that it will not make any evidence available to the police.

15 Sep 2011 : Column 62WS

HOME DEPARTMENT

Report on Phone Hacking (Government Response)

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mrs Theresa May): Today I am publishing the Government's response to the 13th report of the Home Affairs Committee into the "Unauthorised tapping into or hacking of mobile communications".

The Committee's report highlights a number of issues arising from the activities of journalists at *News International* and their associates, as well as the failings of the police investigations into those activities.

The Committee is to be commended for producing such a thorough report and for producing it so quickly after the final evidence sessions, so that it could inform the parliamentary debate in July and also sit usefully alongside other work that the Government have commissioned in this area, including:

the inquiry being led by Lord Justice Leveson, commissioned by the Prime Minister;

Her Majesty's inspectorate of constabulary's report considering instances of undue influence, inappropriate contractual arrangements and other abuses of power in police relationships with the media and other parties, which I have commissioned; and

the Independent Police Complaints Commission's report into their experience of investigating police corruption and any lessons that can be learned for the police service, which I have also commissioned.

Many of the issues highlighted by the report are for the police service and the Government believe that the report is a valuable contribution to the debate around changes needed to police culture.

Alongside the Government's response to the Home Affairs Committee's report, we are also publishing the first report by the Independent Police Complaints Commission on their experience of police corruption. Both documents will be available on the Home Office website and copies will be available from the Vote Office.

5 JULY 2011

**UNCORRECTED TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL EVIDENCE
To be published as HC 1372 -i**

House of commons

oral EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

Home Affairs Committee

The work of the home secretary

Tuesday 5 July 2011

Right hon. THERESA MAY MP

Evidence heard in Public Questions 1 - 94

USE OF THE TRANSCRIPT

1. This is an uncorrected transcript of evidence taken in public and reported to the House. The transcript has been placed on the internet on the authority of the Committee, and copies have been made available by the Vote Office for the use of Members and others.
2. Any public use of, or reference to, the contents should make clear that neither witnesses nor Members have had the opportunity to correct the record. The transcript is not yet an approved formal record of these proceedings.
3. *Members* who receive this for the purpose of correcting questions addressed by them to witnesses are asked to send corrections to the Committee Assistant.
4. *Prospective witnesses* may receive this in preparation for any written or oral evidence they may in due course give to the Committee.

Oral Evidence

Taken before the Home Affairs Committee

on Tuesday 5 July 2011

Members present:

Keith Vaz (Chair)

Nicola Blackwood

Mr James Clappison

Michael Ellis

Lorraine Fullbrook

Dr Julian Huppert

Steve McCabe

Alun Michael

Mr David Winnick

Examination of Witness

Witness: **Right hon. Theresa May MP**, Home Secretary, gave evidence.

Q1 Chair: Good morning, Home Secretary, and thank you for appearing before the Committee. I know you have just come from Cabinet and we appreciate the fact that you were able to come today. In the last seven days, a person that you had banned from entering the country arrived at Heathrow Airport, the President of ACPO told you yesterday in Harrogate that he felt that the Government's policing reviews should pause so that people can be consulted, and police bail has been found to be inoperative. To quote Mr Djokovic when he won Wimbledon last Sunday, "How have your last seven days been at the office?"

Theresa May: Typical for the Home Office, I think: challenging and endlessly raising issues with which we have to deal and hopefully deal competently and appropriately.

Q2 Chair: I want to start with something that is very much in the public domain and that is the allegations that were contained in the *Guardian* this morning. The Committee is conducting an inquiry into phone hacking and we have police officers, Mr Hayman, Mr Clarke and Ms Akers, coming next Tuesday as part of the ongoing inquiry, but I am sure you have heard the Prime Minister's quote when he said this: "What I've read in the papers is quite, quite, shocking, that someone could do this actually knowing that the police were trying to find this person and trying to find out what had happened", in respect of the Milly Dowler phone hacking. What are your views on what you have seen in the newspapers this morning?

Theresa May: My views on these allegations are very similar to those of the Prime Minister. I think it is totally shocking. Frankly, it is disgusting. If I am honest, I think the mindset of somebody who thinks it is appropriate to do that is totally sick. This has come out as a result of the police investigation. I think it shows that that investigation is doing its work, and obviously the Prime Minister and I have both been very clear on a number of occasions that, in terms of the police investigation, they must follow the evidence wherever that evidence may lead.

Q3 Chair: Indeed. You have had no information from any sources that it was not just the Milly Dowler case but perhaps happened in Soham where the *News of the World* were also involved. You have no further evidence about anything else?

Theresa May: No, I have seen references to that possibility in the press, but I have no information in relation to that.

Q4 Chair: Is it still your view that if there is to be a public inquiry-and I think you have not made up your mind whether there ought to be-this should await the outcome of the police investigation because the police are currently looking at this matter? That can be concluded and then, indeed, Parliament, and the Prime Minister and yourself, can then decide what further steps should be taken; or has your view changed and you feel that there ought to be a public inquiry?

Theresa May: My view is that we have a police investigation ongoing, that it is appropriate to let that investigation take its course. As we have seen in the last couple of days, that investigation is throwing up yet further issues in relation to this question of phone hacking. I think it is important that that investigation is allowed to continue and, as I said in response to your earlier question, I believe it is right that the police should investigate this very vigorously. I have every expectation they will do, but that they should follow the evidence wherever it may lead.

Q5 Chair: Does it concern you just a little that some of this information, perhaps all of it, was already on file and ought to have been found out when the previous investigation was taking place under Commander Yates?

Theresa May: What I would say to that, Chairman, is this: obviously, I have seen the reports that have been in the press about this information and about it coming through, as I said, from the investigation. I think it is important that we allow that investigation to continue, and obviously that will be looking at a whole range of aspects of this issue. I do not think it would be helpful to speculate on what has or has not happened in the past. What I think is important is that we have a rigorous and vigorous investigation, at this stage, into the various allegations that have been made.

Chair: Of course Parliament, through the Culture, Media and Sport Committee and indeed this Select Committee, are still looking at the law as these police investigations go on.

Q6 Mr Winnick: The last revelations in today's paper, the *Guardian*, which the Chair has referred to as particularly shocking, will shock a lot of people who perhaps have not taken so much interest in the hacking affair. Home Secretary, you refer to the police investigations, this has been dragging on for some considerable time. Is it not at the stage now, in view of the allegations that have been made-particularly today-for a public inquiry to be set up as quickly as possible?

Theresa May: No. Mr Winnick. I think what is important is that we make sure that the police are able to investigate this properly and vigorously. You say it has been taking some time. It has been taking some time, but I think what we have seen from the reports in the press is that it would appear, if what we have seen is correct, that the investigation is throwing up potentially new avenues of investigation that need to be followed up.

Q7 Mr Winnick: Is there going to be any time limit on the police investigation? Is it going to conclude at some stage, or perhaps this time next year will we get the same response from yourself and other Cabinet colleagues of yours?

Theresa May: As you know, it would not be appropriate for me, as Home Secretary, to tell the police what they should be investigating or when they should be concluding the investigation.

Mr Winnick: So this could drag on for quite a time?

Theresa May: It is up to them to follow the investigation, to follow the evidence, to decide, as a result of that, whether or not they believe that people should be charged and prosecuted. That will be for them and, obviously, were they to get to that point, with the Crown Prosecution Service.

Chair: Thank you, and of course we will have the opportunity of questioning the police next week when they appear before us.

Q8 Dr Huppert: I accept that this police investigation does seem to be making some progress, but one thing that has concerned me, and I think others in this Committee, is that the initial police investigation did not seem to be satisfactory. There is a real concern in my mind that the police did not want to tangle with a powerful media operation. If that is verified by the current inquiry, or by other information, would you agree that that is a matter of key public concern, that there would need to be a public inquiry if the police are not able to act for fear of a powerful media organisation?

Theresa May: I do not want to speculate on what might or might not come out of the investigation that is currently taking place. I think that it is better to ensure that the police are doing what I believe they are doing, which is thoroughly looking into this issue. As I say, it would appear it is throwing up a number of other areas that they have to explore in relation to the phone hacking. I think what is important is that they are doing that properly, vigorously and with great rigour, as I am sure you will hear when you have an opportunity to question the police themselves about it.

Q9 Chair: Can I now turn to immigration and start with the troubling Sheikh. You banned Sheikh Raed Salah. When did you sign the order banning him?

[end of extract]

18 JULY 2011

18 July 2011: Column 622

Metropolitan Police Service

3.40 pm

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mrs Theresa May): With permission, Mr Speaker, I will make a statement on the resignations of Sir Paul Stephenson and John Yates, the Metropolitan police investigation into phone-hacking, and allegations of police corruption. I apologise to the shadow Home Secretary, the right hon. Member for Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford (Yvette Cooper), for the late receipt of the statement. As I am sure she will appreciate, events have been changing rather rapidly through the day.

As the House will know, last night Sir Paul Stephenson resigned as Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis. As I told him last night, I am sorry that he took that decision. He has led the Met through difficult times, and, although current circumstances show there are still serious issues to be addressed, the Met is stronger operationally today than it was when he took over. I will turn to those difficult circumstances in a moment, but first I wish to update the House on today's developments and on the next steps for the Metropolitan police.

I have already started work with the Mayor of London and the Metropolitan police to arrange an orderly transition and the appointment of a new commissioner. I have agreed that Sir Paul Stephenson will leave his post as swiftly as possible. In the meantime he will remain commissioner, in post at New Scotland Yard and in operational command. Sir Paul will be replaced by Tim Godwin, who will again become acting commissioner, a role that he filled very effectively during Sir Paul's illness between December and April this year. With Tim Godwin as acting commissioner, the Mayor and I are clear that additional resilience is essential from outside the Metropolitan police. I am therefore pleased to announce that Bernard Hogan-Howe has agreed to take on the responsibilities of deputy commissioner on a temporary basis. We are seeking to expedite the process for selecting and appointing the next commissioner.

The House will know that within the last couple of hours Assistant Commissioner John Yates has also resigned. I want to put on record my gratitude to John Yates for the work that he has done, while I have been Home Secretary, to develop and improve counter-terrorism policing in London and, indeed, across the whole country. I can confirm to the House that Assistant Commissioner Cressida Dick will take over his role.

I want hon. Members, Londoners and the whole country to know that the important work of the Met—its national responsibilities such as counter-terrorism operations as well as its policing of our capital city—must and will continue. That important work includes the related investigations Operation Weeting and Operation Elveden.

Operation Weeting, the investigation into phone hacking led by Deputy Assistant Commissioner Sue Akers, is now going through the thousands of pieces of evidence relating to the allegations. Unlike the original investigation into phone hacking, Operation Weeting is

proceeding apace, with officers interrogating evidence that was neglected first time round, pursuing new leads, and—as we saw once again at the weekend—making arrests.

18 July 2011 : Column 623

Operation Elveden, also led by Sue Akers, is investigating allegations that police officers have received payments from the press in return for information. This investigation has independent oversight by the Independent Police Complaints Commission. At this stage, it is a supervised investigation—which means that the IPCC sets the terms of reference and receives the investigation report—and as soon as individual suspected officers have been identified, IPCC investigators, overseen by an IPCC commissioner, will take over and lead a fully independent investigation of those officers.

In the future, both these matters will be considered by the Leveson inquiry established by the Prime Minister. In the meantime, I can tell the House that Elizabeth Filkin, the former Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards, has provisionally agreed to examine the ethical considerations that should in future underpin relationships between the Metropolitan police and the media, how to ensure maximum transparency and public confidence, and to provide advice. The management board of the Met has agreed a new set of guidelines relating to relationships with the media, including recording meetings and hospitality and publication of information on the internet.

These allegations are not, unfortunately, the only recent example of alleged corruption and nepotism in the police, so I can tell the House that I have asked Her Majesty's inspectorate of constabulary to consider instances of undue influence, inappropriate contractual arrangements and other abuses of power in police relationships with the media and other parties. I have asked HMIC to make recommendations to me about what needs to be done to address that.

There is nothing more important than the public's trust in the police to do their work without fear or favour, so at moments like this it is natural that people should ask who polices the police. I have already asked Jane Furniss, the chief executive of the Independent Police Complaints Commission, whether she has the power and the resources to get done the immediate work at hand. She has assured me that she does, but additional resources will be made available to the IPCC if they are needed.

I can also tell the House that I have commissioned work to consider whether the IPCC needs further powers, including whether it should be given the power to question civilian witnesses during the course of its investigations. Given that the IPCC can at present only investigate specific allegations against individual officers, I have also asked whether the commission needs to have a greater role in investigating allegations about institutional failings of a force or forces.

Finally, I want to say one last word about the future of the Metropolitan police. The Met is the largest police force in the country, and has important national responsibilities beyond its role policing our capital. The next Metropolitan Police Commissioner will lead thousands of fine police officers, community support officers and staff, the great majority of whom have spent their careers dedicated to protecting the public, often at risk to their own safety. Just three nights ago, hon. Members will know that in Croydon an unarmed Metropolitan police officer was shot as he tried to arrest a suspect. I know that the whole House will agree with

me that it is for the sake of the many thousands of honourable police officers and staff, as well as of the public they

18 July 2011 : Column 624

serve, that we must get to the bottom of all these allegations. Only then will we be able to ensure the integrity of our police and public confidence in them to do their vital work. I commend the statement to the House.

Yvette Cooper (Normanton, Pontefract and Castleford) (Lab): I thank the Home Secretary for her statement, and also for her apology; I understand the timing pressures she faced. May I also join her in paying tribute to the Metropolitan police officer who was harmed during the course of duty in Croydon?

The Home Secretary rightly paid tribute to the work of Sir Paul Stephenson. He has done excellent work in London, backing neighbourhood policing and taking action to cut crime in the capital. The Home Secretary also recognised the vital work of John Yates on counter-terrorism. She referred to Sir Paul Stephenson's decision to resign. It was an honourable decision, to protect the ongoing operational work of the Met from the ongoing speculation, but his departure raises very serious questions for the Home Secretary and the Prime Minister.

Yesterday, Home Office Ministers told the press that the Home Secretary would make a statement today on her concerns about the appointment of Neil Wallis. Today she has been completely silent on that issue in this House. The truth is that the Met commissioner and the head of counter-terrorism have now gone because of questions about this crisis and about the appointment of the former deputy editor of the *News of the World*, yet the Prime Minister is still refusing to answer questions or apologise for his appointment of the editor of the *News of the World*. The judgment of the Met has been called into serious question for appointing Neil Wallis, but so has the judgment of the Prime Minister for appointing Neil Wallis's boss, Andy Coulson. People will look at this and think there is one rule for the police and one for the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister agreed with that this morning. He said this morning:

“The situation in the Metropolitan Police Service is really quite different to the situation in the Government, not least because the issues that the Metropolitan police are looking at, the issues around them, have had a direct bearing on public confidence in the police inquiry into the *News of the World*”.

But the Prime Minister runs the country. The issues that he is looking at and the judgments that he makes have a direct bearing on public confidence in the Government's ability to sort this crisis out.

The Home Secretary is right to have had serious concerns about the appointment of Neil Wallis, but it would have been better if she had told us what they were today. She is also right that she should have been told about the potential conflict of interest in the Met. This does raise serious questions for the force, but the Met commissioner has said that he could not tell her or her boss because of the Prime Minister's relationship with Andy Coulson. So how did it come to this? The most senior police officer in the country did not feel able to tell the

Home Secretary about a potential conflict of interest for the force because of the Prime Minister's compromised relationship with Andy Coulson—it was an ongoing relationship, as they met at Chequers in March, months after the new police investigation began. This morning, she refused to defend the appointment of Andy Coulson and today the London Mayor refused to

18 July 2011 : Column 625

defend the appointment of Andy Coulson. They all seem to have forgotten rather quickly what Andy Coulson used to say—they are “all in this together”.

The Home Secretary has been absent from this crisis, despite the serious allegations that have been made about phone hacking potentially affecting criminal investigations, the serious questions for policing and the growing cloud over the national and international reputation of British policing as a result of this crisis. She has said nothing and done nothing for two weeks. We welcome many of the announcements that she made today, but they are precisely the things that we called for last week.

I called last week for five things, three of which the Home Secretary has now done. First, I called for new standards for the Met to govern the relationship between officers and the press. Secondly, I called for a review by Her Majesty's inspectorate of constabulary into the wider concerns about leaks of information, payments for the press and corruption in other forces too. Thirdly, I called for work to strengthen the Independent Police Complaints Commission and an independent complaints procedure to deal with failed investigations in future. We welcome those, just as we welcome her agreement to the judicial inquiry that we called for too, but she should have announced two further things that we also called for.

First, the Home Secretary needs to call for immediate openness and transparency across the Met in respect of all the dealings between senior officers and members of the press, including those at the *News of the World*—that needs to cover private as well as public meetings. Secondly, she needs to review her decision to go forward with elected police and crime commissioners. The nearest that Britain has to an elected police chief is the London Mayor, and that did not stop the problems at the Met—instead it made them worse. Boris Johnson described the phone-hacking allegations as “codswallop” and said that it

“looks like a politically motivated put-up job by the Labour party”.

What backing does the Home Secretary think Sir Paul Stephenson and John Yates would have expected from the Mayor if they had decided to reopen an investigation that he had described as “politically motivated”?

Instead of their tackling this problem, we have had an AWOL Home Secretary, a “codswallop” Mayor and a compromised Prime Minister. There is a problem—it is one of leadership. The work of police officers across the country is too important to be tarnished by her failure to get a grip of the problems now. The Home Secretary will not answer all the questions, so I leave her with just one. She knows the importance of leadership to get the country through this crisis and she has criticised the misjudgment of the Met in taking on Neil Wallis, so will she now apologise to the House for the Prime Minister's misjudgment in taking on Andy Coulson, so that the Government can now move forward, exercise some leadership untarnished and sort the crisis out now?

Mrs May: I say to the shadow Home Secretary that from the response she has just given one could have been forgiven for thinking that the Prime Minister had not been anywhere near the House of Commons in the past week, but he stood at this Dispatch Box last week,

18 July 2011 : Column 626

he answered questions in this House, he answered all the points that the shadow Home Secretary has made and he will be in this House again on Wednesday.

The right hon. Lady asked a long list of questions. She asked why I had not said anything about openness and transparency across the Met, as I had promised to. I made specific reference in my statement to the management board decisions taken by the Metropolitan police to publish details of meetings held by senior officers with members of the press, and they will be available on the internet.

The right hon. Lady asked about the difference between the Met and the Government. Of course there is a difference. The Metropolitan police were investigating allegations of wrongdoing at the *News of the World*, and it is absolutely right that there should be a line between the investigators and the investigated. The issue I raised with Sir Paul Stephenson—which she is aware of because it was made public last week—was the fact that I had concerns that he had not informed us about a conflict of interest. The police in this country should be able to act against crime and criminals without fear or favour, but when they think there is a conflict of interest that should be made transparent.

The right hon. Lady asked about the impact of elected police commissioners. I think everything that has happened shows not that we should be going slow on reform of the police but that we need to ensure that we reform the police.

We then have the extraordinary situation in that the shadow Home Secretary appears in one breath to be saying that I have been absent and doing absolutely nothing and in the other breath saying that I am doing everything she asked for. She cannot simultaneously claim that I am doing nothing and doing something—that is the have-your-cake-and-eat-it opportunism of Opposition politics to which I note that both she and the shadow Chancellor belong.

Finally, let me remind the shadow Home Secretary of a few things—[*Interruption.*]

Mr Speaker: Order. Mr John Robertson, calm yourself. It is very injurious to your health and I do not want to see the effects. That is very undesirable.

Mrs May: Finally, let me remind the shadow Home Secretary of a few things. In 2002, the Select Committee on Culture, Media and Sport reported that the press were making illegal payments to police officers and called on the then Home Secretary to take steps to review, and overhaul if necessary, the guidance and measures aimed at preventing such behaviour by the police and media. Labour took no action. In May 2006, the Information Commissioner reported that the trade in confidential personal information was

“a pervasive and widespread ‘industry’”.

Labour took no action. Just two weeks ago, the right hon. Member for Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle (Alan Johnson) revealed that he had thought about getting Her Majesty’s

inspectorate of constabulary to carry out an independent investigation into the Met's handling of phone hacking, but Labour took no action. And, if the shadow Home Secretary wants to keep talking about Andy Coulson, she will have to expect to answer a lot of questions about the Labour party's communications director, Tom Baldwin.

18 July 2011 : Column 627

Mr Speaker: Order. In calling the right hon. Member for Carshalton and Wallington (Tom Brake), I congratulate him on his elevation to the Privy Council.

Tom Brake (Carshalton and Wallington) (LD): I, too, pay tribute to the officer shot in Croydon and to all officers who put their lives on the line to keep us safe.

Will the Home Secretary join me in urging the Metropolitan police to move urgently to rebuild their senior team to focus on next year's Olympics and security concerns surrounding the games? Will she strengthen the proposed checks and balances that will apply to elected police and crime commissioners to ensure that neither elected police and crime commissioners nor chief constables can get embroiled in any scandals of any nature once those commissioners are elected?

Mrs May: My right hon. Friend talks about checks and balances. As he will know, we have strengthened the checks and balances that will be provided by the police and crime panels to the police and crime commissioners as the Bill has progressed through the House of Commons and House of Lords. We have made important improvements to those checks and balances.

As regards the senior leadership of the Met, it is entirely right that we move quickly to reinforce it. The additional resilience of bringing in somebody from outside in Bernard Hogan-Howe is important and the immediate step was to ensure that the counter-terrorism post is filled. I can assure the House that the work on the security and safety of the Olympics carries on under Assistant Commissioner Chris Allison, in particular, and he has been doing an extremely good job.

Alan Johnson (Kingston upon Hull West and Hessle) (Lab): If the allegations in relation to the hacking of the phones of victims of the 7/7 attack in London are true, the editor of the *News of the World* at the time was working in 10 Downing street, while his deputy, Neil Wallis, was working in New Scotland Yard, just at the time when the quest for the truth became more intense. I did not know, as Home Secretary, that Neil Wallis had been appointed. Did the Home Secretary know, did anyone at the Home Office know and did anyone in 10 Downing street know?

Mrs May: The first I knew of the appointment of Neil Wallis was when I heard from the Commissioner of the Metropolitan police and from the Mayor last Thursday that this had been brought to the Mayor's attention. It was at that time that I wrote to the commissioner and expressed my disquiet and concern that this issue had not been raised earlier, at a previous stage. I indicated last Thursday that that was a concern, and it remains a concern.

Mr David Ruffley (Bury St Edmunds) (Con): The IPCC is renowned for the long, drawn-out nature of its inquiries. Those of us who are interested in restoring public confidence in the police would like to know from the Home Secretary when she expects the IPCC to report.

Mrs May: I have asked the IPCC to undertake a number of reports. It will report to me by the end of the summer on the report I asked it to undertake last week

18 July 2011 : Column 628

into allegations it has received about corruption in the police force previously and any lessons that need to be learned in relation to that. It will, of course, pursue investigations against any individual officers who have been named. I am sure that my hon. Friend will agree that it is right and important that that is done properly and fully. I understand the point he is making, but I am sure that none of us would want the results of those inquiries to be in any way jeopardised by a desire to do them speedily rather than fully and properly.

Mr Jack Straw (Blackburn) (Lab): May I underline the comments that have been made about the reputation of Sir Paul Stephenson, who was a very fine chief constable of Lancashire police before he moved on to be deputy commissioner and then Commissioner of the Metropolitan police, which he pursued with similar very high standards? Will the Home Secretary explain the point about conflict of interest? Was it not entirely proper and consistent with Sir Paul's level of integrity that, unusually, he decided that he could not disclose information to the Home Secretary because of what he perceived to be a conflict of interest at the heart of government? Why is she trying to shuffle off responsibility for this when it is at that point that the conflict exists?

Mrs May: As I said earlier, I believe that the police should be able to investigate every allegation and to chase evidence as far as it takes them without fear or favour. When a conflict of interest arises—if the Metropolitan police feel there is a conflict of interest—that should be made transparent and that is why I believe I should have been told earlier. However, I say to the right hon. Gentleman that the Metropolitan police did not make the appointment of Neil Wallis known to previous Home Secretaries—notably previous Labour Home Secretaries—either.

Mr John Whittingdale (Maldon) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend accept that some of the biggest questions during the whole of the phone-hacking saga relate to the failures on the part of the police to investigate, as well as to what has been going on in newsrooms, particularly why the police appeared never to interview a single journalist who was named as a client of Steve Whittamore in the Motorman case and why they did nothing to look at the enormous amounts of material seized from Glenn Mulcaire? Does she agree that it would be unsatisfactory if these matters could not be looked at until the beginning of the second part of the judicial review? Will she consider inviting the IPCC to begin examining these questions now?

Mrs May: My hon. Friend makes an important point. As he says, part of the inquiry that is led by Lord Justice Leveson will involve looking at the first investigation by the Metropolitan police. It is not impossible for it to start doing some work while the current investigation is going on, but that would have to be done carefully in order not to jeopardise the current investigation. I am sure that we all want to see a proper investigation and a proper inquiry with answers about what happened in that first police investigation and about why matters were not taken forward in a way that people now feel they should have been. We also want to ensure that the current investigation is not in any way prejudiced by that work because we want people who have been guilty of criminal offences to be brought to book.

18 July 2011 : Column 629

Glenda Jackson (Hampstead and Kilburn) (Lab): What pressure did the Prime Minister exert on the Home Secretary and the Mayor of London to bring about the resignations of both the commissioner and the assistant commissioner, which today, apparently, the Home Secretary regrets?

Mrs May: None whatsoever.

Nicholas Soames (Mid Sussex) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend agree that the Labour Government's failure to do anything about the Information Commissioner's report in 2006 was compounded by the fact that they backed down under the lobbying of the Society of Editors over clause 77 of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Bill, which means that a fine of £150 is the average fine for someone found guilty of stealing personal information? Will she review the section and see whether the offence should be made punishable by imprisonment?

Mrs May: My right hon. Friend makes an important point and reminds us that at stake are some very serious issues, not just about the operation of the police and of the press, but in relation to personal information. I will certainly look at the issue he raises. As I said, the trade in personal information was raised previously by the Information Commissioner as something that should be looked at, and we should take that forward.

Mr David Hanson (Delyn) (Lab): Will the Home Secretary ask Elizabeth Filkin, as part of her investigation, to report to the House of Commons on how many occasions the Chief Commissioner of Police did not brief the Prime Minister or herself because of information relating to the Prime Minister's relationship with Mr Coulson? Can she confirm that News International began to co-operate with the police inquiry only after Mr Coulson's resignation from Downing street?

Mrs May: In relation to Elizabeth Filkin and how she will undertake the role that she will be performing for the Metropolitan police, it is up to her to decide what she wishes to look at and how she wishes to undertake that. I detected, when I announced her name, a certain murmuring in the House. The reputation that Elizabeth Filkin has for challenging the establishment, challenging practices and ensuring that practice is appropriate and proper, and what she did here in Parliament, are such that she is an excellent choice as a candidate for the role.

Mark Pritchard (The Wrekin) (Con): Does my right hon. Friend share my concern about the serious allegations concerning a royal protection officer selling personal and private details of members of the royal family, including our Head of State, Her Majesty the Queen? What conversations has the Home Secretary had with the director of the Security Service concerning this incident? Is it not the case that the Security Service should have known about this? If it did not know, why not, and if it did know, why did it not do something about it?

Mrs May: Matters relating to appropriate royal protection are dealt with by a committee chaired by Sir Richard Mottram, which sits in the Home Office. All those considerations are undertaken independently

18 July 2011 : Column 630

by Sir Richard Mottram and his committee in relation to how royal protection should be carried out. Obviously, the issue will be looked into to see the truth or otherwise of those allegations.

Keith Vaz (Leicester East) (Lab): As the Home Secretary knows, both Sir Paul and Mr Yates are due to appear before the Home Affairs Select Committee tomorrow, when Members will explore their resignations further. I welcome the appointment of Tim Godwin and Bernard Hogan-Howe, but will the right hon. Lady confirm that Mr Hogan-Howe was the only applicant for the post of head of the National Crime Agency? Will she now have to look for a new person to head that organisation? Will she answer the question that I put to the Prime Minister last week? This information is coming out because of Operation Weeting and the excellent work by Sue Akers. Could we please give her the resources she needs in order to go through the 12,870 names that are still on the books but have still not been contacted?

Mrs May: I will make an announcement on the appointment of the head of the national crime agency when appropriate. In relation to resources for Sue Akers, as has been made clear and as the Prime Minister has made clear at the Dispatch Box on a number of occasions, this is one of the largest investigations taking place in the country. I am sure that everyone would agree that Sue Akers is pursuing the investigation with the appropriate degree of vigour, and I am sure that the Metropolitan police are ensuring that she has the necessary resources.

Mr Robert Walter (North Dorset) (Con): The commissioner placed great emphasis on the word “integrity” in his resignation statement, and yet in the eyes of some of my constituents payments and hospitality to police officers are no different from the £12,000-worth of hospitality that Sir Paul received. Was the commissioner in breach of the Metropolitan police code of conduct, and if not, what steps can we take to restore the integrity of the Metropolitan police?

Mrs May: Of course, Sir Paul made reference to this issue in the statement he published yesterday. As I indicated in my earlier response and in my statement, the Metropolitan police have been looking at the code that should be followed by officers and strengthening it in relation to the information that should be made available and should be publicly available.

Sir Gerald Kaufman (Manchester, Gorton) (Lab): Since Sir Paul Stephenson said in his resignation statement that he could not speak to the Prime Minister about Neil Wallis because of the Prime Minister’s employment of Andy Coulson at No. 10 Downing street, and since the Prime Minister took Andy Coulson into his employment after Coulson had confessed to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee that he had committed criminality—namely, making payments to the police—ought not the Prime Minister be considering his position?

Mrs May: No, I have made very clear the difference between the Metropolitan police and the Government in relation to these matters. The right hon. Gentleman premised his question with the fact that the Home Secretary and the Prime Minister had not been told about the conflict of interest within the Metropolitan

18 July 2011 : Column 631

police on Neil Wallis, but he will note, as I said earlier, that former Labour Home Secretaries were not told about the decision to appoint Neil Wallis either.

Mr Ben Wallace (Wyre and Preston North) (Con): Time and time again the Metropolitan police have failed to deal successfully with sensitive issues ranging from cash for peerages all the way through to the phone-hacking scandal. Is it not perhaps time to split the Metropolitan police between the day-to-day duties of policing London and those of carrying out more complex and detailed investigations, such as those that the special operations directorate conducts every day?

Mrs May: I thank my hon. Friend for his innovative approach to these matters. I have to say that there is no intention to split the Metropolitan police. It has been able to take on their national responsibilities, and it has those responsibilities not simply because of the issues that it is responsible for across the country, such as counter-terrorism, but because, as the police force of the nation's capital, it has of course national responsibilities that are greater than those of any other police force. I must say, as I said earlier, that the thousands of police officers and staff who day by day go about their duty protecting the public and fighting crime are doing a good job, and we should encourage them and ensure that they can continue to do so.

Mr Dennis Skinner (Bolsover) (Lab): Is it not a fact that the fire-storm that the Prime Minister referred to a few days ago has turned into a raging inferno around the Government's head? Murdoch's people are resigning and people are being arrested all over the place, and yet only one area remains intact: millionaires' row on the Government Front Bench. When is dodgy Dave going to do the decent thing and resign?

Mrs May: The hon. Gentleman started his remarks with the words "Is it not a fact that", to which my answer is no.

Mr William Cash (Stone) (Con): The Home Secretary referred to the interaction between the inquiries she has set up and the Leveson inquiry, and her references to the relationship between the police and the media are the right approach. Does she agree that, in the interests of clarity and accountability, to refer merely to the press in the Leveson inquiry would be unsatisfactory and that 17 Select Committee Chairmen, the chairman of the 1922 committee, the chairman of the parliamentary Labour party and the leaders of Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales have all said that the Leveson inquiry should be extended to the media as a whole?

Mrs May: The terms of reference for the Leveson inquiry which my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister announced last week were agreed not only by the Government but in consultation with the Opposition and, as I understand it, with the Leader of the Opposition, and of course with Lord Justice Leveson himself.

Alun Michael (Cardiff South and Penarth) (Lab/Co-op): In her statement, the Home Secretary said that she is asking the chief inspector of constabulary to look at some serious issues at the Met, namely "instances of undue influence, inappropriate contractual arrangements

18 July 2011 : Column 632

and other abuses of power in police relationships with the media and other parties." That must involve a number of illegal actions and/or misconduct. Any chief officer who is aware of such things—illegal actions or misconduct—is legally obliged to refer the matter to the

Independent Police Complaints Commission. Why is the Home Secretary not referring these matters there, where they can be properly investigated?

Mrs May: I think that the right hon. Gentleman might have slightly misunderstood the reference I made in my statement. I have asked HMIC to look widely across policing—not just at the Met—at issues of, as he says, “undue influence, inappropriate contractual arrangements and other abuses of power”. As he says, if any officer is aware of an individual officer who has undertaken something that is an abuse of power, a complaint should be made to the IPCC, which will investigate complaints against individual officers. It does not currently have the power to investigate complaints about wider issues in relation to forces as opposed to individual officers. As well as asking HMIC to look at these issues more widely, because there are other examples of this sort of concern in other constabularies, I am asking the IPCC whether it needs further powers and what we should be doing to ensure that it can investigate more widely across forces rather than just individual officers.

Dr Andrew Murrison (South West Wiltshire) (Con): By any reasonable international comparison, the probity and integrity of our policemen and policewomen is unsurpassed, and the Home Secretary rightly paid tribute to them today. Does she agree that we should lose no opportunity to articulate our support for them since their morale and self-confidence are likely to be severely dented by this crisis?

Mrs May: Indeed. My hon. Friend makes a very important point. As I said at the police bravery awards a couple of weeks ago, we have the finest police officers in the world—I believe that—but it is our duty to all those honourable, hard-working police officers and staff across the country to ensure that we get to the bottom of these allegations and sort this all out.

Paul Goggins (Wythenshawe and Sale East) (Lab): The year 2012 was always going to be a very challenging one for the Metropolitan police, with the Olympic games, with convicted terrorists returning home from prison, and with relocated suspects being allowed to go back to their own homes. Given the events of the past 24 hours, will the Home Secretary now give urgent consideration to delaying the implementation of the new, weaker terrorism prevention measures in order to reduce risk and give the new commissioner time to prepare properly?

Mrs May: The right hon. Gentleman knows that the package that was agreed involves not just the TPIMs—terrorism prevention and investigation measures—but extra money, with tens of millions of pounds for the Security Service and the police to put in place extra surveillance so that they are able to mitigate any risk that has come about through the change in those orders. Yes, next year will be a challenging year. The Met police have themselves accepted and said publicly that it will be a very challenging time for them in having to ensure

18 July 2011 : Column 633

the security and safety of the Olympics. That has been worked on for several years—it is under the very competent leadership of Assistant Commissioner Chris Allison—and extremely good work has been done, but we continue, of course, to ensure that we are putting in place what is necessary to do what we all want to do, which is to ensure that everybody can enjoy a secure and successful games.

Dr Julian Huppert (Cambridge) (LD): For decades, all across the country, the media have had the uncanny ability to show up at an arrest or another police incident. While I am sure

that most of the police would never take part in this, can the Home Secretary assure me that we will be looking across the country, wherever this happens, and keeping an eye out for other such suspicious coincidences of a TV camera showing up just in time?

Mrs May: My hon. Friend makes a very important point. I can assure him that this issue is being taken into account in the various inquiries and investigations.

Mr Nigel Dodds (Belfast North) (DUP): At this time of unprecedented chaos within the Metropolitan police, and given the Met's national responsibilities for national security, are not the public right to feel concerned that it has taken its eye off the ball when it comes to protecting citizens against terrorism? What is the Home Secretary going to do to reassure people that the Met is on top of its game in terms of protecting the public against the threat of terrorism both here in the United Kingdom and from abroad?

Mrs May: The work that has been done by the Met, indeed led by Assistant Commissioner John Yates, on counter-terrorism policing has been important. Counter-terrorism policing has improved over the years and extra resources have been put in, which has been beneficial in keeping this country safe. The Metropolitan police have moved quickly to ensure that there is an immediate appointment to replace Assistant Commissioner John Yates in Assistant Commissioner Cressida Dick. I am sure that she will take this work forward every bit as effectively as has been done previously. I assure people that the eye has not been taken off the ball; we are very conscious of the duty to protect the public, be it from criminals or terrorists.

Nicola Blackwood (Oxford West and Abingdon) (Con): I thank the Home Secretary for her statement and welcome her comments about strengthening the powers of the IPCC. However, given that the circumstances surrounding these resignations will have further undermined public confidence in the police, will she tell the House what steps the Met will be taking to put things right as we await the outcome of the public inquiry?

Mrs May: Indeed. When Tim Godwin takes over as acting commissioner, he will obviously want to consider the steps that the Met can take, as he already has been doing, such as being more transparent about relationships with the press. Crucially, Elizabeth Filkin is being brought in to advise the Met on such matters, so that it can show the public that it has changed the way it deals with these things and increase the public's confidence. It is also

18 July 2011 : Column 634

important to have the additional resilience that is brought by somebody coming in from the outside, so Bernard Hogan-Howe will take on the responsibilities of a deputy commissioner to enhance that work.

Mr Michael Meacher (Oldham West and Royton) (Lab): *The Guardian* produced abundant evidence several months ago that in handling phone hacking at the *News of the World*, the police had cut short their original inquiry, suppressed evidence, misled the public and the press, concealed information and broken the law. Why did the Home Secretary not take action then, when it was already perfectly clear that something was going terribly wrong at Scotland Yard?

Mrs May: The initial *Guardian* story that required investigation actually came in July 2009 under the last Government. That was looked at to see whether there was fresh evidence and a decision was taken that there was not. In September 2010, a question was raised about stories that had appeared in the American press. Again, that was looked at to see whether there was fresh evidence. At the time—[*Interruption.*] The right hon. Member for Oldham West and Royton (Mr Meacher) asks what I did. I will tell him what I did. At that time, I came to this House and said that it was up to the police to investigate the matter and that it was not for politicians to tell police officers who or what to investigate. I said that the police should investigate any evidence, wherever it took them, and ensure that anybody who was guilty of criminal offences was properly brought to justice.

Claire Perry (Devizes) (Con): This scandal has run over two Governments and three Prime Ministers. Does the Home Secretary agree that the focus of every Member of this House should be on trying to get to the truth and to find a solution to this problem—we are on the front foot finally—rather than on playing the clapped-out political blame game so beloved by the Labour party?

Mrs May: My hon. Friend makes an important point. She reminds the House that our prime duty and responsibility is to restore confidence in the police so that people feel that the police are doing their job appropriately and properly. There are thousands of honourable policemen and women who are continuing to do their job and we should support and encourage them. We need to get to the bottom of these allegations so that the public truly can have full confidence in what the police are doing.

Steve McCabe (Birmingham, Selly Oak) (Lab): Given the Home Secretary's fulsome praise for Assistant Commissioner Chris Allison, should I assume that she will back his call for a delay in cuts to specialist posts, particularly public order posts, until after the Olympics?

Mrs May: Of course we have reviewed the requirements for Olympic security, and we did an audit of it when we came into government. In the run-up to the Olympics we will continue to ensure that the resources that are available and the measures that are taken will provide a secure and safe games.

Mark Reckless (Rochester and Strood) (Con): Is the Home Secretary aware of the statement that Sir Paul made at the conference of the Association of Chief

18 July 2011 : Column 635

Police Officers in July 2009, which suggests that it was not John Yates who limited the review then to less than a day but the commissioner himself?

Mrs May: I thank my hon. Friend for making that point. As he will know as a member of the Home Affairs Committee, the Committee will have a chance to question both Sir Paul Stephenson and John Yates tomorrow at its further meeting.

Kate Hoey (Vauxhall) (Lab): Does the Home Secretary have any concern that the basic principle that someone is innocent until they are proven guilty in a criminal court has been thrown out of the window?

Mrs May: That is an important principle on which we must base what we do. That is why I try not to comment on things until I have seen the evidence on matters of concern. It is of course true that these investigations must be followed through properly and fully, so that those who are guilty can be brought to justice and any speculation about those who are innocent can be cleared up.

Charlie Elphicke (Dover) (Con): The allegations that payments were made improperly to the police were first made in 2003. The House needs to know what action was taken by the Home Office and by successive Ministers over the period since that date. Will the Home Secretary do a review and make a report to Parliament?

Mrs May: I thank my hon. Friend. As I indicated in my response to the shadow Home Secretary, there were indeed a number of times under the last Government when these issues and concerns were raised and no action was taken.

Chris Ruane (Vale of Clwyd) (Lab): The Metropolitan police have had the names of thousands of UK citizens whose phones have been hacked into for a very long time. Have all the people who have had their phones hacked into been informed of it by the police?

Mrs May: I simply say to the hon. Gentleman that the Metropolitan police's current investigation has made it clear, as I understand it, that it is going through the names on lists. I caution him on his assumption that everybody whose name appears on a list has necessarily "had their phone hacked into", in his terms, but that is being looked into by the current investigation. It is clear that it is alerting people when it finds evidence.

Michael Ellis (Northampton North) (Con): In May 2006, five-plus years ago, the Information Commissioner issued a report stating that the trade in confidential personal information was "pervasive and widespread". In view of the rather self-righteous tone taken by the Opposition, is the Home Secretary surprised that the then Government did not order an inquiry into the matter?

Mrs May: As I said earlier, it is surprising that Opposition Members who are making so much noise about what has happened now seem conveniently to forget that their Government failed to take action despite a number of issues being raised directly with them.

18 July 2011 : Column 636

Mr Gerry Sutcliffe (Bradford South) (Lab): Returning to the security of the Olympics, is it not time that a pause was taken, given the evidence presented to the Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures Bill Committee by Assistant Deputy Commander Osborne that it would take 12 months to get the resources in place to deal with the new TPIMs? Is it not time, now that we have lost the two most senior officers in counter-terrorism, to call a halt to those measures until after the Olympic and Paralympic games?

Mrs May: We have of course been discussing with the Metropolitan police and the Security Service the arrangements that will be in place as a result of the extra finances available for surveillance when the TPIMs come in. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that we have discussed the matter with the Metropolitan police, and it is clear that measures will be in place for an appropriate transition from control orders to TPIMs.

Gavin Barwell (Croydon Central) (Con): I thank my right hon. Friend for paying tribute to PC Wayne Stevens, who was shot while on duty on the streets of Croydon on Friday night.

As a London MP, my concern is that the Met has sufficient resources to do the job of patrolling the streets of London, and that the two investigations are robustly pursued so that we find out exactly what happened and anyone guilty of a crime is brought to justice. Can my right hon. Friend assure me that, working with the Mayor, she will ensure that that is the case?

Mrs May: I can assure my hon. Friend that we do of course talk to the Metropolitan police about the resources that it has available and the way in which it chooses to police the streets of London. If I may say so, one thing that Sir Paul Stephenson did was significantly to increase the amount of time available for patrol by moving to single patrols, which has been a very important step in improving the time for which officers are actually out on the front line.

I again pay tribute to the police constable who was shot three nights ago. It is very easy for the House to forget the danger that police officers put themselves in day in and day out to keep the public safe, and we should thank them for it.

Jeremy Corbyn (Islington North) (Lab): In the Home Secretary's statement, she said that she was sorry that Sir Paul Stephenson had to resign. Does that mean that she thinks he should not have resigned and that he should have carried on, despite this cloud around his head? Could she explain what her thinking behind that is, or is it crocodile tears to cover the fact that she asked him to resign?

Mrs May: On the last point, can I assure the hon. Gentleman that I did not ask Sir Paul Stephenson to resign? As far as I am concerned, nobody asked him to resign: the decision was taken by Sir Paul Stephenson. I am sorry that he decided to resign—I have said that several times, and have made that clear. Under his leadership, the Met has done excellent work in protecting the public, and in cutting and fighting crime. He led the Met through some very difficult times. He took it over at a difficult time, and I think he has made the force operationally stronger.

18 July 2011 : Column 637

Duncan Hames (Chippenham) (LD): In the light of the concerns raised by this issue, what action does the Home Secretary expect of police authorities outside London to root out inappropriate practices and to restore public confidence in the independence of their forces?

Mrs May: I would hope that police authorities will have been considering the issues that have been raised, and that they will give full and proper support to the review that the inspectorate of constabulary will do on this issue in police forces across the country.

Chris Leslie (Nottingham East) (Lab/Co-op): The Home Secretary says that she did not know about the appointment of Mr Neil Wallis to the Metropolitan police. Did Andy Coulson know, and did the Prime Minister know?

Mrs May: I might remind the hon. Gentleman and the House that in fact, the appointment of Neil Wallis—or, to be correct, of Chamy Media—was undertaken not under this Government, but in September 2009, under the previous one.

Graham Evans (Weaver Vale) (Con): The whole House will remember when Damian McBride planned to smear the wives and families of Opposition Members. Does my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary agree that those who live in glass houses should be more careful about throwing stones?

Mrs May: I entirely agree with my hon. Friend, and as I pointed out to the shadow Home Secretary, the communications director advising the Leader of the Opposition is a former News International employee, Tom Baldwin.

Mike Gapes (Ilford South) (Lab/Co-op): In view of the remarks of the Mayor of London—he said that the phone hacking allegations were “politically motivated” and “codswallop”—does the Home Secretary believe that he is a fit and proper person to be involved in the appointment of the commissioner of the Metropolitan police?

Mrs May: Yes.

Dr Thérèse Coffey (Suffolk Coastal) (Con): Given that Sir Paul and Mr Yates resigned from the Metropolitan police, will my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary clarify whether they can take up any other policing position, including with ACPO or any other policing agencies?

Mrs May: Normally, officers who serve in ACPO are serving officers rather than people who have retired. Therefore, I think Sir Paul Stephenson and Assistant Commissioner Yates will not be taking up any such places.

Malcolm Wicks (Croydon North) (Lab): May I first echo the words of my neighbour, the hon. Member for Croydon Central (Gavin Barwell)? Obviously, our thoughts are with our police officer from Croydon and his family at this difficult time.

18 July 2011 : Column 638

May I put it to the Home Secretary that many Londoners are confused about the respective roles of the Home Secretary, the Mayor and the Metropolitan Police Authority? Who in our democracy is ultimately responsible and accountable for the conduct and integrity of the Metropolitan police?

Mrs May: I say to the right hon. Gentleman that the legislation under which Londoners are confused was introduced by the Government in which he was a Minister. This Government are now clarifying the position under the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill. We will streamline the arrangements that exist in relation to appointments and the position of the police and crime commissioner in London. However, the appointment of the commissioner and deputy commissioners will remain, as it is today, a final decision of the Home Secretary.

Bob Stewart (Beckenham) (Con): As I understand it, Lord Justice Leveson’s terms of reference are restricted to phone hacking. I wonder whether it is possible for the inquiry to look also at hacking into e-mails and the illegal acquisition of information such as medical documents.

Mrs May: My hon. Friend is not the first to raise the issue of the remit of the Leveson inquiry. It will cover the culture, practices and ethics of the press, as well as the relationship

of the press to the police and issues of regulation. So I would expect that it would indeed be able to look wider than just the issue of phone hacking.

Mr Chuka Umunna (Streatham) (Lab): I note that the Home Secretary did not answer the question from my hon. Friend the Member for Nottingham East (Chris Leslie) about whether the Prime Minister knew that Neil Wallis was working for the Met and/or whether Andy Coulson knew the same. Could she perhaps respond and let us know that answer to that question?

Mrs May: I must say to the hon. Gentleman that so far as I am aware, no, they did not know.

Jason McCartney (Colne Valley) (Con): An experienced columnist from *The Guardian* said on the BBC yesterday that to the best of her knowledge she believed that the passage of information between journalists and the police was common and widespread. Does the Home Secretary agree that the police investigation should go wherever it leads and follow through all leads on that matter?

Mrs May: My hon. Friend is absolutely right. It is important that, whatever the evidence shows, the police investigation is able to follow the leads to the rightful conclusion without fear or favour, and that they ensure that wherever it leads proper action is taken and people who have committed criminal offences are properly brought to justice.

Hywel Williams (Arfon) (PC): The Mayor of London said this morning that Sir Paul had taken a very brave individual decision. Is the Home Secretary confident that that is the most accurate, appropriate and apposite description of the events leading up to that resignation?

18 July 2011 : Column 639

Mrs May: I have made my position on Sir Paul Stephenson's resignation absolutely clear. In his time in office at the Metropolitan police he has strengthened the force operationally, and under his leadership it has been effective and done excellent work in cutting crime and protecting the public.

Nia Griffith (Llanelli) (Lab): Given that the Mayor of London actively discouraged the reopening of the police inquiry by referring to the phone-hacking allegations as "codswallop" and a Labour plot, what inquiries will the Home Secretary make into what advice the Mayor took before making those views known and using his influence in that way?

Mrs May: The advice that the Mayor takes is a matter for him.

John Mann (Bassetlaw) (Lab): When did Mr Ed Llewellyn pass on the *Guardian* dossier to the Home Office?

Mrs May: I am not aware that there was a *Guardian* dossier. There was information that was generally available to the public, as I understand it. There is an issue here about the role of the Home Office that Opposition Members sometimes fail to grasp. It is not the job of politicians to tell the police who to investigate or arrest. It would be a very sorry day for our police and our democracy if we ever went down that road.

John Woodcock (Barrow and Furness) (Lab/Co-op): Did the Home Secretary raise any concerns to anyone about bringing Andy Coulson into the heart of Government and, if not, does she now regret that failure to speak up?

Mrs May: I have made clear the difference between the Metropolitan police and the Government. The Prime Minister has answered the point about Andy Coulson. He did that last week and he made it absolutely clear that he gave Andy Coulson a second chance. That did not work out and Andy Coulson resigned again.

Toby Perkins (Chesterfield) (Lab): The Home Secretary finally made us aware that she was not told if the Prime Minister knew about Neil Wallis's employment. Can she confirm whether Andy Coulson knew about the employment of his former deputy by the Metropolitan police?

Mrs May: I have been asked that question and I have answered it.

Mr Denis MacShane (Rotherham) (Lab): Before Wednesday's debate, would the Home Secretary have the kindness to place in the Library details of all communications, in writing or by phone or e-mail, between Andy Coulson and her private office since she took up the post of Home Secretary?

Mrs May: The right hon. Gentleman, like a number of his colleagues, is seeming to focus purely on Andy Coulson. I say to him and Members of the House that we have a serious job to do—to ensure that we restore confidence in the Metropolitan police and the police generally and to deal with allegations over the operations of the police. We owe it to the public and to the honourable police officers in the Met and other forces

18 July 2011 : Column 640

in the country to do that seriously, to consider all the allegations and to ensure that they are followed through and dealt with.

Kevin Brennan (Cardiff West) (Lab): Were there any meetings between Neil Wallis and Andy Coulson while the latter was working for the Prime Minister at No. 10 Downing street? If the Home Secretary cannot give us that information now, will she undertake to give it to us later?

Mrs May: No, I cannot give the hon. Gentleman that information. It is not the sort of information that is available to me. I would point out to him that for the first part—considerable part—of the period when Neil Wallis was in his advisory capacity to the Metropolitan police, the Labour party was in government.

Mr Michael McCann (East Kilbride, Strathaven and Lesmahagow) (Lab): May I make a statement of the obvious? The Home Secretary has been chasing this issue from day one. She got it wrong on phone hacking, she got it wrong on a judge-led inquiry and it has taken two high-profile resignations to place just a semblance of respectability on an affair that every dog on the street knows stinks. Is it right that Sir Paul Stephenson resigns for Neil Wallis, but the Prime Minister gets off scot-free for hiring not the monkey but the organ grinder, Andy Coulson?

Mrs May: I am not sure that there was actually a question in all that. I remind the hon. Gentleman that, as I said earlier, in 2002, the Culture, Media and Sport Committee reported that the press were making illegal payments to police officers and called on the then Home Secretary to review and, if necessary, overhaul the guidance and measures aimed at preventing such behaviour by the police and media. The Labour Government did absolutely nothing.

Chris Bryant (Rhondda) (Lab): I am afraid that I welcome the two resignations today because I think that Assistant Commissioner Yates, by his own admission, misled Parliament; because the relationship between the *News of the World* and the Metropolitan police became so close as frankly to be collusive; and because we had this ludicrous situation in which Andy Hayman was leaving the employment of the Metropolitan police to work for News International and Neil Wallis was leaving News International to work for the Metropolitan police. That cannot be good for the Metropolitan police in the end. I know that the Home Secretary cannot tell anybody what investigations to undertake, but will she ensure that there is a proper investigation into the Surrey police and what happened between the police officers in charge of the investigation following Milly Dowler's disappearance and death and *News of the World* and other journalists at the time? I do not think that the collusion was only in the Metropolitan police.

Mrs May: A number of concerns have been raised about issues in other forces relating to contractual arrangements, employment arrangements and other matters. That is why I am asking HMIC to look at these issues more closely across policing, including at issues of abuse of power.

18 July 2011 : Column 641

Tom Greatrex (Rutherglen and Hamilton West) (Lab/Co-op): The Home Secretary rightly said in her statement that confidence in the police—for both the public and serving police officers—must be of paramount concern in getting to the bottom of these allegations. She has just shared with the House information about other police forces, but has she had any contact with the Scottish Justice Minister, Kenny MacAskill, about how these types of inquiry can range across Scottish police forces as well as those for which she is directly responsible?

Mrs May: I have not had such interaction with the Scottish Justice Minister, but I am happy to alert him to the steps that we are taking in relation to forces in England and Wales so that he may look at that in relation to Scottish forces.

Mr Wayne David (Caerphilly) (Lab): Looking ahead to Wednesday, may I urge the Home Secretary to have a word with the Prime Minister to ensure that as well as making a statement he will also lead the debate?

Mrs May: Hon. Members have asked that the Prime Minister comes to the House on Wednesday. He will be doing that.

Barry Gardiner (Brent North) (Lab): The right hon. Lady has sought to distinguish the probity of the appointments made by Sir Paul Stephenson and those made by the Prime Minister on the grounds that there is a proper distance between those being investigated and

those doing the investigation. Does she agree that there should also be a proper distance between the law-makers in this country and those suspected of lawbreaking?

Mrs May: I say what I said earlier about the difference between the Government and the Metropolitan police. The Metropolitan police were in the process of investigating—or had been investigating—the *News of the World* for alleged wrongdoing. It is right, therefore, that we should look at drawing a line between the investigators and the investigated.

Helen Goodman (Bishop Auckland) (Lab): There seems to have been an exchange of staff between the Metropolitan police and News International. Last week, I asked the Minister of State, Cabinet Office whether former police officers were subject to the rules of the Advisory Committee on Business Appointments. He has written to me saying that he does not know. Can the Home Secretary say what the current rules are and whether Mr Hayman followed them?

18 July 2011 : Column 642

Mrs May: Perhaps the hon. Lady should have raised that with the last Cabinet Office Minister, under the last Government, because that was when those issues arose.

Bill Esterson (Sefton Central) (Lab): If Sir Paul Stephenson was right when he said that he made an error of judgment in his appointment of Neil Wallis at a time when he had not been implicated in phone hacking, what does that say about the Prime Minister's judgment in appointing Andy Coulson at a time when he had already resigned once over the very same issue?

Mrs May: I suggest that the hon. Gentleman could have listened to the answer that I have already given—on a number of occasions now—about the difference between the Government and the Metropolitan police. Of course, the point is that the Metropolitan police are responsible for investigating allegations of potential wrongdoing at the *News of the World*.

Mrs Madeleine Moon (Bridgend) (Lab): The stench that arises from the rotting drains underneath this Chamber seems to be an apt background to a lot of the debate that we have had today. Over the weekend, we had the arrest of Rebekah Brooks, ahead of her giving evidence to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee on Tuesday. I appreciate that the Home Secretary says that it is not up to her to say who is arrested or when, but is it not time that we clarified the role of police investigations and investigations conducted by Select Committees for those investigations being conducted in both places?

Mrs May: I think the hon. Lady will find that Select Committees are very clear about the role and the powers that they have. What is important is that police investigations that could lead to criminal charges and prosecution are not prejudiced in any way by other investigations that take place. That is why we are being very careful in relation to the inquiry that is being led by Lord Justice Leveson. The hon. Lady also refers to needing to clear out the drains. Obviously the drains have not been cleared out for a number of years, but this Government are doing it.

Ian Lucas (Wrexham) (Lab): Which individual police officer made the decision to employ Neil Wallis's company?

Mrs May: As I understand it, the decision was made by the director of public affairs, not an individual police officer in the Metropolitan police.