

Contents

Written evidence received by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards	2
1. Letter from Vera Productions Ltd to Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP, 10 February 2015, handed to the Commissioner by Sir Malcolm on 5 March 2015	2
2. Article from Daily Telegraph (on-line) 23 February 2015	4
3. Script from Dispatches 'Politicians for Hire', 23 February 2015	6
4. Transcript of interview with Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP on the Today programme on 23 February 2015	27
5. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcom Rifkind QC MP, 26 February 2015	30
6. Letter from the Commissioner to Vera Productions Ltd, 26 February 2015	32
7. Letter from the Commissioner to the Editor of the Daily Telegraph, 26 February 2015	32
8. Letter from Sir Malcom Rifkind QC MP to the Commissioner, 27 February 2015	33
9. Statement by Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP handed to the Commissioner by Sir Malcolm on 5 March 2015	33
10. Emails between Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP and 'PMR Communications', November 2014 – January 2015	38
11. Letter from Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP to the Commissioner 10 March 2015	43
12. Enclosures with letter of 10 March 2015: emails between Sir Malcolm & Vera Productions in advance of the <i>Dispatches</i> programme	43
13. Transcript of interview: 'PMR Communications' with Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP on 7 January 2015, provided to the Commissioner on 20 April 2015	46
14. Transcript of interview: 'PMR Communications' with Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP on 13 January 2015, received by the Commissioner on 20 April 2015	78
15. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcolm Rifkind, 28 April 2015	109
16. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to the Commissioner, 4 May 2015	110
17. Attachment to email of 4 May: Sir Malcolm's response to transcripts	111
18. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcolm Rifkind, 1 June 2015	114
19. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to the Commissioner, 4 June 2015	115
20. Attachment to the email of 4 June 2015, Sir Malcolm's comments on the <i>Dispatches</i> script	115
21. Letter from the Commissioner to the Registrar, 9 June 2015	117
22. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to the Commissioner, 11 June 2015	119
23. Attachment to the email of 11 June 2015: comments in advance of meeting the Commissioner	119
24. Letter from the Registrar to the Commissioner, 12 June 2015	120
25. Transcription of Interview between the Commissioner and Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC, 15 June 2015	121
26. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC, 1 July 2015	143
27. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC to the Commissioner, 4 July 2015	143
28. Sir Malcom's entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests as at 23 February 2015	144

Written evidence received by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards

1. Letter from Vera Productions Ltd to Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP, 10 February 2015, handed to the Commissioner by Sir Malcolm on 5 March 2015

I am writing to you from Vera Productions, an independent television production company. I wish to inform you that we are producing a half-hour programme for Channel 4's flagship current affairs strand, "Dispatches", which is currently scheduled for broadcast at 20:00hrs on 23 February 2015.

This programme is an examination of the private financial interests of Members of Parliament and whether they act appropriately in maintaining the proper distinction between those interests and their duties as a Member of Parliament and whether the functions they carry out on behalf of those private interests are in keeping with the Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament.

The programme refers back to Channel4's "Politicians for Hire", a Dispatches programme, first broadcast on 22 March 2010. In that programme, a number of MPs were featured applying for positions on a fictitious American Company's advisory board. The company was in fact a front for undercover journalists working for Channel 4. The MPs made a number of claims to the journalists about how they could help the American company and, in some cases, examples of the help they had given to other clients.

Their behaviour was subsequently the subject of an investigation by Parliament's Standards Commissioner who made a number of criticisms in a report published on 9 December 2010. Senior politicians also spoke out criticising the MPs' behaviour and calling for an overhaul of the regulations in relation to lobbying.

This current programme investigates whether the situation has changed five years later. The programme features an approach made to a number of MPs by a Chinese Communications company – PMR Communications - in order to discuss whether they would be interested in joining the company's advisory board and consult on planned investments in the UK and other EU countries.

PMR Communications was in fact a fictitious company and its representatives were undercover reporters. The reporters secretly filmed the meetings in order to gather evidence that will feature in the programme.

The meetings with PMR Communications you attended in Grosvenor Street, one on 7 January, the other on 13 January are to feature in the programme. In the interests of fairness and accuracy, we are writing to give you the opportunity to respond to evidence that we have obtained.

We have provided in this letter a detailed and comprehensive list of all significant allegations and matters which, subject to your response, we currently intend to include in the programme.

The programme will also include an interview with Sir Alistair Graham, the former Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public Life. Sir Alistair viewed footage of your two meetings with PMR and also read the full transcriptions of both meetings. He then appraised and commented on some of the statements you made in the meetings.

Material for broadcast for which we invite your response

The filming, interviews and research for this programme have revealed evidence of the following matters:

1. That you corresponded with, and met representatives of PMR without first carrying out due diligence on the company.
2. That you demonstrated yourself as willing to act as an MP "for hire", using your position and contacts gained in that position for personal gain; in particular
 - (a) That you offered to host PMR in a private business meeting in your parliamentary office and provide a personal tour of Parliament for the representative's "uncle".
 - (b) That you claimed you could facilitate access to any foreign ambassador in the UK "in a way that is useful".
 - (c) That you said you could write to a minister on PMR's behalf, but wouldn't name on whose behalf you were asking, and that you could take soundings on e.g. future plans regarding HS3.
 - (d) That your fee, if you were to work for PMR, would be similar to fees you had earned in the past. You defined this as being in the region of 5,000 to £8,000 for part of a day.
3. Your comments in the meetings gave the impression that you were not applying yourself fully to your duties as an MP; in particular

(a) you claimed you have a lot of free time; you didn't work for any one person full-time; you were self-employed and that nobody pays you a salary.

(b) you suggested that the time from Thursday evening to Monday lunchtime was for you "quiet time".

On the basis of our inquiries, we believe that your voting record of 52% is among the bottom ten per cent of all MPs.

4. In relation to these matters, Sir Alistair expresses the view:

(a) That MPs are not self-employed; they receive a salary; that for most it is a full-time job. He thought your constituents would be appalled that you seem to have so much free time and that rather than representing your constituents you appear to be putting in such efforts to boost your income.

(b) That not naming a company on whose behalf you were writing to ask a question would be a clear breach of the MPs' Code of Conduct and behaviour that the public would find totally unacceptable.

In the interests of fairness, the programme will include your comments that you would not be able to attend PMR meetings if they conflicted with an important vote in the House of Commons. We will also include your clarification that you were not offering access to any privileged or secret information.

We are now approaching the final stages of editing. This letter has been sent to give you a fair opportunity to respond to the matters set out above in a written statement by 18 February 2015 at the latest, in order to ensure that your response can be fairly and accurately reflected in the programme. We may fairly edit any such response for broadcast in accordance with the Ofcom Broadcasting Code.

I can be contacted at the numbers and email address given below. I look forward to hearing from you.

10 February 2015

2. Article from Daily Telegraph (on-line) 23 February 2015

Two former foreign secretaries are exposed for their involvement in a new "cash for access" scandal.

Jack Straw and Sir Malcolm Rifkind offered to use their positions as politicians on behalf of a fictitious Chinese company in return for payments of at least £5,000 per day.

Sir Malcolm, who oversees Britain's intelligence agencies on behalf of Parliament, said he could arrange "useful access" to every British ambassador in the world because of his status.

He has told BBC Radio 4's Today programme that it was "quite unrealistic" to think MPs could live on "simply £60,000" a year without looking for extra income.

The senior Conservative told undercover reporters from this newspaper and Channel 4's Dispatches, to be broadcast on Monday night, that he would submit questions to ministers on behalf of a paying client, without revealing their identity.

Sir Malcolm also described himself as "self-employed" and had to "earn my income" — despite being paid £67,000 by the taxpayer for his work as an MP. The disclosure that two of Britain's most senior politicians are embroiled in a new "cash for access" scandal highlights Parliament's failure to address the issue which has plagued British politics for a generation.

Sir Alistair Graham, the former chairman of the Westminster standards watchdog, said it was "shocking" that two experienced MPs responded to the approaches in the way that they did.

He expressed concern that Sir Malcolm was "so willing to sell himself" with his "enormous range of contact lists".

More than five years ago, David Cameron warned that lobbying was the "next big scandal" and promised to tighten the rules — a pledge which has not been properly enacted. Over the past few months, reporters approached 12 MPs asking if they would be interested in joining the advisory board of a Chinese company.

They were chosen because of concerns about their business activities. Six of the 12 did not respond and one said his contacts were not "for sale". Mr Straw and Sir Malcolm agreed to enter discussions with the fictitious Chinese company looking to expand its business interests in Europe.

Last year Sir Malcolm registered earnings of £69,610 — more than £1,600 an hour — from his work outside of Parliament.

Analysis by this newspaper of MPs' overall earnings showed they made more than £7.4 million from outside work in the past year. The Chinese "company" wanted to form an advisory board. Undercover reporters met Sir Malcolm at the fictional firm's Mayfair office in January. Sir Malcolm, who served as foreign secretary under Sir John Major, described the access he could offer.

He said he could meet "any ambassador that I wish to see" in London. "They'll all see me personally", he added. "That provides access in a way that is, is useful".

In a second meeting, Sir Malcolm suggested that he would be willing to write to ministers on behalf of the company without declaring the name of the firm.

Sir Malcolm’s offer to write to ministers without “nam[ing] who was asking” is likely to cause concern because of the rules governing interests when communicating with ministers or officials.

Sir Alistair said it would be a “clear breach of the code of conduct if he’s not explaining that he’s acting as a consultant on behalf of a particular company when he’s seeking information”.

During a discussion about the former minister’s availability, he disclosed that he had a lot of “free time”.

Mr Straw and Sir Malcolm denied any wrongdoing.

Sir Malcolm said he believed the “firm” had sought his help as a former foreign secretary rather than as an MP. He said: “I have never undertaken, nor would I undertake, any lobbying as an MP on behalf of any private organisation from which I was receiving remuneration.”

He insisted that when he said he could write to ministers he was only offering to obtain information that was “already in the public domain”.

Senior Labour MP John Mann took to Twitter and called for Sir Malcolm to step down as Chair of the Parliamentary Intelligence and Security committee following the disclosures:

23 February 2015

3. Script from Dispatches ‘Politicians for Hire’, 23 February 2015

1	PRE-TITLE	
2	Voice Over (“VO”)	This is the story of two of Parliament’s most respected members.
3	Secret filming – Jack Straw (“JS”)	JS: The jobs that I had: Leader of the House, and Lord Chancellor
4	Secret filming – Malcolm Rifkind (“MR”)	MR: I was a defence minister so its an area that have some interest in
5	Glossy city shots	And who else they work for.
6	JS secret filming	JS: Normally if I’m doing a speech its five thousand pounds a day
	MR secret filming	MR: A whole morning or an afternoon – five to eight thousand pounds, something of that kind

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 7

7	VO	And what you might get if you hire them.
8	Secret filming	MR: I can see any ambassador that I wish to see. They will see me personally
9	Secret filming	JS: The best way of dealing with these things is under the radar
10	VO	Tonight we ask if there's still a problem with politicians for hire?
11	Alistair Graham ("AG")	AG: I'm just shocked that he responded to the invitation without checking you out
12	TITLE	POLITICIANS FOR HIRE
13	VO	Five years ago, Dispatches conducted an undercover investigation into how some MPs were asking for large sums of money for their services
14	Geoff Hoon ("GH") secret filming 2010 Stephen Byers ("SB") secret filming	GH: Three thousand pounds for a day's work SB: Well at the moment my sort of scale is between, it varies but it's usually between three and five thousand a day
15	VO	We'd set up a fictitious American consultancy company with clients looking to invest and get ahead in the UK. Former government ministers were quick to bite.
16	SB secret filming 2010	SB: I'm a bit like a sort of cab for hire I suppose at the moment
17	VO	The fall-out was massive. Former defence secretary Geoff Hoon was banned from Parliament for 5 years and former transport minister Stephen Byers was banned for two years.

18	VO	And soon to be Prime Minister, David Cameron spoke out too - warning that something had to be done to address the issue.
19	David Cameron ("DC") Archive 2010	DC: Anyone who watched any of the Dispatches programme last night could not help but be frankly disgusted by what they saw. There Is a deepening suspicion that politicians are out to serve themselves and not the country. Clearly the first task of an incoming government will be to instruct the Prime Minister's advisor on the Ministerial Code, to undertake a full review of this particular episode so the government can learn the lessons of what has gone wrong and change any other rules necessary to make sure it doesn't happen again
20	VO	There was an inquiry and one or two new rules were introduced. Despite that, is there still a gap between the conduct of some politicians and how the public expects them to behave?
21	VO	Five years on, Dispatches has decided to investigate once again.
22	Antony Barnett PTC	Our ruse worked so well last time we thought we'd give it another go.
23	VO	We've set up another company - this time based in Hong Kong.
24	VO	It's called PMR- and it's a communications agency.
25	VO	We've created the illusion of a real business - but anyone checking it thoroughly would find flaws.
26	VO	We've got a Hong Kong address, some business cards and a phone line - but the company only exists on a website. It's not registered anywhere in the

		world. All we need now are some influential politicians to join the company's advisory board to help us get a foothold in the UK and Europe.
27	Antony Barnett PTC	PMR is backed by a fictitious Chinese businessman. It has plenty of money to spend and wants to hire British politicians with the right contacts
28	VO	We invited 12 MPs to apply for jobs with PMR. We chose ones who already earn large sums of money from their outside interests.
29	Antony Barnett PTC	Not all politicians are for hire. Half of those we approached didn't respond. One said he wanted to check us out in Hong Kong so we took it no further. And another said he just wasn't that interested. Of the others, 2 stood out.
30	House of Commons, Sir Malcolm Rifkind	Speaker: Sir Malcolm Rifkind MR: Central to the concern that the House is expressing is whether the United Kingdom..
31	VO	First, Sir Malcolm Rifkind. He's an elder statesman of Westminster and the Conservative party
32	VO and graphic of MR CV <i>"Malcolm Rifkind – my CV"</i> <u>Cabinet Positions</u> <i>Defence Secretary 1992 – 95</i> <i>Foreign Secretary 1995 – 97</i> <u>Member of Parliament</u> <i>2010 Chair of the Intelligence and Security committee</i>	He has a long CV. Sir Malcolm's held 4 cabinet positions including Defence Secretary and Foreign Secretary. No longer a minister, he is still the MP for Kensington In 2010 the Prime Minister appointed him as Chair of the Intelligence and Security Committee which monitor the nation's intelligence services. Sir Malcolm also declares 5 other jobs outside Parliament that have earned him more than

	<p><u>Other jobs</u></p> <p>-business consultancies</p> <p>-consumer goods</p> <p>-manufacturing</p> <p>-medical services</p>	£800,000 in the last 5 years.
33	VO	Initially we exchanged a couple of emails with Sir Malcolm. We said we were looking to recruit people with appropriate political or regulatory backgrounds in the areas of energy, engineering and transport.
34	VO	He then agreed to meet the two PMR representatives in our pop-up office in Mayfair.
35	<p>Secret filming</p> <p>[note: "UC" = under-cover individual]</p>	<p>UC: HI</p> <p>MR: Hi, I'm Malcolm. I'm a little bit early, I hope that's not a problem</p> <p>UC: That's fine, I'm Claire</p> <p>MR: Hello</p> <p>UC: Nice meeting you</p> <p>MR: Nice to meet you</p>
36	VO	We had an informal background chat with Sir Malcolm where he asked about our company
37	Secret filming	<p>MR: So these – these would all be Chinese companies?</p> <p>UC: Yes</p> <p>MR: Based in Hong Kong or?</p> <p>UC: Most of them are based in China</p> <p>MR: In China itself?</p> <p>UC: But now increasingly, increasingly -</p>
38	VO	He also checked that the job didn't clash with his

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 11

		Parliamentary commitments
39	Secret filming	<p>MR: I do travel sometimes when Parliament is sitting but there is always a risk of some important vote will be announced and I have to come back -</p> <p>MR: But if it was possible to try and fix these dates for overseas meetings when Parliament is not sitting in Britain then I have no problem.</p>
40	VO	We then explained that the company's backer is interested in the history of Westminster.
41	Secret filming	<p>UC: A lot of people in China including my uncle, are very very impressed with the Parliament, the knighthood, the lordship and you know the, it's the whole history and it's you know-</p> <p>MR: Well, if I'd known this we could have had this meeting in my office in Parliament-</p> <p>UC: Maybe another time.</p> <p>MR: Well next time you come then.</p> <p>UC: Well it would be even better if he comes.</p> <p>MR: Your uncle, does he come to London? UC: Not yet but I think eventually he would yeah</p> <p>MR: You tell him, if he comes to London I will give him a personal tour of the British Parliament -</p> <p>UC: Oh fantastic</p> <p>UC: Thank you</p>
42	VO	We discussed with Sir Malcolm what he thought he could bring to a role on the board.
43	Secret filming	MR: Well you see, what I can do in London, I can see any ambassador that I wish to see. They will see

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 12

		<p>me personally.</p> <p>UC: Brilliant</p> <p>MR: If I ask to see them, because of having been a foreign minister it is, it is sort of almost automatic – they would that and that provides access in a way that is useful</p>
44	VO	<p>But earlier in the meeting, Sir Malcolm had made it clear that his services weren't on the House</p>
45	Secret filming	<p>MR: One sensitive issue, but I have to mention it.</p> <p>UC: Yes</p> <p>MR: You mentioned there would be, obviously, remuneration.</p> <p>UC: Of course- definitely -</p> <p>MR: Can you tell me what you're thinking of in that territory?</p> <p>UC: In some ways I think we would probably be guided by you -</p>
46	Secret filming	<p>MR: I would simply give it as an example, but when I did a series of presentations...</p> <p>... on the Middle East and that was usually something in the order of- I mean it wasn't a whole day, it was usually a whole morning or an afternoon and that was somewhere in the region of five to eight thousand pounds, something of that kind.</p>
47	VO	<p>2 days later, we contacted Sir Malcolm again and he returned to discuss our proposal in more detail</p>
48	Secret filming	<p>UC: Hi</p> <p>MR: I see we're in the same room</p> <p>UC: Nice to see you.</p>

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 13

		<p>MR: Good to see you again.</p> <p>UC: Tea or coffee?</p> <p>MR: I'd love some coffee if I may- thank you very much</p> <p>UC: Coffee</p> <p>MR: Yes</p>
49	VO	<p>An important question for our ambitious company; does Sir Malcolm have time for us along with his MP duties, chairing of the security committee and 5 other jobs?</p>
50	Secret filming	<p>MR: You'd be surprised how much free time I have. I spend a lot of time reading, I spend a lot of time walking. Because I'm not a minister or full-time working for one person I can sort out my day.</p> <p>MR: I am self-employed. So nobody pays me a salary. I have to earn my income, but when I'm not doing something I can do what I like.</p>
51	Secret filming	<p>MR: Most members of Parliament leave London on a Thursday evening and don't come back 'til Monday lunchtime. So they're in another part of the country. For me, that is quiet time.</p>
52	VO	<p>As the MP for Kensington, Sir Malcolm earns a £67,000 a year salary paid for by the taxpayer. We checked his voting record this Parliament. And even though he lives close to Westminster it's well below average- out of the 643 MPs who vote, only 57 have voted less than him.</p>
53	VO	<p>We sought expert opinion on Sir Malcolm's dealings with PMR. Sir Alistair Graham is a former</p>

		Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public Life.
54	VO	We showed Sir Alistair footage of the meetings.
55	Alistair Graham	<p>AG: He's the first Member of Parliament I've heard say has a lot of free time. Most members of Parliament I've ever met have complained about the enormous amount of work that they have to do, and what's all this about that he's self-employed? He's paid a salary by the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority.</p> <p>AB: How do you think the public might view a Member of Parliament who makes a statement like that?</p> <p>AG: Well I think they'd be appalled that a member of Parliament seems (a) to have so much free time rather than representing real issues that they will have in the constituency and that he's putting such efforts in to boost his income to do other work rather than carry out his public duties.</p>
56	VO	Later in the meeting, we told Sir Malcolm that PMR's backer was interested in investing in property near the route of a future rail project.
57	Secret filming	UC: ... For example some of the investments and projects he's looking at are with the possibility of HS3.
58	VO and HS2 promo Aston: 'Network Rail:	HS2 is the high speed rail link that's planned between London and Birmingham as shown in this glossy promotional video. Its claimed this will bring

	HS2/DARKSIDE Animation/ Pretzel Films (2013)	greater prosperity to the Midlands
59	VO	And now HS3 is being mooted – linking the north-east of England to the north-west. Any advance information would be a real asset to our fictitious investor
60	Secret filming	MR: What one could quite easily do is find out what is the current detailed state of government thinking on this- UC: yup MR- because at this stage it's an id- it's a proposal.
61	Secret filming	MR: Your uncle would obviously wish to know- well - what is the best judgment at this stage. UC: Yes MR: Is it likely to happen, if so when is it likely to happen? What is the likely route? UC: Yup. Precisely MR: If it's a matter of government policy then there's two aspects to government policy. That which they have announced and which is public knowledge- UC: Yes MR- and is something you can find it in the various ways of... UC: of Google?
62	Secret filming	UC: Yeah MR: Or in my own case I could write to a minister. UC: Right yeah that would be useful MR: And I wouldn't name who was asking UC: Yeah MR: but I would say I've been asked to establish

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 16

		what your thinking is on X, Y, Z. Can you tell me what that is?
63	Secret filming	MR: But if it's an area of - they may be reluctant. UC: To say, yes. And is it possible to take kind of discrete kind of soundings?
64	Secret filming	MR: You can take soundings. But when you take soundings you will get what is likely to happen. UC: Yes, precisely MR: You still have to be cautious UC: Yes MR: I mean sometimes what you can establish is what can be ruled out. UC: Yup MR: Well if we do go ahead we're not going to go in that route UC: Yes exactly, we're absolutely not going through Sheffield MR: Or it's not going to be 2017, the earliest will be 2020
65	VO	But Sir Malcolm does make clear the limitations of what can be achieved
66	Secret filming	MR: They have to be very careful. You cannot give privileged information to one private citizen or a company that is not available to others. Because why should they? There is no benefit from their point of view, and they will simply be very severely criticized. But there is an awful lot of information which is not secret which if you ask the right questions you'll get the answers...
67	Alistair Graham	AG: It's absolutely clear in the Code of Conduct for

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 17

		<p>Members of Parliament that they have to be open and frank in all communications and yet he was saying on that clip that he would be able to write to ministers, and he wouldn't have to say who exactly he was representing.</p> <p>Well that would be a clear breach of the Code of Conduct and an example of here an experienced Member of Parliament rather using their privileged position as a public servant in trying to get access to information which would benefit individuals and this company in a way that I think the public would find totally unacceptable.</p>
68	VO	With Parliament still sitting and constituents to look after, how soon can Sir Malcolm join our board?
69	Secret filming	<p>UC: When are you able to start if we were to - ?</p> <p>MR: Oh, I think not before Friday</p> <p>UC: Sounds good</p>
70	Sir Alistair Graham	AG: I'm just shocked that he responded to the invitation, without checking you out that you weren't a bona fide Chinese company, and that he's so willing to sell himself to, it would appear, maximize his personal income, to give access to this range of contacts, that he's built over a very long time.
71	VO	In a statement to Dispatches Sir Malcolm said:
72	R2R Malcolm Rifkind	"I have never undertaken nor would undertake any lobbying as an MP on behalf of any private organisation for which I was receiving remuneration.

		<p>You suggest that I showed myself as 'willing to act as an MP for hire'. That is untrue...There was no suggestion that I was being approached as an MP... Their approach to me was because of my previous experience as a Minister... Ambassadors tend to respond not because I am a current MP but because I was Foreign Secretary.</p> <p>I did look at their website. Due diligence is something one does when one has received a firm offer.</p> <p>No business meeting in my office was proposed. I said I would not be prepared to write to Ministers on behalf of PMR or any other company...The most I could do would be to enquire from them information...which was already in the public domain.</p> <p>I arrange my affairs so that around 75% of my time is spent on Parliamentary and constituency business...Most constituency events are during the week rather than at the weekend."</p>
73	VO	Coming up, another senior Parliamentarian gives us the rate for his services
74	Secret filming	JS: Normally, if I'm doing a speech or something its £5,000 a day, that's what I charge
75	END of	PART ONE
76	PART	TWO
77	VO	Five years after Dispatches first exposed leading politicians who were selling their services, we're

		investigating again.
78	VO	Even if they're observing Parliamentary rules, are they acting in a manner the public expects?
79	Secret filming	MR: A whole morning or an afternoon - Five to eight thousand pounds, something of that kind
80	VO	We posed as a Chinese communications company and serving MP, Sir Malcolm Rifkind, told us he's free to join our board.
81	Secret filming	MR: Because I'm self-employed, so nobody pays me a salary
82	VO	Our investigation didn't stop there. Another MP who responded to the PMR invitation is one of the Labour party's grandest elder statesmen: Jack Straw.
83	House of Commons archive	JS: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I want to begin with some thanks - first of all to the house for-
84	VO and graphic of JS CV <i>"Jack Straw - my CV"</i> <u>Cabinet positions</u> <i>Home Secretary 1997-2001</i> <i>Foreign Secretary 2001-06</i> <i>Justice Secretary 2007-10</i> <u>Member of Parliament</u> <i>Blackburn 1979-March 2015</i> <u>Outside Interests</u> <i>Advisor to Eurasian Council</i> <i>British Global commodities trader</i>	Like Sir Malcolm he also has an impressive CV. He's held several cabinet positions including Foreign Secretary. The backbench MP for Blackburn, Mr Straw declares two outside interests: both in advisory roles, one of them earning him £60,000 a year working for a British commodities trader. Mr Straw is standing down as an MP but he's been tipped in the press to go to the Lords later this year.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 20

	<i>£60k per year”</i>	
85	VO	When Dispatches broadcast 'Politicians For Hire' five years ago, Mr Straw hit the airwaves to criticise MPs for even falling for it in the first place
86	BBC Radio 4 'Today' 23 rd March 2010	JS: There is such anger in the Parliamentary party as well as I may say incredulity about their stupidity in allowing themselves to be suckered in a sting like this.
87	VO	As with Sir Malcolm, it all started with an email. We told Mr Straw that PMR was looking for people to join the advisory board who could help our client understand the various political, regulatory and legislative frameworks in the UK and across the EU.
88	VO	Not only does Mr Straw seem to have fallen for it this time, he invited our two fake employees to his Parliamentary office.
89	Secret filming	UC: How are you for time? JS: Sorry? UC: Are you okay with time? JS: I'M okay for time now. Yeah yeah sure
90	VO	Mr Straw then went onto explain the kind of business he's already involved in.
91	Secret filming	JS: I am an adviser to a firm you probably won't have heard of but is one of Britain's biggest soft commodity traders, and they're called ED&F Man, okay
92	VO	One of the commodities ED&F Man trade in is sugar. In 2011 the company wanted to import raw sugar cane into Ukraine, refine it in their factory there and then export it.

		<p>But then there was a problem.</p> <p>Mr Straw said the business was prevented from doing this because of recently introduced Ukrainian regulations.</p>
93	VO	And he explained how he had helped ED&F Man.
94	Secret filming	<p>JS:I got into, took Man with the British Ambassador in Kiev to see the Ukrainian Prime Minister-</p> <p>UC: Oh, right</p> <p>JS: A guy called Azarov... And to cut a very long story short, we got it sorted out.</p> <p>UC: So did you get the- Did the Prime Minister change the-</p> <p>JS: They got the law changed</p>
95	Secret filming	<p>UC: Oh wow, that was good</p> <p>JS: It was good, yes</p> <p>UC: So they must have been really happy</p> <p>JS: They were pleased about it, yeah</p>
96	VO	ED&F Man is perfectly entitled to pursue its legitimate commercial interests and seek changes in the law. And Mr Straw ensured that his work for them was signed off properly by the appropriate Parliamentary committee. He also declared the trip.
97	VO	But what he told our reporters reveals how his lobbying activities as a senior politician were extremely useful to a private company.
98	VO	And his usefulness to the commodity trader didn't end there. When EU sugar regulations were hampering EDGF Man's ability to do business, Mr

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 22

		Straw told us he got to work on the case.
99	Secret filming	<p>JS: I got into see the relevant director general and his officials in Brussels-</p> <p>UC: Oh right-</p> <p>JS: And we got the sugar regulations changed</p> <p>UC: Oh amazing</p> <p>JS: Um, so-</p> <p>UC: That must have meant an awful lot to ED&F</p> <p>JS: Well it means a lot to them, yeah. I mean also the crucial thing about these it's all, it's public that the regulations have been changed, but the best way of dealing with these things is under the radar-</p>
100	VO	Once again, we asked the former Chairman of the Committee on Standards in Public life, Sir Alistair Graham, to have a look at our footage.
101	Anthony Barnett/Alistair Graham interview	<p>AB: What did you make of Mr Straw's comments that the change in regulations is public but to do these things it's better to operate under the radar?</p> <p>AG: Well that's worrying because that's saying 'I can do these things without transparency'. Without the openness and frankness that the MPs' Code of Conduct is expecting is the normal behaviour from Members of Parliament.</p>
102	VO	Mr Straw asked us for more details about the job.
103	Secret filming	<p>JS: I'm well aware of the fact that I bring my name, alright- I get that. But it's what it is you want from me, what I can offer you, could do for you, what's the time commitment?</p>

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 23

		<p>JS: Obviously there's the – if we get down the track there's the issue of what fee you have in mind</p> <p>UC: Oh of course, but actually it would be good to – I don't know if you have a kind of daily rate in mind</p> <p>JS: Normally, if I'm doing a speech or something it's £5,000 a day, that's what I charge</p>
104	VO	Jack Straw told us he is well aware of his Parliamentary commitments to Blackburn
105	Secret filming	<p>JS: A) I've got a day job, I mean that's my first responsibility. And B) I don't, you know, I've managed to keep out of any kind of scandal all my political career</p> <p>UC: Sounds good</p> <p>JS: What? You see what I mean</p> <p>UC: Yeah, yeah</p> <p>JS: I don't want to attract a lot of attention by earning a lot more, although I, cos, so as a result of being – I turn down quite a lot, just because I, you know, I've got to be able to justify towards myself and as well to my constituents that working for Man, for example, is something I can do in my spare time</p>
106	VO	Jack Straw is a long-standing MP and former Labour minister, and the press has predicted a move to the House of Lords for him after the next election.
107	Secret filming	<p>JS: if I was ever to go stand up in the House of Commons and talk about sugar, I could end up being disqualified, okay? Because there are very strict rules against advocating advocacy on behalf of companies who are paying you-</p> <p>UC: Right</p>

		<p>JS: Okay. Well obviously if I'm not in the House of Commons, I'm not in that position.</p> <p>UC: Yes</p> <p>JS: I could end up in the House of Lords, so you're aware- you may have seen that. Speculation in the paper at the moment- no one's said anything to me officially. But the rules there are different-</p> <p>UC: Oh ok</p> <p>JS: And plenty of people have commercial interests there-</p> <p>UC: Oh great, so you'd be able to help us a lot more potentially-</p> <p>JS: I'll be able to help you more- I mean- I'll be able to help you more. Well I wouldn't take this on as long as I was a Member of Parliament-</p> <p>UC: Yeah</p> <p>JS: Alright.</p>
108	Alistair Graham	<p>AG: Well, there's a slightly cheeky assumption that he's going to be appointed to the House of Lords. But I think he probably needs to brush up on the regulations because the House of Lords have had a fair number of scandals in recent years and they have gone to some length to tighten their regulations and disciplinary processes.</p>
109	Secret filming	<p>JS: So this is called the back of the chair area because the Speaker's chair is right up the end there.</p> <p>UC: Yeah- Oh I see</p>
110	VO	<p>At the end of the meeting, Mr Straw then takes our two fake employees on a tour of the inner sanctum of Parliament</p>

Sir Malcolm Rifkind and Mr Jack Straw 25

111	Secret filming	<p>JS: Just down there to the right is where the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Prime Minister have their rooms</p> <p>UC: Oh my goodness</p>
112	Secret filming	<p>JS: When they're here- and then down there to the left is where the Foreign Secretary has his room, which is where-</p> <p>UC: Oh, how exciting</p>
113	VO	<p>And like Sir Malcolm Rifkind, Mr Straw then offers a tour to the Chinese uncle he's never met. The man who would ultimately decide if he gets the job on our imaginary board</p>
114	Secret filming	<p>UC: Yes, yes</p> <p>JS: I mean I am very busy but we'll try and sort out a time, when, if you tell us when your uncle's here and if I can arrange for him to be shown around and things like that sort of thing, go to the gallery alright? But I'll do my best</p> <p>UC: Thank you so much <i>I</i> that's very kind <i>I</i> have a good day <i>I</i> bye bye</p>
115	Alistair Graham	<p>Now it's perfectly understandable that Jack Straw wants to have a positive and constructive retirement and he wants to have an income that takes advantage of his past public experience. But it is worrying that he is using public facilities to try and negotiate contracts for when he's left Parliament. And the Code of Conduct makes this absolutely clear that they are there to support their Parliamentary duties not furthering their private interests.</p>
116	VO	<p>In a statement to Dispatches, Jack Straw said:</p>

117	R2R Jack Straw	<p>"Having researched the company, I made enquiries in Hong Kong and was told the company appeared to be bona fide, but that the best way to carry out further due diligence was to meet with the individuals. If I had not received that response I would have cancelled the meeting.</p> <p>I would have made full official checks before accepting an appointment.</p> <p>I made clear from the outset that I was not available for any work until after I stood down as a Member of Parliament.</p> <p>Due to my other Parliamentary commitments, and to save time for further such work, I met the individuals in my Parliamentary office. We had a general discussion about work I have done a consultancy basis for another company.</p> <p>All of my outside paid work is fully and properly declared under the rules that apply to MPs. I have also sought specific guidance from the office of the advisory committee on business appointments (of former ministers) before undertaking projects.</p> <p>I am confident that I behaved, as I have always done, with integrity and that I did not breach any</p>
-----	----------------	---

		Parliamentary rules in substance or in spirit.
118	VO	Whatever the rules, our investigation raises questions about the behaviour of two senior politicians. And with an election round the corner, the conduct of our Parliamentarians inside and outside the Commons is likely to remain firmly in the spotlight.
119	THE	END

4. Transcript of interview with Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP on the Today programme on 23 February 2015

Introduced by JH quoting MR's comments in a recorded meeting saying that he had plenty of free time and was self-employed.

JH People will be perhaps surprised by you saying “no one pays me a salary”

MR No, of course you are absolutely right, that was a silly thing to say. Of course I receive a salary as a Member of Parliament. The part of the conversation I was taking part in at that time, I was referring to my business interests, from none of which I receive a salary; I receive a payment for the services I provide.

JH But, it's misleading isn't it?

MR It could have been misleading, yes, if you read it out of context. I understand that.

JH And they will be surprised, perhaps some people, that you feel you need to earn more money on top of your 67,000 given the responsibilities you hold.

MR Well, let's be.... I'll give you an absolute direct answer. First of all, these are very serious allegations. They are unfounded and I am going to fight them with all my strength. The basic allegation that you are really referring to at the moment is that there is something improper, in the United Kingdom, about a Member of Parliament being willing to take part in, in this case, an advisory board, of a company that is seeking to invest in the United Kingdom. But, of course, there are probably two hundred MPs who have various business interests other than their MP's salary. Now, some people disapprove of that, and maybe the Labour Party is going to disapprove of that. But many of the public take a different view. Not all of them, but many say “actually, we don't want full-time politicians, we want Members of Parliament who have some outside experience of the wider world”, and that is a perfectly reasonable proposition. I think also, if you are trying to attract people of a business or a professional background to serve in the House of Commons, and if they are

not Ministers, it is quite unrealistic to believe they will go through their parliamentary careers being able to simply accept a salary of 60,000. That sounds a lot, to a lot of people earning less than that. But as you will be well aware John, the vast majority of people of a business or professional background, earn far, far, more than that and, ok, if they are told they have to choose one or the other, they just won't come to the House of Commons at all and Parliament will lose their skills.

JH Let's deal with your specific position though, if we may. You chair a vitally important Committee doing a vitally important job, it's hard to think of a more important job than overseeing the activities of the security services. Somebody comes to you, you've never met them before, by definition, and they say "we represent a Chinese company, will you take money for us to help us do what it is we do?"

MR No, they didn't say that. They did say that...If you are going to make the question, I am going to have to correct you right away. I received an email from them saying "we are setting up an advisory board for the company. We want to have serving on that board, people of a senior business background and people with political experience" – they never mentioned MPs – and they want people on their advisory board to give us advice on the regulatory, political and financial position, of many European companies, not just in the United Kingdom", and most of the discussions I had with them were not about the United Kingdom, they were about political risk in various parts of Europe, about the difference between investing in Russia as opposed to investing in Western Europe and matters of that kind and Advisory boards; many companies have advisory boards, many ex-Minister, former Chancellors, Home-Secretaries, Prime Ministers, as well as other people have served on advisory boards.

JH But you were going to... There is no question that you were going, obviously, to be paid by this company...

MR Yes, of course, absolutely...

JH ... which is why you got into questions of money. You said that you were happy with an offer of £60,000 to £80,000 for the advisory board and you gave an example of...

MR Well, that was their figure, they, I didn't ask for that. They said that's what they said...

JH you did give an example of where a bank paid you in the region of £5,000 to £8,000 for part of a day.

MR Well, that was a particular speech that they wanted me to make at a particular conference and that is what they said they wanted to offer and I said thank you very much...

JH [unclear]

MR This is all... Hold on, I have got to make clear; first of all, this is something which Parliament has said is acceptable, otherwise about 200 Members of Parliament would not be accepting fees. As long as they are registered in the Register of Members' Interests, and all my outside income is registered. Any of your listeners can go on the internet to the Register of Members' Interests; they can see every penny I earn and they can see how long it takes for me to earn that money and what I do for it. Now, Parliament has said, and for many years, that that is acceptable, and it is not good enough for the Telegraph or Channel 4... Indeed I am grateful to the Today programme, because I offered to appear on the Channel 4 television programme and answer personally the allegations. They refused to allow me. So, I am very grateful to you Mr Humphreys for giving me this opportunity.

JH Well, let me stay, if I may, with the thought of you being Chairman of the Committee....

MR By all means.

JH People, many people, rightly or wrongly, will look at this and read the transcripts that appear in the Telegraph this morning and watch Channel 4's programme this evening and say "Hang on, that man is crucially important in our national security and here he is, dealing, let's accept entirely your description of the relationship they were offering you, but nonetheless, a company of which you knew nothing, a Chinese company"....

MR Now hold on, I didn't accept any offer. We never reached that stage, this was a preliminary discussion....

JH Indeed, but you were negotiating with them...

MR No, I was not negotiating, at all.

JH Well, it looks like that from the clips that Channel 4 have provided...

MR I'm sorry, Channel 4 are very good at producing selective quotations out of context. I had involved myself in no negotiation. I was there to hear from them what they had in mind and we never reached a conclusion.

JH Well, you actually told that you knew all the ambassadors, or pretty much, all the ambassadors....

MR Well, that's quite true, let me explain that. They said that one of the things that we would be interested in is actually finding out how the, how the investment opportunities might be in various continental European countries, in France and Germany, in Romania and Bulgaria, and so forth. Could you help us in that way? So I said, the only help that I could give you, but I could give you it, is I could contact the Romanian or Bulgarian ambassador in London and ask them to speak to you, and answer your questions, that's exactly what I said.

JH You have reported yourself, so has Mr Straw....

MR Yes....

JH ...to the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards because you want a proper investigation into this. While that is going on, will you stand down as Chairman of the Committee?

MR Not unless my committee colleagues wanted me to, certainly not....

JH You won't offer it...

MR Well, one's got nothing to do with the other, None of the matters, even that the Telegraph are alleging, or complaining about, are remotely to do with intelligence and security. And can I make just one additional point because I suspect we may be running out of time. It's well worth bearing in mind that Channel 4 themselves have, I have a letter from them when they first contacted me saying "we accept you were, in these discussions you had, not offering any access to any privileged or secret information." I have got that in writing from them and it's a pity they didn't emphasise that in their programme.

JH Nonetheless, when you sit down to watch that programme tonight, I am assuming you will...

MR I don't know that I will, but I suspect I will end up doing so, I suspect I might.

JH Indeed. You're going to be hugely embarrassed aren't you?

MR No, I'm going to be hugely irritated and angry because I have nothing to be embarrassed about. Every single thing I said to these people I would have been willing to say on television or to you, if you had put the same questions to me at the time.

JH Sir Malcolm, many thanks.

23 February 2015

5. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcom Rifkind QC MP, 26 February 2015

It has been widely reported in the past few days that you have referred yourself to me to consider beginning an investigation into allegations arising from articles that have appeared in the Daily Telegraph this week and from the broadcast of *Dispatches* programme on Channel 4 on Monday evening.

My office contacted yours on Tuesday, and again yesterday, and it was confirmed that you had written to me. However, I have not received your letter nor any other contact from

you. Given that the material which forms the substance of the allegations is already in the public domain, I have now decided to begin an investigation on my own initiative.

At this stage, I will set out the broad areas my inquiry will cover. These are that, contrary to the rules of the House, you are alleged to have engaged in lobbying for reward or consideration. I will also consider whether your conduct has caused serious damage to the reputation and integrity of the House of Commons as a whole or of its Members generally. The scope of my investigation is widely drawn in the hope that this will enable a complete investigation of all the relevant matters at the earliest opportunity.

As matter of courtesy, I should say now that I will seek evidence from third parties, including Channel 4 and *The Telegraph*. If there are other witnesses whom you think I might usefully contact, please do let me know (including their contact details).

I will be seeking a transcript of the recordings made by Channel 4, as well as a transcript of the television programme, and any relevant correspondence they hold. This may take some time. When I have had the opportunity to consider that evidence, which I will share with you, I may have some specific questions to put to you and may wish to meet you. In the meantime, if you have papers that you consider will assist my inquiry, it would be helpful if you could collate these and send them to me by 12 March 2015. I would also be happy to meet with you at this stage if you believe this would be useful.

I enclose a note which sets out the procedure which I follow. This requires that I set out the allegations under investigation and the relevant rules of the House. The Code of Conduct for Members of Parliament approved by the House on 12 March 2012 prohibits Members from undertaking:

“...any action which would cause significant damage to the reputation and integrity of the House of Commons as a whole, or of its Members generally.”

The rules prohibiting lobbying for reward or consideration are set out in part 3 of the Guide to the Rules.

I will shortly include on my parliamentary web pages the fact that I am conducting an inquiry. My office will not comment further on any aspect of the inquiry. As you will be aware, my inquiries are conducted in private. This letter and any subsequent correspondence between us has parliamentary privilege until such time as a final report is published.

I would very much appreciate your help and co-operation and would welcome your comments on the allegations, together with any evidence you feel may assist my investigation, by close of business on **12 March 2015**.

26 February 2015

6. Letter from the Commissioner to Vera Productions Ltd, 26 February 2015

I am writing to seek your assistance with an inquiry I am conducting into statements made by the Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Rifkind MP during meetings with journalists preparing an episode of *Dispatches*, some of which were broadcast on Monday 23 February 2015.

It would be helpful if you would let me have the full and unedited footage which formed the basis of the programme, including un-broadcast footage, together with any transcripts of the conversations. It would also be helpful to have any correspondence you or your reporters have had with Sir Malcolm or his representatives both in the course of and after making the programme.

The material would be confidential to my inquiry, but I would expect to show it to Sir Malcolm in the course of my inquiry. Any such material is likely to be published once my inquiries are concluded. Depending on the outcome of the inquiry, it will either be on my own webpages or as part of an appendix to a report by the Committee on Standards.

Since I am seeking your help as a witness in this inquiry, I enclose a note which sets out the procedure I follow. My inquiries are subject to parliamentary privilege and that means you must not disclose this letter, or your response, to others except insofar as it is necessary for you to do so in order to respond to my request.

I would be grateful for your help on this matter. If you would let me have any such material within the next two weeks, that would be most helpful. If this is not possible, it would be helpful to have an early estimate of the time it will take to produce the material.

26 February 2015

7. Letter from the Commissioner to the Editor of the Daily Telegraph, 26 February 2015

I am writing to seek your assistance with an inquiry I am conducting into statements made by the Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Rifkind MP during meetings with journalists preparing articles that have appeared in the Daily Telegraph this week. The material also formed the basis of an episode of *Dispatches*, broadcast on Channel 4 on Monday 23 February 2015.

It would be very helpful if you would let me have the full and unedited footage which formed the basis of the articles in the Daily Telegraph, including any un-broadcast and unpublished footage, together with any transcripts of the conversations. It would also be helpful to have any correspondence you or your reporters have had with Sir Malcolm or his representatives in the course of and after the preparation of the articles.

This material would be confidential to my inquiry, but I would expect to show it to Sir Malcolm in the conduct of my inquiry. Any such material is likely to be published once my inquiry is concluded. Depending on the outcome of my inquiry, it will be published either on my own webpages or as part of an appendix to a report by the Committee on Standards.

Since I am seeking your help as a witness in this inquiry, I enclose a note which sets out the procedure I follow. My inquiries are subject to parliamentary privilege and that means you must not disclose this letter, or your response, to others except insofar as it is necessary for you to do so in order to respond to my request.

I would be grateful for your help on this matter. If you would let me have any such material within the next two weeks, that would be most helpful. If that is not possible, it would be helpful to have an early estimation of the time it will take to produce the material.

26 February 2015

8. Letter from Sir Malcom Rifkind QC MP to the Commissioner, 27 February 2015

Thank you very much for your letter of 26 February,

I very much regret that because of the hectic nature of the last few days I had not yet written to you. I had intended to do so this morning!

I shall be very willing to cooperate entirely with your investigations, which until now have been based simply on Press and TV allegations.

You state in your letter that you would like to have my comments on the allegations, together with any evidence I may have in my possession, by 12 March, which I will be pleased to do.

27 February 2015

9. Statement by Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP handed to the Commissioner by Sir Malcolm on 5 March 2015

Background

I have served as a Member of Parliament for 33 years, from 1974-97 and from 2005- 2010. Throughout that time I have been well aware of, and sensitive to, the standards that are expected of a Member. This is the first time my conduct has been called into question. I fully respect your obligation to investigate the allegations that have been made in the media.

Since returning to Parliament in 2005 I have had a number of business interests which have all been fully reported in the Register of Members Interests. On being selected as the Conservative candidate for Kensington and Chelsea I informed my local Conservative Association that I wished to continue with some of the business interests that I had had while outside Parliament. They responded that they had no problem with that.

I have arranged my affairs so that I spend at least 75% of my time on my parliamentary and constituency responsibilities. My business activities have been of an advisory or non-executive type. Some of the work has been done by e-mail. Meetings have been overwhelmingly in the centre of London because I have, normally, only accepted business commitments of companies located in London. Overseas travel on business interests has been limited and often during the parliamentary recesses.

During the period that I was not in Parliament my wife was diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis. Mainly for that reason I decided that if I returned to Parliament it would need to be for a London constituency. That would remove the need for weekly travel and, as London Members can continue to do constituency work during the week, would enable me to have a quieter weekend. I mention this because it is relevant to some of the comments that have been attributed to me in the Press reports.

While some feel that being an MP should be a full-time job, many others disagree. The fact that we have a Register of Members Interests is because such interests are accepted as being entirely legitimate.

Having been a Minister for 18 years, like all Ministers, I had, in effect, two jobs and two salaries. As Foreign Secretary and in the other Cabinet posts that I held, my ministerial responsibilities took up at least 90% of my time with only 10% for my constituency. That compares with 75% at the present time. I am very used to hard work. My present parliamentary and business interests do not begin to compare with the burden I had to shoulder when I was a senior Minister. Others who have had such responsibilities have made similar observations, recently.

An Advisory Board

Recent events began with an e-mail I received on 19th November. I attach a copy of it. As can be seen it is headed "Advisory Board Position".

As I am sure you are aware, Advisory Boards are very common in the UK and international corporate sector. I am, at present, a member of L.E.K.'s European Advisory Board. I was, therefore, familiar with this kind of structure.

The approach stated that the purpose of the Advisory Board would be to help understanding of "the various political, regulatory and legislative frameworks in the UK and across the EU." It went on to say that the Advisory Board would be "made up of senior figures from the world of politics and business" and would "comprise individuals with appropriate political and/or regulatory backgrounds from at least two countries including the UK".

I sent a reply, which I attach. I said that "I would need to be satisfied that there would not be any conflict of interest with my current responsibilities".

Comment

1. This was not an approach to MPs. Indeed few MPs would have knowledge of the regulatory and legislative frameworks in the UK and across the EU.

2. Having served as both Minister of State for Europe and as Foreign Secretary, as well as my previous business experience, appeared to be a reasonable explanation as to why they had approached me.

3. As I had not served as a Minister since 1997, 18 years ago, there was, clearly, no interest in me as someone who would have had recent access to privileged information relevant to potential investment decisions that they might be interested in.

4. Neither directly nor indirectly, was there any suggestion that members of the proposed advisory board would be expected to lobby anyone on their behalf

Against this background I agreed to meet their representatives to hear what they had in mind. I had two such meetings in central London.

It has been suggested that I should have done due diligence about this approach at this stage. I could have done and, of course, wish I had done so. But, normally, due diligence is done when a firm proposal is made. No such proposal was ever made.

A high proportion of the discussions which I had with them covered matters which are not relevant to the current controversy but which were relevant to the proposed purpose of the advisory board as they had set out in their e-mail to me.

They wished to know my views on differential political risk, from an investment point of view, in various European countries including Russia and Eastern Europe. We, also, discussed the European Union, how it functions and the extent to which there were different views in different EU countries to investment or takeovers from abroad, including from China. I pointed out to them that the British Government, as well as other political parties, welcomed Chinese investment in the UK as long as such companies obeyed the law and provided employment. I think we also discussed the likelihood of a UK referendum and the possibility of the UK leaving the EU.

As I recall it, there was only one specifically UK issue that they raised with me. This was HS3.

I was surprised at this being raised as, unlike HS2, there is no such project at the moment. It has been raised as a possible extension north of HS2 but there is no Government commitment to it. I pointed this out to them and said I was doubtful if decisions would be taken for several years.

They nevertheless continued showing interest in this subject and asked, if I was on their advisory board, if I would be able to help them be better informed.

I had already made clear to them that on any subject that might come before an advisory board, I would not be able to assist with access to any information that was privileged or secret. That I made this clear is not in dispute. The letter I received from Vera, the production company acting on behalf of Channel 4, says, specifically, that they acknowledge that I made clear that I could not assist them with "access to any privileged or secret information". I attach a copy of this letter.

This was also confirmed by an extract from their transcript that Channel 4 have made available which says "Sir Malcolm does make clear the limitations of what can be achieved.

[He says] "You cannot give privileged information to one private citizen or a company that is not available to others". I attach a copy of this content from the transcript.

Comment:

The next part of this Statement deals with the allegation about whether I said that I could write to a Minister. I am at a disadvantage at trying to recall the precise words that I used during this particular exchange. Channel 4 and the Daily Telegraph both claim to have a transcript but have both refused to supply me either with a copy of it or, even, those particular exchanges relevant to their various allegations. They were therefore able to publicise various remarks which they claim that I said without either I, or anyone else, being able to check their veracity or see whether they are being quoted out of context in a manner which creates a false impression. This is quite contrary to any rule of natural justice.

While, for the reasons that I have stated, I cannot recollect the exact words that I used Channel 4 has put on their website their own choice of what they claim was said. However unintentionally, this is quite useful as it confirms that any comments made by me was on the basis of information that was already in the public domain and that, at no time, was I even asked about getting access to privileged information.

It is suggested that I said "What one could quite easily do is find out what is the current detailed state of government thinking because at this stage it's a proposal..." It is suggested that I then referred to "that which they have announced and which is public knowledge and is something you can find in various ways". Google is then mentioned as a way of learning what is public. I am, then, quoted as saying "Or in my own case I could write to a Minister." The next words are left out and then I am quoted as saying "I wouldn't name who was asking but I would say I've been asked to establish what your thinking is on XYX".

I do recall saying something of this kind, though not the precise words. I have tried to remember why I may have used those words and what I had in mind.

I would make the following points.

1. At the time there was no Advisory Board nor any decision by me as to whether I would wish to serve on one.
2. Accordingly, at no time did I say, or could I have said, that I was intending to write to a Minister on their behalf.
3. The discussion was restricted to how, theoretically, one could ascertain what information was in the public domain. I was suggesting to them various ways that this could be done.
4. I believe that I did suggest that, in my opinion, writing to a Minister was one option that it would be proper for me to do if I was a member of an advisory board.
5. I was aware that if, as an MP, I wrote to a Minister on behalf of someone else I should say so. It is acknowledged that I said that if I, hypothetically, were to write such a letter I would need to say "I've been asked to establish"
6. I am not clear in my own mind why I obviously thought at the time that it would not be necessary to mention the name of the people on whose behalf I might be writing. I think it

must have been because I assumed that as it was only information already in the public domain about which one was enquiring, it wouldn't be necessary.

You will come to a view as to whether I was wrong in that assumption. I recognize that I may have been but, if so, it was an honest mistake.

This subject was not a line of questioning by them that I had anticipated. I had not reread the Code before the meeting. I was aware of the need to respect the letter and the spirit of the code. That was why I said I would need to say "I have been asked to enquire". I was, therefore, acknowledging that the public information about which I was enquiring was not just for my own benefit. I could easily, therefore, have included their name in any hypothetical letter I might have sent.

Most important of all, I was doing no more than expressing an off the cuff opinion of what might be permissible. Opinions expressed may, sometimes, turn out to have been mistaken. Off the cuff opinions are even more likely to be! Expressing a mistaken opinion is not, in itself, improper, I would suggest, if the mistake has been made in good faith.

Other Matters alleged

1. There was an allegation about "access to foreign ambassadors" which the media must have known they were presenting in a distorted manner.

As I have mentioned much of the discussion was about differential risk of investing in various European countries and whether there were European countries that might not welcome foreign investment in, or ownership of, parts of their economy. I was asked how they might learn which countries would welcome their investment. I responded that as their advisory board was to be based in London one way would be to contact the ambassadors of the countries in question who, I imagined, would be very happy to see them as they would welcome the prospect of foreign investment. I certainly said that I knew many of these ambassadors (which I do) and could help bring them together. I know them, not as the MP for Kensington, but because many of them have been to see me, as a former Foreign Secretary, to discuss developments in their own countries.

I cannot imagine there can have been anything remotely improper about my response. To headline it as "Cash for access" is a travesty.

2. I was reported as saying that I did not receive a salary. Again, by quoting this out of context it appeared a ridiculous statement. I was, obviously, aware that I receive a salary. I have not been allowed to see the transcript but I am certain this was said when I was referring to my business interests. As regards these I am either a non-executive director or a consultant. In neither case am I employed nor do I receive a salary. This is another example of how remarks made in an informal conversation can be distorted by amoral journalists.

3. The figure of £5,000 was mentioned as the fee I would expect per day. They asked me what I would expect to be paid if I served on their advisory board. I said that it was difficult to say without knowing much more about what they had in mind as regards the time commitment. They pressed me on this and I referred them to the Register of Members Interests where around £5,000 is registered as a payment I have received in the past.

Concluding Points

There are two further points that I wish to comment on.

In your letter you say that I am alleged to have engaged in lobbying for reward or consideration.

I have never engaged in lobbying nor have ever offered to. During all my years as an MP I have never undertaken, nor would undertake, any lobbying as an MP on behalf of any private organization from which I was receiving remuneration. Whether or not such lobbying might be permitted under the rules, I consider it improper for an MP to undertake such work.

For there to be lobbying there must be an approach to a Minister or someone else in authority either seeking to influence a decision in a particular direction or seeking to have access to information that is not available to the public.

There is nothing that I said, did, or contemplated in these discussions that constituted lobbying. Indeed, to be fair, nor was there any request or suggestion from those I was meeting that I should act in such a fashion.

Such discussion as there was was limited to information already in the public domain and how one could ascertain what it was. I am fortunate that even Channel 4 has conceded that both in the letter I have already referred to and in the elements of the transcript that they have revealed.

Secondly, you say that you will consider whether my conduct has caused serious damage to the reputation and integrity of the House of Commons as a whole or of its Members generally.

I can have no complaint with that. But I hope that you will accept that it is my conduct that should be judged and nothing else. Any "expose" by the media that is based on entrapment, secret cameras and undercover reporters is presented to the viewer in a sensationalist way. When that is accompanied by selective and distorted quotation, taken out of context, it may make good theatre but it has little to do with justice. When the Member against whom the allegation is made is refused the opportunity to appear on the same programme then, inevitably, a one sided polemic is all the viewers have to go on.

I am willing to be judged on whether my conduct damaged the reputation of the House. The public have, so far, had only a sensationalist, distorted and inaccurate portrayal of what happened. That is why I welcome your inquiry.

5 March 2015

10. Emails between Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP and 'PMR Communications', November 2014 – January 2015

Email 1: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm, 19 November 2014

Dear Sir Malcolm

RE: International Board Appointment

I'm writing to ask if you'd be interested in a new position on an advisory board supporting our clients in the Far East. We are a Hong Kong-based consultancy, advising several companies and private investors with interests in the energy, engineering, transport and

construction sectors. As I'm sure you're aware, there is a growing trend for private firms and individuals in Hong Kong and China to expand into Europe, with the UK second only to France as a preferred destination.

In 2012 China moved from 6th to 3rd in the global rankings of outbound investors and, as reflected by the upcoming wave of financial deregulation, this upward trend is likely to continue. In fact, the Economist Intelligence Unit has forecast that within two years, outbound investments will exceed incoming foreign investment. We now feel it's time to forge more and better contacts in Europe to support our client base and to help them understand the various political, regulatory and legislative frameworks in the UK and across the EU.

We are therefore looking to set up a London office and appoint an advisory board made up of senior figures from the world of politics and business. The board will comprise individuals with appropriate political and/or regulatory backgrounds and experienced business men from at least two countries including the UK.

We feel your experience in both the political and commercial spheres makes you an ideal candidate for the board. Members of the advisory board will be required to attend 6 board meetings a year, mostly in Europe but on occasion travel to Hong Kong will be necessary. There might also be a need for one-off additional meetings but it is envisaged that these are unlikely to number more than 4 at the most.

The remuneration packages will be attractive and will include generous expenses for any international travel.

I am hoping to set up initial meetings in Europe within the next month at which point we would be in a position to give you more details about our clients and can answer any questions. If after these meetings you are interested in being considered for such a position – and we believe that you would be an appropriate appointment – you will be invited to Hong Kong to meet the executive officers of our clients at their corporate headquarters. We expect the appointments to be finalized in the New Year. If this is something you are interested in then please contact me via email in the first instance.

19 November 2014

Email 2: Sir Malcolm's PA to 'PMR', 19 November 2014

Thank you for your email.

Sir Malcolm is out of the office, but will see your message later today when he returns.

Kind regards

19 November 2014

Email 3: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 24 November 2014

Thank you for your email.

I would be interested in considering accepting a position on our proposed advisory board. I would need to be satisfied that there would not be any conflict of interest with my current responsibilities and that the time that would be required to meet your needs would not be a

problem. I would be happy to see you when you are in London. Please respond to this email address and copy to my secretary [redacted].

24 November 2014

Email 4: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm, 29 November 2014

Thank you for your email. Sorry for the delay, I've been away meeting one of our Chinese clients (keen on European energy sector as it happens). Would it be useful to have a preliminary discussion over the phone about any conflicts you might have or would you prefer to do this face to face?

29 November 2014

Email 5: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 1 December 2014

Many thanks for your message. It is always best to meet face to face but if you do not plan to be in London in the near future I would be very happy to speak on the phone. My office no. is (redacted) and my Secretary is (redacted). Please feel free to contact her to find a suitable time for us to talk if that would be helpful.

I do not expect that there would be any conflicts of interest. I am, as you will know, a Member of Parliament and any outside financial interests that I have need to be registered in the Register of Members Interests.

I am a non-executive director of three companies, including Unilever. I am also Chairman of L.E.K.'s European Advisory Board.

There could be a difficulty about meetings held outside the United Kingdom if their timing coincided with important business in Parliament as the latter would have to take precedence for me.

Teleconferences are much used nowadays but you would have to advise whether this would be acceptable if the timing of a meeting in Hong Kong or elsewhere was difficult. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

1 December 2014

Email 6: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm and his PA, 10 December 2014

Thank you for your email and sorry for the delay in getting back to you. I agree face to face is preferable. I'm in London the week of 5th Jan if that's convenient for you to meet with myself and a colleague? Could you let me know if you have any gaps in your schedule that week and then I can revert with the exact time and location? I look forward to meeting you.

10 December 2014

Email 7: Sir Malcolm's PA to 'PMR', 10 December 2014

Thank you for your email. Thursday and Friday that week are fairly busy, but Monday-Wednesday 5th-7th are relatively free. Mornings would be better. I look forward to hearing from you.

10 December 2014

Email 8: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm's PA, 24 December 2014

Thank you for your email and sorry for the delay. Can we go for the 7th Jan at 11am? I'll be hiring a meeting room for when I'm in London and will forward the address shortly. I hope you have a good Christmas.

24 December 2014

Email 9: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 26 December 2014

In [redacted]'s absence, thank you for your message. I see from my diary that I have an appointment at 11am on 7th January but any other time that morning would be fine.

Best wishes for the Christmas season.

26 December 2014

Email 10: Sir Malcolm's PA to 'PMR', 26 December 2014

Thank you for your email.

Sir Malcolm has an appointment at 11.00 on 7th, but has some flexibility. He has to be back at Westminster for that appointment, but is free the whole morning. The afternoon is more difficult as we do not yet have the parliamentary timetable.

The office is closed until 5 January, when my colleague [redacted] (to whom I have copied this message) will be back. I will be away from the office until 12 January, but picking up messages until I leave on 30 December.

26 December 2014

12: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm, 2 January 2015

Happy New Year. Shall we go for 9:30am on 7th? That should give you enough time to return to Westminster in time for 11. My colleague is booking a room but it will be somewhere in Mayfair.

2 January 2015

Email 13: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 2 January 2015

A good New Year to you too. Could we make it 9:45am on 7th? Let me know the venue and your mobile (in case of last minute problems). Mine is (redacted)

2 January 2015

Email 14: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm, 5 January 2015

Thank you Malcolm. Yes 9:45 works. The meeting will be at (redacted) W1K. My mob is: (redacted)

5 January 2015

Email 15: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 6 January 2015

Very many thanks, see you tomorrow

6 January 2015

Email 16: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm, 9 January 2015

I very much enjoyed our meeting on Wednesday and thank you for your time. I've decided to extend my stay in London and thought it would be useful to take the opportunity to speak again. Having spoken to my uncle there are a few supplementary questions and

clarifications. I wonder if I could trouble you to pay us another brief visit (I'd like to save the Commons visit for when my uncle is in town)?

What is your availability next week? Would Tuesday or Wednesday suit

9 January 2015

Email 17: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 9 January 2015

Thank you. 10am on Tuesday would be fine for me. Please confirm if this would be ok for you.

9 January 2015

Email 18: Sir Malcolm to 'PMR', 11 January 2015

Did you get this response?

11 January 2015

Email 19: 'PMR' to Sir Malcolm, 11 January 2015

Apologies for the delay. Yes let's confirm that slot at the same location.

11 January 2015

**11. Letter from Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP to the Commissioner
10 March 2015**

You mentioned, when we met, that you intended to see the transcript of the Today programme in order to take into account my first reaction to the allegations.

To assist you further, I include copies of the two emails that I sent to the Channel 4 company, Vera, when first informed of their use of undercover reporters. These represent my immediate (and continuing) response.

10 March 2015

**12. Enclosures with letter of 10 March 2015: emails between Sir
Malcolm & Vera Productions in advance of the *Dispatches*
programme**

Email from Sir Malcolm to Vera Productions Ltd

Subject: C4 Dispatches

11 February 2015 15:58

Thank you for your message. As I mentioned when we spoke on the phone, I shall be very happy to respond to all the points you have raised. Indeed, as I said, I shall be more than happy to appear on your programme and respond directly to any points that you wish to raise.

Before dealing with your specific questions may I make two general points. As can be easily checked from the Register of Members' Interests, I have never undertaken, nor would undertake, any lobbying as an MP on behalf of any private organisation from which I was receiving remuneration. Whether or not such lobbying may be permitted under the rules, I consider it improper for an MP to undertake such work.

Secondly, as your letter confirms 'PMR' approached me "to discuss whether I would be interested in joining the company's advisory board and consult on planned investments in the UK and other EU countries." There was no suggestion that I was being approached as an MP nor that any lobbying of Ministers was envisaged.

I now turn to your detailed points.

- 1) You consider it significant that I met 'PMR' without first carrying out due diligence on the company. I did look at their website. Due diligence, as you ought to know, is something one does when one has received a firm offer and is considering whether to accept it. That stage was never reached.
- 2) You suggest that I showed myself "as willing to act as an MP for hire". That is, demonstrably, untrue. Your transcripts will show that during the conversation there was no interest in what I could do "as an MP". Their approach to me was because of my previous experience as a Minister, especially with regard to foreign affairs and the EU, because of their claimed interest in future investments in EU countries.
 - 2a) You suggest that I offered "to host PMR in a private business meeting in my parliamentary office and provide a personal tour of Parliament". This is a travesty of the actual conversation. Ms Zheng indicated that she had never visited Parliament and I invited her, if she wish to visit me in my office. I did, indeed, say that I would be happy to show her uncle around, as well. No business meeting in my office was asked for nor proposed.
 - 2b) I did, indeed, say I could write to any foreign ambassador in the UK. Ambassadors tend to respond not because I am a current MP but because I was Foreign Secretary 18 years ago and have maintained my interest in foreign affairs.
 - 2c) As regards writing to a Minister I would ask you to read your transcript. I was asked how decisions would be taken on HS3. I said that this was all tentative and I was doubtful if decisions would be taken for some years. Even if Ministers were considering options they would not wish them to be revealed outside their departments, especially as that might have implications for planning blight. I said I would not be prepared to write to Ministers on behalf of 'PMR' or any other company. The most I could do would be to enquire from them information on HS3 which was already in the public domain. I spent some time trying to explain to them the procedure in Britain for reaching decisions in government departments. What I said to them was all public knowledge in Britain but, I realised, might not have been understood in Hong Kong.
 - 2d) That is correct as can be seen by studying my current entry in the Register of Members Interests.

3(a) and (b) I am particularly amused by one. You imply that there is something improper in my remark that the time from Thursday evening to Monday lunchtime is a “quiet time”. As you must know Parliament does not sit from Thursday evening until Monday lunchtime except for occasion Private Members business. As a London MP I do not have to spend half a day travelling to my constituency and half a day returning to London. In addition, as with other central London MPs proximity to my constituency means that most constituency events are during the week rather than at the weekend.

I wish to make certain further points. The role that I discussed was on an Advisory Board. I am familiar with that work as I serve on LEK’s Advisory Board as can be seen from the Register. Such Advisory Boards meet 4 or 5 times a year usually for 3-4 hours. Because of my parliamentary commitments I ensure that there is no conflict. Your letter confirms that I made clear that I would not be able to attend a PMR meeting if it conflicted with parliamentary business.

Sir Alastair Graham is entitled to his point of view that MPs should not have outside interests. Surveys of public opinion suggest that many of the public do not share that view. I arrange my affairs so that around 75% of my time is spent on parliamentary and constituency business. If you wish to consult my parliamentary diary you will see that I am at my House of Commons office virtually every day that Parliament is sitting. As you may know, I chair Parliament’s Intelligence and Security Committee which usual takes up 1 or 2 days a week. Having served as a Minister for 18 years I am used to hard work.

I shall be happy to supplement any of these points and look forward to hearing from you.

10 February 2015

Email from Sir Malcolm to Vera Productions Ltd

Fwd: Advisory Board Position

11 February 2015 18:04:38

Further to my earlier email, I decided to refresh my memory by re-reading the original message that I received from Ms Zhang and ‘PMR’. I attach it for your interest, and I draw your attention to the second paragraph which indicated what assistance was being sought from those who might serve on the Advisory Board.

It says its purpose was “to support our client base and help them understand the various political, regulatory and legislative frameworks in the UK and across the EU”. To that end they wished to establish “an Advisory Board made up of senior figures from the world of politics and business. The board will comprise individuals with appropriate political and/or regulatory backgrounds and experienced businessmen from at least two countries including the UK”.

You will, I am sure, be good enough to acknowledge that there is no suggestion of requiring people to lobby on their behalf. Nor are they requiring MPs, specifically. What they appeared to be seeking both in their approach to me and in the discussions that I had with them was experience of a kind that I have made available to other Advisory Boards

over the years and which is in no way in conflict with my responsibilities as an MP as long as it is fully registered in the Register of Members' Interests.

Happy to discuss further.

11 February 2015

13. Transcript of interview: 'PMR Communications' with Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP on 7 January 2015, provided to the Commissioner on 20 April 2015

MR: Hello, good morning.

C: Hello, hi.

MR: I'm a little bit early, I hope that's not a problem.

C: That's fine, I'm Claire.

L: Nice meeting you I'm Lin.

MR: Nice to meet you, very nice to see you indeed. [Redacted]

C: Yeah why don't you start?

MR: Please, please do yes.

L: So I, um, I actually... my background is not really business in the past, it's mostly fashion and PR. But my family is, um, ah, they um want me to be closer to the family business and um...

MR: What kind of business is it?

L: Mine or..?

MR: No, no, your family's?

L: It's mostly, we make the money in property and logistics in China, um, so my, my family is based in Guangdong, have you been to Guangdong?

MR: Have I been to where?

L: Guangdong, Guangzhou

MR: No, no.

L: Ah right so it's just across the border from Hong Kong.

MR: Yeah, yeah, indeed.

L: Yeah and my mum's side...

MR: Used to be Canton?

L: Yes exactly, and then um, and now we've started PMR. Just over a year ago, a couple of clients in Hong Kong, we've, I've helped in from China to build offices in Hong Kong, so it's in also again property and the other one is food. Like frozen food and supply to the restaurant chains and we might be going into retail, um but my family's goal is to invest more in the west, in Europe because UK, English... my English is already the best in the family, so [laughs] um and my uncle met Claire um a couple of years ago and he said we should definitely meet her.

MR: You're based in London are you?

C: Yes that's right.

MR: Which, who are you, which business are you in?

C: I'm a kind of private consultant, I used to do lots of medical device stuff and that's how I know...

MR: So you made the connection? Yep.

C: Yes.

L: So now we're hoping to open an office here, and, um just testing this one out but we'll look around here somewhere.

MR: Mm...

C: I think this would be a good area to be based.

L: Yeah, yeah

C: What do you think?

L: Or in Kensington? [Laughs]

MR: Well, no, no, no, anywhere in central London is very attractive because it is not only a prestige address, but it's convenient for people to visit and this morning - I live in Westminster - I went on the underground, two stops and walked for five minutes and I'm here.

C: Mm...

L: Great, and it's also near Claridges- we love it!

MR: And it's near Claridges!

C: Yes what more do you need?

MR: Yes it's very convenient.

L: Great.

MR: Anywhere in this, in this area...

L: So that's, that's what we would like, you know more advice and guidance from people like yourself.

C: I think one of the key things kind of going forwards to help the business expand and looking for investments in Europe will be to build this advisory board...

MR: Yes.

C: ...of people who can guide Lin, and her family about where they should be investing, what would work, what wouldn't...

MR: So sorry, I had the impression that your business was advising many Chinese companies, but what you're saying at the moment suggests you are mainly interested in helping the business that you are most associated with?

L: Yes so, uh, my family has, like a lot of the Chinese family have business and investment in anything that makes money.

MR: Yep, sure.

L: ...and we want to diversify and there's growing...

MR: Now I understand.

L: ...in food, in energy, you know there's hunger...

MR: So it is a number of businesses but they're all linked to your family?

L: Yes.

MR: Ah now I understand

L: And then there's a lot of businesses associates...

MR: That's the connection, now I understand

L: Yes, yes, and if we have interest, you know, an impressive advisory - a group of friends...

MR: Sure, sure.

L: ...in Europe, more of our friends will want to invest together.

MR: And your family business, the business that we are discussing, does it have a cover an overall name for all the businesses that are linked to it? Or...

L: No but there is a fund, um, if you mean um, in terms of industries, right now primarily it's energy, food, property...

C: Property.

L: Property, yes.

MR: Because when you sent me an email, you had a website.

C: Yes

MR: And I looked at your website, and you are also encouraging other people to use your services.

C: Mm.

L: Yes, yes...

MR: So it's not just to meet your family's business requirement?

C: No.

MR: You have a broader interest, in the energy sector, transport sector, number of other things like that...

C: Yes, so mainly a couple of Chinese companies, that Lin's been working with before, that in some ways she's probably come to know through her family...

L: Yes

MR: So these would all be Chinese companies

L and C: Yes.

MR: Based in Hong Kong or some...?

L: Um most of them based in China.

MR: In China itself...

L: But now increasingly, you know, investing through Hong Kong, it's much easier with foreign exchange and the regulations, and I have people in my company in Hong Kong that are much more well versed than me with all the regulations and what which industry or which, um how much money we can move you know.

MR: I understand.

L: And in terms of...

MR: And the advisory board that you are wishing to set up, is that simply for the United Kingdom or is that for Europe as a whole?

L: We are aiming too for the EU, yes.

MR: For the EU area? Yes?

L and C: Yes.

MR: That's what it is. It would be based in London, it would be based in London but it would give advice. And what sort of size of advisory board are you thinking of at this stage? It's early days I know...

C: Yes everything can change! I think probably four to six people.

MR: Something like that...

C: Yes exactly, and of course we can re-visit it all the time - so in terms of seeing what's working, what's not and also, you know, how often the board meets, I'd imagine it might be every other month...

MR: Yes.

C: ... but of course we might think maybe once a quarter would be better or maybe we want to do something once a month.

MR: Yes, you, you have to have flexibility...

L and C: Exactly.

MR: Depending on, on circumstances, and if it is, let us assume, if it is about half a dozen people, are you expecting, people, there to be one person from, each from several different countries, or will it be mainly people from this country, or what's your thinking on that?

L: For now...

C: I would have thought mainly Brits

L: Yeah...

MR: Mainly Brits, to start off with?

C: Yes exactly, I think it might be quite useful to perhaps get someone from the European Parliament.

MR: I, I, I think, if I may offer a suggestion, u m , I think if you want the advisory board to give you advice and support for throughout the European Union, it would be very helpful to have at least one or possibly two people...

C: Yep.

MR: ... from other European countries.

C: Yeah.

MR: Britain can be very insular! [Laughs] And I mean somebody from Germany perhaps, or somebody from France u m would be useful... even if the main group were mainly British.

C: Yeah

MR: Because this is your main interest, um I think at least a little bit of...

C: Yes especially, um, because one of the areas, I think Lin's kind of keen to expand into would be Eastern Europe, for example.

MR: Yes, yes.

C: In terms of property, so actually someone who's got contacts and links...

MR: Yes

C: ...in those areas would probably be advantageous.

MR: Right, I, I have quite a lot of background in Eastern Europe.

C: Oh right, okay...

MR: Because when I was a Minister, Deputy Minister in the foreign ministry, under Margaret Thatcher - u m, my responsibility was Eastern Europe, Russia, Poland...

L: Ah...

MR: Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania, Bulgaria all these countries, so I visited them all - the Baltic states.

C: Oh right.

MR: Uh, So it's a part of the world- Ukraine as well -

C: Oh right.

MR: These are countries which I know reasonably well, mainly from a political point of view but I also for a period - number of years when I was not in Parliament - I was a consultant to Price Waterhouse Coopers.

C: Mm.

MR: PWC? And what they were, this was in the nineteen, u m, 2000-2005, and they were many of the countries in Eastern Europe which had got rid of communism, u m they wanted to privatize their industry, because all the industry was state-owned and so they wanted advice from Price Waterhouse Coopers as to how to do, how to - because Britain was the first country to be privatized,

C: Mm.

MR: It had all began in the 1980s...

L: Right.

MR: ... in this country, and so they wanted advice from the United Kingdom but also Price Waterhouse Coopers asked me to help them because the advice had to include political advice.

C: Mm...

MR: Because sometimes when you privatize a state industry, the new owners want to reduce the number of jobs to make it more efficient.

C: Yeah.

MR: Um, and it can be quite controversial...

L: Yes, yes.

MR: ...that people are anxious, what is going to happen to them, to their jobs, to their lives? So they wanted political advice as well as business advice...

C: Yeah.

MR: ...as to how to take that forward.

C: Yes I think in terms of –

MR: I was involved in that.

C: Liaising with people, um, for instance, if we'd like to get involved with either hotels or residential projects.

MR: Yes.

C: Or infrastructure projects, say roads, in Eastern Europe, um, then we will have to be dealing with people at a local level, ah so National Government...

MR: Yes.

C: Also presumably local politicians, so any help or guidance you could give us with that would be useful...

MR: Well I think that either the advice from my own experience, or to point you in the direction of the people who will have that expertise...

C: Great.

MR: Because some areas are very specialist areas, and we live in an age of specialization nowadays, but yes that can be done, that is, that is not difficult.

C: Yeah.

L: Because also partly why, you know, I was dragged into, not dragged but pulled into this, because there is some concern about like, about um, west, um Chinese money, Chinese investing infrastructures, it seems like, is it still a concern for people in the west about...

MR: Um. not in the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom has been very strongly in support of Chinese investment, we have a lot of Chinese investment- um, there was one area of concern, but which has been resolved, the company of [Redacted].

L: Yes.

MR: A very big company, but it had become involved in telecommunications, and there was some nervousness because some countries, the United States, Australia, will not let [Redacted], investing in their telecommunications, because [Redacted] is owned by the Chinese government.

L and C: Yes

MR: And it's connected to the PLA and so forth, so there was concern whether there would be political problems. [Redacted] are in Britain, they work with British Telecom and this was something which we looked into, I was involved in looking into it - um because I chair, you may have seen, I chair Britain's intelligence and security committee, which is a committee of the British Parliament, which has oversight of our intelligence area, um agencies...

L: Wow.

MR: Yes, it's very part-time, it's not a full-time job...

L: Exciting.

C: Sounds very impressive!

MR: [Laughs] Looks good on print, but we did a report for the government, it's a public document, um, which you can see on the net, it's a public document, which about, the proper relationship between [Redacted] and British Telecom and the British government...

L and C: Mm.

MR: ... which was very well received, our recommendations have been implemented.

L: Oh right.

MR: So generally speaking, Britain wants Chinese investment, it attracts - people in Britain never worry about who owns the company, what they, as long as they pay their taxes, they obey the law - we are relaxed.

C: Okay.

MR: France is much more um worried.

L: Yes.

MR: French companies are being owned overseas, that's a much more politically sensitive issue in France.

L: Okay.

MR: So each country has its own culture

L: Yes, yes okay so France, UK is less?

MR: UK does not have any problems at all, and I think most European countries are very relaxed, the country that is most anxious. It doesn't. It's not a hostile, but it's anxious, it worries about it, is Chi... is France.

C: And in terms of the level of commitment that you would be able to provide would a meeting every other month suit you?

MR: Yes, uh, that would not be an issue. Obviously it would depend where the meetings were being held.

C: Yes.

MR: Because, uh, if they're in London or somewhere in Western Europe, that is not a problem. Occasionally you will want to have one in Hong Kong.

C: Yes, I would have thought there might be one a year in Hong Kong.

MR: Of course, now if it's one a year, if we could discuss the timing of that. As long as it can be during a period when Parliament is not sitting. Because parliament sits only two thirds of the year.

L: OK.

MR: And we know months before.

C: Yes, when...

MR: ...when these periods are going to be so the problem I have I do travel sometimes when Parliament is sitting but there is always a risk that some important vote will be announced and I have to come back, you know, at the last moment and that's something you want to avoid if possible.

C: Yeah

L: OK

MR: So for something like an advisory board it should be possible to fix the dates some months ahead.

C and L: Yes.

MR: And if it was possible and obviously it's up, it would be up to you, but if it was possible to try and fix these dates for overseas meetings, er, when Parliament is not sitting in Britain, then that, I have no problem.

L: OK.

C: I'm sure we'd be able to accommodate that.

L: And then we might, sometimes do some ad hoc consulting, something like that?

C: Yes exactly, that's the other issue.

MR: Now, some of that, presumably, could be done by video or, if necessary?

C: And by email.

MR: Or by email. I do a lot of my work by email and that is. but if also, if it does require a physical meeting, yes we try to do that. One of the advantages I have is because I, um, am in London all the time, do not have to travel in Britain, then my Fridays and my Mondays are very quiet. Relatively, so I have time to do other things, which is quite useful.

L: Oh, alright, Is there any um area of interest or any past experience that you enjoy doing that you think will benefit from this office?

MR: Well, uh, I've had a mixed career because most of my career has been political and serving in Government as a Minister. But I, I have also - since 1990 I have not been a Minister - since 1997. Do not want to be a Minister again, that is something I - that's history - uh, which I enjoyed, but you move on, you know, you do different things, so I've had quite a lot of involvement in the private sector. I'm on the board of Unilever, which is the main company that I'm on their exec, a non-executive, on that board. Er, and one, I've had experience with a number of other companies over the years. I chaired two companies. I was chair, the non-executive Chairman, of a medical company - Alliance Medical, and I'm still on their board. Um, and also of a private security company, Amor Group.

At the moment I'm not the Chairman of any companies. I help, um, I'm on an advisory board, um, a British company called LEK, um, has a European advisory board. And there's three of us. I'm one of the people on there but it's not like you. It's not, it's not involved in trying to find an investment, it gives advice on how companies can re-structure themselves.

C: Oh right.

MR: You know, if a company wants to become more profitable. If it wants to enter some new sector and it needs external advice, LEK gives that advice, so I don't think there's any conflict, from what you have described.

L: We might be able to use their service...

MR: You're quite. they are very good. You know McKinsey in the United States? LEK is like that. It's a smaller version. It's a British version.

C: So it's like a management consultant?

MR: It's a management consultant. Exactly right. It's management consultancy, um, and it's compared to McKinsey, or bits, it's very small - compared to them - but it's international and has been quite successful. It's been going for about 25 years. And they decided to set up an advisory structure, which, a few years ago, which I've been helping with.

C: And in terms of what you think you'd bring to the board, because I'm going to do a note for Lin's uncle, what do you think your key skills would be and how should I report back?

MR: Well, it very much depends on what the company's own priorities are, but from what I've heard, from what I've read from what you've sent me, and on your website, or if your interest is in the, um, the political issues involved in investing, not just in Britain but in European Union, other European countries, my background is political, that was the experience I've had. I was the Europe Minister for, under Margaret Thatcher. It was a deputy Minister's job, but I covered the European Union, I attended European Union meetings for several years. Too many years, so I have quite a lot of experience on European Union aspects of these matters. Political risk. Political risk is always an issue, increasingly an issue for many companies nowadays, it covers a wide range of kinds of risk.

C: Yes, what do you mean by political risk?

MR: Well, political risk is, for example. Let me give you an example. Say a company is thinking of investing in Russia. Now investing in Russia is not just about what is happening to the rouble, or what are the economic prospects, sadly what we have seen in Russia, Mr Putin has been involved, he has interfered in the way big companies operate. He's made decisions which he thinks are in the interests of Russia - that's

his business. That's his decision but it has made companies very nervous. Because they, companies want to know if they have a problem, can they go to the courts? Will they get independent judges? Or will the judges be under political influence and in Russia unfortunately it is the latter.

C: Yep.

MR: So, when I talk about, that is an example of political risk. Or another example would be in the Middle East. We have much turmoil in the Middle East, in Syria and Iraq. What often people ask me is, is this going to spread to Saudi Arabia? To Morocco? To Jordan? To Egypt? even more, you know. Countries that are stable, are they going to end up like Iraq or Syria?

C: Yes.

MR: That is a political judgment. No one can be certain. But someone with my background has a better understanding..

C: Yes

MR: ...of what is likely in these circumstances so that is a second example. A third example would be, for example, um, you mention Eastern Europe. Now Eastern Europe is a region, each country is very different. You have a country like Poland which has been hugely successful, has become almost like Western Europe; strong political institutions, its courts are independent; there's some corruption but not very much. But you also have a country like Romania. It's also in the European Union. It's also in NATO, but it is much more backward and a lot of corruption. Poor economic achievement, so it is understanding the differences between individual countries, because you can't just look at a region...

C: No absolutely.

MR: ..and assume that every country is the same. So these are just examples.

C: And do you have contacts there that, because in terms of kind of finding out what's going on.

M: I have quite a lo... in most of these countries there are people I, I know, who either I worked with as a, who were Ministers or who I met since then. I'm still part of a number of groups. I am for example you have, know who I mean by Madeleine Allbright?

C&L: Yes.

M: The American; former American Secretary of State. Well she and I are good friends, she's a very old fr... I worked with her when I was in Government and she chairs a group of 22 former foreign ministers...

C: Ah

MR: ...of various countries. We've all served as Foreign Minister and we meet several times a year. We're meeting in China in April.

C: Oh, Fantastic.

MR: In Beijing, is our next meeting; beginning of April, as it happens, and that means you know I still have the contacts with all these people who have served at a very senior level, some of them still do so. Some of them are still active. But in addition to that I also, I am involved with the World Economic Forum - Davos - and they have a number of specialist committees - one of which looks at nuclear security, nuclear weapons security. I was a Defence Minister, so it's an area that I have some interest in so I have contacts in, in, er, that area as well, and then of course through companies like Unilever - they are such an international company...

C: Yes.

MR: China, as well as every country in the World. They are operating in 180 countries so if necessary I can ring contacts. These are examples.

C: Yes.

MR: If you've done the kind of work I've done over the years, without realizing it, you find you know an awful lot of people.

C: Absolutely, very lucky.

MR: And they know you and one of the advantages I have - is very lucky - is that because of the jobs I've done, if I go to a country and I want to see someone, I can usually get access.

C: Yes, well exactly.

MR: They're interested in meeting. Because either they've heard, either my name is familiar or they look at the CV they say this, this guy might, might be useful.

C: Exactly, they're more likely to pick up the phone than, unfortunately, if I called.

MR: It doesn't guarantee the results. You've still got to do the hard work, but in terms of making the initial contact that is...

C: Yes...

MR: ...that is quite often because people are so busy and they don't often have time to see everyone, they have to see...

C: Well exactly they get a number of emails and offers, don't they?

MR: And they say is this person going to be worth seeing or not.

L: Yeah

MR: These are...

L: Because one of the interests on a personal or business level, people, a lot of people in China, including my uncle, are very impressed with the Parliament, the knighthood, the Lordship and you know the, it's the whole history and everything...

MR: Yes, well if I'd known this we could have had this meeting in my office in Parliament [laughter] - next time you come then.

L: Well it would be even better if he comes.

M: Well, if your uncle... Does he come to London?

L: Not yet but ...

M: No, no, but if he comes, you tell him, that if he comes... you tell him if he comes I will give him a personal tour of the British Parliament -

L: Oh fantastic. Thank you. That would be, he will be so happy.

MR: It's a wonderful building. I enjoy doing it because I do it for other people as well and I enjoy it, because it's such a marv.... Have you been there?

C: Yes I have.

MR: It's a lovely building isn't it?

C: It's stunning

MR: Stunning building, it really is I mean.

L: OK, I'll tell him.

MR: Let me just ask, if I may, one or two questions about what you have in mind. So you are thinking of an advisory council for five or six people?

C: Yeah.

MR: Based in London.

C: Mm.

MR: That would meet, what four or five, six times?

C: Yeah, exactly, yes.

MR: But even then, you'd judge as we went along, how often this was required.

C: Roughly between four and six times a year I'd have thought.

MR: And you'd have someone as chairman of the council?

C: Yes, I'd think so. I think that would make sense.

MR: And when the, when the council met, would, who would also be present? Would, would you be present or your colleagues?

L: Yes. That will probably be, yes, I'm learning a lot.

MR: So you, you're going to be coming to London quite a lot?

L: Definitely, yes, yes.

C: Time to get an apartment.

L: Yes

MR: Quite. And you think there would be, occasionally a meeting in, in Hong... would it be Hong Kong or elsewhere?

MR: Or China?

L: It... Probably start with Hong Kong first, but yes.

MR: Start with Hong Kong and what about once a year in Hong Kong? Something of that kind?

L: Yeah, yeah.

MR: Something of that kind. Right.

C: Yeah, I think once a year makes sense.

MR: And if there was an occasion when there was a meeting which because of other commitments... is using video conferencing acceptable?

L: Yeah.

MR: Not all the time but as a ... to make sure that the person is there is someone has a problem.

L: Yes of course..

MR: You have no problem with it. That's good. That's good.

C: Would you like another cup of coffee or some water or anything?

MR: No no no no, I, I have too much coffee nowadays.

C: Do you want any more tea or anything?

L: I'm ok, thank you.

MR: And when, when are you... if this goes ahead, when are you hoping to have the council estab... advisory board established?

L: We are hoping to get the first...

C: ...sometime in the next couple of months. Yeah.

MR: In the next couple of months.

C: Yeah, I think we should move quickly.

MR: And are you able to mention other names of people you are thinking of? Confidentially, if you'd rather not I....

C: Probably not at this stage.

MR: Not at this stage, yes I know.

C: Only because we'd keep our conversation confidential.

MR: Instead, instead, don't tell me any names, but can you mention the sort of background of the other people you are, you are thinking of. What, are they political? Are they business? Or are they...

L: Both.

C: Both actually.

MR: A bit of both. Right, right, right...

L: Is there anyone you want to recommend?

MR: Apart from myself you mean? [Laughs] That would be very dangerous for me to do that. You might prefer them to do it [Laughs].

L: That would be very hard.

MR: That would be very unwise. [Laughs] Umm, we have, we have two Chinese members on the board of Unilever essentially.

L: Yes?

MR: Did you, [Redacted]?

L: No, Ok.

MR: And [Redacted]?

L: My uncle might...

MR: Do you know her, do you know the name?

L: I don't personally but...

MR: I think they're both Hong Kong, they're both Hong Kong based and been in, um, in business.

L: Oh right, ok

MR: So, that's very helpful. U m , one sensitive issue, but I have to mention it. You mentioned there would be obviously remuneration.

L; Of course.

C: Definitely.

MR: Can you tell me what you are thinking of in that territory?

C: In some ways I think we would be guided by you for what you're looking for but roughly for an advisory board, I would have thought between £60-80 thousand, um and then of course if there was...

MR: Is that pounds, or...

C: Pounds yes.

MR: Pounds. £60 - 80,000 roughly, something of, something of that order, yeah.

C: But of course it would be, um, guided by you.

MR: Sure, sure.

C: And what you were looking for and then, of course, if there was any additional work one... that might be um kind of consultancy, we might look at a project and think actually we all need to get stuck into this, I think that would probably be done at a day rate, um, we're very up for talking about it.

MR: Yes, no, I understand. The normal thing I'm to expect. You know sort of, the normal structure that you would, you would obviously cover all the travelling expenses. Your... If there was additional work it would be on, on a day, daily rate, something, but in terms of the basic remuneration you're talking about something on the £60 to £80,000...

C: Yes, does that sound reasonable to you?

MR: It sounds reasonable. Yes, yes, that does sound reasonable um, I'd have to think about it but I don't immediately say no that's not, that's not realistic.

L: Does that sound like your usual package that you're used to?

C: Yes, I don't know what your other packages...

MR: Um, it depends, it varies because it depends on the commitment. You know, so there's no single figure. I'd need to think about... that's why I'm interested to know what sort of commitment you're expecting and requiring and then against that one works out what is fair.

C: Yes, precisely.

MR: Because the test is what is fair to me and what is fair to you if we were to, to go ahead. But from what you've said so far I think we, we are in similar territory, if I can put it that way.

C: Yes.

MR: If I can put it that way. I don't find any immediate...

C: It doesn't jolt...

MR: It doesn't jolt.

C: And in terms of your normal... do you have a normal day rate for consultancy.

MR: Um, not, no, it frankly depends, I'll be honest with you, it depends who it is.

C: Yes, of course.

MR: You know if depends frankly who it is.

C: Because they might be tough working with.

MR: If it's a multi-national company it tends to be a higher rate than a, than a small group of people who are struggling to build a business and I'm interested in what they're doing then obviously I try to be reasonable.

L: Yeah

MR: Because my private sector work is not full time.

C: Right, Yes.

MR: You know, but it's something I enjoy doing but it also, obviously the remuneration is useful to my own, er, circumstances, um, but I, er, if we reach that stage, I will certainly indicate to you what I think a day rate will be reasonable. What would be reasonable, but I would like to get a better feel first of what you would expect in terms of commitment.

C: Yes absolutely.

MR: Because, you see I think it also depends on the amount of travel. Because if I travel, for example to China, that's not one day...

C: No, exactly it's an extra day both ways isn't it.

MR: You know, a minimum of three days and sometimes longer to make it sensible. Um, on the other hand, if it's something in London, then I can fit that in so much more, more easily.

L: Okay, is there a range? So I can get some reference for my uncle?

MR: Um, normally I, well, I can, I simply give it as an example, but, um, when I did a series of presentations for JP Morgan and for a number of other City of London...

on the Middle East, and that was usually something in the order of... I mean it wasn't a whole day, it was usually a whole morning or an afternoon, and that was somewhere in the region of £5,000 to £8,000. Something of that kind. Something of that kind. But it, it varies. Don't take that as an absolute given, but it was something of that, something of that order. I'm not an American. I, I, I have fewer zeros [L a u g h s] . Americans are in a world of their own.

C: Great, and what a wonderful world it is.

MR: but it depends on how much travel would be involved, how much of my day is involved, how much preparatory work I need to do.

C: Yes, of course, yes.

MR: So that, don't take that as an absolute figure but you asked for an indicator, and that's been something of that.

L: And for example your China trip. Like the upcoming one, How many days are you going for?

MR: Oh, that, well the actual meeting itself is usually two whole days but, because of travel, it will be four days but it's fortunately I know it's during, it's Easter. It's the beginning of April when Parliament is not sitting so it, it makes it much easier.

L: So you're not building in some sight-seeing time? You might have done that already...

MR: Oh yes, I did that. I went to China several times. When I was a Minister I had a tour of the Forbidden City, I went to the Great Wall. I haven't...

L: It's great isn't it?

MR: Yeah, fantastic. I have not travelled round China. One day I would like to do that so, Chi... when I say China, I know Beijing, I know Hong Kong. Not much else. Not much else, unfortunately.

C: Shanghai's rather lovely as well.

MR: I'd love to go to Shanghai.

C: It feels very European

MR: Yeah, yeah...

C: Lots of walking about...

MR: ...because of the history of Shanghai. Tell me where will... you obviously will want to think about who you would like on this board, I'd have to think about it. What happens after today? What's the procedure you have in mind?

L: I have to bring it back, like, um, you know, I'm staying for the week and then I will bring whatever I can gather back to my uncle. I think we should be able to make a lot of calls and emails because I'm sure you will have more questions.

C: Yes, exactly, and of course after this meeting we have, may have further questions.

MR: Of course, do you have my email contacts? You have them so please do share with, what is, I didn't catch your name, I m ...

C: Claire

MR: Claire, right - thank you.

L: So um, I... I think we will try and decide in the next, you know, month or two.

MR: Sure.

C: Yes, I imagine there will, might be, a second meeting for us, you'll have more questions, as will we...

MR: Yes, sure.

C: And in terms of what we're going to....

MR: Well let me invite you into the House of Commons.

C: Ah, thank you.

MR: If there's a second meeting, please come to me,

C: That's very kind.

MR: If that would be of interest...

C: Yeah.

MR: I'm happy to come here but if it would be of interest please come and pay me a visit.

C: Yes, of course. That would be very nice. And in terms... so, one of the areas we're looking at is kind of strategic investments in the UK and so investing in some

companies that are, you know, already operating here but also some of the Chinese, um, companies that Lin and her uncle are working with how they want to expand here.

MR: And is that in particular, you say strategic, is that in particular sectors?

C: Yes, so for example property, um, is definitely a big area for us.

MR: Residential or commercial or both?

C: Both to be honest.

MR: both or either, yep, right.

C: Exactly. Also there are a couple of energy companies that I know Lin's uncle might sort of be interested in that. There's food as well, but what do you think you could bring to that issue?

MR: Ok, um, on the energy side, I spent several years as a consultant with BHP Billiton.

C: Oh right.

MR: Erm, I was mainly advising them on potential opportunities in the Middle East. The petroleum side, it was the petroleum side of their, of their business. Er, and I also worked as a consultant in the past, not now, but in the past to Petrofac which is, provides services for, the oil and gas industry, both in the United Kingdom and overseas. And I did some trouble shooting for them in countries where they had a... I had to go to Kyrgyzstan on one occasion to help sort out a problem they had.

C: What problem did they have?

[Redacted.]

C: Yeah, but that is the kind of thing that is incredibly useful isn't it. If you know those people, actually having a quick cup of coffee or gin and tonic...

MR: Well, you see what I can do in London, I can see any ambassador that I wish to see. They'll all see me personally.

C: Brilliant.

MR: If I ask to see them, because of having been a foreign minister it is, it is almost automatic...

C: Yes

MR: ... that they would do that, and that provides access in a way that is, is useful.

C: Yes, absolutely. One of the areas, I suppose, in terms of energy that we're definitely are thinking about, should we be investing in Shale gas and fracking.

MR: In the United Kingdom? Yes? Yes...

C: Yes, that's right. I know it's quite a controversial area.

MR: Well it is but I, I think it's absolutely inevitable that these developments will go ahead. I think there will be various concessions, environmental concessions made that, quite properly.... Some people are nervous and worried but, but we have so much knowledge now from the United States of how you can actually manage Shale extraction, um, without serious environmental consequences.

C: Yes.

MR: So, I don't think. I think the politics of it in the United Kingdom are more local than national.

C: Yeah.

MR: I think there are seven localities which are, you know, very attractive bits of countryside and people are very worried that, er, fracking...

C: Yes, what might happen...

MR: ...will damage that, the beauty of that locality, and they're quite right to be anxious. That's something that needs to be considered because when you give planning permission for a development to go ahead under our system you can impose many conditions. So if somebody wants to develop shale, the Government or the local planning council can say "yes you have permission but you have to accept all these conditions to safeguard the environment" and if the company isn't willing to do that they can't go ahead, so you can usually get a compromise that allows these things to happen.

C: To actually happen...

MR: But if you're asking me, do I think there will, whether.... In France they've banned shale, stupidly in my view, completely stupid. In the United Kingdom there is no such policy. Quite the opposite. The Prime Minister, Mr Cameron, said that he believes shale was part of our energy future because our own North Sea Oil sector is declining.

C: Yeah.

MR: Most of that has been explored. 75% of the oil that Britain has obtained from the North Sea around Britain is already used, so although there will be new supplies, most of them are in deeper water which is more expensive to extract and with what has happened with the oil price, it is not commercial for companies to be going deeper and deeper in the North Sea. There is no economic logic to that, whereas shale, if it is possible; which seems likely, will certainly be an important opportunity.

C: Yeah, well it seems to me to be potentially quite a good area...

MR: Yes...

C: ...to get into for us.

MR: Yes, yes.

C: In terms of kind of going forward, how much, if anything will it change things, um, if the Conservatives don't win the next election?

MR: Right. That will be very disappointing. But these things happen. I think what is the most likely scenario is that the conservatives will remain the largest party as we are at the moment but not have an overall majority.

C: Yes

MR: So, in other words, the same as at the moment but there may not be a coalition with the Liberal Democrats. So it could be more uncertain but only for a short period, because, um, Britain has a very mature political system. Whatever happens has happened before and is nothing...

C: Yes, seen it all before.

MR: You know, you've seen it all before, and we do not have a, a deep ideological divide between the political parties. Sometimes the rhetoric makes it sound as if... but in practice the Labour party accepts capitalism, it has a different view as to taxation and regulation and still has some sympathy for state-owned companies, but much less than 30 years ago. Much much less, uh, so the differences between the political parties are important but they're more like the differences between Republicans and Democrats in the United States. It's not a fundamental ideological conflict. So I think it is, the reason I think the Conservatives will remain the largest party is, not just because I want that to happen. It's not just that, it's not just that, it is also for two reasons. First of all, in Britain the most important issue at an election is the state of the economy.

C: Yeah.

MR: And the economy has been through very difficult, cos it's happening in the world, but as you will have seen the British economy at the moment is doing very well. It's recovering very well. Unemployment is falling, economic growth. We have a problem of public finance, but everything else, we have more growth in Britain than any other European Country. At the moment. So when the public come to vote, they will normally say well we don't want to risk that. You know, they're not necessarily saying the government is to be praised. They may say well the Government is lucky, but why risk it by a change of Government. I think in addition to that, there is a question of personalities. But I know Mr Miliband, I've met him and spoken to him. He's a very intelligent man, but in modern politics it is how you seem on television.

C: Yep.

MR: Most people have not met political leaders; they have to make a judgment and he has not been able to create an impression of authority of statesmanship, um, whereas Mr Cameron; people do not love him but they respect him. You know, he's seen as someone who has been Prime Minister for five years and has, he seems able to carry that responsibility so, um, I think the likelihood is that the Conservative party will remain roughly where it is in political support.

C: If they didn't and it was Labour won the election, would that have any impact on how... would it make any difference to how you were able to help us?

MR: Me personally?

C: Yes

MR: Uh, It wouldn't no, not at all, because I am, I shall be a candidate at the election, u m , I'm not going to be a Minister w h o e v e r wins, so my role is as a Member of Parliament, whoever is the Government. That does not change. That does not change, that doesn't change at all.

C: Yes. Is yours quite a safe seat?

MR: Yeah. Kensington. Yes, Very much so.

C: I would have thought so.

MR: No, no, very much so, if the Conservatives cannot win Kensington then we might as well, we might as well pack it in. We might as well pack it in.

L: OK

C: Is there anything else that?

L: I was just curious...

MR: Please...

L: ...about the North Sea oil that you were mentioning. I didn't realise that it was, erm, you just said 85 percent?

MR: 75%, 75, three quarters of the known reserves have already been depleted...

L: Right, right

MR: ...over 30 years, because it's been... and these were the relatively easy ones to...

C: To get to.

MR: To get to, because they were in shallower water and closer to the coastline, still remarkable technology, but that has largely already been completed, um, so you have still 25 percent but there is a possibility of new oil fields being discovered, but these are much further out.

L: Mm

MR: In much deeper water. It is technically possible with modern circumstances but much more expensive.

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

MR: Um, because it's much more expensive, it is only economically viable if the oil price is high and is remaining high, now we've seen the opposite.

C: Yes exactly.

MR: Oil price is fifty dollars, um, so there is no way, um, these projects will go ahead for the next few years, unless... because what the investors have to consider is two things, first of all, what is the oil price, will we get a return on the cost? But also how volatile is the oil price? Because if the oil price is a hundred dollars then marvelous, but if three months' time it is back down to fifty...

L and C: Mm

MR: You know... So my guess is there will be quite serious cutbacks in proposed investment in the North Sea, but that doesn't mean we don't need the energy.

C: Yep.

MR: Um, so that is what another reason why I think shale is likely to become, even more...

C: Potentially a good place to invest.

MR: Even more important.

C: Well, there's also renewables of course, that um...

MR: We have, yes we have wind, we have, um, wave power, wind power, but um even the strongest supporters of renewables do not expect it to provide more than 15, 20 percent of what we need.

C: Yes.

MR: And the problem with wind power, for example, windmills -they're marvellous, I'm not against them but you cannot save the energy, you have to use it right away.

C: Yes.

MR: So it has to be...

C: Because it can't be stored up?

MR: It can't be stored up - it's not like oil or gas where you can keep it for when you need it. Um, if the wind is blowing, it makes the electricity...

C: Yep

MR: So it can be fed into the system, but there has to be a system for it to be fed into, which has to have other sources of power.

L and C: Hm...

MR: So it will never be a freestanding source of energy requirements...

C: Yeah

MR: There will always have to be some either fossil fuel or some new technology that meets that requirement

C: Just for... in terms of mulling over... I suppose one of the kind of areas, other areas that might be worth flagging up, um, infrastructure projects in terms of, kind of, IT software...

MR: Yes

C: And there's quite a lot happening in the UK in terms of kind of road building, rail, that kind of thing..

MR: Yes...

C: construction, so, um, any kind of opportunities for...

MR: There are, I was a Transport Minister.

C: Ah, of course, yes...

MR: I was Secretary of State for Transport, for two years.

C: Oh, you know all about this kind of thing then.

MR: Yes absolutely. I was involved in the, er, privatisation of the railways when I was a Minister and, also, I was one of the first people when we built the channel tunnel...

C: Oh I remember that.

MR: Um, on the day that the people doing the building made contact...

L: Oh...

MR: They were digging from France, they were digging from Britain...

C: Quite amazing.

MR: And, this had taken several years.

C: Yeah.

MR: But by coincidence, I became Minister of Transport six days before we made contact.

C: Ah, lovely.

MR: So we had our ceremony underground, in the middle of the channel.

L: Oh and you were there?

MR: I was there, yeah - I was not the first person to shake hands; that was two of the workmen who were given that - I was the third or the fourth person to shake hands.

C: Brilliant though...

MR: A very strange sensation - because of course they had to make sure they met, they could have gone past each other.

C: Well, exactly...

MR: They could have gone past each other without realizing.

C: Damn it, we're five metres to the left...

MR: Yes, well that would have been quite, quite serious.

L: Very impressive, yes, yes.

C: Alright are there any?

MR: I don't think so, I think we've been, from my perspective I think I've got a feel for what you have got in mind.

C: Yeah

MR: So you will what? E mail me when you have further information?

C: Yes I think we'll probably email you maybe next week or the week after.

MR: And I think I gave you my mobile number so...

L: Yes.

MR: So please share it with Claire.

C: Yes great.

MR: And if you want to just ring me, text me...

C: Yeah, if we have any further questions that would be great.

MR: But normally email is the best - I do, I use that every... on a regular basis...

C: That's brilliant. And, um, if you, um, think of any examples of um your work in the last couple of years, your kind of consultancy advisory work...

MR: Yes.

C: That we could use as examples for Lin's uncle in terms of how you've made things happen or.... That would be useful.

MR: Sure, sure I think, well the main examples I would give would be the work I did with Price Waterhouse Coopers

C and L: Yes...

MR: On privatization in Eastern Europe, um, that was quite important, um, HP Billiton...

L: Billiton?

MR: Um, Bi... they work, they are an Australian based company, but operate throughout the world, um, Billiton was South African, they combined...

L: Oh, right, right...

MR: It's BHP Billiton it's a huge mining company and oil and petroleum company, a, a global company based in Melbourne, located in Australia - but they have a big office in London, I was helping at the London end... Unilever, where as a non-executive on the board I am involved in advisory work...

C: Mm

MR: Um, that's a current one, the other two were past... Unilever is the main one at the, at the moment, and LEK which is the consulting, the management...

C: Yes I hadn't realized they were kind of operated as management consultants.

MR: Yes, no, that's, that's their primary, prime function.

L: And then you mentioned one, a refinery in Kurdistan?

MR: Yes no not Kurdistan, Kyrgyzstan.

L: Oh.

MR: Sorry, Kyrgyzstan, Central Asia, um, you know Bishkek which is near Kazakhstan. It used to be part of the Soviet Union, yes that was for Petrofac that was, but that was quite a long time ago.

L: Yep.

MR: That was a one off, one off project, okay?

C: That is a very useful example though of being able to do things in Eastern Europe

L: Yeah.

MR: Yeah.

C: Where a company has a problem, because especially I think if we're going to do more investment in Eastern Europe or, or, indeed in other countries or in the UK, if you've got an issue it is about just how best to solve it isn't it?

MR: Well and occasionally I've had people who have asked me to do. Prepare, um, on the, em... on email, just to do a report for them on political risk.

C: Yeah.

MR: On a particular country, or on other aspects relevant to my own experience, um, which I, which I've provided for them.

C: Perfect, well thank you very much for coming in.

MR: Um, just, if I may say, from what I've heard so far, I think I very well might be interested.

C: Oh good!

MR: So from my point of view...

C: Glad we haven't put you off!

MR: No, no, nothing I've heard this morning has put me off, quite the opposite because I like, when I, when I'm getting involved in a particular company I like to think it will not only be stimulating but also enjoyable.

C: Yeah

MR: You know, and that involves liking the people and thinking these are people one could work with, which is, which is also very important.

C: Yes well you don't want it to be kind of tiresome every day do you?

MR: I don't need that nor does anyone else!

C: No, exactly.

L: Thank you so much. [Redacted]

7 January 2015

14. Transcript of interview: 'PMR Communications' with Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP on 13 January 2015, received by the Commissioner on 20 April 2015

MR: Hello, good morning, good morning.

[Introductory conversation redacted]

L: So um, yeah, so out of all the places for now, um, we, we really would like to start with England first.

MR: Sure.

L: ...and then, and then you know, invest in the rest of Europe so this is a familiar language and my uncle after our meeting and he's very excited about your contacts in Europe, as well. Um, but my initial question would be, um, what do you think if everyone were to invest or look into Europe, should we be contacting your friends or Ministers here first? Or directly go to your top of the list?

MR: Well, a decision to invest is a commercial decision not a political decision in the first instance. So you have to obviously make a commercial judgment as to who's about. Then, I think you have to ask, is there a political problem? Is it a political, either a political risk or will the government of that country not want this investment, for some reason? And that will vary from country to country. So, a country like the United Kingdom is very open to investment, delighted to have investment and there is never a problem. That is true of most European countries. One or two are a bit more nervous. We were discussing France. And France wants investment, I mean they are very pleased to have investment but it depends on the kind of industry, it depends on whether there is a political dimension to it, so, um.... They, they're always much more concerned about whether too much control of a sector of the French economy by overseas companies, whether that is unacceptable.

C: Yeah

MR: We used to have these debates in Britain. People said the government should have a right to veto if there is a company wanting to invest in Britain, take over a British company, so uh, but we don't even have that now. That's ridiculous. We had such a power and it was never used and people said it's really, why have it in the first place? The French still do, sometimes, intervene. But that is more likely if the investment you were thinking of was to buy a major French company.

C and L: Yeah

MR: An iconic French company that people identify with France and um, it was to be future owned by China or by Russia or America. That's where they get nervous. If it is building up an investment, if it is participating in a sector, the French will be delighted to see you.

C: I think the kind of things that probably, we'd be more interested in would be infrastructure projects, so um road building. Property, road Building, big, and mainly I think in the kind of Baltic states or Eastern Europe where...

MR: I would be pretty certain in Eastern Europe, they would be delighted to welcome you. The only country I would, well, there are one or two countries I would say, be cautious...

C: Mm.

MR: ... not no, but be cautious. One is Russia, because Russia is going through a very difficult period and what you want as a company, if you are thinking of investing. You have to ask yourself, what happens if there is a problem? A commercial problem. Can we go to a court of law if we have a good case, can we be satisfied that if our case is a good case we will win it.

C: Yeah, so it'll be handled properly.

MR: It will be handled independently. There will not be interference from politicians or from criminals or from other people. That's what you want to understand, to be comfortable with. In Western Europe, you're okay.

C: Yeah

MR: Any country is, meets that standard. In Eastern Europe, it varies.

C: Mm

MR: So a country like Poland, very good...

C and L: Yeah

MR: Czech republic, pretty good.

C and L: Mm

MR: Hungary, pretty good.

C and L: Mm

MR: Baltic States, pretty good. Erm, the ones I would be... Russia, not good.

C: Yes I don't think we'd be particularly interested in Russian investments.

MR: Russia, not good. Ukraine, trying to be good (laughs) but finding it difficult. Erm, the only other countries I would be concerned with are Romania, Bulgaria...

C: Mm

MR: ...where they would welcome the investment but there's a lot of corruption there.

C: Yes

MR: And if you want to avoid any problems of corruption then it is, if you have an alternative.

C: Yeah you might want to steer clear...

MR: But I wouldn't want to rule it out. Countries like Romania and Bulgaria, they are now in the European Union, they have to accept the rules of the European Union so they are becoming more transparent. They are becoming, um, more willing to accept the rule of law but it takes time, it's culture.

C: Yeah.

L: Yes of course.

MR: I remember the country that has been most successful in getting rid of corruption, in the world, was Singapore.

L: Mm

MR: Lee Kuan Yew. With Lee Kuan Yew, because Singapore used to be very, very, corrupt, and Lee Kuan... Singapore, of course, is mainly a Chinese community and Lee Kuan Yew when he was President of Singapore, he said to his officials... civil servants, to his officials

"I understand your salaries are so low, sometimes you are tempted to accept bribes and things like that. Okay, I offer you a deal. I'm going to double your salaries, but, so you have no need to go elsewhere if I find even one penny has been corruptly accepted you will go to prison for a long time".

C: Mmm

MR: And he, and it, not just to the civil officials but also to the businesses and so forth and Singapore is a small country, a small city-state. And he applied this very

rigidly; people got long terms of imprisonment, gradually the culture changed and now it's pretty permanent.

C and L: Yeah

MR: And I've met Lee Kuan Yew, he's now in his eighties, late eighties. His son is now the Prime Minister and, and he is a, he is a very impressive man, very, very, impressive. Erm.... But he changed the culture of Singapore, single-handed.

C: That's quite impressive isn't it?

MR: Yes it's very impressive. No other country's done it to the same degree. But you can, you can gradually get rid of the corruption but it takes a generation.

C: Yes. And in terms of liaising with those countries, is the best way, not the corrupt countries obviously, the less corrupt countries.... is the best way to speak to ambassadors here in the first instance or is it better to speak to Ministers in those countries?

MR: If you want to invest in a country like France or Italy or Britain or Netherlands. First, you identify your commercial opportunity.

C: Yes

MR: You satisfy yourself that it is from a commercial point of view, attractive. Then you make some enquiries as to, are there any political problems?

C: Mm

MR: An advisory group could help you in that, but there are other people who also can help.

C: Yeah

MR: Because there is expertise elsewhere. It might involve speaking to the local embassy...

C: Yep

MR: ... to find things of that kind, and that would not be to, to ask them to do something it would be to say, is your government likely to...

C: Yes, to sound them out.

MR: ... be upset, worried, or.... So that can be done in a fairly straightforward way. For Western Europe, um, you would really need, that would take no time.

C and L: Yeah

MR: It would be very brief. For an Eastern European country, depending on which country...

C and L: Mm

MR: ... that might be a more cautious question to be needed.

C: Yeah, cos I think if we were, certainly Lin's uncle were looking to do a big, um, road-building project, I don't know in Poland or Latvia or somewhere like that....

MR: I think road, road building would be... I'd be very surprised if that were to be a problem at all because that is a complete bonus...

C: Yep

MR: ... for the country concerned.

C and L: Yeah

MR: Where there is more, where there is sometimes political anxiety, is if you wish to own an iconic building,

C: Yes

MR: industry, a company permanently...

C: Mm

MR: ...you become part of that economy...

L: Mm

MR: ...and then sometimes some people get nervous.

C: Yeah

MR: But, in Europe that is becoming less and less...

C: Mm

L: Right

C: I think you would probably want, if it got to the stage where it was commercially erm, it looked commercially good, and if he wanted to go ahead, I think he would probably want to be able to go to that country or a representative of his, Lin, to be able to go to that country and meet the relevant people and almost have that assurance that okay, this is what we're doing, any problems?

MR: Let's take an example. Let us say you wanted to invest in Poland and you said to the advisory board, if I was involved in your advisory board, you said to the advisory board we are thinking of a major road-building project in Poland, can you help us identify if there are any problems?

C: Yeah

MR: So what I would then ask, if I was involved, I would say, give me the details of the project and I would contact the Polish Ambassador in London...

C: Ah right

MR: ...who I actually know quite well (laughs). I've been to his embassy several times. And I would go and see him.

C: Mm.

MR: And I would say, or, or I might invite you or your colleagues to come with me to see him and say, this is a project that this company is thinking of, will there be any, do you expect there to be any difficulty from the government's, government's point of view.

C: Yeah

MR: And I would expect them to say 'not the slightest bit' (laughs)

C: Sounds brilliant!

MR: But if I'm wrong, at least you would hear, you would get the response.

C: Yeah, well at least you know early...

MR: He would contact Warsaw and that way we would find out. Now, whichever country it was, that's the first step if, if you wanted the advisory board to be involved.

C: Yes, yeah I would have thought so.

MR: On the political, whether the government would have a problem, I would speak to the Ambassador in London.

C: Mm

MR: And, I can, because I have been Foreign Minister, if I wish to speak to an Ambassador they are very happy to speak to me.

C: Yeah.

MR: They come to see me quite often.

C: Oh that's lucky.

MR: Not on, not on business matters but on political matters, I have an ambassador in my office once every two or three weeks.

C: What do they want to come and see you about?

MR: Well it, ambassadors always are trying to, they're, they're, being asked to report to their own governments, what is the political developments in Britain.

C: I see.

MR: You know, so for example, let me give you an example. There is a debate in Britain about whether we should continue to stay in the European Union.

C: Mm

MR: And there is to be a referendum in two or three years. So I had an ambassador from one European country who came to see me a few weeks ago, he said "can I come and see you?" I said "yes of course." And he wanted to discuss how much of a risk is this? Is this likely?

C: Mm, yes.

MR: We read about this in the newspapers, um, you know.

C: Yes, what does it all mean?

MR: What does it mean? Should we, you know? Another ambassador wanted to see me because he wanted to discuss what was happening in the Middle East.

C: Yep

MR: In Iraq and Syria with the Islamic State, these terrorist people and so forth. So for example, next week I shall be at the Jordanian ambassador; he is giving a dinner for the American Ambassador...

C: Ah

MR: ...and he said, would you be willing to come and take part in that dinner? I know the American ambassador, I like to do so.... I specialise in foreign policy.

C: Yes.

MR: So, that's what ambassadors are there for. They want to make contact so they can understand what is happening in, in Britain and report to their own governments.

C: Yes, I see.

L: And they will, for somebody, like if you change, um, or you retire, for example, or if they retire, does that change, have they got out of date?

MR: No. If I left Parliament, erm, I'm still a former Foreign Minister, and as long as I'm active they will be, they will wish to.... Not just me, it's not just me personally. Anybody who has done this kind of job.

C: Yeah.

MR: The same applies in China. The same applies in other countries. People who have, who have had the job of being a foreign minister or a cabinet minister in their own country, they have experience. And if they are still active in public life people want to use that experience.

C: Yeah.

MR: It's useful.

C: Yeah, of course.

MR: There are not many people who've done these jobs.

C: No.

MR: So if you have the opportunity to use their, their experience then, it depends on their reputation, obviously. But if their reputation is reasonable, then that's seen as an advantage.

C: Yes, absolutely. Have you had a chance to think about your availability and whether, how or if the advisory board would work for you?

MR: Yes I have, I have obviously thought a lot about that, because we discussed last week, err, the frequency...

C: Yes, exactly.

MR: ...you expected, where these meetings would normally be. I no, I think the answer is I don't think I would have a difficulty.

C: Great.

MR: I would assume it would be possible to discuss the timing.

C: Absolutely.

MR: And once it's in my diary then it's set, you know.

L: Because you seem to be very busy.

MR: Well I am very busy. Because I'm used to it. I'll tell you, you're quite right, you're absolutely right. Because erm, for 18 years I was a, a government minister, and I had no free time at all. And I enjoyed that. But when that stopped, right, you can't just spend your time doing nothing.

C: It's nice to be busy.

MR: You know, it's part, it becomes part of your DNA. You have to be busy, you know, because I find it stimulating, and it's how you use your time. So you'd be surprised how much free time I have. I spend a lot of time reading, I spend a lot of time walking. Because, because I'm not a Minister or full-time working for one person I can sort out my day. So, that I, I may have three or four things that day, but in between if I want to I go for a walk.

C: Yes. That's nice. It's a good way to live, isn't it?

MR: I can go and have a cup of coffee. Now if you're, if you're employed to work nine to five or nine to eight, you know, you have to get someone's permission to do something else, and there's nothing wrong with that-that's how most people live their lives. I'm self-employed. So nobody pays me a salary, I have to earn my income, but when I'm not doing something I can do what I like. And because I'm in my sixties that's how I, how I prefer it.

C: Yeah, well that sounds like a good situation.

L: You also don't seem to travel as much as the other.

MR: That's the other point we discussed last week. Because if as a Member of Parliament I was travelling back and forth to Edinburgh or Birmingham or Glasgow or something that would take up the whole day each time you travel.

C: Yes, that's true.

MR: No, I mean, for example, most Members of Parliament leave London on a Thursday evening and don't come back till Monday lunchtime. So they're in another part of the country. For me that is quiet time [laughs]. It's easy.

C: It's a bit of luck, isn't it?

MR: Well it's not luck, its [inaudible], luck, certainly not luck.

C: Fair enough. Do you want some more coffee?

L: Or tea.

MR: No, I'm doing very well, thank you. No, nothing's luck. And in all honesty, I mean I have had, excuse me if I go into detail, but I have had two approaches from [inaudible] to help, in one case to help a particular government, and in the other case to be on the board of a company [inaudible] in the last few months. And in both cases I thought about it very hard and I've declined. They offered it, it was my decision, and I declined for two reasons. First of all, err, I didn't think it would be very interesting.

C: That is a problem.

MR: And secondly, because the way the country, the particular government, I was not very happy with. I didn't want to be identified with this particular government. Well they weren't that terrible, but they, they were controversial. And in the case of the company, I did not like the way the chairman ran his company. This wasn't advisory. He wanted me to be a director on the board, and if you're a director on the board you are legally responsible. And he wanted to just have two or three board meetings a year in a nice part of the world, and he, well he ran the company. I said, No, I don't want to do that. But if you're, you're a member of a board you have a responsibility. I like to feel I am earning what I get.

C: Yeah.

MR: I don't mind being paid well, but I want to feel I am....

C: You want to be contributing.

MR: Yeah, and because I, at this stage in my life I don't, I'm not desperate to find a job. You know.

C: Yeah. So you can pick and choose if something takes your fancy.

MR: I can say yes or I can say no, and if it's something that interests me the answer will be yes. It so happens that in the last few months, two things I have said "no, I'd rather not". And it's linked also, to answer your question more explicitly, I also say, "is this going to be a good use of my time?" Time is finite. I do not want to be running back and forward all the time unless, you know, it's something that is important or that I get a lot of satisfaction from.

C: Yes, and actually one question I was going to ask. In terms of your fee I think you said that you'd done some work for a bank and in terms of a day rate it was I think between maybe six and eight thousand. Have you given some thought to that in terms of, is that umm still correct?

MR: No I haven't. Not in the sense of coming to an actual figure. If you want me to I can try and do that. But I think I said last time, it would depend on, um, whether it was something which one did in London or whether it involved travel, how much time did it take and so forth, how much preparatory work would it, you know, would there more something I'd have to spend one or two days working on before I did whatever was being asked? So, um, I would expect some sort of flexibility, based on objective criteria. But you asked me what sort of spectrum we were talking about. If it was as you said there would be a specific fee as a member of the advisory board.

C: Exactly.

MR: But if in addition there were particular requests that would be paid on a per diem or per basis. And I simply say that as an illustration that some of the things I've done over the last two or three years, mainly for City of London, and, um, investment companies, that wanted presentations to their clients. I did a number in London, I also spent two days in, in New York doing, UBS bank was the bank in question. UBS asked me to do presentations to eight of their clients their over two days.

C: Great.

MR: And that of course involved travel as well. And I think for that whole project, which was, what, about two days of, no, it was about a day and a half of presentations plus the travel, I think they paid me somewhere between twenty to thirty thousand. But that was quite a lot of, it was very solid work for a significant..

C: Yes, it sounds quite intensive.

MR: That was quite intensive.

C: So I suppose all I was thinking is before we talked about the advisory board is just broadly we had been thinking between sixty and eighty thousand, and then I thought

well if your day rate is between six and eight and if there would be six meetings every year, and then at least one preparatory day, you might be thinking perhaps the advisory board fee would be slightly more than sixty to eighty thousand, so I suppose I was just aware of that slight...

MR: Yes.

C: ...slight discrepancy.

MR: I think one has to be fair.

C: Yeah. Exactly, we want to be fair.

MR: Exactly right. And I think that if you say to somebody we'd like you to serve on out advisory board, and the fee will be, let us say, eighty thousand, then yes, that might be slightly less than you would otherwise get per diem, but on the other hand you have the certainty of knowing.

C: Yes, absolutely. Yeah.

MR: You know, there's a trade-off. There's a trade-off. You know, I can plan my own, er, income and expenditure taking into account that that is a specific sum.

C: You know for a year.

MR: So many days a year, so many meetings, that I can assume is part of my income for the year in question. If you do it on a per diem you might charge more because there is less certainty.

C: Yes absolutely

MR: You don't know how often it's going to happen. So you have to price yourself to take that into account.

C: Yeah, yeah, which I totally appreciate. I suppose it's just when I sat down afterwards I thought, Oh hang on, is that an accurate reflection?

MR: Does it add up?

C: Yes, is that fair?

MR: No, I thought when you said the figure of sixty to eighty thousand I thought well, you know, I don't mind if it's a bit more than that, but it didn't sound unreasonable.

C: OK

MR: I'm also conscious that what you're asking is for someone to be not a director of a company but an advisory board, and that is not as demanding and it doesn't involve, for example, if you become a director of a company you accept legal responsibility.

C: Yes, well that is quite something, isn't it?

MR: Therefore, you have to be much better informed about that company. You have to be sure you, you know, there's a higher level of...

C: There's a lot of responsibility there.

MR: I'm on the board of Unilever.

C: Oh are you?

MR: Yes. That takes a, that gives me a legal responsibility, I'm not executive. And that is something I take into account.

L: If, if we wanted to start in the UK first because we're meeting and having an interesting meeting, and once again I'll report back to my uncle, what would you say, in the UK, if we have you on board, would be the most value added sector. I know you're Foreign Secretary, so in the rest of Europe it would be definitely...

MR: Well I think my own value, if you ask me, my own value, is the co... is not just having been Foreign Secretary or Minister of Defence, but it's the combination of having that political experience and political contacts and political knowledge, with 20 years of commercial experience, because since 1997, throughout that period I have been active with a large range of companies either as a director, or as a consultant, or as an advisor, including some household names - Unilever, Price Waterhouse Cooper's, Aberdeen Asset Management, erm, BHP and so forth. So these.... So there's not too many people who have the combination.

C: No, it's a good marriage, isn't it, both those things.

MR: A combination of both public sector and private sector experience as a participant, not as an observer but as somebody who's actually been part of it. I mean I know how companies operate, I know how businesses operate. I've.... Altogether in the last 20 years I must have been involved in about a dozen to 15 different companies in different sectors, so you learn quite a lot as a result of that.

C: Absolutely. It must be very useful for your work in Parliament, actually, because there's often a criticism, isn't there, of some parliamentarians...

MR: Well it works both ways. Exactly right. If you're having a debate in Parliament about some aspect of the economy or aspect of what's happening with the oil sector or something of that kind, erm, then to have that experience, you speak with a little bit more authority.

C: Yeah, you do.

MR: That's right.

C: That's right, one of the things that Lin's uncle asked us to discuss with you and to, kind of focus on, because I think he was keen for us in the first instance, certainly for the first maybe six months or for the advisory board, to be specifically looking at some opportunities in the UK, so he was keen to understand how you might be able to help in that sense. So, for example some of the investments and projects he's looking at are with the possibility of HS3, which follows on from HS2, via the north linking, I think its Hull through Manchester, Leeds, across to Liverpool, because he's looking at some property investments in those areas, and of course if that happens land prices will go up there, and It's in terms of what are the government's thoughts on that? And the same with 5G, actually. So he's very, very, keen that we're all going to be on our mobiles downloading everything and wants to get involved in the investment in the mast technology actually.

MR: Obviously it would depend on the project. Some I might know a little about already, some I would have to inform myself because it may not be an area that I'm experienced in, but what I would do if a, if a request came, you mentioned H3, one would seek to, what one could quite easily do is find out what is the current detailed state of government thinking. Because at this stage it's an idea, it's a proposal.

C: Yes, it's an idea.

MR: You know, something that is for the future. And a lot of work of a preparatory kind is taking place. But there is no absolute commitment, either on funding or on timing. But what your uncle would obviously wish to know is, well, what is the best judgement at this stage? Is it likely to happen, if so when is it likely to happen, what is the likely route? That might be appropriate.

C: Yep, precisely.

MR: Erm, When are decisions going to be taken? Does it depend on who wins the general election? Is there a difference between what a Conservative government or a Labour, Liberal government might do? Now, for some of these questions there may not yet be answers, but if there are answers then I can easily find out what they are.

C: And who would know the answers. Is it the government minister, a civil servant?

MR: If it's a matter of government policy then there's two aspects to government policy. That which they have announced and which is public knowledge, you can find it in the various ways of...

C: Of Google [laughs].

MR: Or in my own case I could, I can write to a Minister...

C: Right. Right. Yeah, that would be useful.

MR: ... and I would, well I wouldn't name who was asking, I would say I've been asked to, to establish what your thinking is on X, Y, Z, can you tell me what that is? I can get a reply either from the Minister or from one of the senior officials. That, that, is quite straightforward. But if it's an area of... they may be reluctant...

C: To say, yes..

MR: Well, not for any reasons of secrets, it's simply that very often if there is a new project being considered there are a series of options being looked at, and they don't want to disclose these options until they've got to some preliminary view.

C: Yes, I see.

MR: Apart from anything else you can get planning blight. You know, if it is known that a government department is thinking of building a new road then anybody who lives there says I can't sell my house.

C: They'd be up in arms.

MR: I know. So it's very unfair to, to make that public unless you are pretty certain that's what you want it to do.

C: Yeah, I see. And is it possible to sort of take discreet soundings?

MR: You can take soundings, but when you take soundings, or you'll get what is likely. You still have to be cautious.

C: Precisely. Yes.

MR: Nobody, until decisions have been taken nobody can give you a guarantee because they don't know themselves.

C: No, exactly. But I suppose it's still very useful to know what they think is most likely, least likely, even.

MR: Yes, I think you've put your finger on it. I mean sometimes what you can establish is what can be ruled out. Well if we do go ahead we're not going to go in that route.

C: Yes, exactly. We're absolutely not going through Sheffield.

MR: Or it's not going to be 2017, the earliest will be 2020. Or, that, you can get a range of... but it's difficult for me to give you...

MR: ...more response at the moment without a particular project.

C: Yes. Well HS3 is a quite a good one.

MR: HS3 is an important one.

C: Because in terms of property development, obviously if it's going to go through a certain part of Sheffield or it is going to link up Hull with Liverpool, actually those places are then ripe for development.

MR: I think, I mean, again it's something one would need to look at, but I would imagine the most they would be able to say at this moment would be if HS3 happens these are the cities that we're expecting would benefit from it. But I would be very surprised if they were able to say and it will be a particular route.

C: Yes. That's normally up for discussion, isn't it?

MR: And that can't...

C: And who's the, um, who's most well-informed? Is it the Minister or the civil servant or both?

MR: Well both, in different ways. I mean, it, basically what happens, the way decisions are taken, if it's a government, let's say, it's a road project in the Department of Transport - I was Transport Minister for two years...

C: So you know all about it.

MR: I know what it was like then. But, um, but, no, what would happen is the Minister would have, when he becomes a Minister, he would want to see what are the projects that are being considered. There are the projects that are currently being built that everybody knows about, but that is currently happening, what is, how are we proposing to spend the money we have over the next two or three years? And they would say, Minister, we have all these list of renewed roads that we are committed to, that we

have announced; one is to begin this year, one is to begin next year. And that would all be public knowledge. And the Minister might say, Well, I think it is time we built a bypass round this town. Well that is not in the current plan. Okay, I would like it looked at.

C: Yep

MR: I want to know how much it would cost, when could it begin? When could it? Because I think it would be very desirable to have a bypass round this town. And the officials would then go away, they would do their homework, and they would come back and they would

say, "Well, Minister, if we wanted to do that first of all unless you either get new money or change the priorities we cannot start this project for three or four years. If you want it earlier you will have to cancel some other projects, or persuade the Chancellor to give you some more money. Okay, that's on the financial side. Secondly, um, yes Minister, we think it would cost so many millions of pounds to do this. Thirdly, we think it would take 18 months or 12 months from the beginning to the end for it to happen. Maybe two years, who, whatever. Fourthly, if this particular bypass, yes, many people would welcome that, but the people on there, might be some environmental problem, there may be some controversy, you know. And they would give the best judgement they could. But that would be all internal to the department. But not the public.

C: Yes, I see. No, of course.

MR: At that stage, that would just be an option that was being looked at.

C: Yes, And can we, would we be able to find out about that, those discussions?

MR: Well they would be reluctant, No, they would be reluctant to share most of that because they cannot inform you without informing everybody.

C: No, well, precisely.

MR: And if it becomes public then well you get into problems of planning law, which is very unfair.

C: But presumably through knowing them, um, it would be possible to find out that those discussions were happening, or...

MR: Not necessarily. It depends, not necessarily. It depends on what stage they have reached. If they are coming pretty firmly down. Sometimes the Minister may be considering a bypass because he's under pressure in Parliament to build one.

C: Oh, I see, yes.

MR: People say, "We want [inaudible] a big campaign to ease the traffic by building some new road. In such a situation they will be only too happy to say yes, we're thinking about it. That's when they'll be wanting to say it. But sometimes it will be for other reasons. So there's no simple...

C: No, of course.

L: So they won't tell us, of course, but will they tell you?

MR: They won't tell me either. Certainly not. Certainly not.

L: Over a drink?

MR: I hope not, because as a citizen I'd be very worried about that. No, no, no we have quite... they have to be very careful. You cannot give privileged information to one private citizen or a company that is not available to others. Because that, why should they? There is no benefit from their point of view, and they will simply be severely criticised. But there is an awful lot of information which is not secret which if you ask the right questions you'll get the answer.

C: Yes. I suppose it's just knowing the right questions, isn't it?

MR: That's right, and if other people don't know that it's because they haven't asked.

L: For example?

MR: Well no, there is a whole range of, in terms of what the government is planning, much of it is already in the public domain but it hasn't been picked up by the newspapers or it may be in a big document, they may have published 150 pages of projects, and some of them have not been noticed by newspapers or by.... This is true in any country. Modern government is very complex. So you know, people, you know, can often not be aware of something that is happening simply because they haven't inquired.

C: Well, people don't know where to look.

L: They have to know to ask the right questions.

MR: Yes

C: Yes. Yeah, that is useful, isn't it? Let me think if there's anything else that your uncle raised.... In terms of your availability, when are you, when are you able to start if we were to..?

MR: Oh, I think not before Friday.

C: Sounds good.

L: Not tomorrow.

MR: I'd like to say tomorrow.

L: Efficient indeed.

C: Yeah.

MR: Do you want me to expand?

C: I get it.

MR: You get it?

C: That's very useful.

MR: It depends obviously what the first steps were.

C: Yes, it might take a little bit longer to get things up and running, I think.

L: Are you around the next couple of weeks?

MR: Yes. No, I... my next visit abroad... I go to a conference in Munich for four days in about two weeks' time.

C: Ah, okay.

MR: But that's over the weekend. That's over Friday till Monday. It's a security conference I do each year.

C: That sounds interesting.

MR: It is fascinating, very, very, interesting indeed.

C: Especially at the moment with so much going on.

MR: Well it'll be an interesting conference because it's a conference which is attended by very many serving Ministers of European Governments and the United States, senior military, academics, businessmen, journalists and people like myself with a background in this kind of area. And I go each year to this conference. It's the major European security conference.

C: And do you go because of your background with defence?

MR: Well, and foreign policy. I'm also.... A number of organisations use it for an opportunity for think-tanks and discussions on the margins of the conference. My diary for these four days is already...several meetings... I already have four or five different meetings I'm attending...

C: Yeah, that sounds good.

MR: ...at the conference, which is interesting.

C: Actually, one of the questions I was going to ask you is, in terms of investing in infrastructure projects in Britain, whether you know, what are the regulatory hurdles and will it be an issue for us as a Chinese company investing?

MR: I would want to check what I'm about to say, but my impression, my feeling about it at the moment is no, you would be subject to exactly the same rules as any British company.

C: Right.

MR: There is no different rules because it's not a British company.

C: Yes.

MR: If a project, if it's a public sector project which you wanted to tender for then that is open to any company to respond to that tender. Not just in construction, this is true in health, in housing.

C: Yes.

MR: Industry. The only exceptions are in the Ministry of Defence.

C: Yes, I wondered that.

MR: Yes. If the Royal Navy wants new ships or the Royal Air Force need new aircraft normally there would be a bias in favour of a British company, because we want to maintain our capability to build warships or military aircraft in this country. Um, But that's very specific. All countries have such a constraint, that's not unusual. But I don't think you're interested in defence projects.

L: We're not, no.

C: Not yet.

MR: Even things like nuclear power stations are built by foreign companies in Britain. Wind energy... most of the wind energy in Britain is owned by a company, by companies, from other countries.

C: Yeah.

MR: So it... I cannot... apart from defence, I cannot think of any other sector where there are not already international companies already operating.

L: And is there any new rules that we should be aware of, like, regarding telecom.

MR: Regarding?

L: Telecom.

MR: Telecom. No. No, I as you saw [Redacted] are already very much involved in British Telecom, BT. It's the single biggest Chinese company that is involved, and we have telecoms internet companies from all over the world operating in the United Kingdom. That is, we are open for that. No, the standard we apply as a country is will you, will the company obey our laws, pay our taxes, and provide employment? And if the answer is yes, we welcome them.

L: Good.

C: And if we did want to get involved in defence projects in the future, would, is that just impossible?

MR: No, no, no, no. No, no. It's not impossible at all. There are many aspects of defence... where Britain uses foreign companies, is either where there isn't a British company that is able to provide the technology required. But sometimes even when there is a British company, if we want value for money.

C: Yeah.

MR: So if a foreign company is able to offer us same for much, much less, or significantly less, then the contract will go to that foreign company. The only time when that ceases to be acceptable is if all the contracts were going to foreign companies, and the British companies would end up having to close down, and we would no longer, in defence, be able to protect ourselves. Because you have to ask if there was a period of tension, of war, conflict, you want to be certain you can build your own.

C: Yeah, you can do your own thing.

MR: Build your own ships, not suddenly find you haven't got any, or they won't provide you with them, so that's a very restricted area.

C: Yes.

MR: But most of modern defence is highly technological.

C: Yes, our systems, I imagine.

MR: Our systems and so forth, and there are many foreign companies involved in that. But that is decided, in the Ministry of Defence that would be considered on a project by project basis.

C: Yes.

MR: But we already have, for example many of our aircraft are built internationally by a consortium of companies, of British, French, European... elsewhere, American companies.

C: And who makes the decision with it?

MR: If it's the Minister... In Government, it would be the ~Ministers.

C: Oh, it would be a Minister.

MR: Oh yes. When I was Minister of Defence, either I took that decision or I discussed it with the Prime Minister or the Cabinet. If it was a very important decision it would be the whole Cabinet meeting.

C: Yes, right.

MR: And it would have to be put before the Cabinet and they would...

C: Yes.

MR: But no, that's definitely taken at the level... and that's public. That's a public announcement.

C: Yes. Yes absolutely.

L: So we can bid for telecom projects...

MR: Yes.

L: ...within Government departments?

MR: Absolutely. Absolutely. Absolutely. And if there was any part of that project which was sensitive that would be explained. That would be explained.

C: Yeah.

MR: And what normally happens is a foreign company, even if some part of the contract is sensitive, they may win the contract for the whole project but for the sensitive part some special arrangement is made. Because it may be not possible to give them access to some very sensitive technology or something like that.

C: Yes.

L: Mm. Mm.

C: Oh, I see. So someone else would maybe run that part.

MR: Or sometimes the company does not, is not given access to the technology but can use the product from that technology. There are customs built, made solution is what we found.

C: Yes.

MR: Because you mention telecommunications or internet, we already have many foreign companies in both these areas, and there has not been a political problem at all.

L: So, China, you're not particularly worried about?

MR: Far from it. No. The Prime Minister when he was in China said Britain is open to Chinese investment. And we already have....

C: Well that's very encouraging.

MR: Yeah. Oh, yeah. It's happening in a big way. And British companies investing in China, it works both ways.

C: Yes.

MR: No, I mean Britain as a country has, for a hundred years, it's not new, believed in free trade...

C: Yeah.

MR: ...in removing economic barriers. Because, although it can create some problems, it creates far more advantages. The net effect is very, very beneficial. And that's...if you think Britain has only 65 million people, but even today we are the sixth or seventh largest economy in the world. Now you don't do that with 65 million people, unless you have a very open economy. I mean China's got 1.3 billion.

L: It's just not open enough, that's the problem. So that's not going to change. It will remain quite open.

MR: No political party in Britain wants to change that.

L: Good.

MR: Because it's worked well, it's served us well. We're very happy with the, it's created the prosperity and created the country we are.

C: I suppose with an election coming that is quite difficult in terms of investment, isn't it, because just thinking about our position, that we might be thinking of a couple of investments, but then you don't know....

MR: Depends what they were. See, I mean, for example, if you were saying you might want to invest in the private health sector, now that is more controversial. Because the present government strongly believes that the National Health Service, which is state owned, should work with the private health sector, and that I think works quite well. The Labour Party is much more equivocal about that. They accept there is some involvement of the private sector but they don't want it to grow. They would rather it was mainly the National Health Service. So if you were saying health, private health, what are the prospects, I would have to say to you, it's possible but it may be influenced by who wins the election.

C: Yeah.

MR: But that's not true in most areas. Health is a very special.

C: Yes it is, it's such a battleground.

MR: You will be familiar with, your own experience.

L: Yes.

C: It's always worth considering, isn't it? Is this situation going to change, you know.

MR: Yes, and normally you can't get guarantees, but I mean if you were asking me about any sector other than health I would say 95 per cent...

C: ...it would continue.

MR: It would continue. Yes. Because you.... Things don't suddenly change overnight. If a major political party that might become the government is being influenced to change its policy on some major area of the economy, there has to be a reason for that. It has to gradually appear. This has become a priority for them. So if you are interested in these things you pick them up quite quickly.

C: But I suppose for example with something like fracking there are various kind of tax breaks for companies that are involved in fracking as a way to support them with their exploration, because it's very expensive, of course. But, obviously you're not a specialist on this area, but if we were thinking of investing in fracking I suppose one of the things we'd be trying to find out is, one, will that support continue? Two, will it be intensified?

MR: Sure, that is right. And fracking is an interesting example because there are controversies about fracking, but it's not party political.

C: No.

MR: It doesn't divide the political parties. It is essentially people who have a strong environmental interest, sometimes campaign, and do campaign, against fracking projects, and that slows down. Now in France, you've been talking about France quite a lot, in France they have come down against fracking, they're not allowing it to go forward. In the United Kingdom the government, the present government, and I think the Labour Party, have all said fracking must be part of our...

C: Of the future.

MR: Of the future, it has to be part of it. But it's all quite new, so there's still quite a lot of thinking about how that will be managed.

C: Yes.

MR: How that can be taken forward.

C: But's difficult for ...

MR: I was at a fracking conference. I was actually part of a weekend conference on fracking.

C: Oh were you? Why was that?

MR: Because it has, because of the political dimension to it, and it was mainly about what was happening in the United States, and because the United States now does so

much fracking, the United States for the first time for 60 years has become self-sufficient in oil, and that means they don't need the Middle East so much.

C: Yeah. Massive implications.

MR: Significant... that was the main theme of the conference.

C: Mm.

MR: I was at about three months ago, six months ago.

C: And you went because of that rather than, not because you're specifically interested in fracking.

MR: It wasn't specifically fracking. I was interested in fracking because it was becoming a headline subject, you know.

C: Yes.

MR: But in my particular case it was because of the political implications of it..

C: Yeah.

MR: ...that I... that I was at the conference.

C: That is very interesting, isn't it, how it might change American foreign policy potentially, or....

MR: Well some of the oil producers in the Gulf, in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia and these guys, are very nervous.

C: Of course.

MR: America was one of their biggest customers.

C: Yes.

MR: And that's one of the reasons why the oil price has fallen so...

C: I see.

MR: It's not the only reason, but it's one of the reasons why it's fallen so dramatically.

C: Yes.

MR: American demand for Middle Eastern oil is disappearing.

C: Yes.

L: Mm.

C: I saw at the weekend actually, though, there were all these articles about drilling in the North Sea and tax incentive, how tax incentives were needed for that because of the falling oil...

MR: Yes, because the oil price is now in the forties.

C: Yeah.

MR: Forty dollars. That is less than half... it was about one-twenty, now it's forty. That means most of the projects for new oil extraction in the deeper waters are just uneconomic.

C: Yes. They become much less viable, don't they?

MR: So unless the Government chooses to subsidise them through tax advantages, they just won't happen.

C: Yeah.

L: Mm.

MR: And even with tax advantages....

C: I know. It's a really big change.

MR: Huge change. It's a huge change. And one... and you can't be certain how long this very low price will last.

C: Yes.

MR: It might last a few months, it might last a few years.

C: Mm. That would definitely be quite a difficult investment wouldn't it? You'd be annoyed if...

MR: Anybody investing in the oil sector at this moment in time has to ask themselves, "will this be commercially attractive even if the oil price remains forty dollars as opposed to a hundred dollars?"

C: Yeah.

MR: And if the answer is no it won't be, then perhaps not touch it.

C: Yes. I know there are now much better areas to get involved in.

MR: Yes.

L Mm. Mm.

C: Ok, Lin's uncle might be coming over in the next couple of weeks, so it might be worth arranging a meeting, yeah.

MR: When are you ... Can I ask you, when are you, in terms of my own planning, when are you thinking of reaching a decision as to whether you wish for me to be involved in this matter?

L: Well, if he manages to come in the next couple of weeks - this week we've had quite a few interesting meetings - we should be able to decide quite quickly afterwards.

C: Yes, I would have thought in February.

MR: Good.

C: I think that would be realistic.

MR: Good. That's grand.

C: Depending on his travel plans.

MR: Yep, okay.

L: Mm.

C: Brilliant.

MR: So what's your uncle's name?

L: You're asking me or my uncle?

MR: Your uncle's name.

L: Oh, sorry. I wasn't listening. Tom.

MR: Tom.

L: We call him Tom.

MR: Tom, right. And what's his surname?

L: Zhang.

MR: So, same as you.

L: Z h a n g, yes.

MR: So Tom, he's known as Tom. But that can't be his only.....

L: Of course. But it's easier for him to explain to people and, yeah, because the spelling is quite difficult.

MR: Good. And he is the chairman of the company?

L: Mm.

MR: And what is the company called?

L: PMR. Also in Hong Kong.

MR: Also PMR?

L: Yes, yes, yes.

MR: And....

L: Because we're trying to, you know, west.

MR: So PMR Communications is part of the PMR group?

L: Yes. Yes, yes. It's a Chinese name.

MR: And the PMR group covers property, different s e c t o r s ?

L: Yes, yes. So it's more like an investment, like a fund, but we have different business that we invest in in the West, which...

MR: So yes, right, so PMR is, it's a funding company.

L: Yes.

MR: Which invests in other businesses. That's right. It doesn't itself run these businesses?

L: No. no...

MR: But it decides where to invest the funds?

C: Yes. A bit like a private equity company.

MR: Yes, yes, yes. And this is a private company?

L: Yes.

MR: It's a private company, yes?

L: Yes.

MR: And is it publicly known what its funding, er, assets are?

L: No, not, no, no...

MR: That's a private...

L: We have annual meetings but it's all private.

MR: It's all private. Good. How long has it been operating as a company?

L: Five years.

MR: Oh, right. So it's a new development. And it's grown....

L: For us, yes. Because we're putting in Hong Kong, and then now we want to go to the West.

MR: Of course.

L: But within China it's been around for a while, but not the same.

MR: As PMR or with a different name?

L: No, no....

MR: Chinese name.

L: In China it's development and logistics and all separate in China.

MR: And does PMR stand for something?

L: Prosperity.

MR: Ah... MR?

L: Prosperity Marketing Resources.

MR: Prosperity Marketing Resources, that's a good name.

L: But we don't want that.

C: It sounds very...

L: Yes, PMR is cooler.

MR: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

L: Cos, yeah, it's very auspicious, all the names in China, so yeah. I'm not telling people here.

MR: No, no, my lips are sealed. It's PMR only.

L: Initially we were, like, yeah it's a really nice thing, but actually it sounds really Chinese.

C: I think in terms of operating in Europe it's better.

MR: PMR sounds good.

C: Yep. L:

Yep.

MR: Okay.

C: Oh, well nice to see you again. Thank you very much for popping over.

MR: So if your uncle is here let me know about timing, and we'll see...

C: We'll see if we can organise something.

MR: Okay.

C: When are you away at your conference?

MR: Oh, not for about two or three weeks.

C: Fine.

MR: But that's from Thursday until Monday morning.

C: Oh, okay. So largely over the weekend.

MR: Yeah, it's pretty much a long weekend rather than during the week.

C: Yes.

MR: Good.

C: Brilliant, okay. Thanks very much for coming in.

MR: Is there a particular week that's more likely for your uncle.

L: Probably not next week.

MR: Not the coming week, but the week after possibly.

L: Yes.

MR: Something like that.

C: But I think we can probably be flexible and liaise with you.

MR: Yeah, sure. That won't be a problem.

L: Was there another question? Yeah, I think that's it.

MR: Anything else?

C: Yes, we can always drop you an email or give you a phone call if that's okay.

MR: Drop me an email.

13 January 2015

**15. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcolm Rifkind,
28 April 2015**

I emailed you on Monday 20 April to say that I had received the material I had requested from Channel 4. Over the last few days I have satisfied myself of the accuracy of the

transcript which they provided. I now enclose a copy of it for your information, as well as a copy of the other material they sent me (copies of correspondence between you and Channel 4, which you will already have seen).

I would be pleased if you would review the transcripts and let me know whether you consider them to be an accurate reflection of your meetings with the two reporters on 7 and 13 January 2015. You will see that the transcripts document the entirety of both meetings, including the opening and closing pleasantries. I include them at this stage for the sake of completeness but may redact these sections from the published material. If there are sections of the text which you would like me to redact (and which were not broadcast by Channel 4), I would be willing to consider doing so. However, as I am sure you will understand, the final decision on that will be for me alone.

If you would like to see the audio-visual recordings of either or both of the meetings before commenting on the transcripts, please contact my office as soon as possible and they will make arrangements for you to do that here.

In addition to the material I have obtained from Channel 4, I also enclose a transcript of your interview on the Today programme on 23 February 2015.

I would normally ask for a response within two weeks. However, I am aware that you may have other pressing commitments and you will, of course, wish to consider the transcripts carefully. If you would let me have your response to this letter as soon as possible, and no later than **15 May 2015**, that would be extremely helpful. If 15 May is not possible, please let me know before then so that we can agree an alternative.

28 April 2015

16. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to the Commissioner, 4 May 2015

I attach my response to transcripts as promised. In the response I mention that I have considered whether I need to make any amendment to the original statement that I gave you in the light of the transcripts but I have concluded that there is no need.

I would be grateful if you would consider the statement and the response to the transcripts jointly as representing my views on the matters that are the subject of your enquiry.

I would be happy to meet with you again, at a time of your convenience, to discuss these matters if you feel that would be helpful.

As you will understand, I am hoping you will feel able to reach a reasonable early conclusion on this issue.

4 May 2015

17. Attachment to email of 4 May: Sir Malcolm's response to transcripts

Having been refused access to these transcripts, or any part of them, by Channel 4, despite my own requests, I am grateful for the opportunity to refresh my memory of the details of the exchanges that took place.

I have reviewed the transcripts obtained from Channel 4. I consider them to be an accurate reflection of the meetings I had on 7th and 13th January 2015.

The allegations by Channel 4 were based, entirely, on my agreement to discuss joining an Advisory Board and the remarks that I made during two meetings. All the relevant information is, therefore, now available and not in dispute.

I have re-read the original Statement that I wrote and supplied to you to see whether I would wish to amend any part of it in the light of the transcripts. I am satisfied that there is no need for me to do so.

Indeed, I have found the transcripts to be very helpful in providing evidential material that, in my view, demonstrates and confirms that there was no impropriety and that the allegations and insinuations made against me by Channel 4 and the Daily Telegraph were unfounded and unjustified.

In your letter to me of 26th February you said that these allegations were that, contrary to the rules of the House, I had engaged in lobbying for reward or consideration and that my conduct may have caused serious damage to the reputation of the House of Commons.

I will not burden you by repeating the matters I raised in my original Statement. I hope you will permit me however, to draw your attention to what I consider to be the most useful and relevant additional information which is to be found in the transcripts.

1. Neither the transcripts nor the original invitation indicate that I was being approached because I was a Member of Parliament.
2. The transcript confirms that the declared purpose of the proposed Advisory Board was to help understanding of "the various political, regulatory and legislative frameworks in the UK and across the EU".

Of the total of 77 pages of conversation in the 2 transcripts over 70 pages deal either with general conversation, or advice that might be sought as regards investment in foreign countries elsewhere in the EU, or questions of remuneration and availability. Only 5 pages of the transcripts deal with whether I could help them with specific possible interests in UK matters and these issues were only raised, in any significant way, towards the end of the second meeting.

3. The transcript (pages 14 and 15 of the first meeting) confirms my requirement that, if there was a conflict of timing of meetings, my duties in Parliament would have to take priority.
4. The transcripts makes clear, throughout, that there was no offer by me of any help I could give them as an MP. Indeed, again and again the transcripts confirm that their professed interest was in both my experience as a former senior Minister in the years up to 1997 and in my subsequent business experience.

Most former senior Ministers have worked with the private sector on Boards or in Advisory roles where their experience has been deemed to be of value. Former Prime Ministers, Sir John Major, Tony Blair and Gordon Brown are, currently, carrying out such roles. In the case of Gordon Brown, he, like me, has done so while an MP and registered his interest.

5. As the transcripts make clear, at no time, did I suggest that my status as an MP could be used to their advantage. Indeed when asked, on more than one occasion, what added value I could provide to an Advisory Board I not only made no mention of my being an MP but, repeatedly, stressed my business experience in the private sector as the most important consideration.

I refer you to page 20 of the second meeting where I say, in response to their question, that my main value is “20 years of commercial experience.....Altogether in the last 20 years I must have been involved in about a dozen to 15 different companies....so you learn quite a lot as a result of that”

6. There is no evidence in the transcripts that I have “engaged in lobbying for reward or consideration”.

For there to be lobbying there must be an approach to someone in authority either seeking to influence a decision in a particular direction or seeking to obtain information that is not available to the general public.

The transcript makes clear not only that I have not lobbied nor tried to influence any government decision but that I made clear that I would not be willing to assist anyone seeking information that was not available to the general public.

7. I would refer you, in particular, to pages 24 and 25 of the second meeting where I say that Ministers and their Departments “cannot inform you without informing everybody”.

I repeat this with greater force further down on the same page:

“L. So they won’t tell us, of course, but will they tell you?”

MR. They won’t tell me either. Certainly not. Certainly not.

L. Over a drink?

MR. I hope not, because as a citizen I'd be very worried about that. No, no, no... They have to be very careful. You cannot give privileged information to one private citizen or a company that is not available to others"

There could have been no clearer indication of my insistence, during those meetings, that I could neither lobby for them nor help them get access to privileged information. Indeed, I make it clear that "as a citizen" not just as a MP I would find that unacceptable.

8. Even if these discussions had led to my being offered a position on their Advisory Board, it is by no means certain that I would have accepted. The second transcript, at page 17, records me giving two specific examples of business opportunities, during the last year, as regards which I had preliminary discussions as in the present case. On both these occasions I was made formal offers. After deliberation and due diligence I declined them both for the reasons I indicate in the transcript. I can give you further details of both these offers if you would find it helpful.

Had the Hong Kong company been genuine and made me a formal offer I would have wanted to satisfy myself in a similar way before reaching a final decision.

It is also, of course, the case that if I had become a member of such an advisory board and been asked to write to a Minister to ascertain what information about a project was in the public domain, I would have wanted to satisfy myself that writing such a letter, and the content of it, would be in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Code. If it was not I would not have done it.

9. The Channel 4 allegations were reported by them as "Cash for access".

The transcripts make clear that any remuneration I was to receive if I agreed to join their Advisory Board was to be for service on that advisory board or for any additional consultancy.

The only references in the transcripts to access were in regard to foreign ambassadors in the UK. The transcript, at pages 11 and 13 of the second meeting makes it clear that that discussion was innocent and unremarkable.

I was asked (page 11) whether "in terms of liaising [with European] countries the best way was to speak to their ambassadors in London in the first place." I replied that that could be an option and that I could help make the contact.

It was agreed by me and those I was speaking to (page 13) that the purpose of meeting with an ambassador would be limited to ascertaining whether their government would have any problem with a proposal for investment in their country by a foreign company.

As most Ambassadors spend a good proportion of their time trying to encourage foreign investment in their countries, such a discussion would not have a shred of either controversy or impropriety about it.

I need hardly mention that a discussion about a possible meeting with a foreign ambassador to discuss Hong Kong investment in his country does not involve either the House of Commons or my responsibilities as a Member of Parliament.

I would like to make one final comment about these transcripts. They are, of course, the record of what was, in fact, a bogus and artificial meeting. The questions raised were those of journalists whose sole intent was to try to elicit answers that could be used to promote their TV programme.

I have quoted above an example of that intent. Having made clear that Ministers would not disclose to one party information that was not available to everyone else, I was asked whether they might, however, disclose such information to me. When I said that they would not, my questioner persisted with the remark "Over a drink?" which led to me rejecting this suggestion in the strongest terms.

That this discussion was, in fact, an attempted entrapment, would have been no excuse if my answers to these questions had indicated that I was willing to lobby either to influence a decision or obtain privileged information. As the transcripts confirm, in an explicit way, they did not. I hope you will feel able to comment on the methods used by Channel 4 when you reach your conclusions.

If there are any matters in the transcripts which you would like to discuss I will be very happy to make myself available at your convenience.

4 May 2015

18. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcolm Rifkind, 1 June 2015

I have now received a copy of the programme script for the Dispatches broadcast of 'Politicians for Hire'. I am enclosing a copy of the document for you and would be pleased if you would send me any comments you would like to make at this stage.

I would now like to arrange a meeting with you to ensure that I have all the evidence I require and to deal with questions arising from it. I would be pleased if you would come to my office on Monday 15 June at 2pm but please let me know if this is not convenient and we will make another arrangement. You are welcome to bring someone with you if you wish to do so but I will be expecting you to respond personally to my questions. Please would you confirm this appointment and let me know whether you will be accompanied.

1 June 2015

19. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to the Commissioner, 4 June 2015

Thank you for the letter of 1 June.

I attach my comments on this document and its relevance to the matters which you are considering.

I shall be very happy to come and see you on Monday 15th June as you suggest. I will not be accompanied. Would it be possible to make the meeting 2:30pm rather than 2pm? If this would be convenient that would be much appreciated. If it would not be convenient to you I shall come at 2pm.

4 June 2015

20. Attachment to the email of 4 June 2015, Sir Malcolm's comments on the *Dispatches* script

I am grateful to you for sending me a copy of this document which I have read.

It is a disturbing example of how "cut and paste" journalism can not only sensationalise but also be used, deliberately or through incompetence, to mislead the viewer.

Throughout the transcript there are questions posed which are combined with quotations from me presented to the viewer as if my remarks were, during the actual meeting, given in response to the same questions. As can be seen by comparing these extracts with the full transcript it is clear that my remarks were either to different questions or in a quite different context.

It is difficult to believe that Channel 4 were unaware of what they were doing unless those responsible were very poorly trained.

I would draw your attention to the 5 worst examples of what I have described.

1. No.6, page 1.

There is a quote from me which is presented to the viewer as if I would always require a standard fee of five to eight thousand pounds.

The actual exchanges are in the first Transcript on pages 23 and 24 where I am, repeatedly, asked to indicate the daily fee I would require and I, repeatedly, decline to offer a figure, saying it would depend on the time involved, whether travel was necessary, complexity etc. I say, specifically, I do not have a standard rate for consultancy.

After being pressed again, I give as an example a fee I received for a series of presentations on a particular occasion (which is in the Register). This remark is used in the programme by Channel 4 in a quite dishonest and misleading manner.

2. No.7 page 1.

The narrator says “And what might you get if you hire them?” I am shown as if replying to that question “I can see any ambassador that I wish to see. They will see me personally”.

The context in which that remark was actually, made is shown on page 27 of the first Transcript. It was during a part of the conversation when I was describing a visit to Kyrgyzstan ten years ago (when I was not an MP) and saw the President.

The lady I was speaking to says “That is the kind of thing that is incredibly useful isn’t it?. If you know these people, actually having a quick cup of coffee or gin and tonic....” I agree with her giving the (true) example of the foreign Ambassadors in London whom I know.

There was nothing improper in that exchange but Channel 4 imply otherwise.

Nor do they acknowledge that the sole reason discussed in the meeting as to why contact with foreign ambassadors might be useful was to establish whether their countries would be likely to welcome investment by the Hong Kong company. (See Transcript 2, page 11) There can be nothing improper about helping a company and an ambassador make contact with each other for such a purpose but this is ignored and presented by Channel 4 as if something improper was being considered.

3. No.42.page 5.

The narrator says “We discussed with Sir Malcolm what he thought he could bring to a role on the board”.

They then use again my remark on knowing foreign Ambassadors in London with the clear inference that this was what I thought I could bring to a role on their board. The transcript makes clear that that is a dishonest distortion of what was, actually, said.

In the first Transcript at page 16 I am asked “what you think you’d bring to the board? In my answer I make no reference to ambassadors at all. I reply that my experience of the European Union and how it works would be of value. A second example I give is in the assessment of political risk in various Eastern European countries, including Russia.

I am asked again (Transcript 2, page 20) “What would you say, if we have you on the board would be the most value added sector”

Again, I make no reference to access to ambassadors. Instead I say that it is the combination of my political experience with 20 years of commercial experience in the private sector that would be the added value.

Channel 4 could not have been more unscrupulous and dishonest in declining to use my actual answers to the question they asked and substituting remarks I made in a different part of the meeting in answer to different questions.

4. Nos.45,46, page 5.

This is a repeat of the distortion that I had a standard fee which I would require from them. As I have demonstrated above I made it quite clear that I had no standard fee and that payment would be discussed on a case by case basis. That was not the impression given to the viewer by Channel 4.

5. No.66, page 9.

Here, they do acknowledge that I made it clear they could get no access to privileged information.

But they have declined to use (Transcript 2, bottom of page 24) the repeated, very strong statements that I used that made it unambiguously clear how improper it would be for them to try to get access to privileged information.

I suspect they did not wish to use this passage because they would have had to reveal the series of questions that they put to me to try and tempt me to claim that I would have some special opportunity to get such information for them. I might have been quoted saying "No, no, no" but that would not have suited their programme!

These are the worst examples of the distortion and quoting out of context used by Channel 4 as regards my own comments.

I will be very happy to discuss this further with you.

4 June 2015

21. Letter from the Commissioner to the Registrar, 9 June 2015

I would like to ask for your advice on a complaint I have received about Rt Hon Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC MP. The complaint I have accepted for inquiry is that, contrary to the rules of the House, Sir Malcolm is alleged to have engaged in lobbying for reward or consideration. I am also considering whether his conduct has caused serious damage to the reputation and integrity of the House of Commons as a whole or of its Members generally.

While my inquiry is not, therefore, focused on concerns about Sir Malcolm's entries in the Register of Members' Financial Interests, some of the evidence which I am considering does contain references to financial interests that one might expect to be registrable. I enclose relevant extracts from the transcripts of meetings Sir Malcolm had with undercover reporters (under the guise of PMR Communications). You will see that he refers to employment in the following terms:

- “...some of the things I have done over the last two or three years, mainly for City of London, and, um, investment companies, that wanted presentations to their clients. I did a number in London. I also spent two days in, in New York doing, UBS bank was the bank in question. UBS asked me to do presentations to eight of their clients there over two days.”
- “I am on the board of Unilever.” “I’m on the board of Unilever, which is the main company that I’m on their exec, a non-executive, on that board...”
- “Since 1997, throughout that period I have been active with a large range of companies either as a director, or as a consultant, or as an advisor, including some household names – Unilever, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Aberdeen Asset Management, erm BHP and so forth...”
- “Altogether in the last 20 years I must have been involved in about a dozen to 15 different companies in different sectors...”
- “I’ve had experience with a number of companies over the years. I chaired two companies. I was chair, the non-executive Chairman, of a medical company – Alliance Medical, and I’m still on their board. Um, and also of a private security company, Amor Group.”
- “At the moment, I’m not the chairman of any companies. I help, um, I’m on an advisory board, um, a British company called LEK, um, has a European advisory board....”
- “I did a series of presentations for JP Morgan and for a number of other city of London... on the Middle East....”
- “...on the energy side, I spent several years as a consultant with BHP Billiton”
- “I also worked as a consultant in the past, not now, but in the past to Petrofac, which is, provides services for, the oil and gas industry, both in the United Kingdom and overseas.”

Please provide:

- details of which of these appear/have appeared in the Register of Members’ Financial Interests, the nature of any employment and the remuneration registered, and details of any contracts submitted;
- details of any relevant advice the Registration team have provided to Sir Malcolm since **May 2010** about either the registration or declaration of his interests; and
- provide any other information which you hold that you consider relevant to this inquiry.

Sir Malcolm is, understandably, anxious that I should complete my inquiry at the earliest opportunity. However, I am mindful, and Sir Malcolm is aware, that the registration team is currently exceptionally busy supporting new and returning Members. I will not, therefore specify a deadline but ask only that you respond as soon as you are able to do so.

9 June 2015

**22. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to the Commissioner,
11 June 2015**

I attach a short note which I hope that you will find helpful.

I very much look forward to our meeting next Monday at 2.30pm in your office.

11 June 2015

**23. Attachment to the email of 11 June 2015: comments in advance
of meeting the Commissioner**

The meetings I attended were an artificial “sting” concocted by Channel 4 for the sole purpose of seeking to achieve material for their TV programme.

I have given some thought as to what they must have hoped to achieve. It is reasonable to assume that they hoped to obtain evidence of lobbying by me.

Simply attending a meeting to discuss the possibility of joining an advisory board could not in itself constitute lobbying. They, therefore must have hoped that during the course of the meeting I would either reveal previous lobbying, or indicate a willingness to do so on their behalf.

There is no allegation that anything I said indicated that I have lobbied in the past. The issue must be whether I indicated a willingness to lobby on their behalf if I joined their advisory board.

Such a willingness to lobby would have been indicated if I had shown willingness to do any of the following:

1. Make representations to Ministers, or in Parliament, to seek to influence a decision on policy or law.
2. Indicate willingness to share with them secret or privileged information that I had because of my previous service as a Minister.
3. Make representations to a Minister to try to obtain information that was not already in the public domain.

The transcripts show:

1. That I was never asked nor did I indicate any willingness to seek to influence any such decisions.
2. As I have not been a Minister since 1997, I did not have any privileged information nor was it suggested that I might have.

3. The transcripts make it clear that I informed them, on several occasions that they could not get any information that was not already in the public domain either with my help or without it.

It is quite clear, in retrospect, that they concentrated their efforts to obtain material for their TV programme in this third area. The exchanges (Transcript 2 page 24) read as a rather crude attempt to persuade me to claim that I could get them information that would, otherwise, be unavailable to them. They did not succeed.

I shall be happy to discuss further when we meet on Monday.

11 June 2015

24. Letter from the Registrar to the Commissioner, 12 June 2015

Thank you for your letter of 9 June.

You ask what information Sir Malcolm registered about the roles which he mentioned in his interview with the journalist. All were registered, with the exception of Sir Malcolm's work for PWC and Petrofac, and the presentations he provided to JP Morgan. I cannot find any of these in the Registers. It is possible that this work was carried out when Sir Malcolm was not an MP.

The majority of the positions mentioned by Sir Malcolm (Unilever, Aberdeen Asset management, BHP Billiton, Alliance Medical, the Armor Group) were at board level and in such cases the Register simply states that the Member is a director, or non-executive director, without specifying their role further. As he said in his interview, Sir Malcolm chaired the LEK Advisory Board, but he gave no further information about this in the Register, nor was he required to do so.

Our correspondence with Sir Malcolm's office during the last Parliament was limited to routine exchanges about Register entries and reminders about registering individual payments. We do not hold any contractual information relating to any of Sir Malcolm's outside work. We would expect to hold this only if a Member is providing services in their capacity as an MP. Sir Malcolm told us in February 2012 that he did not provide such services.

I enclose copies of the relevant entries from the printed Registers in the last Parliament, and the Register of 30 March 2015, which will together provide a record of all the interests which Sir Malcolm registered during the period.

12 June 2015

25. Transcription of Interview between the Commissioner and Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC, 15 June 2015

Kathryn Hudson: Thank you very much, Sir Malcolm, for coming in this afternoon. What I am doing is taking evidence to begin to move towards a conclusion of the evidence-gathering session in respect of the complaint that was made against you some months ago.

I am going to start with some very basic questions, which is some information that I don't have.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Right.

Kathryn Hudson: The first of these was, what was the outcome of the inquiry that was set up under Lord Feldman, and was there any inquiry, or was it discontinued?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It never happened.

Kathryn Hudson: It didn't happen.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: [Redacted]

Part of the problem was of course that the Labour party had adopted a position that none of their candidates would be allowed to have outside interests, contrary to the practice for a very, very long period of time. The Conservative party didn't take that view, but the last thing we wanted was for the issue to be a major issue at that moment in time. So I took my own decision before anything else happened that I was going to withdraw as a candidate, and I announced that on the Tuesday morning, and having made that announcement, I let it be known to the powers that be in my party that there was no point in having their internal party inquiry. I wanted a quick—if you'll let me use the language I used with them—I preferred the Parliamentary Commissioner, whom I believed would be entirely objective, to carry out the investigation.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. That is helpful. Does that go some way also to explaining why your first statements were about, "I'm going to fight this."?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, well, I feel that I have been fighting it ever since, but not in the formal sense.

Kathryn Hudson: Absolutely, but not in the same way.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, no. I obviously thought about it very hard. I was very, very angry when it happened, but this is just my feelings, which I am recording, and I think I said that in the interview on the "Today" programme when I was asked about that. I realised that from a reputational point of view this was going to be damaging, whatever the truth in it. The way it was being presented, and I am not going to comment on the merits of it at the moment, but the way it was presented was obviously very damaging, and therefore I attach huge importance to my reputation, and if I could rectify that damage, but I knew that was going to take some time. I quickly came to the conclusion that there were two ways available to me. [Redacted] I took the view that the most sensible thing was the Parliamentary Commissioner.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I was satisfied in my own mind—you will judge whether I was right or wrong—that I had done nothing improper, and that if the transcript became available, it would demonstrate that I was correct in saying that. So I thought, “Well, if I just protest my innocence, that’s what everybody does, whether they are innocent or guilty.” That tends to be the initial reaction and that doesn’t in itself carry conviction unless you have a reputation of being someone who is thought to be normally a straight guy, that helps, but it doesn’t resolve the problem. So I quickly came to the view that the sensible thing was to let the Parliamentary Commissioner carry forward the normal procedures.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. Does that again explain in part why there was some publicity saying that you had referred yourself to me, whereas at that stage you had not done so?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I had indicated my intent to do so. I had intended to do so, but there was an awful lot happening that day.

Kathryn Hudson: I understand that.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I didn’t realise, for which I apologise, that from your point of view, having said that I was going to refer myself, you would have expected to hear that that day.

Kathryn Hudson: Absolutely.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That didn’t really dawn on me. I was thinking, “Well, you know, the inquiry is going to take several months, it’s unlikely that she will mind too much whether she hears today or in a couple of days’ time.” It was on my list of things to do, but I had not actually done it. That’s the background.

Kathryn Hudson: That is really helpful as the background to that. Thank you very much. One other quick query, again because this came up in the news. I wanted to check with you what your salary was while you were in the House of Commons. You received a salary as an MP.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: My salary or my total income?

Kathryn Hudson: It would be your total income from the House.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: From the House.

Kathryn Hudson: I wanted to know whether you were also paid for your chairmanship of the Committee.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, I wasn’t. I was not paid for the Intelligence and Security Committee because, technically speaking, it was not a Committee of the House.

Kathryn Hudson: That is very helpful to know. Thank you.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I was responsible as Chairman for fundamental reforms, because this is in the process of changing. It’s a very topical question.

Originally, the Intelligence and Security Committee was a Committee created by Parliament, by the Government, that consisted of MPs, but was not part of the House of Commons or part of the Houses of Parliament. It was an Act of Parliament that created it. We were appointed by the Prime Minister, and answerable to the Prime Minister, but that raised questions about our independence. Therefore, there were a whole series of reforms in the last Parliament, which I will not bore you with—it's all on the internet. One of the reforms that we recommended, which was accepted, was that they should change its name to the Intelligence and Security Committee of Parliament, and although we didn't recommend that it should become a Select Committee like other Committees, because it has special powers and special roles and so forth, in other respects we recommended that it should be much more parliamentary. One of the recommendations made by the Committee was that the Chairman of it, whoever that was, should receive the same remuneration as Chairs of other Committees. I indicated that if that was to happen, I would not myself wish to accept that for the remainder of this Parliament, because that was not the basis on which I had been chosen. But in any event for a variety of reasons, the change has not yet been implemented, but so far as I understand, it will come into effect from the beginning of this Parliament. When the new Chairman, when the Chair is selected, it is intended that the Committee will be able out of its own funds to remunerate him or her at the same level as the Chair of a parliamentary Committee, but I never received that. The only income that I received from Parliament was my basic salary, and my allowance as a London Member.

Kathryn Hudson: Thank you. That is very helpful.

Okay, moving on from some of those basic bits of information, in the course of some of the interviews you gave, and in the course of the conversations with the reporters, you sometimes talked about being busy—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes.

Kathryn Hudson: And at other times you talked about having a lot of spare time.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Quite.

Kathryn Hudson: Could you talk to me a bit about how you saw the role of being an MP, and how much time your constituency work took up for you?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: The first point is that both are true.

Kathryn Hudson: I understand that, and that's why I wanted to give you the chance to explain it.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Let me say why. What it basically goes back to—it's not just my temperament and ability to be busy—it is that, for the 18 years without a break that I was a Minister, 11 of them as a Cabinet Minister, I worked very, very long hours. Therefore, right up to the age of 51 from the age of 33, 90% of my time was my ministerial work, even more when it was Foreign Secretary or Defence Secretary. My constituents probably got 10% of my time. It happens with all Ministers. How much time does the Prime Minister spend in Witney or the Foreign Secretary in his constituency, and that kind of thing? So it is standard practice,

and therefore, when I ceased being a Minister, I didn't return to the House for eight years, but even when I returned, it was so relaxed in comparison to the lifestyle I had had, and of course I came back as the MP for a central London constituency.

I think I mentioned in my original statement that that was not an accident; it was my wife's health in fact. I didn't have to return to Parliament, and I discussed it with my wife. She knew I was quite keen to, but we concluded that it just would not be practical and it wouldn't be fair to her to choose a constituency which involved weekend travel. [Redacted.] As a London Member, you jump on the tube and you can be in Kensington in two or three stops.

But taking all of that into account, I probably spent, in the time I was MP for Kensington and Chelsea and then Kensington, 70-75%, sometimes 80%, of my time on my parliamentary affairs, responsibilities, and the other 20-25%—I am talking about working time—on my private interests. And it is not just my own view; I have noticed a number of former Cabinet Ministers have said how, compared to the time they were Ministers, the role of a MP – it can be made 100% of time, it is perfectly possible - but that tends to be Members of Parliament whose interests are very much constituency-based. Members of Parliament have their constituency responsibilities; they have their wider parliamentary responsibilities; and many have outside interests, whether remunerated or not.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And it's how you get that balance right.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. And what about the additional Committee you were chairing? How much time did that take up?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That was probably the single most important non-constituency part of my responsibilities. The Committee met once a week on a Thursday morning, but as Chairman, I occasionally would have to [redacted] drop into the offices of the Committee—sometimes for half an hour, sometimes an hour, depending on what the issue was. The nature of the Committee is such, because it is secret material, a lot of the preparatory work has to be done within the Committee's offices.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: So, my interests in Parliament—my interest in politics, right the way back to the time I entered the House of Commons in the 1970s, was mainly in foreign policy and international issues. So the kind of work that I did in the Chamber or in Committees or at Question Time, over the 10 years that I was MP for Kensington, the vast majority of it was either Kensington-orientated or foreign policy, international policy, security, intelligence. All MPs specialise.

Kathryn Hudson: Oh, yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: These were my areas of specialisation. So when you ask me about my parliamentary, the time I spent or the commitment, it covered both the Kensington constituency side and my interests in foreign policy, international policy and, in the last five years, the intelligence responsibility.

Kathryn Hudson: Thank you. That's helpful.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I should mention, because this has been commented on, what flows from the fact that, the kind of place Kensington is—I think I may have said this in the statement—is nothing happens at the weekend in terms of—that is a slight exaggeration, but if I can illustrate what I mean when I say how quiet—Mark Field, the MP for Westminster, says the same in his case—in the whole year I had two actual requirements to be available on a weekend: one was the Remembrance day service, the second was the Kensington and Chelsea borough civic service. Nothing else—

Kathryn Hudson: So constituency meetings would all be week-day evenings or—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Exactly right.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Because a substantial proportion of—South Kensington is a very well lined area. A lot of the people there have places they go to at the weekends. We don't! I can't afford to live Kensington—

Kathryn Hudson: I am sure there are some people in your constituency who perhaps aren't well off.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: In North Kensington.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: A heck of a lot. Most of North Kensington, and even South Kensington, there's a lot of what used to be called genteel poverty.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: People who don't have any wealth at all. But in terms of the sort of formal things that MPs do—attending dinners, chamber of commerce, meetings of that kind—none of that happens in Kensington on Saturdays—

Kathryn Hudson: If you run surgeries, when do you do those?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, because I did my surgeries from my office in the House of Commons—

Kathryn Hudson: Right.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Because what I discovered was, if I did it in South Kensington, the people in North Kensington found it difficult to get there, and vice versa. What I did was, I had a very good, very efficient office. If it was a mainstream request simply for a letter from the MP to send to the local council or to send to the housing department or the Home Office immigration, we got a pretty good—we had as a policy I initiated, and it was implemented very well, everyone got a reply within 48 hours, and you'd get a copy of the letter and all the

usual things. If it required a personal meeting then I would invite them to the House of Commons, and they actually quite enjoyed that because—

Kathryn Hudson: Oh, absolutely.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I was in Portcullis House, and it enabled them to see that.

Kathryn Hudson: Right; thank you. I thought you might just want to comment about the statement you made that you were self-employed—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes; a stupid remark.

Kathryn Hudson: What would you like to say to me about that?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Okay. You will have seen the transcript.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, I have.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: You will have seen the context. It was a silly remark, because it's obviously nonsense, and such obvious nonsense I wasn't deceiving anyone, or trying to deceive anyone. It was just a silly way of putting it. I was at the time in a discussion, because they were interested in my other business interests, and what I was seeking to say to them was, if I remember correctly, that one of things I find satisfactory about my way of life is, because it's not a sort of 9-to-5 job, if I am not required for a particular hour to be doing anything, I can go for a walk, I can have a coffee, I can whatever. And that's true for an MP as well, incidentally; it is not just because of private sector interests, but that's what I was talking about at that time. Talking about life, I said, either as consultant or as a non-executive director, I get remuneration, but I don't receive a salary. That's my version, but it was a silly way of putting it. I am not even going to try and defend it at all—

Kathryn Hudson: And, presumably, it comes within the context of the remark you made about having made some silly mistakes, which you made publicly at that time.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, yes. Oh, no, I think I said I made some errors of judgment. I am sure I made—

Kathryn Hudson: Errors of judgment, I think, was your term.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That was the phrase I used.

Kathryn Hudson: Okay. Thank you. And just while we are looking at interest, you have asked for the names of some of the companies you mentioned in the evidence to be redacted.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes. It's really for their benefit, rather than for mine.

Kathryn Hudson: I wasn't sure why this was. Presumably, they were companies you were working with at the time you were not in the House—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, they're both.

Kathryn Hudson: Because all the rest go in the Register of Interests—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: They're actually both, because some of them related to—because I was out of the House for eight years.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes

[redacted]

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: If it's simply mentioning a company. PricewaterhouseCoopers was the other one, because PricewaterhouseCoopers, again, I wasn't in the House, and as part of their programme of trying to get work in Eastern Europe—all these countries like Poland and the Czech Republic—they'd got rid of Communism; they wanted to privatise, but they were rather worried about the political controversy when you privatise a company. It's the sensible thing to do, but in the short term, it can be controversial. So PricewaterhouseCoopers, I remember, they felt it would be helpful—as a Minister, I've been involved in some of the privatisations in Britain, so they thought it would be helpful to have me as a part of their team in Warsaw or wherever it was, explaining how you handle the political side of these matters, but I wasn't in the House of Commons at that time. [Redacted]

Kathryn Hudson: Okay. Moving on then to the interviews you did with them and to the setting up of them, and I notice in the setting up of the appointments your secretary was involved.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Only because—we took a decision right at the beginning if you had more than one person in charge of your diary, it is a shambles.

Kathryn Hudson: Right.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It does not work.

Kathryn Hudson: So she was paid for by IPSA.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Oh, yes. Her job was to make sure that anything I did would not interfere with a parliamentary commitment. That was her responsibility.

Kathryn Hudson: Right.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: So I would say, if there was something—well, it also applied to my private life. Any private— if I was invited to have dinner with some friends, or something of that kind, you can only have that kind of situation working if one person is responsible for the diary. If that doesn't work— it was actually very infrequent, but nevertheless it made sense to do that.

Kathryn Hudson: So where things needed to go into your diary, she would be responsible for making sure they didn't conflict with other things.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That's exactly right.

Kathryn Hudson: Even though they would have been your private interests that were going into the diary at that time.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, it had to be in the diary, otherwise—

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, of course.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It had to be in the diary. She knew that if there was any question of them overlapping, then the parliamentary commitment had to be the priority. That was just standard practice.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. Was she undertaking any other responsibilities?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: None at all, no.

Kathryn Hudson: So how did you manage your other private business interests? Did you have other support for that elsewhere?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: When you say my other interests, in what sense do you mean?

Kathryn Hudson: Well, you have a number of commitments outside Parliament. Did you have administrative support to help you with those?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, I tend to do it via email. It's what I'm doing at the moment. I do 95% of it myself.

Kathryn Hudson: Okay. So the staff you had working for you in Parliament and in your constituency, particularly the ones paid for by IPSA, their only commitment was making sure the diary was up to date.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, they did the constituency; they did my parliamentary responsibilities, and the only area of potential overlap—

Kathryn Hudson: Is the one I've identified.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Is to keep the diary, correct.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. Okay, thank you. The next thing is, I wondered why you had decided to follow up this particular offer when the email came in, given what you said to me about wanting things that were in London.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, yes. Well, they said first of all that they wanted an advisory council based in London. This is a good opportunity to mention something else as well, actually. [Redacted I have had various offers over the last few years—not unusual, given the seniority of the posts I had in Government—and several of them I have declined because they were too time-consuming or have involved too much travel or matters of that kind.

This email arrived from people claiming to be a Hong Kong-based company. I looked at it and it said they were interested. First of all, it was an advisory council, which, by its nature, involves much less time commitment than a non-executive director of a company. The subject matter seemed entirely harmless and consistent—financial, regulatory and political risk issues throughout Europe, giving them advice on that. Based in London. Might have occasional travel. You will see from the transcript that I made it clear that if they did ever want

me to visit Hong Kong, it would have to be in recess time, and that parliamentary commitments would also have to be a priority. Even then, that didn't mean I was necessarily going to do it, but what they were asking was, "Can we meet you in London and discuss?" "Yes, by all means." And it was against that basis that the meeting took place.

Now, I said that there was something else that I wanted to raise, and this is the time, perhaps, to raise it. You may have noticed in the transcript that I actually gave them—I say that on a couple of occasions, I had preliminary discussions. At this stage in my life, I am interested in doing work outside Parliament which is—Yes, of course, I benefit from the remuneration - but it has to be stimulating and it has to be something that I feel comfortable with. I say in the transcript, I notice, that it happened on two occasions just in the last year when certain proposals were put to me which I had a certain interest to take, but eventually concluded they weren't suitable. Although they would have been remunerated, I declined them. I thought you might just want—I'm afraid I have made photocopies to explain what I mean. It is relevant to some of the wider issues we are interested in.

One of them was a company called [Redacted]. I was approached and asked whether I would meet the chairman with a view to being a non-executive director. This was in early 2014. And I met him, and had the same sort of general discussion that we are discussing today. I think in fact that I had two meetings with them. It sounded quite interesting, and so forth, and he said—well, I got a message saying they would like me to be a non-executive director, for which they were going to pay me non-executive fees. But, of course, by that stage, this wasn't a preliminary discussion; this was the time you do due diligence, and I had been doing some due diligence. I discovered that not only was the chairman a British—he formed the company. He was a billionaire. You will know who—the name is here. I discovered that he—I know nothing about him that suggests he was dishonest or anything of that kind, but he was a very dominant personality.

When I pressed them, it turned out that there were going to be just two board meetings a year in a very nice watering hole somewhere in the Mediterranean, with about 45 minutes for the board meeting, and the rest of the time we would be enjoying ourselves. And I just thought about this and I said, "No, I'm not going to get involved in this", because if you're a non-executive director, you have legal responsibility. You should be—I have been on companies, and you have six to 12 board meetings a year. You have to acquaint yourself with—you know, is this a properly run company? I had no reason to think he was dishonest, but what I judged—and I still believe—was that it was his company, he had to go through the form of a board and he was doing just that.

I didn't want to have a row with him, so I wrote to him to say, "I've thought about it. Sorry, I can't do it." He came back saying, "But you gave the impression." So I said, "And you want to know?" This is a copy of the letter I then sent saying about my understanding of corporate governance. I said, "What you're really requesting is more of an advisory council than a proper board. Thank you very much, but I don't want to be involved."

The other example, [Redacted]. I withdrew from it.

Now, I think this is relevant—I hope you agree—because the procedure was exactly the same as the early stages of what we are discussing today. I received an initial approach, it sounded potentially interesting, I agreed to have discussions. I had, in this case, two meetings with these people and several correspondence with each one. And then when it became a potential formal proposal - that was the stage at which I said, “Right,”—because there’s no point going through all the due diligence when you’re only having a preliminary discussion and it may not be something you’re interested in anyway. So once it sounded sufficiently potentially interesting, that’s when I did the due diligence. In both cases—it so happens that both were last year; it’s happened before on other occasions, but these are the most recent examples—I declined and withdrew. I can never prove this, but all I can say is: if this had not been a sting—if it had not been bogus—and they had put a proposal to me, that is the kind of procedure I would then have gone through before coming to a final decision as to whether I wished to be involved with them, because that is the normal procedure that I’d have done.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. There are a couple of issues here. The first is the question of due diligence. It is not against the rules of the House for you not to have done the due diligence when you first see a company to consider whether you are going to work outside the House. So as far as I am concerned, there is no breach of the rule. I know there is an allegation from them that you didn’t do due diligence. Well, you just said that there isn’t a rule that you have to do due diligence.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I didn’t think there was. [Redacted]

Kathryn Hudson: We may need a further discussion at some time about what I put in evidence and what I don’t. But in the meantime, that is helpful, just as some supporting evidence on the way in which you work.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It seems to me that when you get an initial approach, doing proper investigation takes time and takes effort. Why bother when all they’re asking for is a private conversation and then at the end of that, you may say, as has occasionally happened, “This is not for me—not interested”?

Kathryn Hudson: Yes. Do we see those interviews, though, as the beginnings of a job recruitment process?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Not—well, it may be from their perspective. No. Somebody asked me—suggested that I got involved in the negotiation. I didn’t get involved in negotiation. We never reached that stage.

Kathryn Hudson: There is some discussion about how much you might be asking for, which begins to look like a negotiation, in the second interview, since we’ve now got to that point.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, it shouldn’t, because if you recall, the way that Channel 4 presented it was: he was asked what he was worth and he said £5,000 or something of that kind. Now, you will see in the transcript—I can give you the actual page references in the notes I sent you—that on several occasions, I am being asked, “What is your rate?” and I say, “I don’t have a rate. It depends on complexity. It depends on whether it involves travel. It

depends on the size—whether it's a great international company or some smaller business." I said several times, because I didn't have one.

I said, "You keep asking me"—I'm not sure if I used these exact words. "I can't give you a figure because I don't yet know what you would be expecting me to do." Then eventually, when she says, "Well, I want to be able to report something," I say, "Well, if it's of any help—it's in the Register. There was an occasion when J.P. Morgan or something like that—I can't remember who—paid me £5,000 for a series of presentations I did. But that wasn't—" I said then, and I can even look it up here if you want me to, "Look, don't take that as an actual figure. That is simply—I'm giving you an illustration."

Kathryn Hudson: That part of the discussion, I think, starts with her saying, "We're thinking in the region of £60,000 to £80,000 per year. Would that be the right sort of ball-park figure?" And you reply, "Yes, it doesn't jolt," I think.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: To be honest, it was more than I thought it would be.

Kathryn Hudson: But at a later stage, I think in the next interview, you actually say, "Well, I wouldn't mind if it were more."

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That was a joke. That was a bit of humour. I can't prove it, obviously.

Kathryn Hudson: And at that stage, you go on to talk about the amount of preparation that might be needed—quite reasonably—and the number of days, and that begins to look like a negotiation.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, it wasn't a negotiation because we hadn't yet—

Kathryn Hudson: No, you hadn't got to that stage.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: —come to a view as to whether we were going to do it in the first place. As you will recall, I didn't at any stage in these discussions, nor would it have been timely for me to do so, say, "Yes, if you do X, Y and Z." There were no conditions.

Kathryn Hudson: No, there is no commitment. I agree with you absolutely.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Not only no commitment; there were no conditions on which a commitment would be determined, in terms of cash and remuneration.

Kathryn Hudson: No, absolutely; I agree with you. You hadn't got to that point. But there is, in particular in that second discussion, a suggestion that you might be trying to push the figure up. I suspect that is why people are saying that you have negotiated.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I don't think people are saying that, because nobody else—that's in the transcript. Nobody else has seen that.

Kathryn Hudson: Right. You might like to look at that again.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, let me look at that now, because I have it here.

Kathryn Hudson: I have too, actually. I'm taking my things out of order, but never mind. Always the same—all these bits of paper. There are two references to it: one in the first interview and one in the second. I have one of them.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Here we go—top of page 18.

Kathryn Hudson: Is that in the first interview?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That's in the second interview. You said it was the second one you were interested in.

Kathryn Hudson: It comes up in both, but you're right; there is a general discussion in the first and you return to it in the second.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: On page 18 of the second interview, she says at the top, "Have you given some thought to that in terms of the sum?" And I say, "No, I haven't—not in the sense of coming to an actual figure. If you want me to, I can try to do that, but I think I said last time it would depend on whether it was something which one did in London or whether it involved travel, how much time it would take and so forth, how much preparatory work it would be—so I would expect some sort of flexibility," and I gave them objective criteria.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, that's right. I've got that bit.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And then I said, "But if, in addition, there were particular requests,"—I simply say as an illustration, because she pressed me on a figure, what I have done over the last two or three years, mainly for City of London investment companies, and these were the sums that were involved.

Kathryn Hudson: That then goes on for a couple more pages around the amount. I'm not saying you come to any conclusion or that you are specific—only that you could read that as the beginning of some negotiation.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, only because she kept going on about it, and I think she had a motive for doing so.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, maybe.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I thought I'd made myself clear.

Kathryn Hudson: Okay, well that's fine. There is some discussion of the amount of money—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I remember that I was getting mildly irritated because I had said to them several times, "I don't have a figure. You've got to tell me what it is you would be wanting me to do, and I would then take a judgment based on the time it would take, the travel that might be involved, the complexity of the issue and what might be fair."

Kathryn Hudson: And those are some of the things that can matter in terms of the number of days.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, but it was not even the beginning of a negotiation, because it was not—we hadn't even come to a view as to whether there was going to be such a day.

Kathryn Hudson: You hadn't got there, and that's another interesting thing for me about what the nature of this meeting was and whether in fact it is a preliminary interview for the job or whether you regarded it as a business meeting. What sort of meeting did you think you were holding?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I found it—well, it was extremely similar to a number of occasions of the same kind over the last 20 years. I have had interests in the private sector since I first left Government in 1997, and that's how it always begins. For example, when I was asked, when I was out of Parliament, whether I would be willing to join the board of Aberdeen Asset Management. The chief executive, whom I didn't know, rang me up and said, "Can I come and see you?" He came to my home and we had an informal conversation, which was similar in many ways to the kind of conversation there. I said, "Well, that's interesting. Let me think about it and let me have some more information." I cannot think of a similar one that was any—for example, when I ended up on the board of Unilever, a member of the board rang me up and said, "Your name has been mentioned as a possible candidate for the board. Can we come and see you?"

Kathryn Hudson: So it is the beginning of an exploration—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, on both sides.

Kathryn Hudson: As to whether there might be a fit on both sides—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: On both sides.

Kathryn Hudson: Between you and the organisation.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, and I can give you a number of examples over the years of whether one has—either I have decided or they have decided that it does not look likely to be simple.

Kathryn Hudson: Absolutely. It may or may not progress.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: But it is not a negotiation—it is exploratory—at that stage, on both sides.

Kathryn Hudson: It is, absolutely, and there is no commitment at the end of this.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Certainly not, no.

Kathryn Hudson: Do you regard it, though, as a business meeting?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It depends what you mean by—we are not doing business in the sense of trying to—we are not two businessmen trying to make a contract or reach an agreement. We are not even interested in whether we want an agreement. From my perspective, at that stage, I do not even know whether I want to have a relationship with them at all at that stage, so I do not see it as a business meeting, but it obviously is a meeting which, if it leads to other things, will end up in a business relationship.

Kathryn Hudson: Right, because what you get from that is—there is an occasion in the interviews when you say, “Well, let’s hold the next meeting in my parliamentary office and I will show you round.”

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Sure, but—

Kathryn Hudson: And, as you know, that could bring you into—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I know exactly.

Kathryn Hudson: A position where you have used the office for—you did not do it, and let us be clear about that.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I did not do it, but it is not just that. I think, I remember how that first came up, and I think—let me just—I know it was in the first meeting.

Kathryn Hudson: That is right.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And she said—

Kathryn Hudson: I have got page 27.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Then you are probably—

Kathryn Hudson: I think your page numbers are different from mine. That is why we had a bit of confusion with finding the previous bit.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Now let us—here we are. It is my page 19.

Kathryn Hudson: Right, it is my 27, but it is the bit—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It is where she says, “*Because one of the interests on a personal business level, a lot of people in China, including my uncle, are very impressed with the Parliament, the knighthood, the lordship, and, you know, it is the whole history and everything.*” Yes, well, if I had known this, we could have had this meeting in my office in Parliament, laughter.” That happens to me all the time, and it happens to every MP all the time. We are all very proud of the building. We love showing people round, and whenever anybody over the last 33 years has said to me, “I have never been to Parliament,” or “I’d love to see Parliament,” I say, “Look, come. We can meet in my office and I will show you round.”

Kathryn Hudson: Right, but it is then—it continues from there, and it is picked up again later in the interview when the uncle comes over.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That is right, because she had told me he is crazy about Parliament, he has never been there, and I did what I do with my constituents—I did what I do—particularly people from overseas.

Kathryn Hudson: Without wanting to make too much of an issue of this, there is a point I think early on when you say no, you did not offer to hold a meeting in your office, and I wondered whether, in the light of having read this, you accept that you did at least offer.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, I agreed to meet them in my office.

Kathryn Hudson: In your office.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I certainly—I do not for a moment deny—it would be incorrect to imply that this did not happen. Of course I said it, but that was—she had said her—I was doing what I would do with anyone. If people tell me that they have never been to Parliament and they would love to see around it, that is what one does. I think every MP does that.

Kathryn Hudson: I do not deny that she encouraged you.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: She encouraged me, but I was happy to be encouraged.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I mean, I would do it tomorrow. I would do it tomorrow.

Kathryn Hudson: If her uncle was coming over, the chances are it was going to be more of a business meeting, because there would be further questions.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It is possible, yes, but the prime reason for saying, “We can do it at my place rather than yours,” is to give me an opportunity to show them round Parliament.

Kathryn Hudson: I understand that. Nevertheless—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: But I take your point. I did not understand there was any formal bar on allowing somebody in your office, even if—

Kathryn Hudson: It is about using your office for purposes that are not parliamentary purposes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Sure, but you can still surely have a cup of coffee with someone who—for example, if you have a business interest and somebody is passing through London, and they come and have a cup of coffee with you, that cannot be a breach, can it?

Kathryn Hudson: I do not think it necessarily is, but if you are using your office for business purposes as opposed to parliamentary purposes—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I certainly did not think of myself as doing that. What I thought of myself doing was allowing—inviting—someone who had, I was told, had—

Kathryn Hudson: Was interested to come and have a look round.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Loved the British Parliament, but had never seen it. I thought, well, you know, the sensible thing is to meet in my office and go and—I would never have a business meeting in the sense of sitting round a table to discuss private business matters.

Kathryn Hudson: Right, but if the uncle had come—let us bear in mind he did not come and you did not have this meeting. If he had come, then he would have been asking more questions designed to sort out whether there was a good fit—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: If he had come, yes, he would have come to my office and we would have had a chat and I would have said, “Look”—

Kathryn Hudson: And you would have said—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: “You wanted to see the House of Commons. This is why you’re here. Let me show you around.”

Kathryn Hudson: Yes. Okay.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I mean, that was the primary purpose why it was suggested. They did not suggest it themselves.

Kathryn Hudson: No.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And it never happened, as you rightly say.

Kathryn Hudson: And in the event it did not happen.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And so forth.

Kathryn Hudson: Okay, thank you. Let me just check. I am jumping about a bit—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, no—partly my fault.

Kathryn Hudson: —on my list of questions as it is relevant. Yes, I wonder what you thought was your understanding of an advisory board. What did you think you would be doing on this board?

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, I mean, I have experience of them.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, I know.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I am on one at the moment. I am on LEK’s advisory council. It is a very—it has become in the last 20, 30 years a very normal part of many companies’ activities that they like to have a group of people with experience, who will not need to take on the legal responsibilities of a non-executive director, or, in the case of LEK, there is not a board—it is a partnership—and you meet several times a year, and they are wanting to essentially get someone else’s perspective on what their interest is—

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: —in what they are doing and utilise your experience.

Kathryn Hudson: Right.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And it is—there are a number of MPs who currently are on advisory councils, and I have obviously been interested in having a look at that to see if this was unusual, and Peter Hain, for example, in the last Parliament, was on the advisory council of a company concerned with investment in Africa and was remunerated for that, and it was in the register and all that sort of thing.

Kathryn Hudson: Right, so you see the role as one of being able to look at what the company is doing to be able to give them advice from your experience—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes.

Kathryn Hudson: Particularly your political experience.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I judged it against their original email.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And, of course, as you will have seen, pretty well the whole of the first meeting was consistent with their original email.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That all we discussed was financial, regulatory, political risk issues throughout Europe, and they hardly departed from that in that first meeting, so, at the end of that meeting, you know, I had no reason to think that this was anything different to what was originally being presented and was the basis of the meeting in the first place.

Kathryn Hudson: One of the things that comes across in the second interview is how much time you spend talking about your contacts and the ambassadors that you know.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, shall I comment on the ambassadors point?

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Because the ambassadors issue came up twice: once in the first discussion and once in the second discussion. In the first discussion, it was actually—well, let us just make sure we get it right, because it was to do with my visit to Kyrgyzstan when I was not an MP, and—

Kathryn Hudson: I have not got that particular page marked.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I will find it. Here we are—I have got it. It is page 27 of my paper.

Kathryn Hudson: Right, then it is likely to be a few pages further on for mine.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: They were interested in energy companies. I had mentioned that I had, when I was out of the House, been a consultant of Petrofac, and they were interested in knowing how I had helped Petrofac, and I said how I had gone to Kyrgyzstan and we helped them and that was about 10 years ago, and then the lady said, “But that is the kind of thing that is incredibly useful. If you know those people, actually having a quick cup of tea, coffee or a gin and tonic”—and I said yes, giving it as an example, yes, you can. I see ambassadors, for example, because of the people I have mixed with for many, many years, so that was the first time on there.

Then the second time was a much more specific point. I do not need to go, unless you wish me to, to the second transcript, but that was about—they raised the question that if they were thinking of investing in a foreign country somewhere, I would explain to them how some

countries have differential views on risk and on whether they welcome foreign investment, and they said, “Well, how would we know whether a country wanted to—would want investment by people like ourselves? Should we—how would we take that forward? Could you help us with that?” So I said, “Well, you have said that the advisory council is going to be based in London. The sensible thing, because I do not think this is going to be a problem, I said—most countries are only too delighted to have foreign investment, and are unlikely to be hostile to it, but if you wanted to check in advance, if you are based in London, the sensible thing is to speak to the local embassy, to speak to the ambassador. And they said, “Could you help?” I said, “Yes, I know a lot of the ambassadors, yes. I could bring you together.” And it was agreed that the purpose of that meeting wouldn’t be to take decisions or to negotiate or anything of that kind. The purpose of that meeting was simply to hear from the ambassador whether his country would be likely to welcome foreign investment. In fact, we specifically said this wouldn’t be a meeting to take a decision, but simply to hear that. I cannot think of anything more innocuous. I really can’t. And I’ve thought hard about that.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Anything, even indirectly. I mean, first of all, it’s got absolutely nothing to do with the House of Commons or a Member of Parliament or anything of that kind.

Kathryn Hudson: No.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It is a foreign company and a foreign investor—

Kathryn Hudson: Except that it uses relationships that you have built—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes.

Kathryn Hudson: Presumably while you were a Foreign Minister.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: But what do you think Gordon Brown’s been doing for the last five years in the House of Commons?

Kathryn Hudson: Well, we’re not talking about Gordon Brown.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, no, no, but it’s important.

Kathryn Hudson: But I think that this is one of the things that makes people outside the House very angry.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, you’ve got to be careful. Yes, you’ve got to work within the code, absolutely right, and I agree with that very, very strongly. But there is hardly a single former Minister who has interests while he or she still remains in the House of Commons who has not been asked to help either an advisory council or a board—

Kathryn Hudson: I am sure that’s true.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: —or in some other way because of their experience.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I mean, for example, again, I've obviously been just bringing myself up to date, to see if I was in some way unusual in this respect. David Blunkett is involved with internet security when he was in the House of Commons in the last—you know, that is obviously because he was a former Home Secretary and they were interested in that. Nicholas Soames is chairman of a defence company and he was Minister of the Armed Forces when I was Defence Secretary. Gordon Brown gets paid by the World Economic Forum because of work he does, and I think they wouldn't have approached him if he hadn't been—you know, so this is standard.

Now, if the House didn't want that, it would prevent it happening. What the House rightly says is, first of all, if you have been a Minister, you shouldn't accept that kind of responsibility for a period immediately after you've been a Minister when you are likely to have access to information which would be inappropriate, you know, in a—

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: As I have not been a Minister since 1997, obviously 18 years is a pretty long gap, so that issue doesn't arise. But I don't think there's a single Minister in the House of Commons for the last 20 years who has had business interests that hadn't to a significant degree arisen because of his past experience.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And that's never been considered controversial. I mean, some people think it shouldn't happen, but it's never—indeed, that's—

Kathryn Hudson: And this is one of the issues—isn't it?—that some people think that is not a reasonable thing to do. I agree with you absolutely that it's not against the rules—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Basically what—I know it's not. You are quite right to put the question—I am not resenting the question at all. But when one thinks about it, that is basically the thrust of the Channel 4 programme.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That's basically what they were really objecting to. It was not because I was an MP—not the experience I got as an MP. It was the fact that, as a former Minister—although in my case 18 years before—I had an experience and I knew people and had various contacts that might be relevant.

Kathryn Hudson: And the suggestion that you knew all the ambassadors there were in London.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, not them all.

Kathryn Hudson: It comes across that way. So there might be a slight exaggeration there, perhaps.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: It was a private conversation, which, you know, wasn't formal evidence.

Kathryn Hudson: Right, but that's helpful to know. Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes. No, I think there is a legitimate issue as to whether the public—whether the country—wants former Ministers, if they want to have business interests, to remain in Parliament.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: You know, they can take that view. They can say, “Do you want to have business interests? Sorry, you can't do that as an MP.” I think Parliament would be the poorer for it, because Parliament often benefits from people who have been Ministers remaining in Parliament.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: But if you say, “Well, you can do that, but you can't have business interests,” then many will take the view, “Well, that's not really going to be practical.”

Kathryn Hudson: I know the fact—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: But that's a matter of public policy.

Kathryn Hudson: The organisations that approach you may indeed be approaching you because they think that you have those contacts which might be of benefit to them.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Well, in my own case, one of the—I gave you in one of the notes, what I—when you kindly sent me the transcript of the actual programme, I gave you what I described as the five worst examples of where they posed a question in the programme—

Kathryn Hudson: Yes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: —and then the answers that I was deemed to have given were actually given in a totally different context.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, that's right. It was a mismatch.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes. And the worst example of that was when they posed in the programme the question when Sir Malcolm was asked what was the added value he could give. Then they quoted me as saying, “I can give you access to ambassadors.” Now, that was wicked, because the transcript makes it utterly clear that I was asked on two occasions that question. The first time I said, “Well, it's my experience, as having been in the private sector as well as having had business experience”—I never mentioned ambassadors. And on the second occasion it was almost exactly the same: it was me saying, “Well, it is because I have 20 years of experience in the private sector. I have been on about a dozen different companies over that period of time, half of the time not even in Parliament during that period, and combined with my experience in government, that seems to apply.” Now, on neither occasion did I mention ambassadors. And yet these rotten so-and-sos—I mean, that was dishonest; that was plain dishonest.

Kathryn Hudson: And it's the reason why I ask for the transcripts and don't rely on television programmes.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes, absolutely. You know, I was really shocked by that, because you can say, "Well, the question was never put, but this is the inference we draw from the—." In these cases, the question had been put. They got answers, and they used different answers, quite deliberately. And that couldn't have been incompetence; that was malice aforethought. Sorry—you can see I feel slightly strongly about that.

Kathryn Hudson: I understand that. Just let me check where we're going. Oh yes, one of the things that you have said is that you didn't say you would write to a Minister without saying on behalf of whom the inquiry was made. And in fact—

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, I did say that. Sorry—

Kathryn Hudson: Right, you did say that. I just wanted to check it, because I don't want there to be any doubt between us on those areas.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Yes. Can I comment on that point, please?

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, do.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: Because this is obviously relevant as well. I think the starting point is that this bit of the discussion—the first point—it only came up towards the end of the second meeting. And up until then I had not been given any reason to assume that kind of questioning would be raised and these kind of issues would be raised. And I say that because I hadn't, as it were, prepared answers in my own mind to those kind of questions that they put. So what we were having was a spontaneous discussion and what is obviously crucial was—the particular bit you are asking about—it is already clear from the transcript, and I don't think it is in dispute, that I'd said, "Look, you can't get access to any information that's not already in the public domain."

Kathryn Hudson: That's very clear.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That is very, very clear. And therefore that particular bit of the discussion was essentially about, how do you find out what is in the public domain—how do you even find that? And she says, "You can google," which obviously means it's in the public domain, and I say, "Yes, and I could write to a Minister." And I can only tell you what I had in my mind, because this was all off-the-cuff comments I was making at the time. And I was—I knew we were discussing only matters that were already in the public domain; it was how they could find out, because it's all very well saying it's in the public domain, but you can't be sure just by going on Google.

Kathryn Hudson: No.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: There might be things in the public domain that Google don't report. You know, it might be in a ministerial statement; it might be in a document that's been published. So I thought, "Well, as this is only information that's already in the public domain we're talking about then there can't be any harm in asking a Minister or asking a Government

Department directly what”—and, incidentally, this wasn’t even an actual project or a policy; this was a proposal. This is HS3, not HS2.

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, HS3, that’s right.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: And you’ll notice from the transcript I say to them, “Look, this doesn’t exist. There isn’t an HS3 at the moment. All there is a debate about whether there should be one, so there may have been some work done in a Government Department.” For the next two or three pages of that transcript, you will see that most of it is my telling them, “Look, don’t expect much out of this. Ministers can’t tell you all these sort of things, either because they don’t know themselves, or it is just internal.”

I tried to give them a bit of a teach-in as to how policy evolves in a Department, because I have been in four Departments over the years. I said that what happens is that either the Government, or the Minister or the civil servants think of some new initiative, and that starts off as just being discussed within the Department. It is not because it is secret; it is simply because you don’t want it broadcast because people will assume that it has become a policy, and it’s not even got that status at the moment. You would open up a whole lot of unnecessary anxieties, when it might never actually materialise. At least two or three pages of the transcript are consistently about that.

Against that background, I said that you can google it—you can write to a Government Department, or I could write to a Minister. I had not looked at the code for some time, because I didn’t think that I was going to be needing to for the purpose of that particular discussion, so I wasn’t trying to remember word for word what the code said. But I knew that if you are an MP and you write to a Minister, if it is not on behalf of your constituency or on behalf of yourself for some outside interest, you should refer to that. That is why I think I say, if I’m not mistaken, “I wouldn’t need to mention your name, but I would say that I have been asked to write to ask for your current thinking on X, Y, Z.” In my mind at the time, so far as I can recollect, because I forgot about it almost after I had said it—not after I said it, but this was all months and months ago—I didn’t think that was controversial or anything of that kind. Now, it may be that I got that incorrect. It may be. That is for you to judge, and to inform me in due course, whether even in that situation I should have mentioned them by name rather than just said, “I have been asked to inquire.”

What I would say is that it was an off-the-cuff remark. It wasn’t thought through and what is crucial, no such letter was written, nor was I asked to write one. And if, subsequently, I had become a member of their advisory council, and had been contemplating writing to a Minister— look, I have been in the House of Commons for 33 years, I have been Chairman of the Standards and Privileges Committee—

Kathryn Hudson: Yes, I know.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: The first thing I would have done would have been to check what we declare and what is appropriate in these circumstances.

Kathryn Hudson: That is fine. Thank you. We are nearly there.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: That's okay.

Kathryn Hudson: The very final question: is there anything that I have not given you a chance to say this afternoon that you would like to have on record at this point? This isn't the final time of asking—there are some more stages—but if there is anything, by all means, say it now.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: No, I don't think so. If there is, I can always let you know, but I can't think of anything.

Kathryn Hudson: If you do go away and think, "Oh, I wish I had said that," then do put it in writing to me, or come back and have another chat if you want to.

Sir Malcolm Rifkind: I am sorry if I have sounded angry at times today.

Kathryn Hudson: Not at all.

26. Letter from the Commissioner to Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC, 1 July 2015

When we met on 15 June, I said that I would send you a transcript of our meeting for you to check for accuracy. This is enclosed. As you will see, I have not made any redactions at this stage; I thought it would be easier for you to check if I sent you the text in full. I will make any necessary redactions when I send you a copy of the final draft report to the Committee. There are a couple of points early in the interview where you indicate that the information you are about to give is particularly sensitive or personal. It would be helpful to have your thoughts on how much of that you would consider discloseable, so that I may take that into account when I make my redactions.

I also enclose a copy of my recent correspondence with the Registrar, [redacted].

I explained when we met that I need the permission of the Committee on Standards to complete my investigation now that you are no longer a Member of the House. I hope to be able to seek their permission before summer recess but, as yet, the Committee has not been formed and we have no date for a first meeting. I will let you know as soon as I have any news on that point.

In the meantime, I would be grateful if you would check the transcript. If you would like to listen to the recording, please let me know and we can make the necessary arrangements. It would be helpful to have your comments on both the transcript and the enclosures as soon as possible and no later than 17 July 2015.

27. Email from Sir Malcolm Rifkind QC to the Commissioner, 4 July 2015

Thank you for your letter of 1st July and the attached transcript.

I am very sorry that you were sent, in error, an e-mail with the first few paragraphs of this reply!

I am happy with the accuracy of the transcript except for two small errors.

On page 10, final paragraph, I referred to an "advisory" council not a "private" council.

On page 30, middle of the page, I did not say "obviously taunting" . I said "obviously tempting".

As regards the reply from [redacted], the Registrar of Members Interests, I confirm that my work for PWC and Petrofac was between 1997 and 2005 when I was not an MP.

There is a confusion as regards JP Morgan. I did register a sum of £4,000 that I received from JP Morgan Cazenove, on 3rd March 2015 for a speech I did on their behalf on 13th November 2014. It must have been this that I had in mind when I referred to "JP Morgan and for a number of other City of London...." in the original transcript.

[Redacted]

I was concerned to hear that the Standards Committee has not yet been formed. I very much hope that this will not delay the timetable that you were expecting to follow.

28. Sir Malcom's entry in the Register of Members' Financial Interests as at 23 February 2015

RIFKIND, Rt Hon Sir Malcolm (Kensington)

1. Remunerated directorships

Adam Smith International (including Amphion Group Ltd and Adam Smith Services Ltd) (non-executive), 3 Albert Embankment, London; consultancy and project implementation overseas. Monthly board meeting in central London lasting 2 hours approximately. Occasional e-mail exchanges between meetings. (Updated 11 June 2014)

Monthly ongoing payment of £2,916.66 gross. (Registered 8 September 2009)

1 June 2014, additional payment of £5,512.50 in non-executive fees, in recognition of success of the company during the past year. (Registered 5 June 2014)

Unilever plc (non-executive), 100 Victoria Embankment London. Approximately eight board meetings a year each lasting a morning and afternoon with a dinner the previous evening. Most meetings in London, two or three in The Netherlands and one elsewhere. Also member of Board Committee, three hours the day before each board meeting. Attendance may be by video conference.

Monthly ongoing payment of £7,166 gross from May 2013. (Updated 24 July 2013)

Alliance Medical Group (non-executive), Princes House, 38 Jermyn Street, London SW1Y 6DN. Approximately 10 board meetings a year, mainly in London, each lasting around 2-3 hours. Occasional ad hoc meeting.

Monthly ongoing payment of £5,000 gross, from January 2014. (Registered 10 April 2014)

2. Remunerated employment, office, profession etc

Since 1 July 2012, Chairman of LEK Advisory Board. Consulting LLP, 40 Grosvenor Place, London. Advisory Board meeting 4 times a year. Each meeting 4 hours approximately. Occasional advice by e-mail. Occasional speeches and chairing of meetings. (Updated 24 July 2013)

Quarterly payment of £12,500 gross; 4 hours approximately.

Senior Counsellor, Dragoman, Collins Street, Melbourne, Australia, specialist advisory firm. No regular meetings, communication by email and occasional meetings in London as might be required. Retainer of Australian \$12,500 paid every three months.

Received fee of £5,000 from United Jewish Israel Appeal, 37 Kentish Town Road, London NW1 8NX for speech at event on 6 May 2014 at Savoy Hotel, London. Hours 1 hr. (Registered 5 June 2014).

28 November 2014, received fee of £1,000 from University of Buckingham, Hunter Street, MK18 1EG for speech to NA Diplomacy and Global Affairs

Students at Duke's Hotel, London on 22 October 2014. Hours: 2 hrs. (Registered 19 December 2014)

Payments from London Evening Standard, 2 Derry Street, London W8 5TT:

£500 received for article published 16 June 2014. Hours: 1.5 hrs. (Registered 19 December 2014)

£500 received for article published 12 August 2014. Hours: 1.5 hrs. (Registered 19 December 2014)

Payments from The Telegraph, 111 Buckingham Palace Road, London SW1W 0DT:

6 July 2014, £500 received for article. Hours: 1 hr. (Registered 19 December 2014)

1 September 2014, £350 received for article. Hours: 1 hr. (Registered 19 December 2014)

30 September 2014, £250 received for article. Hours: 1 hr. (Registered 19 December 2014)

Payment of £250 received from the Daily Mail, 2 Derry Street, London W8 5TT for article published on 2 June 2014. Hours: 1.5 hrs. (Registered 19 December 2014)

Payment of £462.20 received from Time Magazine, PO Box 20500, 1001 NM Amsterdam, The Netherlands for article published 3 September 2014. Hours: 2 hrs. (Registered 19 December 2014)

Payment of £285 from The Guardian. Kings Place, 90 York Way, London N1 9GU for article published on 5 March 2014. Hours: 1.5 hrs. (Registered 24 December 2014)

6. Overseas visits

Name of donor: (1) MSC (2) Global Zero Operations

Address of donor: (1) Prinzregentenstraße 7, D-80538 Munich (2) 1779 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 615, Washington DC 20036

Amount of donation (or estimate of the probable value): (1) Return flights to Munich, value flights £676 (2) hotel 3 nights approx £1,000

Destination of visit: Munich Security Conference

Date of visit: 30 January - 2 February 2014

Purpose of visit: To attend Munich Security Conference

(Registered 10 April 2014)

Name of donor: Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) (Board Member),

Address of donor: 1747 Pennsylvania Ave NW 7th Floor, Washington DC 20006

Amount of donation (or estimate of the probable value): Flight £1,986, hotel £1032, total £3,018

Destination of visit: Washington DC, USA

Date of visit: 6-8 April 2014

Purpose of visit: Attended Board Meeting in Washington.

(Registered 10 April 2014)

Name of donor: Government of United Arab Emirates

Address of donor: PO Box 31966, Abu Dhabi, UAE

Amount of donation (or estimate of the probable value): Flights £5,105; hotel costs (two nights) £1,260; total £6,365

Destination of visit: Dubai

Date of visit: 8-10 November 2014

Purpose of visit: Participation in summit of World Economic Forum and chairing sessions

(Registered 19 December 2014)

