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Appendix A: Transcription rules in this thesis

1. Transcript Symbols:

[ ] Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers, indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at the start of an utterance or later.

] ] Separate right square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers indicates a point at which two overlapping utterances both end, where one ends while the other continues, or simultaneous moments in overlaps which continue.

{ } These symbol are used to mark overlapping when more than two persons are talking at the same time. Similar to the symbols of [ ], { marks the beginning of the overlapping, and } marks the end of overlapping.

= Equal signs indicate ‘latching’, i.e. without break or silence between utterances before and after the sign. They are used in two circumstances:

a) When indicating ‘latching’ of utterances between two different speakers, they come in pairs—one at the end of a line and another at the start of the next line or one shortly thereafter. See below for an example:

[62] Tuesday 08 March 2005: speed humps
(IR: John Humphrys; IE2: Tim Yeo, Conservative Transport spokesman)

IR: .h Yeah, but that doesn’t quite address the question, >tht< these things work, why get rid of them. =
IE: = .h Well our approach to- safety will be evidence based...

b) When indicating ‘latching’, i.e. absolutely no break between utterances of one speaker, only one equal sign is used. See below for an example:
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(IE: Graham Allen, Labour MP in Nottinghamshire)
IE: …These things are too serious Jim. This isn’t about filling the newspaper space or the air time on the Today Program. = These are- things that affect my constituents’ lives every single day of their lives. = Many live in fear↑…

(0.2) Numbers in parentheses indicate silence, represented in tenths of a second; what is given here in the left margin indicates 2/10 seconds of silence. Silences may be marked either within an utterance or between utterances, as in the except below:

‘UK interview with Clement Attlee: 1951 (British Prime Minister 1945-51)’ (From Clayman and Heritage 2002a
IE: Oh we shall go in t’give them a good fight, (0.2) very good, (0.4) very good chance of >winning, = We shall go in confidently, = We always do, < (0.7)
IR: U:::h And- (.) on what will Labour take its sta:nd?

(.) A dot in parentheses indicates a ‘micro-pause’, hearable but not readily measurable, ordinarily less than 2/10 of a second.

The punctuation marks are not used grammatically, but to indicate intonation. The period indicates a failing, or final, intonation contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence. Similarly, a question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.

:: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching. For example:

(IR: John Humphrys)
IR: I see? It is true, isn’t it that the government is still
saying that it’s thinking about how to respond to: [e:h what the House of Lords…

- A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption, often done with a glottal or dental stop.

Underlining is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch. The more underlining, the greater the emphasis. Therefore, underlining sometimes is placed under the first letter or two of a word, rather than under the letters that are actually raised in pitch or volume. Especially loud talk may be indicated by upper case; again, the louder, the more letters in upper case. And in extreme cases, upper case can be underlined.

°° The degree sign indicates that the talk following it was markedly quiet or soft. When there are two degree signs, the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it.

† The up arrows mark rises in pitch; and
↓ The down arrows mark falls in pitch.

<< The combination of ‘more than’ and ‘less than’ symbols indicates that the talk between them is compressed or rushed. Used in the reverse order, they can indicate that a stretch of talk is markedly slowed or drawn out.

= > The combination of equal sign and ‘more than’ sign indicates a rush from one utterance to another, usually within one speaker’s turn and in between two grammatical fragments, e.g. two phrases or two sentences. The excerpt below is an example where this combination of signs is used between two sentences, to indicate a rush from one sentence to another by the same speaker:

[62] Tuesday 08 March 2005: speed humps
(IR: John Humphrys)
IR: …hh And you must give a rather a fa:n of these things. = >Do you think they< wo:rk.
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hhh Hearable aspiration is shown where it occurs in the talk by the letter ‘h’—the more h’s, the more aspiration. The aspiration may represent breathing or laughter. If it occurs inside the boundaries of a word, it may be enclosed in parenthesis in order to set it apart from the sounds of the world.

.hh A dot before aspiration indicates inhalation; and

hh. A dot after aspiration indicates exhalation. For example:

[62] Tuesday 08 March 2005: speed humps
(IE2: Tim Yeo, Conservative Transport spokesman)
IE2: h [Eh (at least)- (.) (least) ] also said that h.

£ Pound symbols means smiling voice.

{ ( ) } Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber’s descriptions of events, rather than representations of them. Thus { (cough) }, { (sniff) }, { (whispered) } and the like. For example:

Rick Scannell (03:02.0)
(IR: John Humphrys; IE: Rick Scannell)
IR: I see? It is true, isn’t it that the government is still saying that it’s thinking about how to respond to:::
[e:h what the House of Lords =
IE: {((biting lips))}
IR: = has said. >And to that extent they migh- s- say what you’ve done is a bit pre-mature.

(word) When a) all or part of an utterance, or b) the speaker identification is in parentheses, this indicates uncertainty on the transcriber’s part, but represents a likely possibility. Empty parentheses indicate that a) something is being said, but no hearing can be achieved; or b) it is not possible to identify the speaker from the audio. For an example of unclear utterance, see below:

[62] Tuesday 08 March 2005: speed humps
(IE2: Tim Yeo, Conservative Transport spokesman)
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IE2: .h [Eh (at least)- (. ) (least) ] also said that h.

Notes:
1. Most of this guide comes from the Appendix F of Halldorsdottir (2006), with some adaptations to this thesis. Guides to transcription conventions can also be found in many books on Conversation Analysis, such as Atkinson and Heritage (1984); Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998); Jefferson (2004); Schegloff (2007). (Steensig and Drew 2008)
2. The core of this set of notational conventions was first developed by Gail Jefferson. It continues to evolve and adapt both to the work of analysis, the developing skill of transcribers, and changes in technology. Not all symbols have been included here, and some symbols in some data sources are not used systematically or consistently.

2. Format of transcription headings:
[Ordering number of the interview in the database]: Date of interview: “BBC radio 4 ‘Today Program’”: start time of the interview: title of the interview: length of the interview: [start time of the episode from the beginning of the interview—end time of the episode from the beginning of the interview]
IR(s)’ name(s):
IE(s)’ name(s):

Notes:
a) The following elements:
- Ordering number of the interview in the database,
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- date of interview,
- the text of “BBC radio 4 ‘Today Program’”,
- title of the interview,
- IR(s)’ name(s), and
- IE(s)’ name(s)

are always present in the transcription headings. The other elements may or may not be present in some transcription headings.

b) Lines and line numbers of the data used in Volumn 1 of this thesis are adapted to suit the format of the thesis. Most of them are still in accordance with the format of data in Volumn 2—Appendix B; however, in some occasions, necessary changes of format are made in those data used in Volumn 1.
Appendix B: Data Transcriptions in this thesis

IR:
IE1: Evon Davis, BBC economic editor
IE2: Martha
IE3: Ben Page, of the Public Opinion Posters of Mori.
IE4: Collin Talbot, professor of the University of Nottingham

01 IR: Well in a minute I’ll be speaking to the (Shadow) of Chief Secretary of the Treasury George our correspondent has been cross-examined by two: expert witnesses, but first our (rumor answer) BBC’s economics editor Evon Da vis are with us. Evon, do these sums add out as they’re claiming?

02 IE1: Well, if you- add the numbers up, you get the total in the bottom. The question is whether the numbers themselves are in the sense. I think. (in venous) twelve billion in savings, it’s quite am- it’s quite ambitious, for the: conservative party. But, if you take- twelve billion out of government pro- then you cut taxes that beat us up. The question I say is whether you can make those twelve billion cuts in the way the Tories say by slashing wastes things like that, not rather than things we’d really fear.

03 IR: Are the cuts as proposed as dramatic as presented.

04 IE1: Well I think it’s worth getting this simp- spectum. >We’ve got< little graphic here. The best way of measuring public spending is the proportion of our national income (.) that is devoted to it. >Have you get back to when (.) Labor came into power you see it when Downing and the austere first years of Gordon Brown? Then he let it go up again. Now if (you- sum up all the hours) where it’s go on to the Labors. i- probably gonna stay around where it is forty percent of national. =

05 IR: =you can- =

06 IE1: =These are the Tories pr-posal. They want it to go back down. Now, don’t make it seem radical. >In two thousand and seven< it’s back down to where it is this year, two
thousand an eleven it's where it is, and two thousand and
two so that isn't. That's radical. The Tories difficulty is
that .h they got it back down to where it was in two
thousand and two. But in building into that huge increase
in health education spending? (. ) .h So all the sort of- .h
pressure all the strain has to be taken by the (examine)
department, >it is so called< .h low priority department. It
h(h)ave to s(h)uffer .h incredibly (. ) to pay for the growth
of .h health education.

IR: There Ma- Martha, politically, is tax cuts being promised↑
e:h with any detail. >I mean< they're pretty modest too.

IE2: Yes, they are. If you remember a the last election .h there
was eight billion of savings translated directly to eight
billion pounds of tax cuts. This time thirty-five billion
pounds↑ worth of savings↑ .h into just four billion e:h
pounds of- of tax cuts. One member of the Shadow
Cabinets acknowledged to me .h that this was symbolic,
directional merely a down payment if- if you like or what
they like in the future. And the reason is that there has been
a debate about whether it was wise to pull those tax cuts at
all because with that .h muddy the message on public
services. In the end they decided they had to do it simply
this was the clearest way of showing differentiation
between them and the Labor party. (In me-) source of main
frustration to people in the Conservative party. .h They say:
you know the Labor is the (Mag Pize Mag pie), Tony
Blair↑ .h ye- know talks out talking our (wears and clairs).
People with tax cuts↑ that's a very simple way of doing,
and also will win them e:h some pro- still in doubt in areas
of Conservative press.

IR: I- is it a flavor of the election campaign to come.

IE2: Oh certainly it was today. I'll tell you three press
conferences three parties and a pile of rebuttal documents
immediately you know in the Labor getting there're a
rebuttal (thurs) there even .h one argument about whether
the meat license in service .h is really [a (magnative) =

[hhhh

IE2: = of the food standard agency or not. .h But I- I will not tell
you the [details of that. =
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IR1: [hhhh
IE1: =I think- I think [it's a good (sanger) that-, kh
IR: [Well, out of our program really?
IE1: Ther- (. ) there are number of ways in which the two party
are sharing the: the very same sort of- I wouldn't go on
fantasies, but sharing the same assumptions. Things↑ (. )
some really difficult questions that .h all of them want to
avoid. The interesting one on the public spending is the
benefit budget where .h both parties are glibly assuming
that will whole benefits more or less lay out at the
moment, .h despite having ambitious grand or some
ambitions for reducing poverty and I suspect (. ) tha-
actually there is gonna be a lot more pressure on public
spending↑ than either of them (. ) really want to admit.
IR: O:k:. Well u:hm let's take some of this up, now with the:
e:h Shadow Chief Secretary to the Treasury George
Osbourne Winnerson in the studio now. Two people know
eh what they are talking about. I suppose (. ) you claim to
know [what you're talking about too.
IE2: [hh
IR: But .h two other people know what they are talking about.
E:h Professor Collin Talbot↑ of the: University of
Nottingham↑ a:nd: (. ) Ben Page of the Public Opinion
Posters of Mori. Eh George Osbourne, u:hm (. ) the last
time you offered us tax cuts of eight billions. Of course
that was spectacularly successful. >And now you're
proposing< .h tax cuts of four billion. Are you a hoping to
do half as well as you did last time or what.
IE3: hh No. We're offer hoping to offer people a real choice at
the: eternal election. Do they want (. ) a lower taxes and
value for money under the Conservatives? Do they want
higher taxes which every independent commentator say: is
coming if the Labor is selected, and more waste. And that's
the choice we offer. And I take the difference between the
last election and this one. There's two >for one is< (. ) I
think our sums are credible↑ there's a huge↑ amount of
work in Scotland and England↑ This is not-.h something
we just done just on the back on the (envelope). And the
second point is people are looking for alternative. And I
don't think they were looking for alternative to Tony Blair fours years ago.

IR: So you will take it that if you lose the next election people
don't want tax cuts and (bear) in public services will you?

IE3: Well we're fighting to win that election and I think what
we've done today brings a sustained place to that by
giving people a real choice. [And you know =

IR: [w-

IE3: = [for all the arguments we have today =

IR: [What a sort of-

IE3: = for all the arguments that Martha produced the
documents just now, for all the rebuttals about whether the
sums add out. What were trying to offer people h in an
emphatic political world is a choice.

IR: [Do you wan- higher taxes in the Labor or =

IE3: = [lower taxes under the Conservatives.

IR: [You talking about being a clear choice, an- Michael
Howell says this is a fundamental difference between your
party and the Labor party. Yet- when it comes down to it,
there is evidence amiably demonstrated. It's one
percent.

IE3: What we're talking about two important (copats). One is
actual tax cuts as opposed to the tax increases which are
coming if a- the Labor is selected. And second of all is a
totally different approach to public services that delivers
real value for money h for the taxes people have already=

IE3: = done in this government.

IR: Professor Talbot, does it add up to you.

IE4: E:hm, well- as I ever say I think- the fi- the figures (it real
particular) adds up. I don't think it adds up in the sense I
would call it fantasy. I- I think both parties main parties are
playing fantasy efficiency savings, the: the bulk of the
efficiency savings that their legend is going to make.
There's no way of measuring whether or not they're
actually going to get them. Most of them have been
recycled within government department, so we'll never
know whether they've made or not.

IR: What most troubles you?

IE4: E:hm will sort of thing you got in the: in the government's

own plans which: the Conservative Party seems to more or

less adopted now. I mean for example in health they expect
to save three point twenty five billion pounds (.) by u:hm

speeding up writing letters a:nd: eh prescriptions and so on.

We- the figures just don't make any sense to anybody

actually works in public services. They know that these

levels of efficiency savings have never been achieved in

the past.

IR: Do you wanna try to explain it, [do you?]

IE3: [Yeah, can I take an issue.

This is not- what we're proposing there- are not efficiency

savings, simply. There are reductioning government

activity. We're not going to running the new deal. We'll

have a big political argument about that? but we are not

running the new deal. We are not offering a small business

service, through the DTI. We are not having strategic

health authorities. Probably no one listening to this

program, no one heard of this strategic health authority,
because they don't- [we think contribute=

IR: [Tho- those- are (things) those jobs
( ) they're- they're- should be ( )

IE3: = hugely to the hospital. (If) they're going. In other words,

there are two things the government [( ] dedededede

IE4: [that's surely cost
twelve billion. You're talk about cutting. You- this is your

(impile) jump. By the way, you talk about e:hm back form

envelop, I mean that's your reportings published today on

basis always massive word that David James has (already
done). And I (phone counseled) the Party [Executive =

IE3: [Yeah-

IE4: = Office today and said .h where is the James report, [and=

IE3: [( )

IE4: =the response was you were not publishing 'cause you too

[much ambition on your publishments

IR3: [And we have publish every- eh James report, but every

single [publish of government.
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187 IE4: [You published set in power-point slide=
188 IE4: = [as soon you published (series annoying) points (to =
189 IE3: [so every single ( ]
190 IE4: = you) =
191 IE3: = Well, I- I promise to you, if you look at the word that
192 David James [has mended, =
193 IE4: [I have to look at it.
194 IE3: = the word that David James has done, with the team of
195 fifteen independent experts, they’ve gone through the
196 books of government. Another say, I may stress this point,
197 this is reducing government activity, getting rid of the
198 small business service, getting rid of failpits of the civil
199 service in the DTI, and I will have a (roil) with people
200 about those things as the election approaches. But we’ve
201 made those- tough choices↑ .h and we are reducing
202 government activity. And that enables us, we think, to give
203 people value for money and lower taxes.
204 IE4: The (avulse) majority of what you’re ca- what you’re
205 purporting to save in these thirty five billion is not by
206 cutting things. >It’s actually to do efficiency savings, at
207 least according to your own documents, that’s what you
208 said.<
209 IE3: You are- you are talking I think about the government-
210 [eh- the g-
211 IE4: [This is your-
212 IE3: You’re talking- the: the elements you’re talking about the
213 [efficiency savings, =
214 IE4: ["well"
215 IE3: = the things that the government have done. We take the
216 government of their words? We think we are gonna be
217 more effective of finding many of the efficiency savings
218 incursive that they talk about but what we have talked
219 about today is a reductioning in government activity
220 contrast at the political will .h which on day won the
221 Conservative Party we can save the permanent secretaries
222 of various departments. .h Do: this do: that. This is our
223 program for government.
224 IR: Ben- Ben Page, wanna ask you, how is this play with the
225 public.
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IE5: Well I think—remember we're living in a time of very low employment and very low inflation by historical standards compared to say: nineteen ninety-two when it was the last very (collactional) election. So the problem is . . . if you ask the voters one of the biggest issues that decide how you vote, (. .) interestingly taxation is actually number seven on the list. It's well behind public services and the NHS, education, crime, which are the top three. . . . And of course if you ask people what's wrong with the NHS which do every single month. Biggest problem? (. .) under-funded, not over-stuffed bureaucrats.

IR: (. .) You- now you're not even telling in which taxes you are gonna cut, are you?

IE3: Well we'll (. .) between now and the general election and I'm happy to come in on this program (gemering) talk about which exact taxes we're gonna cut↑ and =

IR: =But I thought you're trying to get your messages [across=]

IE3: [We =

IR: = today.

IE3: = are- we are getting our messages across. We've come home with four billion pounds [of tax cuts and=

IR: [Ok, well, w-, ( . ) that

again.

IE3: = the (bat tax ) the fact that I'm on this program talking to you. This is part of the sign that we're getting on message on tax.

IR: Well, I think we'll let the audience be the judge- o- of that.

Next, look at this question o: f (. .) e: h (0.2) what public priorities are. You said that- it's pretty low down, (. .) [the =

IE5: [Yeah

IR: = ideal of- of tax cuts. Is it easy to say >in your experience< eh something public opinion. What is the effect in this mixed the message. >(That is it)< both tax cut (. .) a: nd great efficiency in the public services.

IE5: I- I think it's difficult, because you know, everybody wants to pay less tax? But they also want↑ u:m high standards of public service. >What the Conservatives have to do< (. .) is explain precisely how hh. (. .) they are going to be able to achieve that. >If you look at the evidence, unfortunately at
the moment, for the Conservatives more people believe
that actually tax cuts will probably damage public services
rather than just leave them .h with pounds [and pounds in=
IR: [Do people =
IE5: = their pocket.
IR: = understand what the Tory’s stand for.
IE: .hh I think there’s an- there’s an issue there about (.) being
very very clear, and you know thi- this is- this at the
moment doesn’t seem as strong as things like aligning you
to buy your own cars or something like that. I think one of
the things that might make a difference is if they actually
said .h how much the average vote is going to get back
every week. But it seems that detail is still not there yet.
IE3: Well tha- that detail is coming. And I agree with you that at
the moment the public need to be convinced that you can
cut taxes .h and deliver value for money and better public
services. That is all about what today: i- we are trying to
do:. We re trying to show (.) that you can deliver improved
public services on a lower tax be- eh base by reducing
taxes.
And- there are many countries around the world where this
is achieved? This is not rocket sides, but it does require a
real lap of political world? And I think today: we show we-
we’ve got the appetite for [them.
IE5: [I mean the trouble is .h the huge
challenge you’ve got is that people still say the NHS is the
biggest issue and how they will vote and of course the
Conservative has never ever been seen as a better party
than Labor on the NHS.
IE3: But I think- on the NHS, precisely why: today we’ve
plugged in big increase in spending↑ twenty one percent
increase↑, and on top of that promise a totally different
way of delivering health services in this country↑ .h which
puts the patient in charge↑ .h with the money coming for
the government, so that the health care is still free at the
point of views.
IR: .hh Is there any possibility of a party coming back when
this- this far behind.
IE5: E:hm by historical standards no. The moment the
Conservative is going to be forming the next administration. >They want to be about ten or twelve points ahead of Labor.< E: hm obviously there- you know currently three, four, five, six or more points behind.

IE3: Well, even if you believe the: opinion polls.

IE5: hhhhh

IE3: Even if you believe the opinion polls, there are several general- general elections in the last thirty years where parties that were two or three or five points behind have gone on to win their elections.

U:

IE3: I remember in nineteen ninety-two? I wasn’t born in nineteen seventy, by I read a history books that I happened to (lend them) to.

IE4: I- I I think that might happen if you- if you have some big political issues in stake. One of the things I found curious about this is the- the level of political (ratury) seems to be inverse proportion to the level of difference in actual spending figures. I mean Evan was absolutely right. .h Average spending in UK on the public sector over the last fourteen years. A- average is out of forty-three percent. Both parties are hovering around that sort of number.

IE5: [Not enough.

IE4: Absolutely.

IR: °Our concern is there at least. ° Eh I think you’d better come back when you gonna tell us what precisely you gonna do with our taxes.

IE3: Let’s put the date in the diary.

IR: I thought we will all look forward to that. Thank you very much.
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IR: Well tonight I went to see the Culture Secretary Tessa
Jowell who is (babying) this legislation is. I asked her how
she managed to squander a wide spread of view that the
licensing norms perhaps needed reforming.

IE: (0.3) I think there’re still a consensus that the: licensing
need to be changed. But I think what has happened .h in
the two years since the .h licensing act. A secure (royal of
sent) supported (. ) eh by: the opposition parties (. ) at the
time. I think what’s happened .h is that public concern?
and police concern? (. ) about (. ) binch drinking and
alcohol related violent has become (. ) much bigger, much
more prominent. And so (. ) we do have a problem (. ) eh
with- with alcohol? (. ) That’s why we published as a
government, in our strategy? with- you know with plans to
tack on, eh binch drinking, eh alcohol related drinking,
(back-lot smarch). But a very important plank .h of
beginning to change things (. ) is getting this new licensing
act (. ) in force.

IR: But when even (0.2) the last home secretary says this is
just leaping the dog?, when you’re (own bed). Benches are
saying they are against it, when senior police officers are
saying they’re against it. When senior doctors are saying
they are against it. What makes you so sure you are right.

IE: By no means, (. ) all (. ) (poliver) the police ar- are against
this. I mean (. ) the: eh Regnator of the Supreme (Term) of
Association? today was saying .h that he: he suppo:rts
[(e:h flexible )

IR: [we- we can (trace) police- [police officer (ingendously).

IE: [yes, of course you can, of
course we can. And of course I take (. ) very seriously (. )
e:m criticism o:f the potential effects of proposals .h by the
police, or by doctors. [That their concerns-

IR: [Do you accept David Blanket’s point that it is at least a
leaping at the (door).

IE: No, I don’t accept that. [And-

IR: [Or what else can it be=
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37 IE: =Well-=

38 IR: =You don’t know what the consequences will be, do you? 

39 IE: [David- eh David Blanket had concerns about the: David Blanket had concerns about the impact of the legislation. He and I discussed his concerns?, and I met his concerns. 

40 particularly about ways in which eh publicans could take their own responsibility. for tackling the: the risks of crime, eh alcohol related: h crime. An- so all that eh was 

41 written in to the legislation, and into the statutory guidance. But to go back to the main point, the conce:rn is about excessive alcohol consumption particularly by young people.

42 IR: () Yes, it is. () And why are you so sure that it’s not gonna get even worse, when you change the licensing act.

43 IE: Because eh as the police has been telling us, for the last five years, one of the: eh one of [the reason, 

44 IR: [As some of police have 

45 been telling you?

46 IE: No no. I mean the Association of Chief Police Officers? You know back in two thousand, said that they believed that the introduction of flexible licensing?, which means: difference opening and closing times. h in a given area will make it easier. to police: h pubs at closing time. [That promised you-

47 IR: [And since then plenty of police officers have 

48 had second thoughts about it. As you know, Mr. John Stevens, we- when we can carry on training this. That’s not really the point, is it.

49 (0.3) 

50 IR: You know: (0.2) that we don’t know what the consequence of this change of licensing hours will be. You may be right, but you would equally well be wrong.

51 IE: .h We- I think there is very good evidence. (. ) from other countries. (. ) that where you have flexibility. (. ) .h not just substituting one fixed closing time. h for another. You see changes. (. ) and drinking patterns, and you don’t get what we have in this country. which is the increase in alcohol related crime. h and alcohol related crime. h that coincides. h with simultaneous. h pub closing.
IR: What has been the advice to you from the Department of Health.

IE: I've obviously had discussions with the Health Secretary, of with excessive health secretaries. I was a- I was a Public Health minister. And the concern from the Department of Health is about very particularly binch drinking. and adults drinking too [much].

IR: [Has the Department told you, yes Secretary of State, we would like see: (. ) the sort of reform that you are concentrating.

IE: As far as I'm aware, yes they did. You may .h e:h hhh you- you may have an issue to raise eh about which I'm not aware. You know every single member of the Cabinet .h signed up to this legislation .h in a normal way. =

IR: = Because you know research commission for the number ten policy unit? by Professor Colin Drummond said your decision .h flew: in the face (. ) of all the evidence, (. ) and indicated nothing so much as you desired to please the drink industry.

IE: Well, that i:s (. ) absolute rubbish. I mean b- hh these decisions .h you know have nothing to do (. ) with pleasing anybody, [except the people, except the people of this =

IR: [Well then why are you doing.

IE: = country. And making communities after, and give communities (. ) more control (. ) over when their pubs open and when they close. It's the (status of quo) .h which is creating the problem, not .h the potential new licensing [act, which will be part of the solution.

IR: [You don't know that though.

IE: You don't know that. It is easily leaping the (dog).

IE: Well, i- the- the responsibility (. ) and power (. ) will be given (. ) t local authorities. Local authorities will be able (. ) to implement the change at the pace at which they choose. They can- you know they can face the introduction of flexible opening. But most of local authorities, the local authorities support this. You know at lunch time, eh today, the Local Authority Association .h
was on the radio (. ) h supporting (. ) the licensing act. So there is a strong support for the case for this legislation.

[(Pleased) for this legislation which has been made for the last five years. ] =

IR: [No, the chairman of the local government committee, one of your ben- benches,] =

IR: = eh says the move is stupid.

IE: Look, there is a campaign against this legislation. You know it is not my job, .h a Secretary of State? (. ) to bow:

to every campaign, which is got up for whatever reason.

I hav-

IR: [Would you mind at least to listen to them.

IE: Of course I listen to them. And of course I study the evidence. Of course I took all these factors .h into account .h when this legislation was first passed. And e-

these are precisely the kind of factors that I’ve taken into account? .h in subsequent discussions with David Blanket? .h with Charles Clark? .h about how we relate reform of the licensing act .h to: t- a- as a solution to a wider problem .h of alcohol related violence.

IR: Tessa Jowell speaking earlier.
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IR: John Humphrys
IE: Mark Eastern, BBC home affairs editor

01 IR: Thirteen minutes past seven. The police are worried about what will happen when pubs are allowed to stay open twenty four hours a day. Now it seems the government has some plans to try to deal with that. Our home affairs editor is Mark Eastern. Now we are not quite clear what they are, Mark?

02 IE: Eh: no, I don’t think they are quite as far down the road as perhaps: some of the speculation. (hh) In the run-up to the election, frankly the last thing Labor wants to is a herd of the chief constables careering from studio to studio claiming they have not got resources to deal with (.) with binge drinking and all the rest of it< particularly, eh:: since the government believes it has actually a good story to tell on police numbers and (.) and obviously their manifesto’s gonna to be full of measures to deal with anti-social behavior, but equally unappealing is the idea that (.) you (.) you go into an election with a lobby like the drinks industry and open conflict and, .h I don’t know grim warnings about how your pint isn’t safe under Labor. So I think that Mr. Clark does: Mr. Clark and any other ministers will be thinking ha::rd about the how to deal with this, an- an- I’m told that th- Home Secretary will be making his clear- his views eh: clear to the nation within the next couples of weeks, certainly before the new law comes into the force eh: on February the seventh.

04 IR: An- what at the moment (.) what does it look as though the favori::te:: plan is?

05 IE: Well, I think that (0.2) I think Charles Clark’s:: eh: view will be this, tha::t e::h he’ll want to- frankly push the whole thing into the long grass, and an- I- I think eh: he: will say look we simply don’t know yet what kind of effect this act is going to ha:ve .hh Early signs are that very few pubs have indeed applie::d eh: for extensions yet, so the i- I don’t think that they’re really persuaded that the m- there’s gonna be massive increase in the [number of police needed
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IR: [(hh)W(h)e(h)]-(-£) you wonder what's the point is all of this then (£).

IE: Well I- it-it- well I suppose the police argument is that there will be a much bigger impact than the government likes to think. An: th-th-th-th- the discussion is I suppose whether you go down a voluntary route or a mandatory route. Now in-in March last year, when the government eh: published its alcohol harm reduction strategy, proposed this idea about voluntary levy on the drinks industry (.hh) that they did have a responsibility (. ) in this area. Eh: an: d =

IR: = to pay for extra police =

IE: = Yeah. Exactly. An:: now the- the question is (...) is the situation eh: serious enough that the government now to say:: right not good enough, we’ll gonna have to eh:: force them to pay eh:: some sort of booze tax. I- I suspect that what will happen is that .hh they wi:ll say eh: we really don't know quite how this act's going to work? We’re not convinced yet tha- there is going be a huge impact on- on the requirements eh: for police. Eh: but let’s see .hh and should the voluntary ban not provide the:: the kind of resources required then obviously we’re going to have to look at again amendatory band? That I’d think is going to be the sort of political answer, .hh to- to dealing with this =

IR: = what about the possibility that they tell local authorities, .hh if they:: eh:: agree to license pubs to stay open twenty four hours a day↑, with all the effect↑ that they might ha:ve? They: have to find a way of pay↑ing for it.

IE: .hh >well of course the role of local authorities will change quite dramatically on February the seventh.< In the pa::st, the:: the license of a pu::b eh:: or the cost of it was decided by how much they took to process the piece of paper↑ .hh sometimes got a license for a tenner? A::nd a-as on February the seventh it also has to inclu::de the cost o::f .hh inspection and enforcement, .hh so they- they'll council many i::n a::: metaphorical (peaked) ca::ps, .hh a::nd who must go around and make sure it's all working properly, have to be paid for out of the license. That’s gonna put it
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75 down quite dramatically. .hh A::nd e- the:: proposal (.) la:st
76 summer (.) wa:s that the average .hhh license will shoot up
to something like a hundred and ninetynine pounds? But I'm
tell that that wasn't enough for our local authorities and the
department ev- of the DCMS has looked at this again .hh
and indeed .hh has been persuaded that they'll should be
quite significantly higher. They say that when .hh the
figures are announced in the next few days, our local
authorities .hh will be pleasantly surprised =
84 IR: = Mark? =
85 IE: = I don't really think, (h)sorry(h) [I don't really-really =
86 IR: [Well-
87 IE: = think they'r they are going to add an extra burden so you
are gonna k- pay the cost of policing as well =
89 IR: = Indeed. Mark†, many thanks.

IR: John Humphrys
IE: Sunder Katwala, General Secretary of the Fabian society

01 IR: The time is twenty three minutes past seven. Heirs to the throne or at least one in particular are making a lot of news at the moment. Coincidentally some members of Parliament are making a big push trying to change the rules that govern the succession to the crown. There’s a Private Members’ bill in the Commons and another bill in the Lords. The main effect would be to stop giving preference to male heirs over females. Primogeniture and abolish the ban on an heir to the throne marrying a Roman Catholic. Is it likely to happen? Well Sunder Katwala is the General Secretary of the Fabian society, the answer to that is probably not, isn’t it?

02 IE: Well I think it’s probably bound to happen at some point in the near future. This particular bill, ah which in (.) the House of Lords today having a second reading has been adopted in the House of Commons by Anne Taylor the former leader of the House, won’t pass if there’s a general election when we all expect one. But we hope this will be a gentle nudge, so the government perhaps after the election to do something that’s very long overdue.

03 IR: Do we think the government’s keen on the idea?

04 IE: Well actually in nineteen ninety eight, the government said in principle it supported the idea of: eh ending gender discrimination and would consult on how to come forward with its own measures. Nothing’s been heard of that since so this this by eh raising the issue again will- will demand a response, we expect them to be warm towards it. hh and we hope they don’t say it’s not the right time because (.) on that grounds it will never be the right time

05 IR: But aren’t there aren’t there all sorts of sensitivities when we’re discussing the royal family or the House or that sort of thing?

06 IE: I don’t think so. hh I think it’s highly misguided actually Parliament feels it would be wrong, in someway
it would be disrespectful to discuss the monarchy, because it-(uh con-)

IR: [but that is the sense like these? =

IE: => There is somewhat but constitutionally it’s entirely inappropriate for the Queen or Prince Charles or anyone else to say what should happen within the matter of political controversy, and so if Parliament also feels disabled then you(‘ve) got the center piece of the British constitution, you got some highly out-dated features in thirty years since Sex Discrimination Act. And nothing will ever be able to do about it. Sort of like a Bermuda Triangle of British constitution if Parliament council =

IR: [Hehhhh.

IE: = (back either)<

IR: Well hehe (£) qu(h)ite. So what do you think. I mean what’s your best guess. (£)

IE: Well (And this bill isn’t to) go ahead, right? The Private Members’ bill (.) they don’t usually get anywhere anyway, do they? Unless the government has said absolutely clearly <<we are in favor>> (imitating voice) (I think) we haven’t done this time?

IE: No, there- there isn’t- there isn’t time that sounded has been a great deal of support, and not one voice defending the current rules of succession. >And a lot of< .h Labor support in the House of Commons as well. >>Now th-< the Times for example has come out and said .h nobody could possibly defend the current rules. .h It’s sometimes nice to have some .h (qua:ky) bits of history but (not) things are doing entirely .h indefensible. .h I just think this is long over-due, Parliament (will) have to do it eventually. .h If the government I hope all of the political parties might think this is a rather simple thing to put it in their election manifestos.<

IR: Well, we’ll see. (Sunder Katwala), thank you.
Friday 14 Jan. 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0751 Prince Harry
(06:54)
IR: John Humphrys
IRO: Nicole Stanbridge
IE0: Sarah Ferguson, Duchess of York
IE1: Bob Satoror, duet of Society of Editors
IE2: Simon Jenkins, of the Times

IR: The time:: i::s ten to eight. Well the Ashby’s anniversary is
as Catherine Pemonster has just reminded us? (. ) . One of
the factors which has given a certain edge to the criticism
of Prince Harry’s appearance in a Nazi uniform at a fancy
dress party. .hhh But the Duchess of York has been
defending her nephew, and our reporter Nicole Stanbridge
asked her why she was speaking out for Prince Harry.

IE0: I want someone to stand up for him (. ) and say he is a very
good man (0.2) and I’m that person, because I know what
it’s like to have a very bad press. A:nd I know e:h . what
it’s like to continually be criticized. And you know it’s very
tiring and it’s- it’s very unpleasant a:nd .h he is a young
man, he does a lot of good? .hh when he is following his father’s work .h with AIDs and .h in Africa? And he is a
very good young man. And I just think it’s time that the::
the Press backed off and stop criticizing him. = They’ve
been criticizing:: now for months and months. A:nd jus-
you know let him be:: a young man, and be productive and
do what he is going to do. (. ) And I feel very strongly about
it.

IR0: So you think the media should lay off. You think he’s
having too: hard a time in front of the media >at the
moment<.

IE0: I’m not going to (. ) e:h say anything about his feelings?
cause I don’t know them. But what’s- from my personal
opinion? and from what I know feels like to be or- at the
end of being (. ) a continual batter- being battered by the
Press I know: .hh I know how sad it is and then I know
how awful it is. It makes you feel very .h very bad .h and
I- and I- I don’t know. E:h at all. (And I don’t give
spokesperson f- for him.) .h all- all the royal family. But I-
from my own personal point of view? .h I thought s-
somebody needs to stand up and say no? hh leave him alone, he is a very good man. And and he::? both (William) and and Harry are very good men. >And I think< that their mother was very proud of of them both and and ok he- say we- I made a mistake publicly in my life as you know (0.2) many many mistakes. And it's very hard when yo- you think ah::: no::: I shouldn't have done that or you live with ramifications of your own actions

IR0: How is he feeling how hard is it for him right now.

IE0: I don't know? For me (.2) e:hm personally? whe- when you make a mistake and you- you apologize for it? and it's-it's very difficult, because the Press run with it for a long while an- and yo- you know you- you look back (with all pity) (. ) you know sh- could have done it in a better way.

IR0: But wasn't what he wore (. ) a mistake.

IE0: That's not what we're discussing. I'm speaking to you (0.2) .h in support of a great young man? (0.2) .h who needs more support and less criticism. And he has apologized? .h and people have accepted the apology, .h and let's move on.

IR: That was Sarah Ferguson the Duchess of York? .h talking to Nicole Stanbridge? >Well< Bob Satoror's director of the Society of Editors? He joins as do Simon Jenkins of the Times. Good morning, and you both?

IE1: Good morning, ( ).

IR: Back off. Says the Duchess of Bob Satoror.

IE1: .hh We'll I think it is very touching that an aunt shou:ld: get along an- and suppo:rt: her nephew but e::h i- it's not just a- a- a sort of smal:ll mistake of the kinds e::h sometimes may come in. >It's clearly< clearly something which is hh. e:h which is going to run and run. especially when people like Sarah Ferguson in faft join in that roar. And I mean I think that e:h it might well ov- e:h ended sooner if people didn't tried to defend e:h e:m a:hm the situation.

IR: Oh yo- you think that just by joining in the debate, she's actually encouraging it, isn't it.

IE1: Well, I don- I don't think it would help, hh put i(h)t (h)that
w(h)ay

IR: E:m. (.) Simon Jenkins?

IE2: I think it's absolutely bloody rubbish. E:h I've never know-
never known such an over-blame story in my li:fe. E:h we
seem to 've lost all the ability to-, we- we- we can't- we
can't do recognize an accident from a catastrophe, we can't
recognize a mistake from a catastrophe. .h I mean the guy's
a ki:;d. I mean people dress up as Nazis. They- they- dress
up as soldiers? I mean I- I probably dressed up as a
German to fight Britain when I was at school myself. =

IR: = (wel-)

IE2: It is just compl[e:;ely absurd to blow these things out of=

[you-

[you-

[you-

[you-

[you-

[That is never a

pro- [problem

[No:, well, but I mean (. ) well? well? if i- if- if
from the Su:n to the Independent, th(h)ey've got the
sa(h)me st(h)ory on their front page (£), it must give you
some points of report (£).=

IE2: =Yeah, when someone (trips their repaving stone), it's
considered the multi-million settlement. I mean we- we've
lost the ability to ju:;dge language. And I think it's very
sa:;d, when- when Auchwitz is drived into this- the- the- the
entire sort of e;m e:h (Santa of magic Robby's dragging
into this). I mean he is a just a boy. He's made a mistake,
he said so;: And it was a party, it's- it's the ludicrous. e:h
High part of the fault does lie with th- with th- with the
kind ov-.h the overblame or the royal family itself. (It's
not th-) ye kn- we talked about that. But just to say:: that
when someone makes a mistake like this, they've got to be
treated as- as- as- as a glo:bal statementship
catastrophe. It's ridiculous.=

IR: =Bob [Sateror?

IE?: [I think) It's absurd.=

IR: =( ) Bob Sateror? quite e:h broad accusation against the
way it's been covered there?

IE1: Oh I see some of Simon's points, but they ha- the problem
is that it is not as though this was just the first of a series a first mistake which he has made. He is
a young man, but he has actually been running into quite a lot of trouble over the last few months and really I think
the question the reason why the papers are sort of making the points that they are again making so much troubles because there seems to be rather sort of slow reaction from the palace which is fairly typical and also that's Their gonna say: well is this boy out =

IR: [Well wel- yo-

IE1: = of control.

IR: You're changing your ground a bit, aren't you? You've said
to us a moment or two ago: that it was the gravity of the mistake that justified all this. And and .h for Simon Jenkins' point is that that's exaggerated. It's not- it's not an international incident.

IE1: Well I think- I think it's the gravity, it's- it's i- i- it's the continual sort of errors which are happening. And I think the questioning that is going on is .h you know is .h who is .h sort of advising Prince Harry about his behavior. I think that's where the problem is going. >I mean< clearly it is .h it has some gravity. Whatever Simon says, it is offending quite a lot of people. [I think that's- that's-

IR: [It- it-

IE1: = that's their judgment.

IE2: It- it is offending. because it's put in confrontation with the newspaper. =

IR: = Oh that's not true. [Is it?

IE2: [I think- I think a: I think they so what.

>It's not as though this chap< on the government. [He's =

IR: [no but he is- he is

IE2: = no- he's not the head of the state?

IR: He is that of lau- well he could be,
[couldn't he. He's third in line to the throne.]

IE1: [wha- whate- what's e;h ]=

IE1: =third (. ) we- we- we're now taught people you know yo-
should never motor offense to their sixteenth in line of the
151 throne. This is a complete (.) mumble jumble land. This-
152 this guy is- is going, he ought to be an ordinary private kid.
153 And he is virtually a private kid? And I really don’t see
154 why: the fact that he is the thir:rd in line to the thro:ne, a-
155 a job I may save no power at all? Eh it’s significant, it jus-
156 it just doesn’t matter. =
157 IR: = Should h- shouldn’t he be judged differently Bob Sateror
158 to say Prince Charles or indeed for- to Prince William?
159 IE1: I think it’s a- I think it’s actually a- a view of the whole of
160 the wha- the royal family is going at the moment. I think
161 part of the problem is when Simon said is- is should be a-
162 privat- eh private person. I mean of cou:rse he is entitled to
163 som- (. ) privacy an- and everybody is, but- you know th-
164 the media and the press .h the press generally has gone
165 along (. ) with some of the positive stories about what he
166 did in Africa, with children and so on, an- that’s the Palace
167 trying to eh [put a =
168 IR: [Bob Sateror
169 IE1: = different- different fight on it. But in fact [this guy =
170 IR: 
171 IE1: = we used to call (bank to rites) .=
172 IR: = We- get the point. Bob Sataror and Simon Jenkins,
173 thanks very much indeed.
IR: John Humphrys
IE1: Brian Pretty
IE2: Ebon Harries, Liberal Democratic MP
IE3: Lady Finley, professor of palliative medicine at the University of Wales, College of Medicine

01 IR: In the story that emerged from the trial of retired police  
02 officer Brian Blackburn which ended yesterday, hhh was  
03 extremely distressing. Mr. Blackburn killed his wife, who  
04 was suffering from stomach cancer? .h and then tried to  
05 take his own life? but failed. She told him that killing her  
06 was the last loving thing he could do. Mr. Blackburn was  
07 given a suspended sentence because of what the judge  
08 called .h the exceptional circumstances of the case. .h W'1  
09 Brian Pretty has some experience what it's like to deal with  
10 the law in this area? although .hh his own situation was of  
11 course very different. He and his wife Dianne tried but  
12 failed to persuade the courts .h that he should be allowed to  
13 help her die when she was terminally ill. But Motor  
14 Neurion Disease Mr. Brian Pretty is on the line, good  
15 morning.  
16 (0.3)  
17 IE1: Good morning.  
18 IR: Did you feel (0.2) hh. so:me sense of sympathy with Brian  
19 Blackburn’s story.  
20 IE1: .hhh e:h yes I do in fact, because:: the simple reason is he  
21 done (.) the one thing that: (.) Dianne didn’t want me to  
22 do? But: eh (.) also th- (.) what happen(ed) was he’s: eh (.)  
23 he- he was taking his own life as well which (.)  
24 unfortunately it didn- it didn’t do, but: eh .hhh anyway it  
25 wo-.hh within (.) his life is still with us (.) has helped (.)  
26 helped him to turn round and move on, in one respect.  
27 IR: One ima:gines that if you are: in the:: very distressing  
28 circumstances of having .hh eh wife or partner, o:r husband  
29 or partner, come to that, e:h who is very i:ll. (.) A:nd you-  
30 you- you want to help them end their lives, that dealing  
31 with the legal system must be: a very .hh difficult thing to  
32 do.
IE1: Yes, it is very difficult, because at the moment where the laws in this country stand, hh if you: help someone to die, you can be: imprisoned up to fourteen years. But: eh luckily for: Brian that they gave him a suspended sentence? which is in all due respects- there're issue he shouldn't have even a sentence, because eh as- as we- (. ) we all know he was helping his eh last request of his wife.=

IR: =D- do you recognize after being through what you have been through that .h whatever people may feel about their individual circumstances, this is an area where society (. ) should really reserve to its rights, collectively to make decisions about what people can: eh or can't do, and that even (. ) if it's very difficult individuals have to: accept that to some degree.

IE1: hhh not really, because: eh you know you g- you have the: (.02) choice yeah. This is what we have say: that people (shou-) have choices. You have choices, I have choices. Terminally ill people (. ) also have choices. But: eh at the end of the day, i- i- if you take those choi- rights and choices (well often), then- they jus- they (gonna tell) and say well- l've got a take on what: the: government tells me (good) to do, which aren't right. Then, you know, then you've got no rights at all. This is what (Dian) was saying.

IR: Brian Pit, thank you very much indeed for talking to us. We: are joined now by the Liberal Democratic MP Ebon Harries, who is on the line from Oxford. hh Harries, what do you make o: of the: case (of) Blackburn.

IE2: .h Well- it's clearly a tragic case. I bu- I think it's an example of the desperation that some people are in, because they foresee a time. If they are terminally ill, where they are going to be suffering? despite what (pallet of cac) can do, despite that, .h or indeed, that they will be:: e:h they will lack dignity at the end, and they want the ability to choose the ti:me .h and means of their going, and may need assistance in dying, as Dian Pretty has requested.
And the fact that the law is very cruel, it says (.) that you can’t do that. Doctors are not allowed to help? And any family member who wants to help out of love? providing you all the autonomy, to do this (.) for yourself face the sentence of up to fourteen years. So: w- we do need just more grace to them ill, about reforming the law to allow those people who wish it? No one is forcing those have moral views against this (.) to go down this path. =

IR: = Could you not look at the outcome: of the case, and say that there was (0.2) a sort of sanity in it, the tragic there it was, in the sense that the end the judge allow Mr. Blackburn to go free and recognize the exceptional circumstances of his individual situation. But at the same time upheld the principle, which is the heart of the law: works in this area.

IE2: No, because this is a man who’s been bereaved effectively? He lost his wife, and he was in jail for months. And he’s been through the trauma of court case, and indeed the states spent a lot of money in time on the court case. That we’re hypocritical in this country, because there have been at least two: Two people who’ve been taken by their loved one? To the dignity test (claimed) in Switzerland? which provides eh help in dying? and that’s clearly an offense in this country? But neither of those two people have been charged with aiding and betting. So- British situation is we don’t allow it. U:m and if you do it we won’t charge you if you have the ways and means to get to Switzerland. And I just think that we ought to take a rational view of this. In the political establishment which against the views of the majority of British people as always opposed any change in the law, (how) won’t even allow a debate in Parliament, far less a vote on it. Should open its mind to the possibility of liberalizing the law of- as the Dutch have done, and Oregon has done, with no ill effect. =

IR: = Well I suppose I- in a sort of way I was- I was asking you whether em eh a bit of hypocrisy in this area might not
be a bad thing, but because the vast majority of politicians are opposed to the change of the law that you're talking about. Perhaps common sense in the way the law is administered is a sensible way to go.

IE2: Well firstly I'm not sure what the vast majority of politicians are in favor of, because we haven't had a vote. My own party has argued although a little bit of free vote for members that there should be a change in the law. With adequate safeguards in the debate I think isn't around the principle any more, it has to be around the safeguards to prevent coercion, and people feeling a burden so forth. And I recognize those fears. But we don't know what people want. And I don't think we want to have a legal system particularly based on these profound issues of end of life, which doesn't provide the certainty that people want. I don't think there is room for hypocrisy and doubt, in law in this area. And that's why I think it's time that Parliament reviewed it, >maybe< another law commission, because since the House of Lords looked at this, a number of members of the House of Lords committee, who had rejected a change in the law, have changed their minds and indeed been on this program to say they've done that. And then Lord Jophy's bill, a private members in the House of Lords before a select committee. I hope [I think that =

IR: [Well-

IE2: = select committee will back it. [And I think the =

IR: [We do-

IE2: = government really has to consider giving time to debate this on a free vote.=

IR: =>We have a member of the House of Lords directly involved with us, eh with us as well. >We're joined now by Lady Finley, who is professor of palliative medicine at the University of Wales: College of Medicine. U:hm you I think take a rather: () different view, Lady Finley.

IE3: Yes I do, thank you.
IR: And could you explain why.

IE3: I- I think that this is a tragic case, and there will always sadly the individual cases which for which you can not legislate, because you have to decide in law: where you put the line. And the line in law is to protect the vulnerable from coercion, from feeling that they have the duty to die. If we look at those countries where they have changed the law, they have gone down this road, hhh we know that in Oregon one in three people requesting (position) assisted suicide decide to do so because they feel that they are a burden. This isn't about these people feel the physical suffering or other aspects. It's because they feel like a burden, (find out) this coming into- into this decision from people are feeling pressurized and coerced.

IR: [.h Now if =

IE3: = you have (a) situation where people feel pressurized and coerced into asking somebody to kill them? Or that they feel that they have- to somehow go down the route of asking for (at least or over) their take themselves, then we've lost the fundamental premiership on which our society is based, and that we are providing care for those who are vulnerable and we have a duty to do so.

IR: [.w-

IR: What do: you make of Ebon Harries' suggestion that we are hypocritical, that we wink at people who've got means to break this law.

IE3: I don't think that we wink at people who have the means to break this law at all. I think that we are not doing as much as we should in society to make sure that we provide all the care that people need. Most of the palliative care is not provide on the NHS, it's still in the charitable sector. We should be making sure that everybody in this country has good pain control, has good symptom control, that they have nursing at home over night, if that's what they need. Not relying on charities to provide nurses, hh one or two nights a week to supplement the district nurses. [We =

IR: [.hhhh
Dangjie Ji—Indirect Defensive Responses to Hostile Questions
In British Broadcast News Interviews

IE3: = have a ( ) sitting care. It isn’t surprising that people feel .h worried about what life is ahead of them.=
IR: =Well=
IE3: =And they need to know that they will get the care that they need, and they also need to be quite sure .h that when they don’t want to have active interventions any more .h that they can say no, I don’t want any active interventions and they will still be supported.
[everything done to maintain their dignity.=
IR: [Well tha- tha- That brings us to the point that: Brian Pretty made, .h which is that there is .h an issue of choice yeah?
IE3: hh, Indeed, there is an issue of choice that people are not aware that they (.) can (.) refuse to have interventions, they don’t have to have treatments if they don’t want. And indeed at the moment .hh we have a bill going to Parliament to try to make sure that people can state in advance, what they would want (.) if they lose the capacity (.) to be able to express [their wishes.
IR: [Alright, we- we- we haven’t got Ryan (.) long left. I’d like to put- to Ebon Harries, your point, your original point, .hhh that people .hh are going to feel pressured in this area if the law is changed, Ebon Harries.
IE2: .h Well I think we have to (.) allow people the autonomy and have safeguards to ensure that isn’t a case. But the bizarre situation is as .h Bannis Finley has admitted, .h that even if you are not terminally ill, even if you are not suffering, even if your decision is rational, but you have the capacity to make the decision. You can refuse treatment, .h and therefore (.) die, but you can’t request help. If you are terminally ill, suffering, .h and making a rational decision, the gap is too wide .h between the active and the [passive.
IR: [Lady Finley?
IE3: If you want to die, if you are terminally ill, and you want to carry on living, you struggle to carry on living. And when you want to let go as life, you let go as life. Those have su- worked with these patients see it day and day out. People who want(ed) to select let go as life .hh do so at the time as
they are choosing. Good care gives people the power to choose. Bad care is pressurizing people in having a duty to die.

IR: Lady Finley, Ebon Harries, thanks both very much indeed.
IR: Charles Grainer, the American soldier convicted of prisoner abuse in Ever Grave has continued to insist that he was acting under orders. He’s been sentenced to ten years in jail, but the case remains controversial in some quarters in United States. Admiral Stansfield Turner is the former director of the CIA.

IE: I think that Grainer was in that atmosphere that was corrosive and improper. But I think the things that Grainer did were things that no reasonable people ought to e;h e: even consider doing regardless whether he’s been told to do them or not. He disgrace the uniform? he disgrace the country? and doing things that are just reprehensible.

IR: But in terms of what you called the atmosphere in which he was working, do you believe that he would have been given direct instructions to be- soften the: prisoners up as, some have alleged? or simply that- there was a: feeling around the place that people can do that kind of thing.

IE: Oh I suspect he was given direct instructions? But whether he was given direct instructions to do some of the very terrible thing th- that he did like piling prisoners, naked on top of each other and standing there making jokes and so on. I– I can’t imagine that- the really was given those instructions explicitly.

IR: There is no evidence though, there were no evidence that has come into light of any kind of instruction from above, is there?

IE: No e:::h there isn’t but again tha- hhh there was just permissive at- atmosphere and you do have to go back to the fact that any military organization if it’s going to maintain discipline, must hold people responsible for things that go wrong. Sometimes those things that go wrong are really done at only a very low level? But sometimes they a:re done with either the
knowledge of superiors (0.2) or the superiors should have known what was going on. An- when something this (heinous) takes place and anyone's military command (0.2) the commander has got to be held responsible.

IR: To what extent do you think the administration bears some measure of responsibility.

IE: I think they're bear great deal of responsibility. >I think the-< recently testimony of the President's counsel (0.2) when he was being interviewed by the: Senate for possible .h confirmation as our next Attorney General our Chief Law Enforcement officer in the United States? in the case that (. ) a:h he was sympathetic to some of these (. ) procedures. He was not (. ) really (. ) against torture. He would (. ) say he was against torture, but he: really didn- (. ) sound very convincing.

IR: >Do you think there's any possibility? that any of these matters will be pursued further, and that the- question that whether there was responsibility in higher up the chain of command will be looked at again.<

IE: I don't think so. I don- I don't think this administration a::h is holding i- its people: responsible in many other respects. .h and (. ) I don't think with any Republic and majority in the Congress, there is going to be a demand e:h or law or something from the Congress' requiring (. ) an investigation. So I think we're (0.3) stuck (. ) at this time.

IR: >Admiral Stansfield Turner? Thank you very much indeed.<
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IR: John Humphrys
IE: Rick Scannell

01 IR: The time is (. ) nineteen minutes past seven. There was
another vote of no confidence in the system for dealing
with foreign terrorist suspects of the weekend? Second
lawyer who represents those the government wants to lock
up the Special Immigration Appeals Tribunal has
resigned? .hh A:nd Rick Scannell is in our radio car? for
his first broadcast interview? Good morning?
08 IE: Good morning?
09 IR: .hh Your colleague Ian MacDonald did this (. ) couple of
weeks (. ) ba:ck. E:m you decided not to go: at the time?
although you- basically a- agree with his objections. Why
not. Why did you delay.
13 IE: At the time I hope(d) that the government would react
positively, E:h an- release the men. At least in the fullnest
of the time, when it had had the opportunity to:: e:h reflect
on what course to take. I- i- it was a landmark decision in
December of last year? [.hh e:h
18 IR: [>This is the decision by the Law
19 Lords that< .h this was a- g- the decision to- hold people
without trial was contrary to their human rights from regis-
legislation.
22 IE: In- in- indeed it was contrary to their fundamental rights in
liberty? The rights of personal freedom has (. ) very long
traditions in English law? dating back to the Magna Carter?
24 And indeed the right of personal freedom is- .h if you like a
reflection of democratic society in the post-war era. U:hm
27 (. ) unfortunately the initial optimism (. ) that I had (0.2) that
the government .h might upon reflection .h actually (. )
change its mind, and not (. ) seek (. ) the continued (. )
detentions of these men, a- and release them, pro:ved to be:
misplaced. A:nd one saw that because e:h special advocates
were continuing e:h to receive instructions? because CIAC
i- is still sitting? because (0.2) reviews are due shortly to
take place, of thee .h continue the detention these men u- u-
under e:h the:se la:ws.
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36 IR: hhh=
37 IE: And I wasn’t prepared to: continue to: (0.2) be involved
in a: system that sought to review the legality of
detention. Where the House of Lords has said in absolutely
unequivocal terms (. ) that their detention (. ) was contrary to
their human rights.=
38 IR: =h There is a story in the: Daily Telegraph this morning
suggesting that (. ) all of you? all the special advocates met
( ) and decided that if the government doesn’t accept the
House of Lords r- ruling in some shape or form, everyone
will go:. Is that true.
39 IE: I’ve no comments to make- about e: any other special
advocates. >I’m delighted to< talk about my own position,
but I have no comments to make about others’.
40 IR: I see? It is true:. isn’t it that the government is still saying
that it’s thinking about how to respond to::: [e:h what the =
41 IE: (((biting lips)))
42 IR: House of Lords has said. >And to that extent they migh-
s- say what you’ve done is a bit pre-mature.
43 IE: Well (. ) you know (. ) as I’ve emphasized? the: right to
liberty is a fundamental right. It: (. ) has been (. ) I think a
little bit over a month now, since the:: House of Lords gave
their eh landmark decision? emphasizing the (fundel)
importance? (. ) of (. ) the right (. ) to liberty. U:h i- i- i- it is
in my view intolerable that the government should sit on (. )
a decision (. ) like this. It’s very simple? Their lordships’
decision’s very clear. A:nd if- the government isn’t to
continue to breach these people’s fundamental rights, to my
mind, e:h the: action that it should take (. ) is very very
simple. [It should =
44 IR: [r-
45 IE: = release them.
46 IE: Rick Scannell? Many thanks.
Monday 17 Jan. 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0733 Voluntary euthanasia (05:08.0)

IR: John Humphrys
IE: Tom Butler, the Bishop of Southwark
IE0: Deborah Annetts, chief executive of the Voluntary Euthanasia Society

IR: Seven minutes to eight? Canon Robert Gill, who’s an advisor to the Archbishop of Canterbury, attracted plenty of attention over the weekend by saying that there’s a very strong compassionate case for voluntary euthanasia. Because of its connection to Lambeth Palace? The remark was interpreted as a sign of the Church of England’s position on the issue is changing? The Chief Executive of the voluntary eutha- Euthanasia Society? . h i: s Deborah Annetts.

IE0: Perhaps, one of the reasons why: the Church of England is shifting its position is- is because it understa::nds that . h in this day and age, assisted dying, . h as is currently dealt with under the law, with fu:ll criminal sanctions is not in an appropriate way. Given () the: very high suppo:rt () within church-goers, . h fo:r changing the law () o:n assisted dying in this country. I’m () very much welcome the fact . h that senior church leaders are (. ) h respo:n ding to the concerns o:f (. ) ordinary church people.

IR: hhh And the Bishop of Southwark (. ) Tom Butler is here, good morning.

IE: Good morning.=

IR: .hh Do you believe there is a very strong compassionate case for voluntary euthanasia.

IE: There is a compassionate case of course because this is a very difficult e:h area. E:h but- there isn’t a strong case . h e:h for changing our fundamental values. E:h e:h fundamental values that life is a- a gift from God? It’s to be revered? It’s to be cherished? An- tho:se who become vul:nerable thro(ugh) ill:ness↑ o:r old age, deserve special care and protection. E:h the law: rightly gives us this protection at the present time. And in no way: are we striving for a change in the law. [(That is our) =

IR: [J-

IE: = compassionate position.
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IR: To be absolutely clear about this, the official (.) position of the Church of England remains (.) as it has always been, and the hints that we had over the weekend that it might be changing, are what just no more than hints, they are wrong.

IE: Th- the media are putting two and two together and making five. Eh the House of Bishops (,) and the Roman Catholic Bishops Conference (,) put in a joint submission eh to the select committee, eh stressing that we could not accept a change in the law. Eh as it happens eh last week, eh the submission eh took place during a meeting of the House of Bishops in Leeds? and therefore Robin Gill eh went to eh represent us. And eh he in eh giving his view, after giving the official eh submission, eh said it was a gray area. Eh but he he also said that he himself did not believe (,) in relaxing the ban on euthanasia. Eh he feel- he felt that it would make vulnerable people even more vulnerable.

IR: [.hh

IR But- if (,) the Church’s position (,) hasn’t changed? and it is as you have just spelled it out, is it legitimate (,) for individual priest to say the kind of thing? that Canon Gill (,) said.

IE: Well of course it’s always legitimate for priests and and an: d eh indeed lay people eh to discuss ethical issues. And and as he’s said eh this is a very difficult area and a very painful area. And a strong case can be made out. Eh eh to- for eh assisted euthanasia. But a much stronger case eh can be made out, for keeping the present eh legal and moral position intact.

IR: Do you accept the point that Deborah Annetts was making there, which is that on this particular issue, you are probably at odds .hh with many of your members?

IE: .hh Well I- I just don’t know whether that’s eh or not. But- but obviously it’s our duty as- as Bishops to think these things through (,) very clearly (,) we have a lot of experience of: eh of being alongside people (,) eh who are v- v- very ill or dying. Eh and: we wouldn’t want their position to be made more vulnerable.
But you'd also want to reflect, hh (. ) a change in the mood of the Church as a whole, wouldn't you. >(During)<
that's- the Church isn- doesn't usually operate as a sort of dictatorial system in which the bishops just hand down what they believe to be right?
[And (one of us) has to [(lump) it.

[Of course ( ). ]But- but- but bishops have a a particular responsibility eh to give eh leadership and to give ethical leadership. And as I say we- we have wi:de experience (. ) for being alongside people .h eh in this kind of vulnerable position? and we don't want their position to be made more vulnerable.

Do you regret the fact that Canon Gill said what he said.

Eh Canon Gill is- is a a remarkalble theologian. Eh he- he chairs the Archbishop's Medical Ethics Committee? Eh he gives: a great deal of- eh insi:ght and advice to the Church.

>And I'd want< him to continue to do that.

Yeah, but he's- he's got you in here on a Monday morning, trying to sort of pouring water on the fire, hasn't he?

Well, I- I- in- in- in- to be fair to him, he- he finished his submission as I've said, by: stressing that he didn't believe:ve .h tha- that we should relax the ban on eu-euthanasia? and saying precisely as I'm saying that it will make vulnerable people more vulnerable. .h As I say, I think this is a .h a- a- a story that has come out of nothing.

Tom Butler, many thanks.
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(04:14.3)
IR: John Humphrys
IE: Tim Collins, Shadow Education Secretary

01 IR: Nine minutes past seven. There’s always been a hard core of
02 children who play truant. The government said it would deal
03 with them and spend hundreds of millions of pounds
04 trying. According to the National Audit Office, it has
05 failed. Tim Collins is the Shadow Education Secretary?
06 Good morning?
07 IE: Good morning.
08 IR: But failed only with this- small percentage, because
09 school attendance is up in tile with everybody).
10 IE: Well let’s put this in context, John. This is now the third
11 devastating independent report about the government’s
12 educational record? First (the) Education Select Committee
13 (.) said there was no proof at all the extra money going to
14 the system (.) had improved the exam performance. >Second<
15 early this year the Chief Inspector of School said (. ) the
16 number of failing schools was up by thirty percent in the last
17 year. This morning the National Audit Office (. ) said the
18 government had spent eight hundred and eighty five million
19 pounds on reducing truancy (.) actually hasn’t fallen.
20 >Indeed< the government’s own figures (. ) shows this has
gone up by a third since nineteen ninety seven. So (. ) I’m
21 afraid you have to put this in context, the government is
22 spending an awful lot of money not getting a lot forward.
23 That’s a metaphor of their record (across) indeed. =
24 IR: =But you didn’t deal with my question about the fact that the
25 school attendance is at record levels. ]
26 IE: [hhh ] Absolutely. What all
27 we need to look at of course is that what the government has
28 succeed(s)ed in doing which frankly is not that much an
29 achievement, is to reduce the amount of authorized absences.
30 >That’s< when head teachers (. ) say to a parent you can take
31 the child away perhaps for holiday in school time. As the
32 government have reduced that, but they’ve made no progress
33 at all according to this independent report (. ) in reducing
34 unauthorized absence which of course is what we should be
worried about, which is truancy. 

= But I can't see any evidence that it has gone up, from the report that is.

Eh but if you look at the government's own figures (. ) produced in parliamentary answers, that it shows the number of children playing truancy a year (. ) has gone up by more than a third since nineteen ninety seven. An- and actually it's now over a million for the first time.

.hhh Well hh. how do you square that with them saying: that e::hm (0.2) the hard core you- as you S AY: the hard core of two percent only two perCENt of six point seven million pupils .h (en-ter-) almost half of the truancy. But it has remained- (. ) sTAble. That's the way I read the figure.

[( ) reading them wRONgly.] =

[well what they're saying ] =

=No no no John. What the Audit Office is quite right at pointing out is that the proportion of young people eh who are playing truancy is about the same. But of course the age group has increased and therefore the numbers .hh who are playing truant has gone up. That I think is why the government can both claim (. ) that there are more children who are (. ) going to school while at the same time the number of children who are playing truant has also gone up, because the age group is growing in the recent years. =

That hardly sounds like a devastating indictment, to use the word you used at the beginning?

Well I think (. ) you've got to put as I say this in the context. They spent eight hundred and eighty five million. They had a target only TWO YEaRS ago (. ) that we were going to see a ten percent fa:ll in the (. ) amount of children playing truant. And this report confirms (. ) there's been no fall at all. In fact they've set successive targets since nineteen ninety seven. Let's actually talk positively about what should be done instead, because of course we can play knock-about. [I think ]

[Well I- be-bu-just before we [do that, just for one second. =

[e:hm

= This is the point, isn't it. .h what they're doing (. ) is they're setting a target. And if you set a target and you fail it, you still
75 (ha)ve made an effort. I mean (hhh) they are in a sense (.).
76 taking a risk, aren’t they, by saying (. ) you know you- judges
77 by this, if you fail to achieve that target, yeah we were a fail,
78 but at least they’ve set the target.
79 IE: Well John you’re a very very generous man. You’re (clearly
80 in a (ma-))
81 IR: [Try my best.]=
82 IE: = Absolutely. Ehm (. ) I do think however if they’ve set a
83 target and then spent a huge amount of all our money, that’s
84 eight hundred eighty five million pounds of tax payers’
85 money, h and failed to hit it, then it’s legitimate for us (such)
86 to say (. )hang on there’s something [going wrong.
87 IR: [Alright, what would you
88 do.=
89 IE: =Absolutely. Two things I think we have to recognize.
90 Truancy of course has many many different factors. And no
91 child is exactly the same as any others. But two things are
92 driving I think in particular. h One is (field reporting)? And
93 we need to crack down hard on disciplining schools, we need
94 to give here teachers the final say excluding h eh d- eh eh
95 indisciplinary pupils and provide proper supervision for that.
96 We talked about that earlier this week. The second thing is
97 that we need to make sure that particularly for the- .h older
98 age group in secondary school where truancy is particularly
99 prevalent, fourteen and fifteen year olds. hh There’s
100 alternative vocational education. And we set up plans as ( )
101 yesterday. Eh for one in three ultimately in that age group to
102 have access to two days a week outside school. Eh maybe in
103 any (question) centre if they’re interested in animals. Maybe
104 in garages if they are interested in cars. Actually to make
105 them (. ) more interested in being engaged in education. I
106 think if you did that, you actually make them feel that
107 education wasn’t boring. It was relevant. You really would get
108 rid of the roots of much of the truancy. That is the problem.
109 IR: Tim Collins, thank you. We’ll be talking to the Education
110 Secretary herself at about ten to eight.
Chief of Staff Mark Malloch Brown has admitted that there are very rare questions over the management of the United Nations. He was speaking after the United Nations' own investigation ( ) the food scandal found that the UN official running the program .h was guilty of unethical behavior. That has seriously undermined the integrity of the organization. But Mr. Mark Malloch Brown said the problem .h wasn’t just with the UN, and critics should look closer to home.

What British politicians did know well was .h massive oil smuggling, .h which they (condoned) and allowed and which eh allowed revenues to approve to (. ) Saddam Hussein, which dwarfed (. ) anything he made (. ) to the UN ‘Oil for Food’ program.

Mark Malloch Brown, whose interview you can hear at ten past eight this morning. Well on the line is Mr. Donald Anderson, who chairs the Foreign Select Committee. Good morning.

Is Mr. Mark Malloch Brown right?

Yes, he is partly right. But: (. ) clearly the focus now; (. ) is on (. ) the focal report what he says about the UN, and perhaps said there’s an element in what he’s saying as (. ) (fully industing) the (either) people. I- a;nd attack as a bit of formal defense.

But he is also referring to what he is in the balk of report, which is an- Paul Paul Volker sets out that- the panel said there was convincing and uncontested ev- evidence that the selection process for the three UN contractors chosen at nineteen ninety six, (0.2) broke Financial Competitive and Bidding rules, and he’s particularly .h pointing to, = in that case, the Loyds Register & Inspection Limited. The British company ° law °.
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IE: = Well, if he makes and i- if an- obviously I have as
repo:r:rted.=
IR: = eh =
IE: = The new repo:rt. Eh if eh people are mentioned, or groups
are mentioned. Eh I think they should be followed up. And:
as just as the UN, itself has been in the talk, and hopefully it
will take- (. ) a medium on measures, and not simply (. ) e:h
be: a- attack others. I hope that- if the cap fits, that the
appropriate measures will be taken, and people will be
exposed.
IR: Well (. ) e::h how- (. ) what needs to happen to in- to see
whether British- British involvement needs to be "(in this
pl[ace] °.
IE: [Well, I hope that: the government look very carefully. The
chapter- chapter of verse, that is that: (. ) if allegations are
made, that they will be looked at carefully? And it is clear
that there was (. ) undoubtedly enormous (suprege) (. ) of oil
from Iraq. Eh that: clearly there was- there were- we have
ships of course (. ) eh in the street, you can (to prevent). Eh it-
but we knew very well that there was (. ) an element to this.
That was there was corruption. And: equally there was a
quite lot of smuggling into Turkey. (. ) eh (. ) And I guess- (. )
for th- fi- at the ti:me, .h e:h (. ) there was that- certainly a
degree of toleration. So (. ) let's- (. ) yes he is right, Mark
Malloch Brown? Chief of Staff? (. ) the UN is on the
defensive, and he was right to point out that they were not
alone. So: just as UN (. ) needs to (. ) look very carefully at
some measures, they are not restricted actually to (. ) eh the
director. Because hhh clearly for the- the amount of abuse,
suggests that there was: (. ) quite a large team of people
involved eh directly or indirectly. Equally of other (. ) eh
groups are mentioned, that they are not to be exposed.
IR: Do you think that it raises the question (. ) over whether Kofie
Annan can stay at the United Nations?
IE: (0.4)
IE: .hhh I hope he- he is able to stay. He's- (. ) eh popular, he's
done a remarkable job and he's given- (. ) a: a new focus eh a
new efficiency to the UN. And clearly his statue will be
diminished in part after this. More- mo:re I think (. ) eh
 partly for his family reasons. But: although eh his statue will be diminished, I would hope that he will be able to remain. IR: Kofie Annan, many thanks. IR0: Ehm Kofie Annan? IE: [(Well I-)
 IR: [Eh forgive me, Donald Anderson, hahahaha there is a man we would like to speak. 81 [Donald Anderson. Hahahaha?
 IR0: [Absolutely. She will be one day, who knows.
IR: The time now twenty-eight minutes (. ) to eight. Finance
Ministers of the world’s seven most powerful economies
meet in London today. They’ll be talking about poverty in
Africa, .hh and about the rise of China as a major trading
block. But what do; such financial meetings really achieve.
It’s something our economic editor Evan Davis has been
considering.

IE: I didn’t think they were very useful at first. But I came to
realize how valuable they were. Eh Allen Greece explained
to me the first thing is to get to know the other ministers, you
may have to deal with them. You’ve got to meet them, get to
know them. You may have to deal with them on the phone
(. ) .h when you’ve got a crisis? And the other thing is, you
are very mutually and inter-dependent. Your own success,
your own polity? (. ) is gonna be very much affected by: (. ) by
what’s happening in the economic count, looking at other
countries, by what other ministers are doing. So they are very
good (. ) way: eh semi (. ) informally getting together, trying
to reach your consensus which you never do, but trying to
understand how you gonna tackle .h problems you have in
common. An- and then sometimes not always (. ) there is a
kind of circus outside which (. ) often bears well the
resemblance to what the meeting has been like. And that’s one of the things which happen in this occasion. There
are already drafted communiqué which would be very
(anal dying) we won’t save very much, (. ) and when it set up
the mar ket. Because otherwise you waste a lot of time (. ) .h
arguing about the communiqué when you are having the
meetings. An- and then ministers go up to explain their own national press if they want to. What they say is we going on inside, an- an- and everybody will (else) understand Gordon has got an election in ten weeks. I actually think (.) that they will share his concerns for Africa (. ) poverty which is a legitimate subject? I’m sure they’ll talk about it. And an- British Chancellor (Vick Chair) is to go to French really, (. ) have already taken the lead on these public issues. It was Nigel Lawson who (. ) was the first British Chancellor to start to kick off the whole question of debt relief and get it under way, and they eh eh the British Chairman should be usually (. ) does get around these poverty issues.

IR: Well the- the poverty issue (. ) make poverty history is the challenge. We talk about huge challenge (. ) is sort of (. ) almost setting up for failure.

IE: .hh i- it is I think the most challenge is facing the world today; I would risk of upsetting the Americans there by saying actually (. ) it’s a greater single global problem, = is more important than world terrorism. Eh eh th- th- they all know, including Gordon, (0.2) and that isn’t just going to be solved by putting more money in eh or just by debt relief. Eh although I think that they all agree: (. ) that it is important that more money (. ) is required. Th- th- the real challenge in Africa is how: to challenge this money in, in a way which actually eh is combined with better government, with less corruption, creating the conditions (rambling) investment, starting developments of some trade. Eh so (. ) al- al- although ou- outside interviews will be about how much money of each country agree was now gonna be required. I mean it’s no good making political speeches to finance ministers. [Eh the real problem th(h)at they’re =

IR: [.hhh

IE: = faced with [their central bank of governance .h

IR: [em

IE: =is how to tune this in something eh that might eh get Africa to surge ahead of us. Parts of Asia have been surging ahead of us [about the last ten years.=

IR: [.hhh
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IR: =well Gordon Brown has got a job convincing certain
countries not just the America about his proposals on how to
deal with it. An- and do you read anything that the fact that
John Snow, ..h the US Secretary isn- isn't there?
IE: Well I think it's the difficulty, 'cause (.) my impression is that
John Snow hasn't got much to do: with American e::h
economic policy. I mean it sounds very curious. An- under
the Clinton government, I was alongside a very distinguished
Treasury Secretary, a guy called Bob Ruben, who really was
the most powerful finance minister in the world, 'cause he's
pressured to let them running. They agreed. (.) But Bob
Ruben really did, (the Labor) really- really did contribute.
Snow gives me the impression of just being out there to
advertise the case for tax cuts. ..h So (.) I don't think his a- his
absence will- will matter very much. Eh eh th- the American
e::h th- (affair), eh the American [Treasury people are =

IE: = extremely important. They will argue with Gordon about
how he is suggesting to raise this money. Eh what I think
they have really in the private conversation have agreed
upon? ..h is the difficulty of ..h how to challenge yet more
financial assistance, channel them in- into eh eh Africa? (.) in
the way of producing some la:(h)sting economic growth and
recovery.

IE: Kenneth Clarke, many thanks.
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IR: Caroline Queen
IE: Charlie Marlic, chairman of the Labor’s Ethnic Minority Forum
01 IR: Nine minutes past seven. hhh According to Trevor Philips the chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, black boys may have to be taught apart from other children in some subjects. (0.2) hh to improve their grades. (hhh He believes it’s necessary because so many black youngsters are failing to get good GCSE’s. hh He also wants tougher actions against black fathers who don’t take their parenting responsibilities seriously enough hhh. Charlie Marlic, from Labor’s national executive committee is chairman of the party’s Ethnic Minority Forum, as well as being a former commissioner for the CRER. Eh Charlie Marlic, good morning to you.
03 IE: .hh Hi good [morning.
04 IR: [eh Do you agree with Trevor Philips?
05 IE: hhh Eh, e: it’s not a question of agreeing or disagreeing. I do think it’s:: slightly out of context. (I think) Trevor was doing a: (0.2) hh a documentary and listing a scheme in the US (. ) hh where:: segregation: I think for black boys (. ) in English classes- had led to dramatic- (. ) results. positive results. hh An- I think he was just asking a question that- you know after- (. ) thirty years, of educationalists working on this issue, on the achievement of black boys↑ .hh ehm (. ) should we close our minds to: other options and possibilities=–
07 IR: = But what about that question then, if i- if it’s been shown to be a success in a- hh. US school↑↑, should it- could it be adopted here.
09 IE: .hhw wel- I- I’ve got to say I’m eh it’s my firm belief that this is principally a debate for: the African (Caribbean) Community, hh in order to look for th- the shortcomings of the education system as it currently: stands, but also to look at the: the causal factors which contribute to those hh. poor achievement rates. = You’ve mentioned some of it. = >I mean, .hh we looked at the disproportion of (or) lack of eh (0.2) male role modals within the: the household, .h social
economic problems, teacher expectations, a kind of gangster 
rap culture. They're- you see they are very- they are very 
complex and sensitive issues, but- I do: thi:nk (0.2) the a lot 
of this isn't- .h rocky signs, .hh in a sense that- (. ) we've got 
a very very serious problem for: for society. I think African 
Caribbean (. ) pupils, boys in- certain areas up to eight times 
more likely to be: excluded. When I say it isn't rocky signs 
what I mean is (. ) if you are more likely to be excluded, you 
are more likely to underachieve. [(.) If you are more likely = 
[And- and- 
IE: = to underachieve, you are less likely to get a good job. >And 
if you are less likely to get a-< a- good job, then you are 
more likely to engage in activities .hhh that the society 
from:ns upon. = 
IR: = wou- th- those- those figures have been quoted already 
about GCSE resu:ts. Ehm last year just h. thirty five point 
seven percent of black and Caribbean pupils in England 
scored at least five C grades in GCSE compared to the 
national average of .h fifty one point nine percent. = >How 
do you< .h redress that balance then if h. you; (. ) don't think 
that educating (. ) black boys separately is the answ[er. 
IE: [.hhhh 
well (0.3) I think- the education system is one thing (. ) that 
we need to look at. The educationists: hh. clearly a::re trying 
their hardest. But (it) isn't working. We've seen gains each 
year, but they are marginal gains. .hhh And society (. ) really 
could do without marginal gains†, we need significant gain†s 
to ensure that this is a (level of plai:n field). .hhh Eh eh I- I 
notice that: a the deputy General Secretary one of the Head 
Teacher Associations, .hhh talked about- .h you know it has 
been seen as- (. ) eh kind of preferential special treatment, (. ) 
and perhaps (to) legal that the thing that: Trevor had: [.h ] = 
IR: [ehm] 
IE: = had booked forward as possible option.= 
IR: =You are referring to the comments by Martin Wa:ll the 
deputy General Secretary of the- .hh Secondary Heads of 
Associa:tion, you ] say, he believes the suggestions could = 
IE: [Yes, indeed.] 
IR: = fall fail of .h racial equality l[aws ]. Do you- =
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75 IE: ["Yeah"]
76 IR: = do you think that’s right? =
77 IE: =No no I mean- (.) clearly that there is provision- (.) within
78 the existing legislation and: .hhh sound of a bit like a (no)
79 now, = about one hundred parts six section thirty five. .hh
80 That allows for positive action measures in education for
81 this survey: (.) groups. So it is clearly to be: (.) lawful. And
82 it’s not about special treatment, it’s about .hh rectifying a
83 problem for society. [The important thing is (£) that .hhh if=
84 IR: ]
85 IE: = this works whatever this is, they won’t just benefit African
86 Caribbean- (.) children. It will benefit- (.) society as a whole.
87 =
88 IR: = wu=-
89 IE: = But I think one- I think one thing that Trevor hhh. has
90 successfully done (0.2) is (.) initiate a debate (.) eh I- I think
91 many people within the African Caribbean Community (.) .h
92 will feel .h eh is a debate whose time has come.
93 (0.3)
94 IR: ((biting lips)) .h Charie Marlic, thank you very much.
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(03:28:7)
IR: John Humphrys
IE: David Bickford, the legal advisor to MI5
01 IR: Thirteen minutes past seven. It's: a pretty frightening
02 thought if Sir John Stevens Lord Stevens the former-
03 metropolitan and police commission is right (.) and there
04 really are at least a hundred (. ) probably as many as- (. ) two
05 hundred terrorists (. ) connected to Al-samah Ben Laden .hh
06 walking in the streets of our cities. .hhh Some (sort of) the
07 puzzling thought if he can be that sure (of) the figure,
08 therefore obviously he knows who they are, why can't they
09 be arrested. .hh David Bickford was the legal advisor to MR
10 five and MR six for nearly ten years. He now advises foreign
11 governments. Ehm Why Mr. Bickford, what's going on here.
12
13 IE: = .hhh I don't understand. If these terrorists (. ) have been (. )
or suspected terrorists have been walking around in France
or Italy, or in Europe. .hhhh they would have been (. )
arrested by now on suspicion of association with a terrorist
organization or terrorism. .hhhh Their (. ) investigation
would have been supervised by an examining judge. .h
A:nd once the investigation was proceeding they should be
19 held in prison detailed for up to four years. =
20 IR: = But we don't have that system. =
21 IE: = Eh we don't have that system. And what I don't
understand is why not. .hhh I think the Home Secretary
wants to hang on his executive powers, .hh not give power to
the judicial system. .hh And therefore; he is: .hh missing out a
golden opportunity. .h to really protect us, where as in fact he
is giving us a (mishmash) mage .hh of legislation, which
28 really terrorists can probably walk through quite easily. =
29 IR: = So there is no: offense th- that says ehm eh connection
with a terrorist organization.
30 IE: No, that's preparatory, it's sort of ehm eh offense, in- in the
United Kingdom. .hh The United States also has .hh eh an
offense of association with terrorism, .h as do all the
European countries. .h (coughing) And the European system
or- or judicial system- (0.2) of detention for up to four years
in these circumstances with judicial (overside) has been proved of by the European Court of Human Rights. The current proposals mean that this government have to go to Europe, and derogate from the obligations under European convention of human rights. The current proposals (. ) mean that this government have to go to Europe, ( ) and derogate from the obligations under the European convention that makes this the only country in Europe to do so. .hhh =

IR: = Do you think they really (. ) know: who: these people are ( ) hundred two hundred whatever the figure has to be wi- with- bearing in mind your connections that the part of MR fi[ve MR six.] Do they know these guys?

IE: ((clearing voice)) (0.3)

IE: .hhh Yes if- (clear throat) if Sir John Stevens says: (0.2) that's the figure, .hh then he i:s (. ) in the best position to know:, .h a:nd, let's face it he's kept us safe during his watch, .hh and we have to respect its- wha- what he say:s. [( )

IR: [And presumably they have been watched all the time. these people if they know where they are, presumably there are a lot of people on their case and keep an eye on them.

IE: .hh Well I would assume so, because if- if there is as a danger as Sir John Stevens says or Lord Steven says, .hh then no doubt they are being kept under surveillance. What I don't understand is why they are not .hhh being detail:ned at this very moment under a system like a French system or Italian system .hh to make us completely safe, whereas i- at the moment, .hh they are walking in the streets.

IR: David Bickford, thanks very much?. We did: eh (. ) want to talk to the Home Office, about this it's but there was no minister prepared to talk to us, and would of course very much like to Sir John Stevens, Lord Stevens himself, we are hoping we Might be able to do that later in the program.
Monday 7 Mar 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0717 reform the National Curriculum (05:33:6)

IR: Caroline Queen
IE: Chris Woodhead, former Chief Inspector of Schools

01 IR: Sixteen minutes past seven. A top-to-bottom (.) review of the National Curriculum’s been promised by the Conservatives .hh if they win the election. Michael Howard told his party’s Welsh conference over the weekend that he wanted the current curriculum slim down: .hh Pupils should be given more traditional teaching: , .hh and an end to political correctness. .hh The man who is chosen for this job is the former Chief Inspector of Schools† Chris Woodhead, who is on the line now. Good morning?

02 IE: Good morning to you.

03 IR: Mcht. Ehm you’d be put to work within a month of eh Conservative government coming to power. How do you view your task?

04 IE: Hhhh Yes, within a month. And I think it’s important that the task is undertaken quickly, because it’s very very important, and it’s urgent. So: I: would look forward to doing the job, very positively indee:d. It’s important. And I think I can make a contribution.=

05 IR: =And what are [the priorities then. =

06 IE: = Well the priorities as Michael Howard indicated yesterday: are: to: ensure that the national curriculum does focus on proper†, if you like, traditional subject knowledge, of the kind that I think most people in England expect (. ) young children, children to be taught at school. I mean we’ve got a situation, just take history, where recent survey shows that half of sixteen to twenty year-olds didn’t know that Drake defeated Armada. Thirteen percent thought that Hornblower, seen as far as this fictional character, ehm was the man responsible. And six percent, god help us, thought it was Gandalf from the Lord of Rings. [Now: ] (hhh) a national=

07 IR: [(hhhh)]

08 IE: = c(h)urr(h)iculum (£) order for history (£), .hh that is resulting in that k- level of eh ignorance, sh- clearly can’t be the ri(h)ght order (hh), can [it.
IR: [Uhm, but what about the rising success in ( ) exam statistics.
IE: [hhh. [Well the other strand actually of the work that I would be asked to do: ehm assuming a Conservative victory has to do with public examinations and national curriculum tests. hh And I think there again: there are some very obvious challenges. hh I mean the point of examination is to ensure: the: candidates who really are most deserving: for the particular prize being at a place as a university or a job. And with escalating numbers of candidates getting grade As, particularly in A level, the exams are simply not fulfilling their basic function. hh So I think that: eh it is very very important that we look first at the curriculum as the building blocks of a child’s education. h and then secondly ( ) at examination system as the means of establishing which children are best suited hh for: which particular prizes or goals in next stages in their careers.
IR: And when you are talking about getting rid of political =
IE: [nose noise = correctness, what do you mean by that.
IR: [nose noise =
IE: Well: we mean ( ) ehm h. take Citizenship as a classic example. Citizenship was eh a new national curriculum: ( ) subject that was introduced by David Blanket. hhh And just looking at what’s called the Program of Study. Children in primary schools are: to be taught to FEEL positive about themselves. Not quite sure how you TEACH that, that self-esteem, but that’s- a fundamental aim. hhh Secondly, they must meet and talk with people hh. ehm who contribute to society through for example environmental pressure groups or international aid organizations. hhh They’ve got to be taught respect and understanding between different races and dealing with harassment. hh Now I’m not saying that any of these things aren’t important, I just think that an explicit focus, the idea that they can be taught, that they should be taught, to children as young as five. hhh is wrong. hh That the best way, for example, to develop to teach self-esteem is to teach children to read and write (hhh), =
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75 IR: = Ehm =
76 IE: = and add up, .hh and to know something about the world.
77 [(.) ( )]
78 IR: [But the way that- k- the curriculum's been developed e:hm
79 (0.2) they would argue, is: is reflecting changes in society,
80 you might want to [be ] stepping backwards then.=
81 IE: [nose noise]
82 IE: = Mcht. Well- () hh. you could put it like that. I mean I
83 think that [t-
84 IR: [But is that good.
85 IE: Well () hh. I think that to learn, to read, and write, and
86 spell, .hh and to learn to add up. .h We live in the twenty
87 first century, but I'm not sure that those basic skills are any
88 Different than they were in the twentieth or indeed the
89 nineteenth century. When you come to history, surely- () I
90 think- the: focus of history ought to be: the national story.
91 And the national story hasn't changed in the last decade or
92 so. Eh: I just reject the idea that the curriculum has to
93 be .hhh to use a jargon word that is banded about
94 re-engineered [e:h to meet the =
95 IR: [.hhh
96 IE: = de(hh)man(hh)ds of the twenty first century. There are;
97 some essential truth. It's upon those truth and skills=
98 IR: = (alright) =
99 IE: = that the education should focus.
100 IR: Well the government's saying that Michael Howard
101 shouldn't instead be looking at his policy of cutting at least a
102 billion pounds they save from state schools to- hhh
103 subsidize private education, that he is barking up the wrong
104 tree with this one.
105 IE: Well I just wish:, I mean I'm not a politician, and I'm not
106 really interested in that kind of political knockabout. I just
107 wish that the government would look at the kind of
108 problems that Michael Howard has identified, because these
109 problems are real.: .hhh I mean Prime Minister, ehm quite
110 rightly education is number one priority. .hhh He (retreat)ed
111 it at the other day:. .hh He wants standards to rise. () How:
112 can standards rise when the national curriculum is wrong.
113 IR: Eh just a- a quick one on ehm () the story that we were
covering earlier, Trevor Philips the:: eh (0.2) .hh CRA
chairman saying that black boys may have to be taught
apart from other children in some subjects to-.hhh improve
their grades. Would you approve of that kind of segregation.

IE: Well if Trevor Philip is right, = and there is evidence from
America that black boys benefit from (.) this- (inadvertently
called) segregation, .hh the word is loaded obviously, then I
think we should look at the evidence. But my experience as
an ex-Chief Inspector, .hh is that the problems aren't
problems of the color of skin, they are problems of f- f-
failure to teach literacy to: (hhh) black boys but also white-
working class boys in primary schools†, .hh a failure of
expectations, .h and a failure to develop appropriate
educational curriculum at the top end of the secondary
school†. .hh So I'm not sure myself that: eh dividing up the:
the children teaching black boys separately is the answer. I
think that there are fundamental general problems that
should be addressed. .hhh And Michael Howard's review of
the national curriculum would be established towards doing
that:

IR: [.hhh
(incomplete recording, about the end, probably only the IR’s ‘thank-you’ left out)
IR: John Humphrys
IE: Keith Vaz, former Europe Minister

(bold interview omitted)

01 IR: hhh That was Roger Liddle talking to Keith Vaz. Who’s on the line now is the former Europe minister Keith Vaz.
02 (coughing) Did I say (.) to (.) Tim Thas. Tim Fra:nks. hh
03 That’s because Keith Vaz was the former (. ) Europe minister who is on the line (hh) good morning to [you (hh).
04 IE: [Good morning, John.
05 IR: Ehm: some people (. ) skeptical about: m Europe will have listen to that. (They say) that is: (0.2) blow the gap, that is giving us away, because it does threaten our sovereignty and he has acknowledged it.
06 IE: Well Mr. Roger is passionate on these issues and always has been. h And I think there’s nothing wrong with him: putting his views forward. hh Where he is right is that- e-
07 I- thi- think we’ve probably been much further along the road, as far as our general agenda is concerned, hh but for the fact that we’ve had hh other (. ) foreign (office) issues: ah on the foreign poli- policy decisions to be made every (welcome) the wars against terror. h That has h. (. ) prevented us having this (debate) with British people. The second thing is everytime a minister (0.2) .h starts to talk about Europe, hh certain parts of the (US) skeptical media (. ) .h go (be circumstance) screaming at them. hh But what are [we-
08 IR: [Do they or do they not simply make the reasoned argument that Europe does threaten our sovereignty and they don’t like it.
09 IE: (biting lips) No::: ehm They don’t engage of the issues that are very important as far as Europe is concerned. But I think we can be optimistic about this. I think Europe will be dominating our thinking over the next year. .h I think there are three reasons for this. .hh First of all, of course we’ve got to have a referendum. Ehm next year. Secondly we are gonna have a general election. .h And I think it is
important that (. ) European issue should be part (. ) of our general election campaign, .h because we’ve achieved so: much over the last (few) years. .h It’s impossible to have (. ) a huge domestic election (0.2) without mentioning Europe. .h and without showing what we have achieved eh. (. ) And thirdly, (. ) .h I think (in) Tony Blair and Jack Store the two- (. ) principal ministers responsible for this issue. .hh You have to invest the campaign as in British politics. .h And what Roger was saying (0.2) .h is that we should relate much more: (. ) to the British people, what we’ve achieved. .h Where I disagree with him, (. ) .h is I don’t think abstract notions (. ) are the kinds of issues that will encourage people to think about Europe. I think people- (. ) do: need to see Europe, (. ) in terms of the jobs that are being created, .h because of the list of agenda. Or the fact that we need the cooperation of our European partners, .h if we are going to solve (. ) .h the immigration and asylum issue. .h And it’s these kinds of domestic issues .h that need to be related to our: (. ) position in the European U[nion.

IR: [And is that what you mean when you talk about further along the road, because a lot of people would interpret what you’ve just said, that further along the road (betters) being further along the road to cr- to eh closer integration h. eh with Europe political integration, and the sort that makes (. ) many people nervous.

IE: No:. it isn’t that. I doesn’t- I meant further along the load, road, making sure .h that our agenda, which is very much the formal agenda, making sure that the European Union, what happens in Brussels hh. is (. ) directly related to ou-our domestic a- agenda will work. We have of course played the crucial part of what’s happening in Europe (both) the last eight years. .h But what we need to do (. ) .h is to make sure that we use for example (. ) .h the new allies that we have, (0.2) after enlargement, and th- the new countries that we join, .h who very much share our view [(0.2) of what Europe should be doing.

IR: [if-

IR: If: eh::: when the (. ) referendum has (held), assuming the
other countries including France obviously vote: in favor
of the constitution. If we vote against it, hhhh ehm- (. ) is
that the end of us in Europe?
IE: (biting lips) hhhh I agree with Roger. I think it would be
catastrophic. That’s why it’s so important that we should
win. That is why[:

IR: [Catastrophic, let’s just be clear about
what you mean by catastrophic. Catastrophic meaning
we’d have effectively lead to pull out?
IE: Well we don’t have to pull out, but we obviously have to
going back, and talk to our colleagues (.) about what is going
to happen, because everyone else ratifies: this constitution.
>And< Britain is the only country (. ) .h that does not do
so:. Then we will be: (. ) totally isolated. I think it is very
important that we explain to the British people (. ) .hh in the
run up to the our presidency in the European Union (. ) .h
with the presidency that we will have in the first of July,
that we are central (. ) .h to the European project. If we do
not win (. ) that referendum, it’s clearly going to be: pretty
bad for Britain. hh And that is why it’s important that we
should focus on these issues, (0.2) .h and explain to people
( . ) what a no-vote would actually mean. [( . ) ]=

IR: [Kea- ]
IE: = To that extent, Roger was absolutely being right, we need
to be:.h campaigning (. ) now'; (. ) .h and for the next year.
IR: Keith Vaz, thank you.
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IR:
IE0: Jason (Burquol), the author of (Alkido), the true story of radical (lousland)
IE1: Lord King, chairman of the terrorism and security committee
IE2: Lord Harris, former head of the metropolitan police authority.

01 IR: It's ten past eight. How scared should we be of the terrorist threat in our (best). Sir John Stevens'
02 (randamentory politian) police authority until a few weeks ago, and he (said) we should be: very scared. .hh He wrote an article for the news of world
03 yesterday in which he said .h there are at least a hundred terrorists trained by Asama Ben Laden
04 walking in Britain streets and the number is probably nearer (.).h two hundred. .hhh and that is frightening.
05 Obviously it's true. .h Skeptics will point to the timing of the article. The government's trying desperately to get its anti-terrorism bill through Parliament in the teeth of serious opposition. .hh And there is another story in the paper this morning quoting a Home Office study that says only twenty (.).h terrorism suspects would be subjected to the government's proposed control orders. .h So what is going on here. Jason (Burquol), the author of (Alkido), the true story of radical (lousland), .h he's skeptical of the claims made by John Stevens.

21 Burquol: As so often, (.). Sir John (.). along with many other senior figures, .h is using words like (alkidor), .h as Alma Ben Laden trained, .h eh with some abandon. Eh we know (.). clear indication exactly who he is talking about. .h Eh he's talking (.). about the scenes (.). British citizens have been trained by Alsama Ben Laden. .h Now that would mean they would have to be trained before two thousand one, .h eh in which case one wonder is where they have been in the four years and why they present such a: .h clear precedent danger now. .h The threat comes from people who are called clean skins, people with (.).h no previous
records, wh- who: are feel sufficiently angry at what
they are perceived to be in justices, that they feel it’s
their religious duty to act. .h Eh m they may not be
trained, they may be (amerstrish), but they may still
perhaps if they are lucky put together .h a fairly ()
affective () terrorist () operation. .h That’s where the
threat comes from, not from: two hundred as Alsama
Ben Laden trained militants () .h stalking the streets
and the kind of: .h analysis in such histrionic
language that we saw eh at the weekend does not
help combat it.
IR: (turning pages, biting lips) .hhh That was Jason
(Burquol) on the line to discuss. This is eh Tom King,
Lord King who eh was a conservative defense
secretary and chairs the international (ambit). .h the:
ch- eh- (hh) terrorism and security committee. And
Lord Toby Harris, former head of the metropolitan
police authority. .hh Ehm I take that you accept
what:: hhh. eh: Sir John Stevens has to say, (.) Lord
Harris.
Harris: Well certainly eh:hm (0.4) Sir John was party to all the
intelligence. E:h he was a: oversaw the metropolitan
office, eh at the time that he was tackling
terrorism. .hhh I think though ehm (0.2) that one’s
got really to recognize () that there are: .h several
levels of people who hh. eh may or may not be
engaged in terrorism. There are those who may be the
potential suicide bombers. .h Eh the potential front
line, they would be those who are coordinating with
those hh. () who will be providing support of various
sorts. .hh And all different levels and ehm some much
more prevalent involved than others. .hh And I think:
it depends really which () definition you’re using .hh
as to precisely what sort of number one needs to talk
about. =
IR: = You don’t think it’s a coincidence that: ehm he- he
should have written that piece for the news of the
world yesterday at this absolutely crucial stage in the:
the progress of the bill through: Parliament.
Well I remember him telling me before he retired that he was planning to reach an agreement with the News of the World to write a regular column. I think this is just the first of his column. I think the idea that has distinguished public servant is somehow after his retirement in cohort with the Downing Street when he is no longer in the pay of the government, the answer is frankly rather (and both) unbelievable.

Now, Lord King in intelligence and security committee, as what I should have said earlier, obviously, what do you think. (0.4)

Well ehm I think what comes up this morning you brought that very well, is the (conceivable mumble) at least at the moment. If this is in the media and current threat was suddenly occurred, a point just made by year earlier contributor. These people who came out of training camps some time before two thousand and one. And what I-what I think so those things I don’t think you mentioned in the story today, that even if the government gets this bill through the present form, it’s not going to introduce the more major orders immediately, which I think just in the sense I’ve never seen such a model in Parliament ever. But the government having true (a journey turn) its own business, ’cause it couldn’t get its own members, in order. And what I think it says is this, there is a serious threat, suicide bombers in particular and the sort of means that there are people prepared to undertake. do propose serious challenges. But we mustn’t panic or completely lose our heads. And so what we should do: is either renew the order that the Law Lords said .h needed to be changed but would certainly give time, so government was committed to change, h to (allow) through nuance for a short of
period. Or to carry through measure now, but may counter such an incredible trains our susceptible justices (.). has to be reviewed as in the bill of Sunset Clause, where you get the election out of the way. hh People can arrive in a saner and calmer way. h Look at what the best way is to deal with this, while making sure in the mean time (. we protect the security in the country. =

IR: =. hh But the government's position has been (. all along look there is a very real threat. Sir John seemed to: eh confirm that yesterday, hh eh something must be done about it. We don't have the (well with all), the legal (well with all) to do it at the moment. Something's got to change, therefore (. let's do it, then we can lock (. a lot of these people at board at least::: hhh [restrict them.

King: [W- w- well- w- he- hh. Your- your correspondent said (. that Sir John dare to re- reinforce the government's case. And some could say it's a very serious attack on the government. h Here is Sir John is right, and saying for the last four years, h there have been hundreds of terrorists on the loose of this country†, h and now suddenly the government decides they need legislate to do it. What have they mean to do all the same. I- I don't attack the government in that way

IE: ((not finished, tape destroyed))
Dangjie Ji—Indirect Defensive Responses to Hostile Questions
In British Broadcast News Interviews

IR: John Humphrys
IE: Dr. Mitchell Reiss, American special envoy to Northern Ireland

IR: Five to seven. There’s been an angry response to the Irish statement about the killing Robert McCartney on both sides of the Atlantic? The American special envoy to Northern Ireland, Dr. Mitchell Reiss gives me his response.

IE: My initial reaction is that it’s not quite the appropriate step? The appropriate step is to have the guilty parties? and those who have the information about the case? to report to the police? And let the Court process the case as he said. =

IR: It’s pretty shocking really, isn’t it? that the first instinct of the IA was to say we’ll shoot these people.

IE: Thinka: I agree completely with that.

IR: What is an appropriate response to from Sinn Fein to that do you think? =

IE: = Well I think it’s responsibility: of every political party in Northern Ireland to not only cooperate with the police? but actually encourage our citizens to cooperate with the police. Mr. Adams made a number of very encouraging statements at the: the recent conference for instance. But they didn’t quite come up to the (moric) in terms of (.) hh. asking and question(ing) and indeed demanding that: all of his constituents cooperate with the police not just in the McCartney case, but indeed with all cases, eh involving criminality in Northern Ireland.

IR: So: let’s be clear what would you like to hear from Sinn Fein: now. =

IE: = Think it’s what the people of Northern Ireland would like to hear or I think what people in United States would like to hear? It’s time for the IA to go out of business. And it’s time for eh Sinn Fein: to be able to say that explicitly without ambiguity without ambivalence that criminality eh will not be tolerated. One of the statements that- Jerry Adams mentioned at conference I found particularly worrisome. It was that we refuse to
criminalize those who break the law, and pursuit of legitimate political objectives. And I'm not quite sure what he means by that. You can't find up for the rule of the law (or the court). Or you can't pick and choose which laws you are gonna all abide by.

IR: David Trimble: said at the weekend that it was time for the IRA to become a purely peaceful democratic movement with no private army. Do you think the time has come for Sinn Fein to distance themselves completely from the IRA to cut or remaining links between the two organizations.

IE: Well not only do I think it's time? I think it's past time. I mean this was after all the promise of the Good Friday Agreement. So: we are now going on seven years from that date. The possibility the prospect of justice (. ) is something that no community in Northern Ireland has to suffer (through) any more.

IR: Mitchell Reiss thank you very much indeed for talking to us.
Time is a quarter past seven. Tony Blair has consistently refused to publish the advice he received from the Attorney General on whether the war in Iraq was legal or not. Now it seems he didn’t even show it to his own Cabinet and some MPs are demanding that the Cabinet Secretary hold an enquiry into whether that was a breach of the code of conduct. Simon Thomas is the Plaid Cymru MP who’s been on this case. How do you know this Mr. Thomas?

We know this now because the Prime Minister has admitted that the way of Code of Conduct applies to him as a minister. And looking in details that a Minister way of code of conduct? you can see: that the members of Cabinet give in a summary of legal advice to some of the officer? they’re all supposed to receive the full copy and text of that advice. And we know for plain sure that from other members of the Cabinet this time that it didn’t happen.

Isn’t this a rather technical point?

It’s not really technical, is it, because making a decision to go to war is something we know the Attorney General have some difficulties with? Eh that he had to be persuaded, and by the Prime Minister really thought that the United Nations Resolution was being broken by Iraq? And their members of the Cabinet could not actually debate this. [Well he denies that, doesn’t he? He says that there is no doubt in his mind that the war was legal, and that’s what he told the Prime Minister.

Eh that’s what he told the Prime Minister eh a day before the Cabinet meeting which was a day before the important voting of House of Commons. This whole thing went very close to the while. And we now know that the members of Cabinet did not have the full legal advice before them. (Either way will be quite fool.) The
ministry correspondent know when somebody’s been the
(misdeemed) the code of conduct as a minister? they plainly
just asked him to resig:gn like Pe- Peter Mandason or (0.2)
(nobody knows) what the Prime Minister now going to do? .h
when he knows tha- has admitted to various kinds of
purposes that he has broken the code of conduct himself. =
IR: h.h well you say he has admitted to all ( ) he has breached
the code of conduct himself. You still can’t actually prove
that.
IE: We can’t prove it bec(h)ause we do this to answer the
question, (.) as to whether he did or did not (.) e:hm sho:w
the fu:ll legal eh advice. He now (.) admits that the code of
conduct applies? (.) He- he admits eh by indication therefore
we should have shown the full legal advice? We were (lying)
for people like Clair Short unless he didn’t do that. It sounds
technical, but- this was the legal advice of whether you go to
war now that we sti:ll (.) no:w dealing with the aftermath of
that decision by the Cabinet. =
IR: = S[o- that’s-
IE: [That should about the legal advice.
IR: Simon Thomas, many thanks.
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IR: John Humphrys

IE: Charles Clarke, the Home Secretary

01 IR: It’s ten past eight. Another morning in the House of Lords yesterday for the government’s proposals to deal with suspected terrorists even worse than the one they got the day before. .hh More concessions are on the way. But will even they be enough to rescue what remains of the bill. And how much damage is all this doing to the government. .hh The man who’s been fighting what looks increasingly like losing a battle is the Home Secretary Charles Clarke who joins me now? Good morning Mr. Clarke?

02 IE: Good morning John.

03 IR: Losing or lost?

04 (0.3)

05 IE: I don’t think it’s lost in any way whatsoever. hh Eh I think: we’ve had twelve weeks putting new legislation between the .h Law Lords’ judgment just before the Christmas in the end of the current legal powers. .h Eh I’ll be seeking to put forward a legislation which guarantees our national security? eh and in accordance with eh the request from the Police and Security Services, respects of liberties, and meet the Law Lords’ concerns. Eh quite naturally there’s been plenty of debate about that in the Commons and the Lords. Eh an- that will continue until the bill finally reaches its royal assent. Eh but: it’s critically important we do get the bill agreed this week? eh in order that we can deal with the people that we have to- eh have to deal with.

06 IR: And it’s looking increasingly likely that you won’t get the bill this week.

07 (0.2)

08 IE: Eh I don’t think that at all actually. Eh- I think that’s: absolutely [not the case.

09 IR: [So you’re gonna make more concessions then.

10 IE: [.hhh

11 IE: What I’m doing is today I’m putting down two sets of th- amendments which will try to make the concerns which have been expressed. .hh Eh the first is to: eh i- in- allow judges to
eh make the orders right through the whole eh control order
regime (.h on the basis of application from myself. [.hhh

IR: [In other
words, not just the House (or the rest).

IE: E:h precisely not just the: the deprivation of liberty as us-
was often called House of (Rest) rights for the whole range.
With the ability also where there is an emergency, .h for me
to be able to ensure this order until (.h the judge can hear the
case. eh An- that deals with the concerns I had on that front.
Eh the second amendment that I'm putting? .h eh is that the:
eh bit of the (hoge) should be renewed annually by vote of
both the House and the Parliament, .h which means that in
total you'll have that annual decision? .h If there is a
derogation order in place that two has to be voted on
annually by Parliament. That there is an annual independent
review to Parliament .h where the re-operation of the Lords
is currently looked at. There is a quarterly report Parliament
on the control orders. An- and there is a new legislation
which I'm attending eh after the election on terrorist powers.
That's a very substantial degree of Parliamentary scrutiny, .h
of the operation of this legislation. Hhh.

IR: Why didn't you do that before?

IE: Well of the: eh f- five measures I've indicated there, four are
already in the bill, and they will put forward all of them in
the bill from the outset. And precisely in order to secure the
parliamentary scrutiny. The one that I've added, the one that
I've put down in the amendment this morning, .h eh eh
allowing annual review of the bill as a whole. And votes in
Parliament of both of those before (.h is an attempt to
answer the concerns which were addressed particularly in the
Lords. Now that there needed to be an explicit ability for
Parliament to consider the operation of the legislation by
vote. Eh every year. hhh. So the four of the more original
legislation, the fifth that I put in response in the concerns of
the Lords. =

IR: = but you:: came on this program and others a- a few weeks
ago, and they all argued very strongly for your case that you
as the Home Secretary should have powers that you now
(constitute) must go to judges rather than to you.
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IE: I did and I said when I made the first concession on that- eh particular point I thought the: .h case for the Home Secretary meaning the executive to take responsibility for these matters was right. Eh I was re-enforced to that view (. ) .h by the fact that I was aware that a number of very senior judges also took that view, .h and thought it was right for the executive not the judiciary to decide what should happen, .hh but there’s been a very substantial parliamentary expression of view on that. .h eh which I’m bound to listen to? And because I’m very keen to get eh as wide support as I can for the procedure in the legislation. Eh that’s why I’m making a proposals as I’m today. The practical concerns that I had which I said .h both in your program and h. eh in parliament: when we talked about this earlier h., eh was whether there was eh any circumstances in which eh the delay of going to a judge might mean that somebody who might nee- need to be under a control order, eh would be able to (actually) to get free of that possibility. Eh but we found a way around that particular proposition, so that I can meet the concern which (the) Parliament has been expressing.

IR: There is another concern that is still lying there, that is the test of reasonable suspicion that the suspects involved with terrorism? Eh your critics say there should be a higher level of proof? an- the balance of probabilities? You’re going to give way on [that as well?=

IE: [.hhh

IE: = No I’m not. Eh I don’t accept that argument. Eh we’re talking about eh control orders the lower level of deprivation of liberty. .hh I’m aware there are restrictions, but the way is not the level of eh of- of eh detention in any particular place. An- and I think it is reasonable to have lower burden of proof. The reason why I’m concerned about a higher burden of proof in those cases, .hh is it could mean that certain people who are a threat to us .h eh could not be put under a control order. I think that’s a risk that I’m not (gonna) prefer to take.=

IR: = As if the House of Lords or indeed the House of Commons says we are not prepared to accept that, then what happens.=

IE: =.hhh Well I’m not prepared to: go down that route, because
I think the whole purpose of the control orders is trying to deal with the situations where you haven’t got enough evidence to go through the prosecution in court, where people are nevertheless real threat to the country.

IR: = So if you are not prepared to go down that road? you are not prepared to give on the conservative Sunset Clause either, though some would argue that perhaps you’ve already made concession in that direction. But if you are not prepared to give those other concessions, then it may well be, indeed it’s likely that you will not get this legislation. What is the: well what is plan B?

IE: hhh Well if the legislation will not to be passed, as I think is extremely unlikely actually, but: were the legislation not to be passed, then the effect would be: that the eh current legislation would run out this weekend, and people currently in Belmarsh eh would go free. Now that’s a completely unacceptable status for the first. That’s why I’m not prepared to tolerate th- those circumstances. I- it has been suggested I would to review the current legislation. Eh and that was a device proposed by the Conservatives right at the (out of the circumstance withdrew) because they acknowledged that wasn’t the right way to go. Eh A because people have the ability to go to the European Court of Human Rights and be free on that basis. Hhh. B because the eh conditions would arise and their lawyers will put it to them. It means the current individuals would have to be freed. And thirdly the existing eh legislation eh doesn’t cover people (like the gloss) on this issue of (bomber) who admitted the other day that he was trying to (block) a plane. And under those circumstances we need to have the powers that we have. Both the Conservative and the Liberal Democratic spokes people in the House of Lords would acknowledge we get the legislation under the statute before the end of this week? And I hope they’re (onto) that. =

IR: = But you do have the fallback of extending the current legislation.
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153 ()
154 IE: eh well we-th- the (head) panel would have to vote on it.
155 But it’s extremely (flawed) fallback
156 [to the recent (legislation).
157 IR: [And hardly is embarrassing for you hardly embarrassing for
158 the govern[ment.]
159 IE: [well that
160 IR: = That’s already been declared illegal by the Lords.=
161 IE: =Embarrassment isn’t: isn’t: isn’t isn’t dignity. That’s not really what we’re talking about. It would not be secure at the point to say firstly, .h the individuals in Belmarsh could go to the European Convention eh European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. .hh Secondly (.) even within that .h eh we think that they’ll be able legally to make the case to be a remove from detention into no control whatsoever. Hh. And thirdly doesn’t deal with people like the (dust issue) in (bomber) .h eh who’s made this poin- point directly. I mean fourthly, .h it would not refl- reflect the House of Lords th- th- the Law Lords’ judgment .h eh just before Christmas. .h eh And I- I don’t want to be in that position. I think we should respect the Law Lords’ judgment which is why we put the legislation forward. Now .hh the Conservatives (ha)ve reached a propose try to beginning of this, .h that we should simply renew the existing legislation. But David Davis to his credit .h eh later made it clear that he acknowledged that wasn’t the right cause to do, so .hh he’s acknowledging that renewing the current legislation doesn’t solve the problem. .hh which is why we need the current legislation. ((clear throat))
182 IR: So it isn’t the case then that you have that as a: fallback position.
184 (0.2)
185 IE: Oh no it’s not fallback position. I mean that’s clear throughout. Eh and- eh if you take: eh any serious eh legal opinion on it, eh they would acknowledge (the right) as what I’ve said is not a f- is not a fall back.
189 IR: [Right. So in other words, le- let me become clear about this, in other words, if the legislation you said you are confident it will go through >other
192 people are also answer confident. But if it does not go
through, then what happens, they won't free.

196 IE: Correct. hhhh hhhh.
197 IR: But that would be highly irresponsible, surely better to renew
the legislation for the time this- that’s necessary.
199 IE: No the point I [fail-
200 IR: [If you regard them as [a danger to us [then =
[I-
[I-
202 IR: = it is a threat to us?
203 IE: =I'm probably failing to: to make the point. I’m trying to
explain it again. .hh If we were to see to renew and to
succeed in renewing the current legislation, it would not
have the effect (.) of keeping the people in Belmash currently
in Belmash. Those for two reasons. Reason one, .hh because
the Law Lords have struck down the existing legislation,
they could go to the European Court of Human Rights that (I
view), .hh and win a case they- they would have to [be ( )
211 IR: [They
could be but probably wouldn’t.=
213 IE: = [Eh eh that- (.)
214 IR: [Immediately.=
215 IE: = W[ell-
216 IR: [Isn’t that the case?
217 IE: = I think that’s not correct at all actually. E:h but secondly eh
more immediately .h eh even the fun- leave the socie- legal
timetable of going to Strasbourg, .h e:h the eh tho- the
lawyers are able to make the case which they have been
making to sign, which is special tribunal (losing sign of)
their legislation. .hhh that eh that we the- the- they would not
need to stay in prison, .hh in those circumstances. Eh and we
think that those succeeding those cases which are what I said
into Parliament this is(n’t) new to you John this morning,
and not being discussed, this is what I said in the Department
right at the outset, hhh. when this particular option is raised.
It's why we don't think it's not ( ) situation as well we do
think you need to have ne- new legislation. [.hhh
230 IR: [The reason that
I used the word embarrassing is because this isn't the first time that: you- your government has wanted to do things which at the end it hasn't been able to do. >And the reason< that appears to be you simply don't talk to people before you plan to [do these things.]

IE: [.hhh

IE: Well I o- of all the criticisms that have made of me eh through this, some- some of them are very colorful. E:hm I: don't accept that in any respect whatsoever. .h I took unprecedented, and I emphasize John, unprecedented steps, hh. in talking to the opposition parties hh. both before the statement that I made in the House of Commons on the 24th of January hhh. Then the Prime Minister talked to the leaders of the opposition parties? before we h. eh published the bill. Then again before the second reading I talked to the opposition parties directly. h. At each point, seeking agreement about the best way to proceed. .hh Now: that is the position I've taken throughout, an- that is what I want to get to hh. In all those conversations, acutely aware (. ) that the government does not have majority in the House of Lords, never has (it only) has about thirty five percent of the votes. So: if the opposition party's decided they wanted to defeat ( ) the laws, then they can do so, as in fact they have done. And th- my point in all this, is that I am keen even at this stage, to legislate together with the opposition parties rather than in spite of them. But in the conversations that we've had .hh there has not been any readiness on the part of the other party to discuss these ques[tions seriously.]

IR: [Right. Let- let-

IE: =We even John that's my final point is th[is, we even have =

IR: [eh

IE: = this real example last night hh. eh of Lady Thatcher (. ) going to the division lobby in the House of Lords (. ),h to vote for (increase) social security for people who have suspected of being terrorists hh. It's completely surreal. [.hhh

IR: [Let me just review very briefly >if I may< to that order. You say that it's not an order down to renew, e:h the existing legislation =

392
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270  IE:  = [Sorry, (let me let me fun-) =
271  IR:  = ( )
272  IR:  = a : h =
273  IE:  = we- we we lay the order, right at the beginning. =
274  IR:  = Right. =
275  IE:  = Because we said we would right at the beginning. But we
don’t think it will have the effect of: keeping the people eh in
Bel[ mash (now for- for )
278  IR:  = [So why didn’t you lay the order down then if it’s not a
fallback position.
279  IE:  = We laid it right at the beginning before we le- introduced the
trades of legislation. Eh in an order that it should be there for
people to be aware of the possibility. hhh [Eh but it’s not a =
280  IR:  = full- but it’s not a fall [back position.
281  IE:  = But it remains there then it is still
282  there.
283  IE:  = .hh Yes but it- eh eh I’m really- an- I’m really not conveying
of this properly eh
284  IR:  = but either
285  IE:  = [Righ- fairly good. I understand you [obviously bu- bu- =
286  IE:  = an an- then- ( )
287  IR:  = but either
288  IE:  = [I- if your order is there, you can’t say renew. ]=
289  IE:  = [Wha- wha- what I- what I’- what I’m saying- ]
290  IE:  = what I’m saying is: the order if passed, and if renewed,
would in our view not have the effect (_) of securing th-
291  IR:  = [So why did you lay this in the first place. ]=
292  IE:  = should stay in Belmash hh. Because eh th- we laid it
300  actually before we went through the whole processes of eh
301  introducing this- this other legislation we have. And th- the
302  cause of laying this other legislation hh. eh it is clear, that the
303  legal judgments that have been made by th- by the court, the
304  side court, in relation to people currently in Belmash, mean
305  that we would rene- would not have the effect of those
306  people hh. eh remaining eh under custody. =
307  IR:  = eh le- le- d- d- ho: w many terrorists are walking in the
308  streets of our city in your view. You know that Sir John
Stevens former () (featurists) said in the news at the world at
the weekend? .hh at least a hundred probably nearer (to) two
hundred? Tony Blair himself has talked about hundreds. .hh
And yet our Home Office study says only twenty terrorism
suspects would be subjected .hh to these control orders, in
spite of that warning from Sir John Stevens. Now () eh
what's the true figure here, because we don't know the dan-
the danger of difficulty of lots of people is .hh we simply
don't have any .hhhh realistic () assessment. We are not able
to make a realistic assessment of the threat.

IE: .hh I acknowledge the difficulty therein. That's: eh a
perfectly fair point of view to make, which is why we
publish at the time the bill was set out hh. Eh our assessment
which we set out an- and (re)published at the department
was- widely covered in the media, .h of the assents of the
terrorist threat in this country, .h including the statement
which I believe profoundly to be true, .hh that since 9.11
there have been terrorist attempts to- make outrages happen
in this country, .hh which our security services)
are ready to solve.

IR: [But how many are there (in there).=

IE: = You then come to numbers. In the discussion which you
have my source as Sir John Steven's figures (on Tues) he
used the other day. Eh and I'm not going to get into a
number's game, but let me make one of [two things clear.

IR: [Well Tony Blair did.

IE: Eh when he was asked, he- he- [he didn't- he said hundreds.

IR: [Yeah

IE: = for the same [reason asSir John Steven[said =

IR: [s-

IE: = the number in [().

IR: [W- so do you support that. As Home
Secretary do you believe you should know. Are there
hundreds, aren't there.

IE: There are. And the- the fact is (.h that you're in the
situation where you've got people who are suspect to
terrorist offenses. Eh we've all had since eh 9.11 .h seven
hundred people, eh arrested on suspicion of terrorist charges.
about third were actually just between third and a half
were actually charged eh i.e. hundreds have been charged
of terrorist offenses, eh since 9.11. You then come to the
question, for those number of people who you can’t go down
the prosecution route, for a variety of reasons, and you
therefore need the control order regime that we are talking
about. Eh how many are there? And the reason why we make
eh assessment to a much smaller number that we are
talking about eh in that regard, .h is because there is that
smaller number where you can’t get down the prosecution
route.

IR: Charles Clarke, many thanks.
Dangjie Ji—Indirect Defensive Responses to Hostile Questions

In British Broadcast News Interviews

IR: John Humphrys
IE: Lord Strathclyde, the Tory leader in the Upper House

01 IR: Twenty four minutes to nine? A short while ago† (.) we heard Charles Clarke’s response to the drag in his anti-terrorism bills taken place in the House of Lords† .hh Lord Strathclyde is the- Tory leader in the Upper House. He joins us now? .hh eh Lord Strathclyde as we heard in the news the: two concessions that he seems to have in mind† are: eh giving judges a role in a:ll control orders >an< also .hh ensuring that the legislation has to come before Parliament once every year? Is that enough for you.

09 IE: .hh Well I’m glad the Home Secretary’s coming forward in a more (considering) manner than perhaps has been shown in the pa:st. hh. An- and all of these could be avoided if we had a very more sensible discussion right at the start of the process. I- I’m delighted that he is including judges for all control orders† .h and he is taking a very small step forward in the direction of the Sunset Clause. What’s being offered then, in annual review, eh really isn’t e- enough, and the reason for that i:s that what the House of Lords demonstrated (. ) last night indeed in the last couple of days .hh is that this bill (. ) i:s fundamentally flawed in all its aspects, and the Home Office† and Parliament needs to have a [long: think [eh before coming forward with=

26 IE: =legislation] an- and that is why we: have (. ) suggested that this bill (. ) come to an end after eight months and its replace with really rebus legis[lation to deal with the =

29 IR: [.hhh [.hh

IE: = (francs facings). =

32 IR: = And I think short of that (. ) (won’t) be enough for you, you will- you will see- you will desire this bill to be killed in th- in the circumstances that he doesn’t hh. give you Sunset Clause. =

35 IE: = I have no desire to- to kill this bill. What I: hope will
happen in the House of Commons this afternoon: eh that: from all sides at the House people will look at what happened in the House of Lords. We'll see that this vote that we had last night was a record vote since the reforms of nineteen ninety nine led by former Lord Chancellor†. If not a single conservative had voted last night the government would still have lost by forty-five. So I hope the- in the=

[Yea-

House of Commons we'll see that as a signal of=

[well-

of what needs to be done.=

[but y-

You- you have what he said in the program a short while ago. He was absolutely clear that will not be a Sunse- what Sunset Clause.

(.hh) well like- few days ago he was absolutely clear (.) that he wouldn't give any more: (.) role to the judiciary (.) and a:hm I hope that good sense will prevail over the course of next twenty four hours. So: by the end of thist week† (.) we will have h. legislation to deal with what the government tells us is an (.) emergency† hhh. but also time for the Home Office to get its act together with Parliament h. to create rebus legislation against terrorism in eight months’ time. =

If you don't get an agreement, what's your understanding of what happens.

(0.2)

.hh i- i- if there is a no bill†=

= Yeah =

an- then there is no: cover for the Belmarsh prisoners, hh in which we indicated all along that our initial offer (.h) was that the current law should be extended for a short period of time, perhaps three or six months†, .hh an- and that of course was: eh what the government originally intended to do by laying the orders .h to extend the current legislation to do just that.=

But you would have heard him say in this program a short while ago that he doesn't believe that it would
work, that the- the eh Belmash detainees will have the right to: eh appeal to the European Court of Human Rights† and get out of eh detention.

IE: Well the government clearly did think it would work. (.) eh only a few [( s) ago.

IR: [But they are not now. And we are- now where we are. An- (0.2) you prepare to take that risk.

(0.3)

IE: hhhhh well equally I'm convinced that the: eh that th- the British law courts, the Law Lords h. (.) would understand the situation that has happened within the Parliament† hh would understand that it is immensely undesirable for these people to be: let out of jail† hh. (.) and would understand the Parliament had accepted .h eh the case to extend the current legislation for perhaps three or six months h. while we worked out what to do next, and that would be the responsibility of whoever within h. eh government in the next Parliament.

IR: Lord Strathclyde† (.) thanks very much indeed.
The time now eighteen minutes past seven. (.) The government will set out a mini-manifesto on children today. We know among other things they are supporting Jimmy Oliver’s campaign to improve school dinners. But what do children’s charities want. Pam Hibbert is a principal policy officer at the children’s charity Barnardo’s. Good morning.

What would be top of your wish list.

Interestingly, Barnardo’s along with a number of other children’s charities published their own children’s manifesto in February this year. I think top of our list would be: the eradication of child poverty. Many of the other things that impact on children would stop if we- if we did get rid of child poverty. With the fourth richest country in the world, and yet one in four children still live in poverty in the UK.

Ehm, but is that situation improving.

((biting lips)) It has improved. The government’s campaign has improved it eh to some extent. Ehm but there’s still a long way to go.

What is needed then to tackle out.

Ehm well it’s interesting. It’s estimated that as little as (null) point forty eight percent of our gross domestic product would be all that’s needed to get rid of child poverty. We would suggest that the best way: is to ensure minimum income standards for families with children.

W- what else did you look at in your manifesto. G- I mean in one of those areas was- you say too many children are being locked up.

We did We looked at youth justice ehm in England and Wales, particularly. We locked up more children at a younger age and for lesser offenses than almost all other European countries. But we
also looked at how we deal with children in care? and how poorly they achieve? We looked at how we protect children, and how we protect children from sexual exploitation. And we looked at how we treat refugee children in this country.

IR [.hhh When you look at s- considering all those u-u- priorities, how important then is it to get school dinners right.

IE: [.hhh Ehm it is important. Clearly nutrition is a real problem and it's getting worse. Ehm we are: what we would like to see is a requirement for nutrition based standards in schools. Ehm we are: sure about setting up yet another bureaucracy to oversee this. If there are resources they ought to go directly to schools.

IE: (hh) It's a terrible amount, isn't it. I think we would agree with that. >And< perhaps we have something to learn from Scotland, eh Scotland are currently investing: sixty three million pounds over three years to improve the standard of school meals in Scotland.

IR .h And they've also banned vending machines there, aren't they. =

IE: Absolutely. Ehm they- Vending machines are really difficult, >because< clearly they'll make a lot of money for schools, but they encourage children .h to eat fat laid and sugar laid foods.

IR Pam Hab- Hibbert, many thanks.
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IR: John Humphrys

IE: John Neate, chief executive of the Prostate Cancer Charity

01 IR: It’s twenty four minutes past seven. Ten thousand men in this country die each year from prostate cancer and the prostate cancer charity says there’s still a great deal of ignorance about it. Many men at the risk of developing the disease could learn to recognize the warning signs, but they don’t. John Neate is the charity’s chief executive, good morning.

08 IE: Good morning to you.

10 IR: [e:hm

10 IR: How many people if it’s possible to say this, do you think when it could have been detected and dealt with at an earlier stage, relatively straightforwardly.

14 IE: [biting lips] It’s very hard to put a number on that? But I think that given the extent of ignorance of: eh prostate cancer symptoms and of: what the prostate does: es, eh that’ll be: a pretty: substantial proportion (that over) a number of people [who= 19 IR: [.hhh

20 IR: = get the disease every year. You said there is a great deal of ignorance. Yet, people talk about it the whole time, don’t they.

24 IE: [.h I don’t think they do:. I mean thee uhm the evidence we have is that although a- awareness is growing, eh e:hm the the po:ll that: we: we commission(ed) from the I- from ICM eh show that eh ninety percent of: eh people .h didn’t know what the vital functional of the prostate gland wa:s, eh the vital functional in a normal .h healthy sexual functioning. .hhh A:nd less than fifty percent of the people knew: where eh the gland was. .h So I think ther- there is a- a hu:ge amount of ignorance and still a lot of embarrassment about talking about prostate cancer.

34 IR: .hhh E:hm eh- eh- eh- isn’t it the case that most GP:s: would want to check men: say over fifty. E:hm as a matter
of routine.

(0.3)

IE: .h I think there is a lot of: e:hm eh divided opinions among the GPs. There are certainly .h some who would take that view, but I- I think a very large: eh number of GPs would be: .h hesitant about doing that, because of: ehm .h eh the complex decision that (they) have to make about treatments. .h A:nd the Prostate Cancer Charity has a great deal of concern about the way that: hh. ehm GPs are not being as open as they might be in: eh giving good advice to- to men on- on testing and on (treat) adopt[ions].

IR [Because you think that thee rate could be cut dramatically °(if) that happened°.

IE: I think we could make a significant impact if: the whole of the NHS an:and Information and Awareness hhh. were geared up to: get information across earlier and to g- give people goo:d inform choice. =

IR = If you: were to say to- somebody- I don't know, around fifty hh., ehm what the risk was and what they should do about it, how would you put it.

IE: .hh I- I think that('s a lot,) You ne- you need to be aware that (what) you have is a very important gland? it's important to your sexual functioning? .h Eh things can go wrong: with it? E:hm i- it goes wrong with: a lot of people. >It's the< most common cancer in men. .h now: in the United Kingdom. .hh A:nd: you have a right to go to your GP, you have a right to ask fo:r a: a blood test, you have a right to be given .h good advice on the pros and cons of that test. .hh E:h I would advice that any man to think good and ha:rd about doing that.

IR John Neate, of thee Prosta- Prostate Cancer Charity†, thank you very much.
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Twenty six minutes to eight. Travelers and gypsies have somehow found themselves in the middle of the election campaign. The Conservatives’ latest ads draw a distinction between the way the planning laws affect travelers and the rest of the population. And they claim that the Human Rights Act is making it easier for travelers to flout planning laws. About two and a half thousand travelers have banded together to buy land which is then developed without permission out of a population of travelers and gypsies estimated variously because figures are very hard to come by. We’re between about a hundred thousand and three hundred thousand. We’re joined by Dominic Grieve, the Shadow Attorney General, and also by the Lord Chancellor Lord Falconer. Dominic Grieve, first of all, how big a problem do you believe this to be. Oh this is a growing problem. Eh I can see it in my own constituency in Beckenfield where there are unlawful encampments that have been set up on green belt lands. Travelers have purchased land and insisted on remaining there, in breach of the planning guidelines. It’s now proving to be impossible to remove them. Eh- eh- what is preferable in most people’s eyes is the use of permanent sites provided by local authorities. Which stops the problem, to a large extent anyway, which stops the problem of these unregulated sites. Why then did you as a government abolish the statutory duty to provide permanent sites more than ten years ago. Well I think the view was taken ten years ago, that the demands to on local authorities to create permanent sites, was in some cases excessively onerous, and that local authorities should have discretion to whether they
provided sites or not depending on the nature and level of the problem they have.

IR: [But you accept it that abolition has probably contributed to a problem which you now say is very serious and growing.

IE1: [.hh

IE1: Well I'm not so sure about that. >You see< one of the interesting things is that the number of travelers has (risen) very greatly since nineteen ninety seven. And it seems to be rising faster now. = On the back of the travelers' perception they can get around the planning laws. =

IR: = .hh [Well-

IE1: [There is evidence that [many have come over from Ireland, where in fact the laws are far more rigorous, because they believe that they can exploit the (law powers) here. >Indeed the< there are traveler websites, which actually provide advice as to how: h travelers can act illegally to circumvent the planning laws and ensure that they can remain permanently on sites [which they are =

IR: [ehm

IE1: = occupying.

IR: = Eh- eh- the case that you are making argues that the Human Rights Act makes things worse. What evidence is there for that.

IE1: Well- I think it's quite clear that the Human Rights Act presents a difficulty in the manner in which it is being interpreted. =

IR: = .hh[h

IE1: [Eh the courts have held that in certain circumstances hh. eh camp sites which are in (frequent) breach of planning k- permission set up eh in areas without the permission of the local authority where there has been lengthy litigation can nevertheless remain there till kingdom come. .hh Eh because of the opera[tion=

IR: [.hh


IR: [ehm]

IE1: = many of my constituency, and other people around the country, eh this is an extremely offense of state of affairs.
They are fettered by the human rights, by the planning laws. And they can not see; nobody wants to see travelers discriminated against, but they don't see why people should have special privileges.

IR: [Well-]

IR: Ehm: m-, but the way the Acts are framed, it's them and us, it's: you; and them. Eh- eh- just let me put a- a quote from one of your Labor critics >I'd ask you to respond to it. Keith Hill < hhh. said: this is Michael Howard tapping into what is probably the deepest vein of bigotry in our society. In other words, easy target, go for the gypsy. °Look. °

IE1: For the last three years, indeed for longer since I had been elected in my constituency, I have received an avalanche of complaints about the activities of travelers. who: invade other people's land† and can't be removed†, who buy land in breach and then start to develop it in breach of planning control. It's a serious and growing problem. And large numbers of people in this country are very troubled by it, and it's therefore necessary that government (. ) and political party should address that issue.

IR: Right. Thank you very much Dominic Grieve. Lord Falconer, do you accept that it is: a serious problem which upsets many people: justifiably.

IE2: Eh I- accept that. Yes. And I think it's a problem that needs to be addressed. I don't criticize people for addressing .h thee issue. .h But I think what we need is solutions hh. It's not caused by an unexpected increase in the number of gypsies .h or travelers. It's caused by the fact that h. people are developing unauthorizably in breach of planning law. .h Then they- they are then using the planning law: which applies to everybody, .h in order to try to stay: on the sites for as long; as possible. What we need to do is two things. One:., we need to make sure: planning law is properly enforced. And secondly, .h we need to make sure that there are sites which don't upset the settled community[. Those are where the =

IR: [.hh (th-)
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112 IE2: = solutions lies, not in the- in the- in the- the sort of talk =
113 IR: [ehm]
114 IE2: = that h. e:h Mr. Grieve is making about the Human Rights Act. That’s not where [the problem] lies.
115 IR: [ehm] Well we’d come back to the
116 Human Righ[ts Act =
117 IE2: [Yeah]
118 IR: = after a moment. Th- the select committee that looks at John Prescott Department h,[, ] eh one, two or three =
119 IE2: [Yeah]
120 IR: = years ago, that this was: uh a real- () problem. h And they argued, eh Dominic Grieve disagrees with that, but they argued that the abolition of the statutory duty, (0.2) eleven years ago, h was partly responsible. h Why hasn’t Mr. Prescott’s department sorted it out. I mean if the[re’s =
121 IE2: [He]
122 has tha- ( )
123 IR: = a modal, it’s your modal.
124 IE2: i- i- i- it’s not our modal. Thuh eh the- the- deputy (prime minister’s) department has taken steps and took steps some time ago. >Let me identify< two: First of a:ll, they’ve: .h made local authorities consult on identifying sites which don’t up- upset the (certain) community†, [.h ] which =
125 IR: [ehm]
126 IE2: = are part of the planning map. h That is solution number one. h Solution number two: in the planning act, that’s just gone through Parliament, >(the interview some may call that)< temporary: stop notice, which allows eh local authorities to- make an immediate order, stopping development. They came into force two weeks ago(?) .h And the first one was granted h. in: >just in a village near Bristol< eh two weeks ago. The effect of it .h was: that eh some travelers came, they were: they were about to develop on an un- on an unauthorized site. h The effect of the temporary stop notice .h was to stop it. And that’s- where the solutions [lie: ]
127 IR: [.hh ] Everyone accepts: that most people in this category of travelers and gypsies hh. ehm behaves in accordance with the rules of development. But
there are some who don't. [>And everyone agrees =

IE2: [(true)

IR: = something has to be done [by it.< ] >Now<, .hh why =

IE2: [Yes. ]

IR: = not do: what Mr. Howard suggests, .hh and make
trespass: a criminal offense.

IE2: So that when you stray: off the path, you are: committing a
crime. Trespass: as a criminal offense is such a: madcap
idea. Ehm we welcome >Dominic (refused to make this)<
trespass: for everybody .h would be mad(? ) One other
problem is that- what you are talking about here is people
who buy: land. How can you trespass:.h on your own land.

And if Dominic is suggesting- trespass by travelers are
being ( )

IR: [I'll co- come back to Mr. Grieve on tha- =

IR: = [just in a second], 'cause I think it is important to get =

IE2: [Yeah, yeah ]

IR: = yo- both of your views on that [one]. But just let me =

IE2: [( ]

IR: = ask you about the Human Rights A[ct. ]

IE2: [Yeah. ]

IR: = isn't it the ca:se .hh that, eh- even though this was not
intended, It complicates the business of getting proper
legal decisions on these matters, >which< .h in a small,
relatively small number of cases, compared with the vast
number of hh. travelers who- don't get involved in these
things, .hh can be very upsetting and irritating to people
who think h. they are obeying the law and other people are
getting [away without obey[ing].

IE2: [.hhh [The Human Rights Act is not
giving one person (. ) planning permission. No:r is the law
fundamentally changed. >Even before< .h the Human
Rights Act was introduced, the courts wouldn't evict
people .h whether it's a (bricks-and-moor to) house, o:r a
carry van, .h once planning admission was going
through. .h The critical thing to do: .h is to stop [people =

IR: [.hhh

IE2: = right at the outset, so the Human Rights Act is not
making the difference to this. =
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190 IR: = I want to come back to Dominic Grieve. >On< this
question of trespass and criminality, what exactly are you
proposing.

193 IE1: .h The proposal is the Irish modal. Wh- that doesn’t make
any trespass or somebody wondering into a field criminal
offense at all. I’ve noticed that to see that happening would
be absurd. .hh It makes a criminal offense where somebody
goes onto a land with vehicles or plant or equipment
interferes with the use and amenity of that land, or starts to
damage it. .hhh We believe that [that’s-

200 IE2: [(No they do:n’t?)]

201 (0.2)

202 IE1: No:. Clearly [not (obey)-

203 IE2: [>That is th- That’s where the problems are.

204 The problems are whe:re< .h you own the land yourself, .h

and >you do want a authorize to

206 de{velop °it°.<

207 IE1: {(Forgive me. Tha- that’s I can [( ]

208 IR: {( ) [By the way-

209 IR: {( )Anyway it’s an interesting discussion. {Anyone- }=

210 IE1: {( )

211 IE2 {( ) {It’s very exa-}

212 IR: = Anyone would take there was an election coming. =

213 IE1: = Well, there a:re two separate issues here. Firstly there is-

where travelers buy land and start to develop it. That has to
be dev- that has to be dealt with by dealing with the
development and control issues. But where they go onto
with other people’s land, that’s where the trespass law: that
we propo:se would kick in. .hh So those are two
completely separate issues. >It’s quite wrong with Lord

220 IR: = Dominic Grieve, Lord Chancellor, thank you both.
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The time now nine minutes past seven. Britain is coming under more pressure to give up the three billion pound rebate it gets from Europe every year. It was secured by Margaret Thatcher twenty years ago. But over the weekend, the president of the European Commission said we have to accept that the situation now is very different. Now Roger Knapman is here. He is with me in the studio. Good morning.

And the situation is different, because there were ten members, there are twenty five. And those fifteen new members are much more in need than we are.

The rebate is set in stone, there's absolutely no reason to negotiate it at all. In some two and half billion pounds a year. It's extraordinary to do it this time just when we are becoming the biggest contributor to the EU. If we lose our rebate as well, where the British taxpayers are indebted in such a rate, that I think everybody will go off the European project.

But it seems odd to argue that with these changes, as I say, new members who are much poorer than we are, that we should be taking so much out of the system.

Eh well I don't think we are. We are net contributors, the biggest net contributors. And you have to decide, whether we think the British tax payers' money should be spent for the benefit of British schools, British hospitals and British pensioners. Or whether we should ship it abroad in every increasing rates.

But the EU would argue, look it's our membership of the European Union which has provided much (of)
the prosperity that we have gained from over the last twenty years, that there is a single market, and that is contributing to our wealth. And it is time that if this club is going to work, then the balance is changed.

IE: No I think it's just the French tail is wagging the European dog here. Eh we debated in the European Parliament some two weeks ago. The simple Lisbon agreement, which was a grandiose ten year affair to bring full employment. Eh the (legislation that could go on). Eh the European economy is in a dreadful state. And we shall follow them if we adopt this sort of legislation.

IR: Surely we have to take account of the new member states, who are so much poorer than we are.

IE: O: h yes indeed. The concerns of Labor and Liberal Party are so keen on sending our money abroad. They want political union with Turkey (fair for sake). H Where does it end. Eh all we say in UKIP (visibly) want British tax papers' money spent for the benefit of British people.

IR: >Is it inevitable that this is going to be re-negotiated, isn't it<, if you have any budget coming up and it has to be settled.

IE: Eh there is inevitable thing: is the French referendum on the constitutionalists driving this. It looks like a no vote. And this (suddenly ( ) (the dining-)

IR: [But why do y- why are you blaming France for it though, because there are- this is- two of the arguments I'm- I'm quoting one to you, this is the arrival of new members, but also the second argument, it's not France, but it's the Netherlands who pay a disproportionately large amount into EU conference. H And it's those two things that Britain has been asked to take account of.

IE: [.hh Eh no:. Wel- w- the- as- I say whether should we give up our rebate was negotiated, h eh to ensure that we paid a fair proportion
in:to the European conference. .h We are about to become the biggest single contributor, .h why should we make it worse by voting them another two and half billion pounds a year.

IR: Roger Knapman, thank you.
IE: Thank you.
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IR: John Humphrys
IE: Bruce Holder QC, a member of the Bar council

01 IR: It's thirteen minutes past seven. The collapse of the jubilant
02 line in the corruption trial in London after a couple of years
03 has cost the public purse tens of millions of pounds, but the director of the prosecutions, and the Attorney
04 General decided that the six defendants should be for: mally acquitted because one juror had refused to go on
05 and others were complaining of hardship. The jury already
06 lost two members who had to be excused for personal
07 reasons. Other of those accused had pleaded guilty.
08 The question is whether in such long and complicated
09 cases, thus may well have been the longest jury trial in
10 British legal history. There should be a jury at all.
11 Allowing a trial in such serious charges but how do the
12 jury (have a-) would be very controversial. Bruce Holder
13 QC is a member of the Bar council under the Committal
14 Bar Association. A greatest argument that has been
15 rolling on for some years about whether long and
16 complicated cases can be handled by jurists. What do
17 you think.
18 IE: Well bad cases, such as this, make bad law:. Eh there is
19 a great temptation eh when you get a situation like this =
20 to throw the baby out with the bath water. But the
21 issue is not how: but how well and how long these cases take. And the concentration should be on
22 shortening them. Eh eh a number of things have happened
23 in fact in the last couple of days, they haven't happened, by accident. They've been worked on by
24 not only by the judges, by the Law Chief Justice, and by
25 members of profession, for some months now. Eh e two
26 things. First of all, yesterday, the Law Chief Justice
27 produced a blueprint for trying long and complicated
28 cases. He proposed in a sixteen-page document a
29 protocol for the conduct of these trials. Secondly, thee
30 government have introduced, and the criminal justice act eh
31 a regime eh which is now enshrined in the criminal
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procedure rules, h draft(ed) by the judges, h to secure shorter trials by active case management.

IR: [w-

IR: = Well can you (guillotine) a trial.

IE: You can't (guillotine) a trial. But what you can do::: is settle so many of the issues that are played out in front of the jury.

= How can y[ou- Well i- i- [if that i- if that's possible,

IE: [f- [a full (trial) ( )

(0.2)

IR: .h Presumably the reason that it isn't done at the moment, is because the councilors on both sides are getting huge fat fees and figures on for two years. They do rather better ((outfits.) = >Sorry I just sound< skeptical. =

IE: [well- (hh)

IE: = Well i- i- it's an- it's an easy observation to [make

IR: = Well it's- it's a (theorem). I think a lot of people listening will want that observation to be made and hear your response [to it.

IE: = Yeah.

IE: Well, first of all, it isn't entirely true any more, because the government have made very heavy cutbacks into the level of fees. hh I- I don't want to get drawn into fees =

IR: = ehm.

IE: = issue, 'cause it's not really [( )

IR: [It's just a principal issue, o1° accept] [that.

IE: = No of cour-se not°. The- the- the- thee issue: i- is how long these trials take. An- and (0.3) cooperation at every stage of the process is now necessary. hh There's going to be a real cultural change. First of all, the investigators are being re-trained as how to conduct short interviews. hh The judges are involved in earlier stage with early stage with council, h agreeing areas of evidence, areas of expert evidence. >So when< the case actually gets before the jury, h so much of the evidence has set out in schedules, h and doesn't have to be played out of links.

IR: [Because of- of- Finally an- and briefly, it has been said by some
people in the profession. (.) for a long time, that there’s is really in the end no way rounded, that for some very complicated cases, which are bound to go on for a very long time in the interest of the accused, you really just can’t have a jury, I mean this starts falling off their purchase. (.) But Lord Dennis said this more than twenty years ago, “didn’t he.”

IE: Wel- it’s true; but I think these changes are going to make the difference. Trials I don’t think any longer will be anything like that long. Six months, I think is going to be the maximum. You know, it’s never been more important, to have a system which allows ordinary people to stand between the State and the individual. If you start (whittling) away jury trial at the top end for the really serious cases, someone is going to say aren’t they. Well look at all the little cases at the other end that are now tried by magistrates. What’s left, the little rump in the middle. Let’s get rid of them. (.) You know, juries are an important part of our participatory democracy. That some people might say has been eroded by the State. We must protect and preserve this system by shortening these trials, and that can be done. (.) We are quite confident.

IR: Bruce Holder QC, thank you very much.
mental health legislation (07:54.5)
IR: John Humphrys
IE1: Lord Carlisle, Liberal Democrat Peer
IE2: Rosie Winterton, Health Minister

01 IR: Twenty seven minutes to eight. The government’s propose
to change to mental health legislation are in a bit of
trouble it appears. A joint committee of Peers and MPs
which has been studying the bill, hhh says it would mean
that too many people would be detained.h without
adequate reason. >Under the legislation< people could be
compulsorily treated, .hh who don’t necessarily pose a
significant (. ) risk to the public. Committee says that
(>there<) needs to be evidence of risk, .h for treatment to
be imposed in this way. The government says the bill
would allow the small (minority of) people .hh who need
to be treated against their wishes to get as they put it, .h the
right treatment at the right time. I would talk to the Health
Minister in a moment. .hhh First the Liberal Democrat Peer
Lord- e:h Carlisle who chairs the scrutiny Committee of
Peers and MPs, .hh joins us now. Good morning.

17 IE1: Good morning.

18 IR: What is the e:h problem here. What do you think the
outcome would be that you consider to be hh. undesirable.

21 IE1: = .hh The committee had a great deal of evidence. And we
found that it is extremely difficult to predict
outcomes. .hh Ehmm w- w- we fear o- o- on the basis of
evidence that an- an awful lot of people could be locked up
in psychiatric hospitals .h who actually pose no: risk, of
course in-significant or serious harm to others. .hh We have
concluded therefore that people should only be forced into
compulsory treatment, .h if firstly they pose significant risk
or serious harm to others. .hh And secondly the
compulsory treatment must be of therapeutic benefit to
them.

32 IR: And who would (. ) decide, who draws a line in these
cases.

34 IE1: .hh Well it all depends on whether it’s a health case or a
public order case. We- we are:- the government has given
us a splendid opportunity and the Committee was up to this
view, () to reform compulsory mental health treatment
laws for the first time in twenty two years. >And< we have
applauded much of what's in the draft bill, .h there we've
recommended many changes. >But< what we have
said .hhh is that if there are people suffering from
dangerous and severe personality disorder h. who eh can
not be shown to pose a significant risk of serious harm to
others >and there is no therapeutic benefit< then if the
government want s- legislation on that, .h it has to be a
different form of legislation, [providing a different form =
[.hhhh

IR: = of care.

IR: = Do you: believe that one of the reasons f- eh for the way
this provision has bee:n fra:med, .hh i: s the public concern
about the number of cases, and: we have the result of a
terrible modal trial only yes[terday] involving someone =
IE1: [Yeah.]

IR: = who has severe mental heath problems. .hh That people
have- (0.2) an exaggerated idea () of how many people
there a:re () .h who commit very serious crimes () as a
result of their mental state.

IE1: The answer to both of your questions is yes. Tha- we do:
believe that there is an exaggerated fear. .hh Ehm we also
believe this is something that is extremely difficult to get
across to the public, .h that if you look at detailed evidence
as we did, a hundred and twenty four witnesses, four
hundred and fifty written submissions, .hh there is actually
(.) no: reliable evidence to show: that one can predict these
terrible outcomes. We agonized over these terrible
outcomes, we heard evidence about them, .h and we have
come to the conclusion (that) as so far as mental health
care is concerned, .h that has: a health role to fulfill. The
government may well wish to take other measures, and
maybe able to persuade Parliament that other measures are
appropriate for a small number of people, .hh but we do:
fear the risk of mental health asperse or worse, >this is a
criticism of the newspapers not the government<, .h a sort
of concentration camp mentality. =

IR: = hhh Lord Carlisle, thanks very much. Rosie Winterton is
the Health Minister. She is with us. Good morning.

IE2: Good morning.

IR: h E:hm () i- is this the kind of- () criticism, (which is
fairly) constructive because the Committee welcomes
many of the proposals you've made in the draft
legislation, .h that you are going to take seriously and do
something about it. =

IE2: = h Well I- I do want to thank Lord Carlisle and members
of thee ehm Committee .h ehm who've looked at the bill.
We'll be looking at their detailed .h recommendations, it is
part of a very wi:de consultation process, .h that we have
he:ld .h on this extremely important .hh legislation. .hh
Which i: s () needed f- for two reasons. I mean, first of a:ll,
we want to see increased safeguards for thee h small
number: of people, .h who are detained because they
either () pose a risk to themselves (.r) or to others. .h And
that's why every person who is detai:ned will in future e:h
have to have their detention approved by an
independent .h mental health review tribunal. .hh And they
will a:iso: have eh advocacy available [during =

IR: [hhh

IE2: = that process, >they don't< have that at the moment, but
we are introducing that safeguard. >However<, .hh there is
a balance here, .h with public protection issues, .h and the
problem we have with thee current bill, .hh is that for
eexample ehm people who have a personality disorder, but
who may be:: a very serious risk to others or to
themselves, .hh currently are considered to be: ehm
untreatable. .h Now that is not the case. [There are
thera[pies that =

IR: [.hh

IE2: = are available. Secondly, .h people who perhaps have a
dual diagnosis of drug abuse, o:r who are pedophiles und-
under the current bill, .hhh the:re has been confusion, and
they haven't recei:ved [the treatment that they: need,
because they: .h there =
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IR: [.hhh
IE2: = has been [confusion about whether they can be detained or not. =
IR: [.hh
IR: = >But even if that is< (0.2) true, I mean even if that is a fair description of one of the problems that has to be tackled, .hh isn’t that also a danger and do you accept that it is a danger. .hh E:h if you have a system where people are detained compulsorily, .hh without it being demonstrated that there is a serious chance of them committing some act against the public.
IE2: .h Well the system at the moment is that people are detained if they are believed to be .h either of- at risk to themselves, or at risk to others. What this bill does, is to update the legislation, so that where people have not been able to receive treatment, >and this isn’t just about< (.h) eh being a risk to others, >this is about< people actually not getting treatment. =
IR: = Ehm. =
IE2: = So there are people at the moment, with personality disorders, ehm with perhaps dual diagnosis between ehm drug abuse and eh mental health problems, or pedophiles. .h Ehm th- the- there is confusion as to whether they- th- whether they can be treated, >what this< does, is to provide that treatment for them, .h and to say: yes, there is an ability. >But better remember<, they have to f- fulfill five very strict conditions, .h and it has to be im- approved by an independent mental health review tribunal. =
IR: = Well that argument ( ) committee will go on. Let me very briefly raise one of the matter h. .hh Ehm Sa:ne the mental health charity i:s having to cut back its: (_) helpline may have to close it entirely, .h six thousand calls a week. Because it claims that the government has (renamed) in a confect effectively into a contract .h for million pounds a year. .hh (0.2) This is going to affect some people who desperately need the service very much which won’t be taken up by other h. eh government help lines. Why can’t you justify that money for an organization which is helping
six thousand [people a week, =

IE2: = who’s in-.h who’s in desperate trouble. =

IR: = Well we gave the- we gave help to: eh Sa- Saneline over
two years. We gave two million pounds on the
understanding .hh that it would become self-funding after
that. .h What we have done, is all the mental health help
lines have joined together in a: partnership, .h so that they
can provide .h twenty four hour, cover seven days a week
tabin three hundred and sixty five days a year. We have put
funding of five million pounds into that partnership, .h and
agreed with all the mental health charities that that is
where: .h funding should go. .h To single out one eh
organization above all the others .h would be: unfair, and
the money was given on the understanding in the first
place .h that after that two year period the organization
would be: self-funding. We can not .h continue to provide
core funding .h to one organization and not the others when
we have set up a very specific partnership .h to deal with
the whole issue of providing mental health help lines.

IR: Rosie Winterton, thanks.
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[28] Friday 29 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0718 Attorney General’s role (05:35.1)
IR: John Humphrys
IEO: Alan Trench, senior research fellow
IE: Lord Thomas of Gresford

01 IR: It’s sixteen minutes past seven. >The< Attorney General’s probably the only senior figure in a government who’s deemed to be in a success of the politics never heard of him. hh ’He may be appointed by the Prime Minister, he may have attended Cabinet meetings, but he’s not meant to act as other politicians even though many of them HAVe BEEN politicians. hh It’s not always easy. As Lord Goldsmith has been discovering over the Iraq war. hh Alan Trench is a senior research fellow at the constitution unit, hh at University College London.

02 IE0: The problem with Lord Goldsmith is that he’s never been elected as an MP. hh He’s sat in House of Lords for quite a number of years. But that’s the limit of his political experience hh. His predecessors would have been able to give hh much more authoritative legal advice. hh Because they would not simply have been acting as lawyers, they would also have been acting as politicians. hh And they would have been able to say, this is how far you can go, hh but you can’t go any further. hh Knowing that their advice would be taken hh very very seriously indeed, because they were politicians, they understood very clearly their political imperatives.

03 IR: hh Well, is that a fair argument? Let’s put it to Lord Thomas, who rules the Liberal Democrat? and their Attorney General? the: he Shadows the Attorney General? Hh. Eh () good morning to you?

04 IE: Good morning?

05 IR: Do you agree with that analysis?

06 IE: No I don’t. I think that there is a very good case for having an Attorney General who is independent of Parliament. hh E:h [eh

07 IR: [ENTIREly =

08 IE: = Well yes. I think it happens in other jurist dictions. I
think the nearest to us is Ireland. hh Eh you: then get the choice of the best talent from the whole legal profession, and not just those ("who") are going for politics. h You'll have someone who would be independent and free of political bias, h. (.) and out of the ladder of political promotion, [ah-]

IR: [So who would appoint him then°. =
IE: = Eh well the Prime Minister would appoint him↑, obviously↑, for the for the period of the government. >But:< Eh it doesn't follow: that: m. h e: he would:: continue- necessarily continue with that particular government. He could run into another government, as- as the director of public prosecutions does at the moment. hhh The Argument against is the lack of accountability to Parliament.] =

IR: [Uhm°]
IE: = h. But: if (this) advice is a secret, and confine to the Prime Minister and one or two other close cronies, where there is no accountability at all, and that (is) of course "what's happened", h in relation to: the issue about Iraq. hhh As for a lack of political awareness where: Lord Goldsmith was (plucked from the bar)? as your previous speaker said, an- and made Attorney General without political: h. eh without any political background. h Eh I- I- I: think that independence is probably h. eh a better way to proceed than ha- having somebody with a- u: m eh who spend their life eh pushing leaflets through doors. =

IR: Might it's a: seductive idea, but isn't one of the other problems is with it that e- politicians, Prime Minister, would be much less likely to accept legal advice from e:: an Attorney General .h if he isn't one of the: m. I mean the Attorney General needs to have e::: a fine political sense as well, >even though< he is not a politician, (yet) he has to understand the system, surely. =

IE: = Well I- I do↑n'- well obviously most lawyers understand the system because we work within it, but: [e::: e:::
IR: [But (in the other) you don’t work in: politics, do you. °I mean w'en°- [() [You're not of politics. =

421
IE: [No. We're- w- (. ) Politics

IE: = Let me- (we're) not of politics. I think this is a great advantage. Ehm I think that: Lord Goldsmith and thee: eh Iraq instance was sucked into the political sce:ne: hhh He was sucked into: following the American view: (. ) of how thee eh s- eh of how the Security Council's ehm eh decision shou- should be regarded. H. E::hm i- it was (. ) eventually: not the Security Council not the Cabinet not the House of Commons not the Attorney General but it was Tony Blair who decided that being a material breach .hh of thee eh resolutions, .h relating to Iraq. [(.) And then that-

IR: [= And in the end surely that has to be how it is. Surely it has to be: the Prime Minister, a:nd all the Cabinet together, .hh ehm who makes that decision. They can take advice, they can take advice from a hundred different legal sources.

IE: Yes if y- if you want to broa:den it. Of course it is the Cabinet who should take a decision h.. .hh In this particular instance, it was the Prime Minister who took the decision and who carries the whole responsibilities for it. .h An- and in relation to the Security Council's position of course the rest of the world, apart from the United States, .h includ:ing this country, believe:ve that it was for the Security Council to deci::de, =

IR: = ehm =

IE: = .h whether Iraq was in material breach of previous resolutions. [.hh >And- and<- =

IR: [So:

IE: = and- and: e:h Lord Goldsmith allow:ed himself to be dra:wn in to thee (. ) into thee ah::: American way of thinking. =

IR: = So: w- your party (. ) i- if it were: to: eh have the option? .h would get rid of the Attorney General? .h as we now know him? or her? a:nd have a completely different person doing a completely different job independent of Parliament, [>independent of the government<.

IE: [Yeah.

IE: Yeah, but that's not unusual. That's what happens [in other government s. [°Yeah. °
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113 IR: [But that's what you do. That is policy. So that's [a =
114 IE: [No; °it's-°
115 IR: = Liberal Democrat policy.
116 IE: °It's° not policy? It's a matter of that's come up for
discussion. eh eh at this particular time because of the
very exposed position of this Attorney General, = >but: eh
hh. eh we: were the first to argue, for example that thee
judge(s) should be removed from the legislature, and we
will, (for) people who proposed there should be a Supreme
Court, .h separate from Parliament. .h And similarly, it
seems to me, that we should .h divorce the politician from
thee eh from the Attorney General's office. .h After all,
should we have a politician who's head of prosecutions in
this country. >If you'd like to think about thee< .h thee
thee e:hm thee policy behind that, that may not be a very
good thing. >So it's SOMething for discussion.
129 IR: °Wel-°
130 IE: .h E:h eh and it's been highlighted by Lord Goldsmith's
approach in this case. =
132 IR: = Lord Thomas, many thanks.
[29] Friday 29 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0750 legality of war (05:35.0)
IR: John Humphrys
IE1: Major General Patric Cordinly, who commanded in the first Gulf War
IE2: Louis Moony, former Labor MP, former Defense Minister

IR: The roar over Iraq has raised many questions about the legality of war, but for the men and women who fight, (. .hh it’s not a question of legal niceties? = If a war† is found NOT to be legal, they: can find themselves in the dock literally. .h In the words of General Sir Michael Jackson, head of the ARmy, “I have no intention of ending up in a sail next to Milosovige”. .hh Well is this a real issue: for Army officers. Eh on the li:ne is Major General Patric Cordinly†, who commanded the (Desbra†) in the first .hh Gulf War†, and Louis Moony, former Labor MP, .h eh former Defense Minister. Ehm (0.3) General (. ) Codinly, what is .h the issue here, because if eh a Prime Minister† (. ) orders: you to go to war†, you go to war.

IE1: hhh If I could just (. .try:ing (0.2) paint a picture as to what it feels like when you’re sitting there with all your soldiers, .h waiting to do something, = you- .h you think (what the hell) are we doing there, and, and is this really worthwhile. = You need to know: (. . you are absolutely k- clear that you’ll pop here, quit for the job, you’ll pop your supply:. = But most importantly of all, .h you need to know “that” the war’s just, necessary, and legal. And it’s very very important for soldiers when they’re waiting, thinking what the hell are we going-, what the hell are we doing this for:. They need to know that it IS legal, and it is just.

IR: When you say they need to know, how far down does this go:. Because it’s hard to imagine that- you know th- th- the bloke who’s driving .hh a food wagon or something is worrying about whether it’s a legal war: or or mind it being just. (hh) Is- is that not true. = I mean do they all worry about it.

IE1: I think they’d all worry about it. >There’s always plenty of time to wait and train before you’re going to do: these things†s. And you are worried about all sorts of things. .h And if there’s any question in your mind “that”, that this
isn’t necessarily something that’s correct and right and legal. It’s actually very bad for morale. It’s very difficult for commanders to be absolutely, certainly when they’re giving their orders that, that is what is, that’s what we have meant to do here. And it is every- every soldier thinks about these things. I promise you.

IR: And knowing what you now know, what we all now know, about the events leading up (during) the last Iraq war, do you reckon it was, it’s satisfied the requirements that you’ve described?

IE1: I think it’s of doubtful legality, myself. And of course the thing that I think was irritating is that you’ve got to trust both ways here. You’ve got to trust, you put your trust in the government. It’s sent you there legally. It’s sent you there because it’s a just cause. And that goes should go the whole way down, and BACK UP trust to you, they’re gonna behave correctly. You’ve got a situation in Iraq. I’m aware quite rightly as this prosecution is going on, but also people being being f- be charged with- with crimes which, were perhaps accidents. And the trust all break down. And that: the: the: the Arm Forces will say well we’re not getting the trust from the government, and they actually put us here. I for doubtful legal reasons.


IE2: I think that: Patric Cordinly has: made a very important point about: the fact that we have to take the feelings of our soldiers before they’re going into (conflict). (Take) into: considerations that (won’t) worries. Eh in the light of: the legal situation. I’m not sure how far down through that (anxious) actually calculates. Eh I can’t see that anybody mentioned it to me that- when I was out on the Gulf a few days before but- what’s- the: nation.

IR: [Well maybe >you just want to (say)< they didn’t think = ]

IE2: [.hhh Bu-]

IR: = about it. Now that [they do: ]

IE2: [No no, absolutely. And it is: eh you know I quite take my point of it that something must be very- like very weird. And frankly, when you look at the
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the: what the Attorney General di:d, .h over the period before we invaded it, it's clear: that, he was making very sure(ness) on his m:nd, .h eh that it WA:s legal, before he gave the government that advice. =

IR: = But General Codinly s- says it's doubtful legality [now. Now that we know everything?]

IE2: [.hh NO:::.

IE2: I have to say now the generals that are lawyers, and lawyers (n[o doubt]>without being ever bothered with whether it's =

IR: [(hhh)

IE2: = legal<or NO:t. H. But::ehm () I think .hh I- I listened to Jessy Robinson QC a couple of nights ago, I don't know if you heard of him, bu[t: =

IR: [Ye::s.

IE2: = he made a very eh strong po:int, basically that it was very clear from the .hh narratve of what was going on, eh he used a fashionable word, eh that:: (0.2) eh the Attorney General had pr:ented the government with- what he considered to be a best option. .h E:h eh on the seventh of March. .h Eh this advent being discounted because: very obviously it wasn't going to take pla:ce, when he could get a secondary solution. .hh He then taken from the legal advice himse:lf, eh as you know no: no lawyer (and) institution rely purely on his own skill. .hh And he'd come to the conclusion that it wa:s legal for the reasons that have been set out at the Cabinet.

IE1: .hh Ye::s, I think the answer is it would have done. Ehmm I think Admiral Boyce is the perfect example. Clearly he was concerned. .h A:nd that filtered through, that the Armed Forces is concerned about the legality and had to be persuaded that it wa:s legal. And I think- we- .h I- I wasn't serving obviously but I think the people I talked to toOOk THAT as the green light that this was- this was legal and just. A:nd but I think e- e- in hindsight now, you know
one would have liked to have thought that the Cabinet had
definitely discussed this thing. eh fully, just to make it
ce:rtain that Admiral Boyce was getting the
correct [answer.
IR: [And a very quick thought from you Louis Moony do
you agree with that.
IE2: Ehm I saw the Cabinet minutes as all ministers do. And:
there was certainly discussion took place. Not having been
(there I can't say) how full the discussion was, but from:
colleagues: eh that we have been meeting, there are very full
very full di- mcht. discussion indeed took place. [.hhh] =
IR: [Ok?] =
IE2: = around what was happening.
IR: Louis Moony†, (. ) Patric Codinly†, thank you both.
IR-1: a correspondent in press conference
IE-1: Tony Blair, Prime Minister
IE-2: Margaret Becket, the Environment Secretary
IR0: John Humphrys
IE0: Margaret Becket, the Environment Secretary
IR1: Sarah?
IE1: Roger Halberd, BBC correspondent
IE2: Tim Yeo, Shadow Secretary of State for the Environment

01 IR: On Friday, John asked the Environment Secretary Margaret Becket, if Labor would build nuclear power plants. She raised the possibility that they would.
02 IR0: We aren’t gonna have any new nuclear power stations, top of that.
03 IR0: = are we can we be clear about that then.
04 IE0: What we’re saying is that we can’t close down that option. It’s possible that in the end, for climate change reasons, we would need to reconsider that. But-
05 IR0: = Right. So there is a review, or there isn’t a review. I’m still puzzled, I’m afraid?
06 IE0: No you’re not puzzled. You’ve got an energy white paper that sets out the policy.
07 IR0: = That policy is, let’s see if I can put it in my words and then get you to agree with it.
08 IE0: = (hh) That’s always dangerous?
09 IR0: = As dangerous, but let’s try? Eh th- we MAY have more nuclear power stations at some indeterminate time in the future but we DON’t know yet when that time might come or what might influence it.
10 (0.2)
11 IE0: Yes.
12 IR: Macht, well, clear. On Saturday, the Independent newspaper led with the story that Labor was considering introducing a nuclear program if they were re-elected. But at the press conference Tony Blair started to slap the story down.
Prime Minster, is there going to be a review of nuclear policy?

No. I mean that’s all the story this morning. I mean, the position is exactly the position we set out in our green paper or white paper.

"It is the energy white paper two years ago, where we said two things. One: that, of course we’ve got to keep open the option. ’Cause there could come a time when for reasons of cutting (carbon oxygens) we need to reconsider, the use of nuclear power. But that if we were to think that it was right to do so, there would be a special white paper on this issue.

Mcht well that was Margaret Becket on Saturday. I’m joined now by our correspondent Roger Halbin. [hhh]

[with Labor policy on nuclear power.]

Well what’s going on is general election. E:hm let’s put it in context. Two years ago they had their energy white paper which put climate change at the heart of energy policy. At that time they said they were going to focus on renewables and energy efficiency for delivering the savings. They put nuclear on the backburner. What has happened since then, is that the turn-back in emissions that Mr. Blair expected has not happened. In fact the emissions are still rising. And there is a lot of worry in government about about what they are going to do about this. They are trying to lead GA toward this issue. They can try to push George Bush. And their own emissions, our own emissions in the UK are going in the wrong direction. [So, as =

= election is coming. They don’t wanna talk about nuclear. = They wanna put it on- leave it on the backburner. But as soon as the election is over, they have to start thinking about it again. =

And do you: have heard about their plans after the election. =
IE1: [.hh = I've heard that after the election I mean th- Mr. Blair said that no: there will be no: review of nuclear policy. = >He said that quite clearly. And in a sense,< .hhh he can get away with saying that; ehm m- because n- n- nuclear policy at the moment is left open o:n the backburner. h But a:fter the election in Ju:ne or July; before GA, before he meets with George Bush, .hhh eh Mr. Blair has to deal with his own cl:mate change policy review:. .hh And that will raise the issue about rising climate change emissions and raise the question of what to do about it. And he: is trying, I:’m told, .h he is trying to- to- to give the answer what we are going to do about it, before he meets George Bush. = So that locks him in, .h before the second week in July, .h and coming up with some new movement in policy.

IR: And just very briefly, the answer, is the answer nuclear power. =

IE1: = Thee thee answer is a lot of people in government think it’s nuclear power. They know they have to get it to pass the skeptical public and several skeptical ministers.

IR: .hhh Roger Halbin, thank you. We are listening to that as the Shadow Secretary of the State for Environment and Transport, Tim Yeo, good morn:ing.

IE2: Good morning. =

IR: = .hh Eh we are trying to e- work out what the Labor policy e- is on thiTs. We don’t know what the To:ry policy is on this. Would you::: m- .h introduce mo:re nuclear power plants.

IE2: Any responsible government must have two aims for energy policy. The first is the security of supply,: because life comes to a ho:ld if the oxygen is switched off. .h And sec:ond, i:is to meet our environmental commitments in cutting h carbon emission, .h so we address h cl:imate change. >Now< .h Labor has failed on both accounts. It’s made Britain h. eh dependent on i- gas impo:ts from Russia and Nigeria, >(and in the instance of) Russian gas gets to us, .h through a pipe plant across Germany which is Russia’s biggest customer. So you know .hh they’ll be looked after if there’s any employment in that industry.
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An- and it's only hope of meeting our environmental commitments to cover the countryside with thousands and thousands of winter (binks), against the wishes of (Labor) communities. So we've had eight years of (dither), [and delay, and duck in the position.]

IR: [°Right, so what work° can Tories do.]

IE2: Well, we believe that nuclear power can play a role, an important role in addressing this problem, provided, this is very important, that it is cost competitive, and provided that it can satisfy people's concerns about waste disposal. Now the cost equation has changed a lot because oil is now updated with fifty dollars about that's nearly three times what it was a few years ago:<. And if increasingly we capture the environmental cost of burning fossil fields in the price, it's likely that those costs are gonna go even higher. = So, nuclear may find it easier to (become a better cost grants). But the most important thing really is that eh it already supplies over a fifth of electricity. Eh if that is not replaced as the old nuclear stations run down, the alternative of burning fossil fields, eh will enormously increase carbon emissions. At the time they are already going up under Labor., eh they've reversed the decline that was achieved under the Conservati°ves. Eh they are failing to meet eh the most urgent environmental challenge of our genera°tion.

IR: [Right. So let's tr- let's try being clear on this.]

Now I'm gonna do to you: what John did to Margaret Becket, which is that the Tories are saying we will build nuclear power stations.

IE2: Provided that we can show that it is cost competitive. We don't want to have a huge subsequent (aspect)°.

[But- but all the arguments you've just put to me would suggest that they are.

IE2: Mcht well we will- we will examine this urgently. We believe this decision must be taken within twelve months.
of the general election. Eh I haven’t [-
IR: But why not
before. I mean people are voting in a couple of weeks. Surely they have a right to know what the Tories will do [on this issue.=
IE2: [.hh
IE2: = An- an- an- and what we will do is absolutely clear. If the costs of nuclear power are competitive, eh then we are happy to see nuclear power stations built, h provided of course that the waste issues can be dealt with, as [they have now been in a number of countries.
IR: [And given that that is unlikely to change within a year, is it your argument at the moment as the costs stand now: that they are.
IE2: [.hh Well I find it very hard to see how we can address the problem of carbon emissions, h if we do not replace the existing nuclear power stations h with a new: h generation of nuclear power. I think we are gonna find our climate change commitments h impossible to meet. h And what will happen if we have another term from Tony Blair, h it will [bring forward the date on =
IE2: [.hh Well we’re published a brief manifesto. We’ve backed it up with detailed chapters as our ‘action on the environment’ chapter, h There’s a whole range of detailed documents which sets up what we would actually do. h We wanted to have a manifesto that was short enough h for the average reader and the specialist reader can go behind that, look on our website, h and find out the detail of our policies.
IR: Tim Yeo, thank you.
IR: The Liberal Democrats are repeating their call for a full public enquiry into the Iraq war. Meht hh it follows the story in the Mail on Sunday yesterday:†, publishing a leaked memo from the Attorney General’s Office, .h warning Tony Blair the war could be illegal. .hhh The Tory leader Michael Howard has accused Tony Blair of lying about it†, but the Prime Minister insists the war was right† and legal. Iraq’s outgoing deputy Prime Minister Barium Sally, .h says that Iraq is a better place since getting rid of Saddam Hussein.

IE0: I understand that war is a painful option. But for us here in Iraq, that war was necessary to overcome a brutal (terrain). That war was needed (.) to remove a:: brutal dictator from power†, .h who has committed terrible (atrocities) against the people of Iraq. .hhh And for those who really (.) .h question the legitimacy and morality of the war, .hhh they should come and see: the mass grieves, and talk to the widows, .hh a::h of those who are killed by Saddam. (.) And (thereafter) the war (.) ah gave us the opportunity (.) to start .h a democratic process in Iraq, and admittedly with a lot of difficulties. But .h it gave us the chhance to build in a free eh- nation here (0.2) in the heart of the Islamic of Middle Eas†.

IR: [mcht .hhl That’s eh Iraq’s outgoing deputy Prime Minister Barium Sally. Well Menzies Campbell. Sir Menzies Campbell is the Liberal Democrat’s foreign affair spokesman. Good morning.

IE: Good morning. =

IR: = .hhh Isn’t that how: ultimately people will judge the Iraq war as- painful but necessary.

IE: No: †, I don’t believe so. .h I believe people will judge it on the basis of which: eh on on which: the British .h peo†ple† and the British Parliament, .h eh were persuaded to endorse it by the Prime Minister, .h relying on: .h the
presence of weapons of mass destruction an- biological eh
an- chemical weapons, .h relying upon a (legit) threat that
these could be deployed in forty five minutes h. An- and in
circumstances as we now: know, .h of doubtful legality,
even so far as the Attorney General the principal Law
officer of the government, .h was concerned, [(.) this is =
IR: ]
IE: = an issue. It’s rather like a h. nagging tooth. .h It’s an issue
which simply will not go away.
IR: .h But if you follow your argument, even if you do- if it
was deci:ded that the war was ille:gal and one- took steps
to redress that, you will be putting Saddam Hussein back in
power.
IE: hh mcht °ah:: ° One has to accept that if- eh there had been
no war, then Saddam Hussein might still be there. I accept
that. .hh But that- there’s no guarantee of that? Not least
because we know: that the policy of containment and
(deterrence) hh. eh was having an effect on that Saddam
Hussein’s .hh eh regi:me, was under very severe pressure.
But when we come to- conduct- (. ) this balancing exercise,
because that’s essentially what lies behind your
question, .hh I think I can do no more than to accept the
logic of Sir Steven Wall the former policy advise- f-
foreign policy advisor, .hh in Number Ten Downing Street,
when he said, .h that there are dyade consequences of an
action, .h but even more dyade consequences of departing
from the rule of law.
IR: Eh but it- it’s a difficult argument you’re making, because
if the Liberal Democrats had their way, .h then there wou-
we would still not even be aware of these mass grieves, the
brutal a [brutal dictator would still [be in place, =
IE: [Oh yes we would- [eh-
IR: = and you’ve got somebody like the h. eh deputy Prime
Minister of Iraq eh uh on i- uh outgoing Barium Sally, .h
saying this: this stro:ng point about the British people
should h. should feel plea: f sed they were involved in this
process. =
IE: = eh We’ve been well aware of what was happening in
Iraq, indeed we knew about it. h. The British government
of the time extended further financial credit to Saddam Hussein in the weeks immediately after (helapture), when five thousand curs or h. gas, by the use of chemical weapons. When it comes to the treatment of Iraq, then there is a great deal to be said about a lack of consistency, in the approach not only at the United Kingdom but at the United States as well. =

IR: = mcht We have already had four enquiries, what could another one achieve.

IE: We've never had an enquiry into the conduct of ministers, the decisions which they took and the basis upon which they took them. That's- this form of an enquiry, which was established after the invasion of the (furculum's), the Franks enquiry. And one of the reasons why Charles Kennedy declined to nominate anyone to serve on the (battle) of enquiry†, [.h was that =

IR: [.hh

IE: = the terms of its remit did not go wide enough, to deal with the political judgments. This is a political issue†, =

IR: [why-

IE: = we're in the mid of a general election, hh it seems to us (. ) that the British people are entitled to know what it was that ministers did, [not simply (what) inadequacies, =

IR: [An-

IE: = there may have been (in) intelligence.

IR: And yes some make its- it's an issue that hasn't really e- come up a great deal in the general election campaign so far†, and somebody (will) be wondering why the Liberal Democrats haven't been jumping up and down about it = and partly, hh the suggestion is, .h that it's because in those seats y- the seats you need to win, .h are Tory seats.

IE: No, well if I may say so:, .h there are a number of Conservatives (E) who are opposed to the (h)war (E), .h although Mr. Howard ha- has that rather curious position, .h now of saying that: if he'd known (.) then what he knows now he wouldn't have voted for that motion, but he was .h still in favor of the war. That's- I think a rather h. difficult position to occupy. .h No so far as we have been concerned, this is a .h general election campaign†, there
are h. a number of issues, a raft of issues, h about domestic politics which we have h spent time and effort in trying to explain to the British people. But Iraq is an issue which goes right to the very heart, h of trust and credibility so far as this government is concerned. h And indeed if we have begun with the Iraq, and go on with the Iraq, h then I suspect your questions in this morning would have been [.h why are you concentrating on Iraq and not on =

].h

IE: = health or h education or pensions or something o- of that kind°.

IR: Sir Ming Campbell, many thanks.
Remember the days when the Conservative Party was the party of business. Labor had filled sandwiches with their union friends. h The Tory's dined of the survey with the captains of industry. hhhh Well not any longer new Labor flagged their lashes and the bosses were seduced away. The Tories have been trying to woo them back ever since. = And they'll try again today by launching their business manifesto. George Osborne .hh is the Shadow Chief Secretary to the Treasury, good morning to you?

Bit tricky really are, 'cause they are in love with new Labor, now aren't they. [You'll have an awful] lot to do = [((noise))] = to get them back into your bed.

Well one of (irony) have been handsomely rewarded with peerage†s. [Eh but I say that

[A;] I'm very cynical. They [must have been

[b]ut I say hhhh

= rewarded because they run good companies.

I'm sure some of them have been rewarded as well because they run good companies. = But look- eh .h eh a great majority of businessmen are exasperated by the increasing red tape, .h by the increases in taxes that happened under h. Labor of- including the national insurance rise a few years ago? .h And of course they are now concerned that if Labor wins this election↑, business taxation will increase? Probably national insurance again. .h Eh and regulation will continue to mount.

You don’t think that they'll believe that economic stability and a competitive tax framework have created the environment for business to invest for the long term?
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IE: Mcht I suspect: you're quoting that [John. ( )
IR: [Yeah. ( ) (lottery).
(0.2)

IE: ((clear throat)) Yeah, indeed if you read on new TV talk about thirty five billion pounds of TAx cuts which I think (go and gus) probably spending cuts which eh .h I think gives us a clue as to where that letter was dra:fted. .h And indeed (if) you look at the people who si:gned that letter in the Financial Times, .h it includes people like Trevor BT who's actually running Labor's advertising campaign: .h includes some of their biggest do:nars. [I- I prefer- I- I-
IR: [Shalom Fellow?
IE: Well as I say you've th- (. ) the [great majority
IR: [Jerry Robinson?
IE: [Allan Sugar?
IE: [( ) (yes)
IE: Well Allan Sugar has given very substantial: sums of money to Labor in the pa:st.
IE: [Eh I prefer to- I pr- HOLD ON HOLD ON hold on John ]
IR: [SO IN OTHER WORDS, ANYBODY who has given money to your party we have to discount, do we?
IE: No no I'm just saying one should treat with skepticism comments about eh Labor and Conservative policy from people who give money to the Labor party. [E: h ]'ve- I- I-
IR: [Or the Conservative party, presumably on the other side of the coin.
IE: Well I- indeed one should bear it in mi:nd.
IE: [Well t- I prepare to ( )
IR: [(Great.) I shall bear that in mind next time I talk to you then.
IE: [heheihei (£) but I would prefer to look at (£) for example .h a survey done by the former p- private business which is a h. organization h- happens to be based on my constituency† but represents thous:ands of businesses† and it is independent h. eh of any political party? An- and they; po:led a businessmen†, five thousand businessmen and
businesswomen, two thirds of them think, that a Conservative government would be better for business. = Right [so you (apply) cutting taxes, yeah?]

IE: [Eh and-]

(0.2)

IE: Well there’re it’s- it’s two things. One is a a move to deregulate. = We’ve set out exactly how [we get rid of it]=

IR: [Oh dear. That again-

IE: = (laid a) thousand pages of guidance, thirteen hundred targets? =

IR: = Ehm. [Do you reMEMber LO:rd Heseltine was going =

IE: = [but also tax-

IR: = to make a (bomb fire) of regulations?

IE: Well I do remember actually that: under the last Conservative government there was a:: climate in which business e:::h regulatory climates in which business had a chance to succeed h.. An- and I was just saying this, if you look at the world at the moment, all the developed countries in the world, all the countries that join us in the G7 and so on, h are all moving in the direction of reducing taxes and reducing regulation in order to meet the challenge of India and China and those kind of emerging economies. hh [We are the o::nly- we- we-

IR: [Business has the lowest tax regime of any other country in Europe.

IE: No no, we are heading in exactly the other direction under this government. We are heading in a direction where taxes are gonna continue to go up, where regulations are gonna continue to mount. h And in the end, that is gonna cost British jobs, cost British investment, and damage Britibi-

British business as we’ll make clear in our manifesto we’re publishing [(today on).

IR: [But- except what you will not be saying in that manifesto is that all of those innocuous taxes heaped upon business by this Labor government we will repeal. I mean if you could say that, that’ll be very impressive, and they’d no doubt say (my world) things are gonna be, = °but° of course you ca:n’t say that.
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114 IE:  Well as you know we are only making promises [on tax =
115 IR:  [Ehm.
116 IE:  = we know we can keep. But we have set up how to:
117  reduce tax, ANd of course .h eh we a:re setting aside a
118  great deal of money from the savings (if you identify) to
119  avoid the tax increases which are coming this way , .h if
120  Labor is elected, = and again I'll draw your attention for
121  example to reports there in the paper, .h by the Item Club,
122  eh which is a very respected independent organization
123  which says there is a considerable fes- deposit in Gordon
124  Brown's budget? .h and that taxes will go up. They're
125  which is what the issue of Fiscal Studies, another .h
126  independent organization said h. last week. The choice in
127  the election couldn't be clearer. .h High taxes under the
128  Labor, lower taxes and better value for mon(ey) un(der)
129  (the) Conservati[ves.
130 IR:  [Geor†ge Osbor†ne, thank you.
Tuesday 19 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0653 Liberal Democrat leader Charles Kennedy (04:35.0)

IR: John Humphrys

IE: Paul Burster, Liberal Democrat spokesman on health

01 IR: From the polls consistently shows that the health service is the biggest issue of the election campaign for many people, which means it's the biggest for the parties too. The Liberal Democrats will tell us how they would cut waiting times and give more freedom to frontline staff. Their spokesman on health is Paul Burster. What does it mean more freedom, Mr. Burster?

08 IE: 

09 IE: All we're going to be announcing this morning is our plans to cut the waiting times for diagnostic procedures, so that people in NHS treatments are not delayed. And part of that is about giving frontline staff the responsibility and the authority to use their common sense and clinical judgment rather than always having to look over their shoulders, to see whether they are ticking the boxes that the administrators have set for them.

17 IR: Well, in other words you don't like targets, but ehm they are an instrument. And I'm quoting the Kings Fund here, ehm independent experts in these matters, they'll recruit instruments their acknowledge, but they haven't driven down the time that people have to wait.

22 IE: 

23 IE: They are a crude instrument, and there they are blunt instrument, because they can never capture the complexity of a patient's journey through the NHS.

26 IR: [Yeah, but d- they work. That's the question].

28 IE: [Well, they don't always work. And we know from a research that was published back in March by the BMA that: they found with the forty eight with the eh four hour waiting target for A&E departments. It was compromising people's care, = they were being pushed from one part of the hospital to another, often as a consequence picking up infections and spreading them as well.
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IR: Mcht so you would get rid of all this sort of thing. And you’d allow: .h eh doctors (.) to run the hospital, is that what you are saying, [>because that’s =
IE: [.hh [what we ]
IR: = what used to happen long time ago, and we had a lot of problems from it.
IE: [What we’re saying is that we would remove the politically set targets that are not based on evidence, .h and have evidence based standard in the NHS, .h allow clinicians to use their clinical judgment, and their common sense to always treat the sickest patients the quickest. .h That’s not what happens at the moment. = Often, .h because of the obsession we’re trying to get down the numbers of people who are waiting too long, .h e:h those that are sicker don’t always get treated first, and that can not be the right way forward.
IR: It sounds terribly sensible to say let the clinicians decide, but the reality is what you’re talking about then is having people who are experts in one area, .h that’s to say expe:rts, (h)l- I’d want a doctor to operate on me quite frankly rather than you or anybody else I know. .hh Bu:t, when it comes to managing things, doctors are necessarily the best. That is [( ]
IE: [An- and that’s why we are no:t: mimicking the cold Tories and simply bashing managers and say we need to get rid of them. = >What we need to do is< in (paran) allow managers to be accountable .hh for the decisions they are taking with our hospitals. .h Having centrally go- central government targets gets in the way of that, gets in the way of meeting the local needs on the ground and actually making sure that .h those who are the sickest get treated the quickest. = >That’s the < .h eh objective we have here, that we want to make sure that hospitals .h can be free: .h to get on with treating the patients, and that the managers can do their job effectively as well.
IR: Mcht but you’ve- not acknowledged that things are getting better in the NHS. = >I mean wouldn’t we have a< a more rational debate (.) about all this if- if eh .hh the opposition party said lo- e- e- there’s a lot wrong in the NHS, there is
always gonna be a lot wrong in the NHS, but things are
going better. =

IE: = Well John ah- we certainly don’t dispute the fact that there
have been improvements in the NHS over the last few years.
The extra resources that have been going in for the last three
year’s, which .h Charles Kennedy called for at the last
general election the only party. .h To be honest with people
you don’t get something for nothing. .h Eh yes it is making a
difference, but we are demonstrating today: with the .h
survey that we are publishing is that .h there are over five
hundred thousand people in this country who are: .h on the
government’s hidden waiting list. > These are the people< .h
who don’t know what’s wrong with them or waiting to get
onto the government’s published waiting lists, .h before
they even start to know how long it will be before they get
the treatment.

IR: But what the government is now saying is that under their
plan, they have this five year plan don’t they, waiting times
will be cut to eighteen weeks FRO:m first being referred by
the GP. [(.) So no =

IE: [.hh

IR: = w- no hidden list there and no hidden waiting time there.

IE: Yes, but we’ve been pressing the government: since two
thousand and one, = >indeed the national audit office said in
two thousand and one the government should have been
collecting and publishing this information< .hh for all of that
time. The reality is, from our survey results we know that in
two out of five NHS hospitals in this country, .hh people are
waiting for over six months for an MI scan. .h That’s to
enable them to find out whether they have a tu:mor or
cancer, serious heart conditions. .hh This is leaving people in
limbo. It’s putting lives at risk. And this government hasn’t
dealt with it.

IR: Well, you say it hasn’t dealt with it, is it an increase in MI
scanners [eh hu:gely from what it two hundred and =

IE: [.hh Yeah, they are- Yeah-

IR: = nineteen: .h eh to two hundred nine(ty) >it used to be two
hundred and ten it’s two hundred and [nineteen now.<

IE: [It’s an increase in the
number of scanners but they are standing idle, because they are not being funded. One of the things my survey also has demonstrated is that in one out of four trusts across the country, twenty five percent of their capacity for MI scanning is not being used. Tax payers' money is being wasted in this equipment at this moment, because the government has not properly funded the ability to actually use it.

IR: Paul Burton, many thanks.
IR: And that are two: Blair::s in this election campaign. The
other one: i: s Sir Ian Blair, Britain’s most senior police
officer, the metropolitan police commissioner. = Also his
critics say he stirred things up, .hh at the weekend when he
told David Frost that the issue of ID cards needs to be looked
at seriously.

IE-1: I think there has to be:: further consideration of that. = I
mean I wasn’t particularly keen on ID ca: rds, until recently,
until I began to understand .hh the way in which identity set
is carried out. .h And the fact that what you and I and many
of the viewers would recognize as forgery, it isn’t doesn’t
exist any more, there are no more printing presses in
basements. .h The documents that are being produced are
exactly identical: to the do- real documents. Just
unauthorized. And so we have to go to a place, where we do
know who people are. We now have the technology I think
through (Irish) recognition: (0.2) to go to that.

IR: Well, police officers aren’t supposed to be involved in
politics†, and ID cards are a hot political issue. = Richard
Barnes†s .h is the deputy chairman of the metropolitan police
authority† and a Conservative.

IE0: I’m aware that he: issued a press statement yesterday to
explain that he- was only restating a position that he had
earlier. .h But I think it’s: e- hi:ghly inappropriate during a
general election that a senior police officer should make
political comment.

IR: Mcht .h well what do: other police officers think about that?
Chris Fox, (.) of thee Association of Police Officer†s, it’s
president†, is on the line, good morning to you?

IE: Good morning John†.

IR: Inappropriate.
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IE: hhhhh We'll I- I don't think so. I mean it's quite right we shouldn't be commenting on the hundreds of requests we get everyday to talk about po- policies from the different parties. hh Bu- events in policing go on, an- and last week we saw the end of a- of a major terrorist trial. (0.2) With many questions being asked about the result and about e- e- how it was progressed or investigated. h And one of those issues was identification. h So I think Sir Ian had- really to say something in that circumstance. h Bu- but in general terms polit- commenting on po- party policies isn- should not be: ehm e- a police business at this time. We should be keeping our lower profile.

IR: Except that that whole case did become highly politicized, didn't it. And you say Sir Ian had to say: h something about I- ID cards. The fact is ID cards were entirely irrelevant to that particular case, wer- weren't they, because the asylum seekers h. eh wouldn't be affected by ID cards.

IE: E:: hm it was about identification. The point about that particular investigation that he was making was: h to be more effective, h for us to be better in those sorts of investigations, h we need h. eh a better forms of identification. = >But,< that's not- that's not really the issue. [I suppose-

IR: [Well it is, because David Frost asked him about ID cards, didn't he.

IE: Well- well he did in tho-, but in those terms, the point I'm trying to make is that when a policing event's around, then I think it's legitimate to comment. h When it's not legitimate to comment it's: it's: eh in th- on the general pieces of- of: eh the election campaign. >(And I mean) for example, < (0.3) .h we all believe that: crime is too high. Everybody believes that. And therefore we are obviously interested and the voters are interested. h in which party has the best policies to reduce it. It is not for us to give our opinion about which h- has the best party eh policies to reduce it. .hh

[Ho- however it may be: it may be an- it just may be,=

IR: [Shou-{en

IE: = ri[tght, that i- if information that has been used is wrong, h eh it may be eh better for us t- to make it
accurate. But again no\textit{t} comment on the policy, but the
context of the discussion.

IR: Well, but th- but again that's: a grey area, isn't it. If you've
got a chief constable: .h describing a Tory advertisement has
been misleading and sti\textit{r}ring up h. fear of rising crime, that
is entering the political debate, isn't it, because you know
and I know how controversial .h how confusing some of
these crime figures can be, (and how open to: interpretations

IE: [.hh

IR: = of all sorts they can be:.

IE: That's right. And that's why such a- you know a- a really
delicate line because- (.) the word you use is very impor\textit{t}ant.
I mean I think what we eh wha- what we should be doing is
entering the statistics and saying here you are, but the real-
the real issues a\textit{r}e .h look everybody agrees crime is too
hi\textit{g}h, let's talk about how we are going to reduce it. =

IR: = Right, so we shouldn't hear Mr. Barnes saying that chief
constable in this particular case saying the kind of thing he
said.

IE: Eh\textit{m} well l- l- (.) you have to speak to Richard Barnes about
[that? but- but in my opinion, we should not be getting =

IE: = into the day: today. .h I mean, th- the media a- ask hu-
hundreds of questions every day. We should not be
answering those on policy issues. [.h But if the debate has =

IR: [Al\textit{e}right\textit{e}

IE: = been wrongly eh g- steered, then perhaps we should put
some accurate statistics in and .h but with no: judgment.

IR: Alright. Final quick thou\textit{g}ht. Eh should police cards used
by the Prime Minis\textit{t}er carry eh Labor Party's slogons? =

IE: =.hh Well you have to talk to Ian Blair abo\textit{ut tha\textit{t}. Eh\textit{m}: =

IE: = (0.3) n-

IR: = You're obviously doubt\textit{f}ul about it?

IE: .h Well, I don't know the reasons for it. But I know that
no\textit{r}mally eh ca\textit{r}ds are to in the protection: eh convoys for
Prime Ministers are playing ca\textit{r}ds, they are propriety
c\textit{a\textit{r}ds\textit{t}.h Eh they are not ma\textit{r}ked police cards. E:hm I don't
know the reasoning behind it, and I'm not prepared to comment.

IR: Mcht very good. Chris Fox, many thanks.
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(05:11.0)
IR: Sarah Montague
IE: Liam Fox, the Conservative party co-chairman

01 IR: ( ... ) its leader over them to nil:ne points. Well the
Conservative party co-chairman is Liam Fox. He is on
the line, good morning.
02 IE: Good mornin[g.
03 IR: [.hh Eh g- shall we get to the bottom of this
first of all. Was there we:re there ca::lls made to Michael
Howard by senior MPs (.) h over the weekend on Sunday
expressing unease about his handling with the campaign? =
04 IE: =h No I probably talked to more people in the
Conservative party as a chairman than anybody else. And I
talked to about twenty five (.) h of my: MP colleagues and
our candidates every single night. And I’m around the
country (.) h pretty much all the ti:me. h And I hear f- in
from our party workers h and from voters they think this is
the best organized and theh .hh campaign was the most
resonant on the issues that really matter to people, h that
we’ve had for a very lo:ng ti:me. And people actually
say: h we think that your campaign on pensions, we think
your campaign on cleaner hospitals as school discipline, h
on more police, .h on lower taxes, as well as your
immigration campaign are all very effecti[ve.
05 IR: [Which doesn’t
06 answer the question as to whether senior MP:s called
Michael Howard on Sunday to express concerns about the
way it’s going.
07 IE: No I’ve- been talking to a lot of my senior colleagues and
in fact it’s quite the reverse message.
08 [.h They are saying they can g- THEY THINK TH- THEY
THINK THIS-]
09 IR: [.hh Can - Can I quote to you then, that
you can just r- tel- tell us i- that it isn’t true. The Guardian
today has two: quotes. .h One:↑ from the fron- a-
well-placed front benchers >how they describe this
person↑<, .hh quotes there was a ring round on Sunday our
IE: Well people- the individuals may have their views. But I'm telling you what the view is of the vast majority of my colleagues, because we are talking about the issues that really matter, ( )

IR: [So it's- so it's true: then. I'm just trying to get to the bottom on whether there were-]

IE: [Well w- we didn't ] want it to- I don't want it to: (mile contents) talk to thee Labor leaning papers like the Guardian or the Times. >I'm telling you,< h what the viewers of the Conservative party, h of the majority of our colleagues, and of the candidates on the- or thee (activates) in the party which su:rely h. is far- by far the most important point. =

IR: = h Eh bu- bu- with- one of their concerns is that as- as I quote the:re that thee h party is becoming- h a single-issue party and that- conc:ern might be reflected h o- e- in the story on the front page of the Evening Standard today:, h where- a: fa:ther of a policeman who was killed ten years ago referring to Michael Howard’s comments about h. eh Detective Contworth Steven Oak, h says I'm appa:lled by the cynical way Michael Howard is using the death of a police officer by i- an illegal immigrant as a political and electoral ploy:. hh And he makes the point that ten years ago his son† was murdered by an illegal immigran†. h there was no public outcry from Mr. Howard then and at that time he was Home Secretary.

IE: .hh But I think that this idea that we’re talking about as single-issue is nonsense. I spent most of the weeke:nd (. ) h in the TV studios talking about MRSA, h and cleaner hospitals. = Yesterday I spent a great deal of the time .h (actually) my colleague David Willets talking about pensions. This is far from a single-issue election and I think it’s preposterous h to portrait it as such.

IR: .h One of their concerns there e-e- e- it must be something
that: e- y- y- you feel unease about, which is I know y- I’m sure you will say that the only poll that matters is that- b- that on May the fifth. But you must be wondering why if your strategy is wor†king†, the poll’s not mer- m- m- moving i- i- if anything they are moving in the wrong direction.

IE: Well on Sunday we saw a number of polls, which showed everything from a one percent Conservative lead to a ten percent Labor lead. I notice you’re bulleted. h You mentioned the one poll that gave an increase Labor lead, .h but you didn’t mention the poll that gave a decrease Labor lead this morning. Funny that?

IR: .h Well- hh I might (h)mention(h) another one, which is as- perhaps more specific, which is that in the Financial Times today, .h which is reflecting .h supposedly othher concerns that- a- a- a lot of Conservative MPs >according to the Financial Times have†<, .h which is- the Tory position on tax, and the suggestion .h by a number of people [sound of turning paper] that (. ) actually there should be, = >well let me put it in the words of David Mellor<, the current four billion pound package is pathetic.

IE: hh We woll, we would love to have made (. ) greater reductions in taxation. But you know we face with a big problem. hh Gordon Brown (. ) would leave us in massive ho:le in the public finances, which we think is responsible to fill. Michael Howard will not promise things that he can not deliver. We are not going to: say one thing before the election and do another afterwards. Our tax cuts, ye†s they are modest. But you know there’s a very big difference in this election? .hh We know that if the Conservatives win, the taxes will be cut in the first budget, we know that if Labor win, taxes will go up, there could not be a starker choice.

IR: .h But if- of course one of the things that seems to come from that as Financial Times suggest is that theh .h public according to this (mory) po:l, .h shows that nearly- .h seven out of ten people believe the Conservative government would increase taxes which is clearly not the
message you want to get across.

IE: And of course a far bigger number if you’re going to be balanced in your reporting actually shows that people expect Labor to raise taxes if they’re elected. E: hm yes I think it’s part of the public has developed in recent years. Not least because before the last general election in two thousand and one, the Prime Minister gave us a strongest hint possible, that he had no intention to raise national insurance, and yet we’d a huge hike in national insurance after the two thousand and one election. = And of course now: hh we have been told Labor are not again ruling out rises in national insurance. We weren’t born yesterday. We know exactly what Labor are intending to do, and that’s to raise tax, on hard-working people, if they should be re-elected in this election.

IR: Liam Fox, many thanks.
The dog that hasn’t barked in this election so far is Europe. Remember when it was the issue. Well now this time Europe seems to be on hold until we know whether the French will eh (defile) the new Constitution their referendum at the end of next month. So where does that leave UKIP, the party whose purpose it is to get us to leave the European Union. Dr. John Whittaker who’s an MEP is one of its candidate, actually he’s standing in not one, but eight constituencies. No one, we think has ever done that before. He’s on the line, good morning to you.

= Eh which rather proves how eh seriously you- you do not take these elections. Doesn’t it (mean) you can’t be a- (£) a serious candidate in eight constituencies? (£)

No that’s not the point at all. Eh I’m standing in more =

[They can’t have you as their] MP? You can only be an MP for one constituency?

[(Oh) absolutely, = yes. But more than that, we wanna draw attention to this phony election. All we hear is endless mind numbing arguments about tax and spend. People are bored of this. The main parties have got nothing new to say:. h No room for maneuver over the budget, and just tiny differences between them. [.hh And all ( )-]

[Well that doesn’t make it unimportant, does it.

Let me just finish the point please. h You know they’re all steadfastly ignoring the fact that there are real governments in Brussels. And that’s where most of our law comes from, and why for instance, none of them can control
immigration, the European Union has seen to that. hhh

IR: = Well, and you are making a nonsense obviously by
saying I'm going to stand for eight different constituencies.
= >I mean what do you expect, just to get a-< h a kind of
handful votes in each or something?
(0.2)

IE: In last June general election†, thee (.) UK Independence
Party polled .h nationally two points six million votes.
That's about sixteen percent of the electorate. Now- (. ) we
were starting from absolute scratch last June in the north
west†. It's the first time that (I was) elected last: June. So
th- that's the first time we've had i- representation in the
north west. We've grown from strength to strength. I just
want to see: h as many of the constituencies where people
lots of people voted for us last year†, I want to give them
an- opportunity to vote for us again.

IR: >[Yeah but you (stand-) Sorry, can I just make the point,
you say we have to start somewhere. You start surely<, h by
trying we have a democratic system, if you are serious
about wanting to change, you try to get as many of you
elected h. to the Westminster Parliament as possible? And
then if you've got enough call for the referendum and get us chapped out of Europe, h that would be the constitutional-.h way: of going about things, wouldn't it.

[>This is j-, you're just a protest party, aren’t you.< =

IE: [Y- you do-

IE: = You- you do; make it sound ever so easy, don’t you. =

IR: = [Of course [it’s not easy. Democracy isn’t easy.

IE: [.hhh [We ( up-) we-

IE: We’ve been in th- we’ve been in a party for ten years. We’re gonna stay until: eh this- government they- they- until this country is self-governing again. We cannot eh simply just go around getting more and more votes without getting into the Westminster Parliament†. = >I agree with you<, h until some of us get into Westminster, h then things will not change. = >But we have indeed<.h eh- ehm quite reasonable chance of getting some people elected†.h this time round. But at the same time we have to motivate voters all around the country and that includes my party in the north [west. ] And I can tell you there are very =

IR: [Ok? ]

IE: = strong su- there is very strong support, h particularly from principled old Labor people, [.h ] we need to =

IR: [Righ-]

IE: = give them something to vote for.

IR: John Whittaker†, many thanks.

IR: (female)

IE: Roger Knapman, UKIP party leader

01 IR: The UK Independence Party launches its manifesto today†, and the party leader Roger Knapman (.) joins us in the studio†, good morning to you? =

04 IE: = Good morning.

05 IR: ([hhhh E- e- you make it clear in your introduction that while people ca:ll eh UKIP a single-issue party the point is a single issue of freeing Britain from the EU overrides all others, .h no other issues can be properly addressed while we remain in the EU. = And you point to: the ehm your policy on asylum seekers. .hh E- do you face a problem: now: that the Conservatives have been focusing so hard on immigration and asylum. = They're basically occupying crucial UKIP ground. =

14 IE: = No:, eh thee Conservatives want to stay in the European Union. I was in the European Parliament thee other day† when the President (inside thee†) we have a president†, .hh was telling us that immigration is a European wide problem†m, .h and will be solved on the European wide basis. Collapsed in Mr. Howard's argument, he can not, if he wish to stay in the EU, have an independent national immigration policy, full stop.

22 IR: Well if you say that you are operating then separately from the Conservatives, what about the threat from (various task). Eh, .h you've lost Robert (Kil Rolji), possibly your- your best known household name.

26 IE: .h Well it is true† that currently the opinion polls are showing us at one to two percent. But of course that is only if you ask how you are going to vote in the next election. If you say how you are going to vote in the next election, Conservative, Labor, Liberal, UK Independence Party†, then we are over eight percent. And we are over eight percent nationally, that means our strong holds in (Devon Cono), .h in- in Boston, in Harage, .h and in Thanet, eh then we are probably nearer twenty percent. And we strongly think we may well win (six no zeros).
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IR: He's hoping your party's hoping to get in a toe-hold at Westminster on May the fifth, then has real chances in around twenty seats. Is that how you see it? Can you be that clear?

IE: Oh yes, we've been first in twenty one seats last June, we came first. And those are the seats we will target. And after all, there are six hundred and fifty nine MPs. What is the main business of the House at next year? It will be the referendum on the constitution for Europe. Surely out of the six hundred and fifty nine MPs we want just a few who will argue unambiguously for the no campaign.

IR: = But you- you gave a number there where you came first, but you actually had twelve MEPs elected.

IE: = Yes I'm providing the constituencies where we came first last June, we got twelve elected. I'm talking about constituencies rather than regions.

IR: So just finally, are you continuing the policy of standing against Conservatives because there are people for example like Antony Steen, you're going to stand against him. He's a Europe skeptic Conservative MP, why do that?

IE: Is he the same Europe skeptic MP who was organizing kind of leadership campaign, is he?

IR: Well, so is that justification for standing against him.

IE: We are not a Conservative party in drag. We have a radical manifesto to unveil today? We are a party, we are taking from the Conservatives, but we are also taking Labor voters the most flaky of all, and the Liberals there are a lot of Liberals who don't like their party's policy. And also there's Britain's biggest party that don't bother to vote. Those are the people that are coming in, but as we are saying votes through conviction rather (than) have it vote UKIP.
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75 IE: Everybody's trying to attract the m. Roger Knapman,
76 thank you very much. =
77 IR: = Thank you.
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[38] Friday 15 April 2005: BBC radio 4 "Today Program": 0654 Scottish National Party deputy leader Nicola Sturgeon (03:23.0)

IR: John Humphrys
IE: Nicola Sturgeon, Scottish National Party deputy leader

01 IR: The second manifesto in five minutes? The SNP's wants coming out today? We are joined by thee Scottish National Party deputy leader Nicola Sturgeon? Ah good morning?
02 IE: Good morning.
03 IR: [h Ehm what's the evidence: that on your principal aim of eventual independence for Scotland, h people in Scotland believe that that is thee h the great issue that should be at the forefront of their mind. = >There is no evidence to support that, is there?< =
04 IE: = Well it's interesting that you asked that question, because just eh two days ago a Scotland opinion poll was published that show:ed .h support for independence outstripping .h those who oppose it. I think that's very good news. Everybody (. ) eh a majority of people under fifty (£) five in fact: (£) supported independence an- I think that's very good news for thee SNP and that's why we are expecting to do rather well on th[is election. =
05 IR: [h [h
06 IE: = Ehm, .h what is thee essence of your campaign going to be: on that independence question. If you go into the streets and say, .h vote for us and in the end you'll get an ind- an independent referendum. .h Do you come clea:n and cost independence (. ) [for them.
07 IE: In this election our message is just make Scotland matter. All of the other par[ties in this election (campaigni-) 08 IR: [So you don'- you don't put a cost on it at all.
09 IE: If you let me- answer your question. We say make Scotland matter. All of the other parties in this are campaigning (composes apply) only (serves at) the border. Only the SNP in this election can make Scotland matter, = >and make sure that the issues that are important< .h to people in Scotland, .h at the top not the bottom (. ) of the agenda. And
yes, advance (. ) the keys for independence. = >If you look< . eh to Norway for example a country that this year . h celebrates one hundred years of being an independent country. . h It's one of the richest countries (. ) in the world. It's got some of the best public services. That's the kind of country . h Scotland should aspire to be. And it's the kind of country we can be, if we were independent. = 

IR: = If- e- just return to the question if- if a voter asked you on the doorstep, . h how much will it cost to me (. ) if you become independent. = >Have you got< (. ) any idea what the [answer is.] =

IE: = Well it ] =

IE: = it won't cost anybody anything, = >it will make Scotland< (our) are competitive nation. >Scotland's got the lowest< . h long term economic growth (. ) in the whole of Europe. If we were to match over the next ten years: the economic growth rate >the average economic growth rate< of other European countries, . h then it would be an additional nineteen billion pounds: in the Scottish economy. That's four thousand . h pounds per head for everyone in Scotland. =

IR: = [. hh

IE: = Independence would be good for the Scottish =

IR: = hmhm

IE: = (h)economy(h), and it would be good for Scottish people. =

IR: = How well are you going to do: e- e- people will know: e- outside Scotland that: the number of seats have been reduced because people are sh- a sort of new-bind reason it's . h quite difficult to predict. . h What's your prediction for how the SNP will do: in this election.

IE: = Well we said only progress it's up to the Scottish people here on May the fifth how much progress we make in terms of . h how many seats we win? >But we are< . h confident of winning more seats than we have, just no bu[t th- one thing- ]

IE: = [You’ve got five at the moment.] =

IE: = Well we’ve got four under the new bound at least. And
we are confident of having more than that on May =

IR: [Yes. Ok. ]

IE: = the fifth, but the important thing (.) is that when the SNP
does well, Scotland does well, and the only way to put
Scotland [on the map =

IR: [.hh

IE: = in this [election is to vote SNP. ]

IR: [What’s the evidence- e- ] What’s the
evidence for that, when the SNP does well Scotland =

IE: [Well, there’s a- i-

IR: = does well.

IE: Well, anybody who knows anything about Scottish politics
knows that it was the SNP pressure that let the .h
establishment of the Scottish Parliament†. Back in nineteen
ninety nine it was fear of the SNP .h that resulted in the .h
at two Glasgow shipyards being saved. When the SNP
does well, the other parties sit up and take (notice). And,
everybody in Scotland knows that a strong SNP .h means a
strong Scotlan[d.

IR: [Nicola Sturgoen, thanks very much.}
It seems clear (.) that many thousands of servicemen and
women won’t be able to vote in the election because the
leaflets explaining (.) how they should register to vote
were delivered much later than it had been promised.
Nearly half the army at the moment are abroad, (h in places
from the Forclans to Iraq. And the first advisedly leaflets (h
arrived only about ten days from the registration deadline.
That was about a month later than the government had
promised (it met) them. Many people didn’t register. The
Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats (h are
complaining that many people in the forces have been
(disadvanchized) as a result. (h We are joined by Lord
Garden, Liberal Democrat PF, former d- deputy chief of
the defense staff. (h Also by Sam Younger who chairs the
Independent Electoral Commission, (h overseeing electoral
procedures. (h As far as you can work out, Lord Garden,
what (0.3) was the effect of the delay: in getting these
advisedly leaflets to forces.

The leaflets are only part of the story. They are very good
leaflets done by the Electoral Commission: that help
remind people they have [to re-

= Yeah I- l- th- the real problem has been that thee the
system changed back in two thousand and one:, so that .h
instead of the old system which I served (underway) you
registered to vote, (h and it stayed on your (h eh registration
f- until you changed it. So it’s a life long registration. (h
You then- eh the system changed so you have to do it every
year. So servicemen have t- and women have to remember
and their families have to remember each year: they’ve got
to re-register. Hh. A:nd e- the system for reminding (.)
them i- is a (. ) pretty imperfect. And I was delighted that
the Electoral Commission (. ) (h produced this leaflet (. ) to
help people. Unfortunately it- it arrived a bit la:te. [.h

government said that it would be: out- e- in February, an- it
wasn’t ou- () till a month later. And the deadline was-
racing up, so so[mbody (still-)

[Well the deadline was March thee tenth in
North Ireland March the eleven fo:r the
res[t of the country.

[Could you get an leaflet in the desert in Iraq on March
the second, your chances of registering by the tenth are
limi[ted.

[Yes, y- I mean you still got to d- a process to do
which is the registering. And then of course you also got
the process of voting later, so .h it’s a settled hurdles which
is very difficult if you are on operations. =

= How many people potentially we’re talking a[bout.]

[.h ] We’ll
e:h two hundred thousand in th- in the military who a:re
eligible for this sy†stem. .h E:h perhaps half as many again
families, civil:ians, who suppor:t. .h l- i- it’s a la::rge
number of- of voters, but we- thee military defense doesn’t
track how many of them are registered, so we don’t
know: .h wha- what the sca:le of the problem is.

Ehm, Sam Younger, you chair the Electoral Commission†,
independent body which (.) looks at election procedures, .h
ehm- (0.3) Lord Garden’s praising your leaflet, do you
think the government’s let you down by not getting it to the
people who needed it.

Well- I’m disa:ppointed that the leaflets that we produced
that were available at the beginning of February didn’t get
much more quickly to their- to their destination if indeed
that’s- what happens ’cause certainly we see this as an
important issue, we were alerted to it. hh. eh back in the
autumn began working closely with the Ministry of
Defense. The leaflet was one part of it? .h Eh an updated
website giving people access to dow:nload forms is
another:. We spend some time going on to forces
broadcasting, = putting thing into thee forces’ newspapers
and magazi:nes, .h to remi:nd people of the need to register
to vote, = >and of course it was part of a much wi:der< h
campaign for registration. So: in so far as there are =
IR: [En-
IE2: =.h ah large numbers of >people in the forces who haven't
had the opportunity to register, that's very regrettable, and
something we need to make sure that we h.< close off for
next time. =
IR: = Well it is: biza:rrre or unfortunate, isn't it, eh Tim Garden
that eh there are people out there ah(.) fighting or e- e-
being shot at or doing difficult jobs, .hh ehm who:se views
on- policy on government policy on matters of war and
peace are extremely important to the part of the democratic
process. .h And they have been deni:ed or that's been made
rather difficult for them to express them.
IE 1: Wel- i- we've got sort of paradox here, because we- we
also want a non-political military. Eh a::nd actually you're
not allowed to go in canvas on military stations, you can't
hold meettings there. .h Ehm so we- we sort of insulate the
military from: the political .h eh fray: that we're all used
to. .h Ehm but then we are expected to go and establish
democracies, set up voting stations in Afghanistan and the
Balka:ns, in Iraq. .h Eh and we don't facilitate their own
voting back home, = >which I think< .h is very strange.
Postal voting's originally set up .h to help servicemen. And
it's now- they are now the one group that (£) can't regist[er
?: [hhh
IE1: = for it (£).
IR: (hhh) Just on that last point. It's not what you're here to
discuss in detail Sam Younger, but the whole postal bo-
voting business we had thee-.h case in Birmingham the
other day the discovery of boxes. .h (Out of) great deal of
concern about this, now the Lord Chancellor was saying
yesterday that- there is nothing to worry about. What's
you:r view.
IE2: .h Wel- certainy our view: i:s and it has bee:n for the last
two years, that there need to be changes: to the legislative
underpinning for postal voting to make it more secu:re,
that's clear. [.h
IR: [But it isn't secure at the moment.]

IE2: It's not as secure as

IR: [Not as secure as it shou-

IE2: = as it needs to be. And I think when you've got the

Birmingham case that came out and people began to
get yet more worried about it, I think the issue that you
faced was that there was nothing that could be done about
it in legislative terms, before a general election. And I
think our view has been that very large numbers of people
across the country use postal votes, appreciate postal
votes, and that you mustn't actually deprive them of that
opportunity. That said, I think there are still a number of
things short of legislation, that have been put in train in
order to make it more secure on this occasion including,

IE2: eh working with the police for example, and a code of
practice for political parties in the handling of postal votes.

IR: =

IR: = Well we'd be returning to that, before polling day
without any doubt. Sam Younger, Lord Gar
den, thank you
both.
And you will remember Tony Blair’s three big issues when he first came to power, education, education, education. Is that still the case? And have they delivered on those big promises? Well education is the big issue on the campaign trail today, and the education minister Stephen Twigg is on the line, so is the Liberal Democrat’s education spokesman Phil Willis. Eh Mr. Twigg, eight years of education, education, education and we’ve got one in five eleven-year-olds who can’t read and write properly. It doesn’t work, does it. (0.2)

Mcht, education remains the absolute number one priority for Labor. We’ve seen a big advance: in terms of the literacy and numeracy achievements of children in primary schools? But of course we need to do more, not only in primary schools but in secondary schools as well. And that’s partly what we’ll be setting out today in our education manifesto.

in five can’t read and write properly?

Well the number of children who left school not achieving their level fours at the age of eleven in primary when we came into power, has fallen into twenty two percent. Twenty two percent is too high, but I think teachers and pupil should get the credit, for the very real improvement there has been, in primary schools. We want to build upon that.

Big improvement, then eh Mr. Willis.

Well well there certainly isn’t a big improvement. We were told that we were going to revolution our standards in Britain schools, and what we’ve had is not
education education education, but targets targets
targets in central interference from our government.

IR: [Ah but do you agree with that point that Mr. Twigg just made
specifically than e- th- e- TWice as many CAN read and
write properly (years) years (could) before.

IE2: Well I- I- I think I dispute that: totally. [Well you-
IR: [Have you got the facts.

IE2: Well the fact is that when you actually get to the end
of children's life, school life, the age of sixteen, what we now have is sixty percent of our young people, having had sort of eight years of English, math and science, do not reach the national standard. I actually call that failure not success.

IR: Eh Mr. Twigg?

IE1: What we've DONE over the last years is to very significantly increase investment in education.

IR: [Well indeed. But let's not talk about what you-
IE1: = Democratic rats' called first to do.

IR: Ah sorry, but let's not talk about what you've put in. Let's look at what has come out of it all. That's what matters to people, isn't it, not how much has been spent, (£) but, huh the achievements that have- (£) been: eh eh gained. So: were- was Mr. e- v- Willis right, in his criticism that he's just made, that at the end of the school term, the kids school years they are not as well educated as they should be, effectively? [°( )°]

IE1: It is absolutely right to say that we need to do more with respect to literacy, numeracy in secondary, and that was what I was saying just now. That is why we set out now fourteen to nineteen white paper [.h how we can =

IE2: [hah

IE1: = encourage more young people to stay in education beyond sixteen. It's why we =

IE2: [(You've just reject-)]
IE1: = introduced education maintenance allowances (.) to give financial support to the poorest students to stay in education beyond sixteen. I'd have thought =

IE2: [hoh]
IE1: = that's something that Phil Willis would welcome. =
IR: = En. [() was just saying, go on Mr. Willis. =
IE2: [Listen I-
IE2: = Wel- well I've got- I- I welcome anything which actually tries to improve the lot of our children I think it will be (childish) not to do so: .h But just literally a month ago:, the government had a- the cost of one and a half million pounds at (Thomason) report which would have REVolutionized the way we deliver education .h from fourteen onwards to really turn young people .h onto education. And the Secretary of State, having talked to a few parents at church gates in Burry, .h decided to ( ) get rid of that. Now I- I- I think that was a betrayal of our education system, it's a betrayal of young people., h many of whom find the present curriculum, the present s- e school system h. totally (outputting). [(I'll say they have =
IR: [You're offer-
you're offer-
IE2: = to admit it.)
IR: You're offering lots more teachers: eh Mr. Willis, but you are not going to be able to afford it, are you. The Inland Revenue is just: .h eh revi:se down: the estimate ad-
amount you get from your tax [increases.
IE2: [Well a- absolutely not. Eh I mean we- we accept that after any budget you are going to invite after readjust oh readjust figu[res >and by< the time we actually r- e- produce our manifesto later this wee{k. All those cutting will be emplaced, but ou- b- e- b- eh class p- size pledge, .h which is to reduce classes for infant children to twenty, .h and juniors to twenty five. The lowest ever seen in Britain's in the history of education, .h is paid for by strapping the child trust fund. .h One and a half billion pounds spent to get twenty one thousand more teachers, .h in our schools. When it matters when children are starting off. If you give them
the best start possible, then my goodness, you don't have the problems later on of missing targets.

IR: = Mr. Twigg, doesn't matter how many teachers you've got how much money you've spent the kids aren't prepared to learn if you get the kind of indiscipline that we now have in so many schools. It's not going to work, is it. What are you going to do about that.

IE1: Well discipline will be at the heart of the education manifesto that we set out today, giving head teachers the support they need, giving teachers the protection they rightly deserve.

IR: What's that mean.

IE1: One of the issues that we'll talk about today is knives in schools. There is a real concern.

IE2: about the growth of knife crime, and we want to ensure that schools have the power to deal with that so that we don't see knives in our schools, so that we don't see attacks either on other pupils or on teachers, there is no doubt that this question of bad behavior in schools has become a much bigger issue in recent years. It's got to be taken seriously, and we'll be setting out our detailed proposals on that in the education part of our manifesto today.

IR: Stephen Twigg, Phil Willis, thank you both.
IR: John Humphrys
IE1: Marian Agran Baha, chair of the Norfolk Agreed Syllabus Conference
IE2: Nick Seaton chair of the campaign for RE education
01 IR: Norfolk Education Authority has come up with some guidelines for teaching religious education which have caused a bit of controversy in this morning's newspapers. Marian Agran Baha is the chair of the Norfolk Agreed Syllabus Conference. She joins us as does Nick Seaton chair of the campaign for RE education. Marian Agran Baha, you can not now say holy ghost 'cause children might think that was a bit spooky.
09 (.)
11 IE1: Hehe. Well that's one way of putting it. Eh (h) it's simply making it more modern as well as as most of thee: eh .h ehm texts in the Christians' now refer to it as a holy spirit and that is the recommendation: =
15 IR: = And you also ca:n't talk about the body and blood of Jesus in communion because that might make children think that Christians are cannibals.
18 IE1: .h I think you have to be very careful with that one because you don't want to give them the wrong impression. It was one of the early accusations leveled against the Christians that this is what they are doing. hh Whereas in fact it's not. It's a representation, not th- not an actual: eh event. [.hh
24 IR: [Well we're not getting into this theology of that. Then let's move on [to another one. =
26 IE1: = Ehmm, you can't apparently ca:l1 thee early books of th- Bible the Old Testament either.
29 IE1: E::h you don't call the early books of the Bi:ble the Old Testament if you are referring to it within Judaism which is where it is in the guidelines. hh You actually refer to that in the appropriate way but use the words Ol(d) Testament when you put it within the context of Christianity.
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35 IR: Nick Seaton, what do you make of all this.
36 IE2: Eh we'll, the NUG and Marian call it's modernism I: think it's something much more sinister. I think most people: are extremely hostile to this manipulation of language for the sake of political correctness in the education system. And it's quite well known of course that if you change the language you change the culture. And I think that's what six- exactly what's happening here. Eh George Orwell provided (.) one of the best examples in: eh his book Nineteen Eighty Four. And of course there's nothing wrong with calling a spade a spade or giving children their tradi- eh things their traditional names. Hh.

38 IR: What do you make of that accusation Marian Agran Baha?
39 IE1: = mcht hh I- I think it's a bit spurious really. I- I mean that i- i- we are ta- simply talking about accuracy. We are talking about the translation of a Greek word which is now done as spirit not as ghost. [It's an old fashioned term. ]
40 IR: [Well: that- in that particular case.] But I mean tak- take the question of communion. I mean the idea of body and blood of hh. ehm Christ is is as old as Christianity it's- (£) it's used in you know every Sunday in Church (£). Why- why are you trying to stop- pe(hh)ople using that. Hh.
42 IE1: We are not trying to stop them using it. We are trying to make sure that they don't give children a rather peculiar impression of what Christians actually are doing. And I think it's people within the Christian faith, .h who know what that means, and it's a representation. It's: ah: [you can go back to (enquire) in some theology ]
44 IR: [The same- the same Christians use those words] use those words every Sunday, don't they. I mean their- =
46 IE1: = Yes, of course they do. (0.2)
47 IE1: And you wouldn't stop people using them. You will just be careful how you express it to young people.
49 (.)
50 IE1: [Ahm and young children too.
IR: [.h
IR: Well I suppose that’s fair enough, isn’t it, Nick Seaton.
IE2: [.h Eh well no it’s not. Because: I mean there’re even basic
corcepts like right and wrong are disappearing from
educational language these days. So are words like
competition and success and failure. [.h And you rarely [hear al-
IR: [.h
IR: [.h
IE1: (£) Well (£), the majority of Muslims don’t.
IR: No [they don’t. But that’s not the same as] saying that you
= .h children photographs of Muslims holding: swords or
Kalashnikov which is presumably something with a
clear: [.h political[: purpose.
IE1: [hh
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IE1: (£) Well (£), the majority of Muslims don’t.
IR: No [they don’t. But that’s not the same as] saying that you
= .h children photographs of Muslims holding: swords or
Kalashnikov which is presumably something with a
clear: [.h political[: purpose.
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113 IR: well you
114 would pr’sum’bly if you are doing a s- a lesson about the
115 crusades, for example.<
116 (0.2)
117 IE1: Well, that’s different. And we don’t do the crusades in
118 R.E. That’s a history topic. =
119 IR: I see. Right. Well we’ll have to leave it there. Marian
120 Agran Baha, Nicksy, thanks very much indeed.<
121 IE1: Ok. Thank you.
122 (): .hh
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IR: John Humphrys
IE: Keith Taylor, one of principal spokespersons of the Green Party

01 IR: Thirty minutes past seven. The Green Party launches its manifesto today. Keith Taylor is one of its principal spokespersons. He’s here. Good morning?

02 IE: Mcht. Good morning.

03 IR: Guess talk a lot about social justice as well as about the environment. Is it wise to dilute your core message in that way.

04 IE: Well actually I think what people are seeing and over a million people did vote Green in the last European elections. And I think part of the reason for them giving their vote to us was they recognize we weren’t a a minority interest party in so far as just looking at the environment. Eh we actually are campaigning on a platform here of economic, environmental, and social justice. Eh which is actually putting people, the planet, and peace at the centre of our policy.

05 IR: I thought it is surprising to hear you say that environment is a minority interest. I thought the whole point of your party was that it sh-

06 IE: ((hhhhhh))

07 IR: = it’s something that should concern us all.

08 IE: [°No.°]

09 IE: = Of course. That was an unfortunate word to use. Eh you know I think the reason that a big part of the reason that we are enjoying an increase in their vote. Is that people are recognizing that climate change, which is our number one campaign issue, is something which the major parties are choosing to ignore in this campaign so far. Eh An- and really a manifesto which we’re launching ehm later on this morning, is all about regenerating local capacity building. It’s all about saving and conserving resources eh for this generation and the generations to come. Eh And it’s about getting
IR: Better value for money and doing more [with less. =

IR: But that really brings you back to my- to my main
question. If climate change is the issue you want
people to talk about, why: dress up a manifesto with all
these- other issues to do with tax, crime, and so forth,
which you know perfectly well you’ll never get a chance
to implement. Doesn’t that distract attention .h from what
you’re trying to achieve. =

IE: .h mcht I think what people are hungry to h. hungry to
hear in Westminster .h is the issues that we’re talking
about are being treated h. eh with the importance they
deserve. And it’s not only climate chan:ge. I mean our
second major campaign the:me .h is all around public
services, .h is all about challenging h. ehm the
Westminster three parties h. in their un- unalloyed
enth u:si:am to privatize everything that’s insight. We’ve
got- public finance initiatives, .h foundation hospitals.
We’ve got a two-tier, health and educational servi:ce.
And I think people are getting fed up .h with e- e- hearing
( .) very little difference between the major three parties.

IR: But you are not () °realistically going into challenge them
on those issue, are you°. = >I mean °your voice is just
[g kind of big public policy [questions°.]<

IE: [°.hh° ] = actually I’ve been
a councilor now in Brighton for- for nearly seven years.
And what we’ve seen in Brighton is i- is a growth in
our support. We- we- we poll more votes every time we
stand. .h And actually what we’re doing, even though we
are a small group, we are influencing the group, we are
[ pushing those other [elected =

IR: [.h

IE: = politicians. Because it’s quite simply, if there is nobody
making a debate, and maybe making the argument, they
can get away with ignoring it, pretending it’s not there.

IR: And you can f- of course got the Jamie Oliver vote I
suppo:se because you’ve long: ehm held to the policy of
healthy food (of against) schools. =
IE: = Of course.

IE: (.)

IE: Yes. Absolutely right. Ehm I mean you know it's- it's- it's a farce to pretend that new Labor was going to do anything about it, 'h until we have a television program, ehm exposing the shortcomings and theee- 'h an- and the rubbish we are actually feeding our next generation.

IR: Keith Taylor, many thanks.

IE: Thank you.
[43] Tuesday 12 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0722 Ed Balls (05:02.6)
IR: John Humphrys
IE: Ed Balls, Gordon Brown’s chief economic advisor

01 IR: Twenty: four minutes past seven. Labor says we must not elect a Conservative government because it’ll cut spending so savagely our public services will be destroyed. The savings will mount to the salaries of every teacher and nurse and doctor in the land. We’ll end up having a teacher of our own children in perform open-up surgery on each other. h Well I exaggerate a little but not much. So, what’s this a Labor candidate suggesting the Tories would actually spend MORE than Labor. And not just any old candidate. Ed Balls, Gordon Brown’s chief economic advisor and right hand (manor to lead) decided he wanted to see it in Parliament for himself. h Mr. Balls, what is going on here.

02 IE: Good morning John. [Good morning to you.

03 IR: [Good morning.

04 IE: Ehmm just on behalf of the Labor Party before we start, can I just say eh congratulation to Charles Kennedy [and () on the birth of =

05 IE: Ehn. [Yep.

06 IE: = the birth of your first child. I just thin- on behalf of [the everybody around] =

07 IE: [(rings) ]

08 IE: = the country just to send them best wishes.

09 IR: Indeed. Now, what about this mess you’re in.

10 IE: Eh mess? Mess I- I’m- I think the mess we tried to avoid is the mess of Conservatives we’d: bring it with i- if they are allowed to do a first budget among ( ) election. [What we’re doing-

11 IR: ['cause they are spending too much A:Nd too little simultaneously, a remarkable trick to pull off. ()

12 IE: What we are doing today is setting up the details. Let me just go through with you just so we’re absolutely
clear. The first thing to say is the Conservatives are absolutely clear year by year they want to cut public spending. Ehm a- they want to cut seven point five billion I mean two thousand and six seven the first folia of the Conservative government. But in all of that to thirty five point e- ehm t- to thirty five billion at thee end of thee eh Parliament. So they have a plan for big cuts in public spending. But they’ve-

IR: [Right.]

IE: but they’ve also come along and made promises yesterday in their manifesto which is quite surprising. They’re saying in the first year of a Conservative bu- e- government, h they could also reduce borrowing by a billion, and cut taxes by four billion A:nd, on top of that spend more money in certain areas, seven billion in the first year, fourteen billion in the second year. (The problem they’ve got is,) it doesn’t add up. It’s not possible to cut taxes, and spend more, and borrow or let all at the same time without a black hole. And, their long-term cuts plan, which I said was seven and half billion in two thousand and six seven, just doesn’t get anywhere near big enough to pay for the extra commitments they’ve got.

[So in the end, say, in the end, it will lead to-

IR: [Well now I can imagine people over- i-

IR: ehm=

IE: You asked to explain, and I have to explain. So in the end, h in two thousand and five six, either, they would have to increase borrowing by eighteen billion pounds which will end up a big higher mortgage rates of the families or they would have had earlier and even bigger cuts than we expected the following year? h They wanted to reduce borrowing by eight billion; cut taxes by four billion; They’ve got fourteen billion of spending commitments now. They’ve only got s- a cuts plan of seven and half billion in the second year again,

[eighteen billion black hole. [The last question to] =
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75 IR: [Now I  [Alright, I- I- ]
76 IE: = go through (.) these kind of figures as (join made) in
77 nineteen ninety two. You can not go to the country, and
78 make promises without showing [where this is going to
79 come from.
80 IR: [Alright, I- I did indeed ask you to explain. But I do: =
81 IE: [I'll be explain it to you John.
82 IR: = think [all those figures may(hhh) may(h)be(h)- =
83 IE: = [maybe jus- just a little bit too much over the =
84 IE: = [Yea- =
85 IR: = com[plex this morning, 'cause an awful lot of =
86 IE: = [In the end of the day, John, it's very clear.
87 IR: = [there of this-
88 IE: = [(.) In a sho:rt term they are not, but no no John, no no
89 no, let me ( . ). You asked me to make it clear. I really
90 want to be clear, I really want- Well I really want to be-
91 but thee- I-
92 IR: Well, let me ask you the question, let- no no, NO↑NO↑,
93 NO↑NO↑, let me ask you- (I should ask the question),
94 that's- that's the rule Of the game; That's the rule ok.
95 I'm allowed to ask you question as well.=
96 IR: = So let me ask you this que- very very simple question.
97 IE: [Preferably without nineteen different figures in the =
98 99 IE: [Yep.
100 IR: = answer.
101 IE: = Cool. =
102 IR: = A::RE THEY:, would a Conservative government
103 spend more↑ e- o:r spend less according (.) to your
104 sums.
105 IE: In the first year (.) of a Conservative government, they
106 want to cut taxes by four billion and spend more by
107 seven billion and cut borrowing
108 [by eight billion. There is a black hole: in the first year:
109 of eighteen] =
110 IR: [Spend more. Right. No don't give us all of those
111 figures all over again, please.]
112 IE: = billion pounds, and it would end up meaning high
113 mortgage rates of the families. =
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114 IR: = No no. Look, [I- I- I asked you a terribly simple =
115 IE: = The following year-
116 IR: = question, [an- and you give me all the =
117 IE: = I’m answering the question.
118 IR: = [same figures as all over again. Would] =
119 IE: = [The first year- the first year-]
120 IR: = a Conservative government spend more over it’s
121 period in office, or spend less [than you are =
122 IE: =]
123 IR: = spending on the public services.
124 IE: = That wasn’t the question you asked me. In the first year,
125 [they wanna spend more and cut taxes. That doesn’t =
126 IR: = w-
127 IE: = add up over time, year by year, so what’s happened =
128 IR: = [.hh
129 IE: = is (. ) all-
130 IR: = You’re not answering the question. =
131 IE: = I- no I just exactly answered the question. [Over the =
132 IR: =]
133 hahaha
134 IE: = period of- of the Parliament, by the end of the
135 Parliament, they want to be spending (. ) hugely less.
136 [They want to spend less in hospitals, =
137 IR: = They do.
138 IE: = less in schools. But what they’ve done is
139 [(. ) come along and collect- but- it’s ( )- it’s ( )- tha- at
140 the end of this-]
141 IR: = That is less than you of course, not less. That is less
142 than you, not less than we’re spending now. That’s less
143 than you might be spending, if you have told what]
144 you are going to spend, but you haven’t told us so we
145 don’t know. =
146 IE: = We’ve set- hang on, John, we’ve set up very clearly
147 our budget spending books, our spending plans all the
148 way through the next Parliament. And at the end of the
149 period, the Conservatives will be spending thirty five
150 billion pounds less than us. Which should be thirty five
151 billion pounds less (. ) of doctors nurses and teachers.
152 So it’s clearly the case (. ) I-
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IR: [Not less than we have now.
IE: No th- w- e- bu- that’s not the point. The point is
IR: [we’re setting-
IE: [That’s the point.
IR: No of course it’s not. [(.) We are setting up pla:ns for =
IE: [he
IR: = more hospitals for more police, for more doctors, for
IE: more nurses. If the Conservatives [had thirty- but no if =
IR: [( )
IE: = the Conservatives had thirty five billion pounds less
IE: (.) the public spending, that will be thirty five billion
IE: less [on public services. That’s clear. But in the sho:rt =
IR: [Alright.
IE: =term, they are try:ing to claim, that they can- e- th- that
IE: they can cut taxes and raise spending in the first year. It
doesn’t add up. Therefore you’ve got the same old
IE: Conservative cocktail, .h in the long term big spending
cuts, in the sho:rt term, .h a borrowing black hole which
should be in high interest rates [for families.=
IR: [Alright.
IE: = We don’t want to go back to these days John,
IE: honestly.
IR: We shall return to this subject idea say Ed Ba(h)lls,
IE: many thanks(h).
IE: Thanks for having me.
In the meantime, let’s hear from Vincent Cable, who is the Liberal Democrat Treasury spokesman. H. E:hm it’s just as well that we’ve got Labor policies in charge at the moment. Anyway Mr. Cable enforces it at the moment because Donald James will have a nice little gift from the Treasury, won’t he.

IE: h w- well in- indeed I- of course I wished Donald well that we- we- you’r- you’re quite right in suggesting that we are gonna get rid of one of the things that he might benefit [from, which is the =

IR: = baby-boom scheme and we think that is actually not a terribly good use of government money? hhh It will be much better if it won’t employ any things like cutting class sizes. So yes oh- i- it’s part of our tap choices an- saying to people you can’t have something for nothing? hhh It is one of the things we are proposing to get rid of. =

IR: = However, he will get it. Will he then have to give it back onto you, do you think? = Or will he be able to hold on to it.

IE: .h No, for those people who’ve already invested in the baby-boom st[hec]eme, we would ehm (win fence) and protect their investments. But we would stop the scheme and we wouldn’t rule it out. And there is a result: .h there won’t be significant savings that could come back into: eh- you knowing cutting class sizes another- other useful priorities [that we give more emphasis to. =

IR: [.h

IR: = Now you’ve had a news conference this mor[ning. An- and you were supposed to do to: eh eh [publish =

IE: [hh

IR: = the result from the poll, which show: s .h surprise surprise I’m tempted to say that people are happy with your: r increases in tax. But then, people always say that
don't they. Before elections they say "ah no we’re happy to pay extra tax for better public service’s." .h They don’t necessarily vote that way, do- [do they.]

IE: [mhht]
IE: .h well the poll you- quote was produced by MOP. It was independent, it was [(nothing to do with) ( )].
IR: [Oh sure, (I know) (that’s .)]
IE: E:hm, mmm l- I think what came out of it (very strongly) We’re- we are not in fact proposing a general increase in general taxation. We have one tax resigature, which is on: individual earnings over a hundred thousand pound a year which affects: .hh around one percent of the population [( ].
IR: [And you have local income tax [which will affect some other people.]
IE: [.h we have local in-
IR: [ehm]
IE: [in- indeed it wi:ll. But local income tax is a- is a tax cutting measure. We will take some of the revenue we are getting from the high rate tax about two billion and plough it into cutting local taxation. So the average family .hh will in fact be about four hundred and fifty pound a year better off (founder episosals) and pensioners in particular will benefit greatly. = A large number of them will pay little or no: local taxation. =
IR: = Now, you have a regress to make to the income from your fifty pence tax ↑rate, didn’t you.
IE: Mcht No::? We:: had a set of eh projections and we’ve: taken into account the: most recent estimates which you are: referring to, which will produce the: which produce quarterly about the inland revenue. .hh Thee inlan- the Institute of Fiscal Studies which keeps a very close eye on all of those, makes sure that our numbers do add up, .hh acknowledged eh this was an issue and acknowledged we had set aside a contingency (firmed) in order to deal with shortfalls of this kind. We’ve been very careful [(that our tax will-]
IR: [Right, so there was going to be a shortfall.]
Let's- let's be clear about that. I mean you'r- you are certainly brushing that aside as though .h it doesn't matter. But you did get it wrong to the extent that there was going to be. There would have been a shortfall on the figures you originally published.

IE: Th- ther- there were certainly a reduced (estimate) to the (ridiculer) year. [Certainly the last quarterly figure =
IR: [Yap.
IE: = show that thee (year as the (last) () to project(ed. (That we-)
IR: [And that's because of a fairly: fun:- elementary mistake really, wasn't it, that you you assumed .h that the threshold f- for the higher rate was a hundred thousand taxable income. It is not of course. It's a hundred thousand gross income. =
IE: = No no, tha- that's completely wrong. Now we- we-there was no mistake there. We've always taken it [as =
IR: [Well-
IE: = the gross ( ). Thee the figure about the thee revision which you are referring to simply comes to the fact that every quarter the Inland Revenue produces its estimate about what the future, .hh (year) it would be from the high rate tax we based our (.).h forecast on that. But we were very careful to set aside ten percent as a reserve, because of (if) these things go up and down, and they r- that they may well go up in future as well as down:. hh
And we've been therefore rather careful in what we did.
On the issue to the Fiscal Studies acknowledged that we'd approached this in the right way, by setting aside a reserve, and it didn't invalidate any of thee .h commitments we've made on the back of them. =
IR: = mcht. What are you gonna do about wa$t.e. All the other parties (.).h have got their own waste things, whether it's Gursions review or James review or whatever. You- you're gonna shut down the DTI, but we don't know how many jobs that'll: eh get rid of, do we.
IE: Mcht mcht well we- a- a- agree that you know (hh) (h) waste like sin is something we all want to get rid of. And we- we certainly support thee proposals in eh Mr.
e- tha- S- Joshua report which involve .hh more efficient government procurements an- and using IT systems and we are a bit skeptical about how quickly this can be done, but we certainly support it. .h But our approach to cutting waste is I think a good deal more realistic than what- the Tories (project it) who- who just- take one simple example, we want to strip out a (terror) of the health service bureaucracy which is called .hhh strategic health authority. The Tories want to exactly the same. .h We’ve estimated you can save about a hundred million by doing that, whereas the Tories are claiming that by doing exactly the same thing they could save six hundred million. Then in practice, the only way they can do this, .hh is by cutting back on training. Things like training a generation of nurses in the new .h (surgical council) screening tests. And that- is to our view, is- is somewhat dishonest? It’s not waste saving. [So- bu- yes, where genuine waste exists, we-=

IR: [.h

IE: = we want to get rid of them.

IR: Mcht Vincent Ca†ble, thank you.
Thursday 7 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0713 Vincent
Cable (03:23.0)

IR: John Humphrys

IE: Vincent Cable, Liberal Democrat Treasury spokesman

IR: And let me turn now to Vincent Cable, the Liberal
Democrat’s: eh spokesman on the economy? Eh:::
Mr. Cable th- th- the fox has been shot really hasn’t it.
Now isn’t it the end to it?

IE: Mcht no I- I don’t think so. I mean certain in terms of
the personality we’ve- we’ve moved on, but the
underlying issue remains the same that economic policy
is the weak- (link) here. Eh what the Conservatives are
saying, they’r- they are simultaneously claiming that
they can spend more money, cut taxes, and maintain
budget discipline all the same time. And that really isn’t
credible. [It all-

IR: [Well except that they are saying they will cut
eh out waste. [And that is credible to many people.

IE: [Oh that- w- w-

IE: Well there is certainly lots of waste to cut and we are
very much in favor of that. But what we’ve also said is
that if you are going to be credible on public
spending, hh and you want to spend more on priority as
you are gonna cut things which are not (typority). = And
what their proposals rest on is this so called James
report, h whose plausibility (how would if) I called
into question because it rests on .h propositions like
saying we can tougher immigration control while
ha:ving [(h)] the administrative budgets of thee =

IR: [em]

IE: = immigration control department. They are talking
about cutting: inspection of local government to a
(greater) extent that their total budget of that activity. h
Eh it’s replead with examples of nonsensical eh cuts
which are just not plausible. And that’s why the whole
package .h is going to unscram[ble.

IR: [But th- the broa:d
picture and it’s: not always the case that fine details of
packages get unscrambled during the (heat in an)
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election campaign, and isn’t it. An-the- and the broader picture is that we have the Conservative saying ‘hh we::
don’t want to slash spending, we want to spend a little less slowly than the present government’s present plans. ‘hh eh And a lot of people will be sympathetic to that? Surely well as you, actually want to spend more money, ‘hh a:nd put up taxes.

IE: ‘hh e- Well, neither of those things are absolutely clear = We certainly wish to spend more money on what we’ve got as our pro- priority activities which are pensions, particularly for older pensioners, eh as (clue) class sizes, eh eh elements within the health service, like improve diagnostic services and more police officers. But we- we suggest very clearly ‘hh how that can be funded. We have tough choices. Quite specifically selling out some of the things that can be k- cut like the child trust fund, the ID card scheme, [( )]

IR: [And give your money from the child trust fund to:: [e- th- e- mothers, new = [e- e- e- e-]]

IR: = mothers.

IE: In-Indeed. And there is a full package e- about five billion pounds a year, things that we would cut in order to fund our high priorities. And the Conservative’s not been willing to do:: that. They take refuge, ‘hh in- in vague promises about cuts, in thee ‘hh elements and detail within the James report, which are simply not plausible. And I think the more and more we discuss this, when the more they are a:sked about very specific things, ‘hh for example they’re- they are saying they can cut three billion from low priority areas of spending. When you look at the low priority areas, ‘hh it turns out to be things like further education in universities. So there are deep cuts ‘hh in areas of that kind that have never yet been properly de[bated].

IR: [But, your problem is you are- going to have to rely very heavily as you’ve always have done, on (.) ‘hh a lot of middle class votes. And it’s the middle ↑ class who will be penalized eh under your
policies.
[hh eh I- I don’t think that’s true. Thee- we have one tax raising measure as you know, and this is raising th- thee marginal tax (rate)
[for forty to fifty percent, = which were a hundred thousand pound-
[And local income ( ), which will- which will hit the middle classes.
.h Well, e- e- the average family, family on average income will actually pay four hundred and fifty pound a year less than- than it does at the moment. So many middle and low income families will do much better on (cut) tax. But it’s certainly true† that .h people of very high inco†mes can expect to pay a little bit mo;re. And that’s only fair and reasonable.
Mcht Vincent Cable†, many thanks.
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IR: Jim
IE: Stephen Twigg, school minister

01 IR: The government’s made a great deal in recent years
02 about the improvement of standards in primary schools
03 in England. Yet the Cross Party Common Education
04 Committee says that too many eleven-year-olds, =
05 nearly twenty percent of them, are falling below the
06 expected standard in reading. Why. Stephen Twigg is
07 the schools minister, joins us from West Minster.
08 Good morning, Mr. [Twigg.
09 IE:
10 IR: Ehm, no one is denying even the Conservative
11 spokesman who is not happy with ehm what is
12 revealed by these figures, no one is denying there have
13 been improvements. The question is eh why:: not
14 more, given what’s been done, given thee emphasis on the literac-
15 literacy strategy? still twenty percent of eleven-year-olds not reaching the
16 expected standard. Why.
17 IE: Well let me say first of all that we welcome the report
18 that has been published today and we’ll consider it in
19 detail. The position now compared to when we came
20 into power, is that one in six children are leaving
21 primary school not achieving the expected level.
22 When we came into power, it was one in three. That’s a
23 very significant improvement. But I absolutely agree
24 with the select committee that we need to do more: We
25 need all the time to be examining the evidence of what
26 works in some schools, and doesn’t work in others.
27 IR:
28 IE: Well e- much has been made of the phonics experiment (that) was going on in
29 Clackmannanshire in the Scotland which e- appears to
30 have a remarkable effect, saying that children we
31 were taught in this way at a very early stage, were
32 three years ahead in reading age when they got to age
33 eleven. mcht Now, what do you think of the system.
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The evidence that's highlighted in the report about Clackmannanshire I think is important. And I asked that we look at this, in the education department to see what lessons we can learn. I am advised that in fact there is quite a close similarity between what they are doing in Clackmannanshire, and what we've been doing through the national literacy strategy, that the key contrast is between Clackmannanshire and the rest of Scotland. But others tell me that that might not be the case. We need to look at the evidence for that, more closely. One thing I would want to say about phonics, is that we (taste) [(Just) e e e just e- for people who may not be into the jargon. I mean who are talking here about recognizing the sounds of the alphabet. Absolutely, which: the majority of experts I think now would accept, is absolutely vital particularly in the early years: of literacy learning. And that's why we actually changed the literacy strategy early on, to place a much greater emphasis on phonics in the early years. Now some people say we've got that right, and that's shown in this report. Others say no we need to go further. And I think what we need to do is to examine the detail of the evidence from Clackmannanshire to see if that might be the case. One of the difficulties I suppose is that different children need different kinds of teaching, eh to improve their reading standard. And presumably the twenty percent, whatever it is, round about that figure, who are not reaching the standard at age eleven, might need a different way of approaching it, from those who are doing well.
That's a point that the report makes. I think it's a powerful point. We should remind ourselves that, some of those children, by virtue of their special educational needs, not be able to achieve at the level that we expect. Not all of them but some of them. But there are children who in one school, would be achieving the expected level, who in a similar school down the road aren't. And clearly that's not acceptable, because we want every school [to be meeting the needs of every child. I think you're making an important point there though, which is that we shouldn't be totally prescriptive, from central government. Very often it's the teacher who knows best for their own child in their classroom. So let's ensure we've got the best advice on phonics. But let's also enable teachers to get on with the jobs of teaching [as well.

Stephen Twigg, thanks.
Thursday 7 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0852 anti-war Labor candidates (04:59.7)

IR0: John Humphrys
IE0: John Reed, the Health Secretary
IR: Jim Naughtie
IE: Robin Cook, the former Foreign Secretary

01 IR: What do anti-war Labor candidates say to their supporters who are still infuriated by the invasion of Iraq. It’s clearly an issue that has (convulsed) the labor party. And in some quarters has made the Prime Minister extremely unpopular. Yet it is one that ministers have to confront. Here’s John Reed, the Health Secretary, on yesterday’s program.

08 IR0: Well let’s deal with the Iraq first.
09 IE0: [Let’s] let’s deal with the Iraq [first then?]
10 IR0: [Yeah.
11 IE0: Eh the question of eh Iraq eh touches upon the question of trust. But so does the competence in running the economy, the potential of the national health service (founding) values? Eh the competence of a government and motivation of a government in- (. ) trying to address the problem of immigration rather than trying [to (exploit) it.
19 IR0: [I thought you are dealing with the Iraq.
20 IE0: Eh Eh I- I started with the Iraq, John, but I just want to make sure that you know that the issue of trust go to wider than I[raq.
23 IR0: [Indeed?
24 IR: Eh mcht and that was John Reed. We are joined by perhaps the most prominent opponent of the Iraq war, the former Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook. Morning, Mr. Cook.
28 IE: Morning Jim.
29 IR: = Eh, just let me ask you a very straightforward question about this. Eh How many (. ) people, whom you would normally expect to support the Labor party do you think will either abstain or defect because of their anger at the war.
IE: .h mcht well I- I don't do the figure Jim. [I ( ) I- ()

IR: [No, I know

you don't do the figure. But you think it will be big.

IE: I- I spent a lot of the last few months going- round or about twenty thirty constituencies in the quest of colleagues, talking of those troubles. And I'll be going around in even a larger number of them in the next four weeks. Eh and yes there are people out there who are troubled by what happened↑, deeply concerned by it? And I think it's important that we .h answer those concerns. I- I would- .h give three responses to that, first of all, .h it's not going to happen again. I think lessons have been learned. I'm sure it was on your program, that Jack Straw said it would be inconceivable that we apply the same military solution to Iraq. And it was really interesting, an hour ago on your program you- .h had a senior figure in the American State Department saying that now .h Washington actually backs the European approach of negotiation to resolve the problems in Iraq. [.hh ] Secondly, I- I- I- it would =

IR: ["Yes. 0"

IE: = be a good test in justice, (£) I said this ( ) ago (£), if the discontent of public over Iraq was to result in the Conservatives benefiting because they were really tuned for the invasion. Part of the problem in their (gust) period in the run-ups in invasion, .h is that the opposition stopped behaving like an opposition. And most of thee MPs have voted against the war were Labor MPs. .h And lastly, Jim, I- people have to look at it w- th- in around, thee government's record on international affairs, and there are many positive elements to it. .h That people who: (.) often are most worried about the war, particularly those in the churches, are the same people: most keen that we'll make poverty history. = >Now,< .hh Britain has done more than any other country to lift the debt [for the =

IR: [.hh ehm.

IE: = poorest nations. And we have got this commitment, >about< two thousand and thirteen we wiill be on
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honoring the UN target before ( ) is in. But that's not
going to happen if the Labor does not get re-elected.

IR: Well, th- the problem though, is that there are a lot of
people who say that the issue of trust is central to this
election. hh And, there are people who say whatever
the consequences, = they believe (.). h that as a result of,
= >as they would see it< having been led into war on: a
false prospectus, some of them >as we know< hh (. a-
accuse the Prime Minister of lying to the House of
Co†monns which he's always (. of course, vehemently
denied. h Nonetheless, they feel betrayed, and they
want to do something about it. In those circumstances
aren't they right to vote against the Prime Minister's
party.

IE: Well, first of all, Jim, I represent a: constituency
where: hh saw for eighteen years vulnerable people
who: were damaged, and h- g- good ( ) which is a very
good severe hardship because of Conservative policies.
I've seen also the way h in which their life's been
transformed, about the opportunity in the last eight
years. h And I want to make sure, that the people I
represent continue to get a government [that can act in =

IR: [° hhh°

IE: = their interest, [.h and provid:de them with the help

IR: [°ehm. °

IE: = that- that they need, .h make sure that we do have the
minimum wage, we do have to tackle the child poverty;
After all w(h)e we check a quarter of children out of
child poverty, .h and we are on ta:rget to hit our
objective [of halving it. Now that's not gonna =

IR: [.h

IE: = happen if we don't get re-elected. On the question of
trust, i:-: tha- that is- I think- a- a big issue, not just
for- .h the government, but .hh also h. for h. the bit of us
generally of thee decaying trust in our elected
insti[tution.

IR: [Do you think the war has made that worse. The
way we went to war.

IE: Mcht .hh ah i- i- it's not help, but it's only part of a
much wider scene. I do think we need a very big change in culture, in our political class having (the way of)
approaching party politics. h We’ve got to stop being (.).
so negative. We’ve got to start talking positively what we’ve done, what we’re going to do. hh And I think also we’ve got to stop being: so shrill and so partisan. I mean (h) (£) in the papers that they- they talk about (£)
Michael Howard having eh done well in the House of Commons yester†day.
[Quite h(h)onestly, they are hi;ghly partisan behavior
[( ) war.=
IR: [We’ll, he- he’s not the first party leader to do that.
Come on, I mean, [ (. ) you know that’s tradition.
IE: No, I’m not (suggest) (at one moment) he is.
[(You need)] to be a bit fair to myself, =
IR: [Yeah. ]
IE: = Jim I said, it’s the bit of fast and hold, who will need to s- change the way in which we do politics,
because h the problem of
[trust goes much wider than just [the fact that w- l- =
IR: [°.h Ok. °
[.h
IE: = w- i- there is- maybe some doubts of a [particular =
IR: [°.h Alright. °
IE: = person who happens to be the Prime Minister for a long period of time.
IR: That’s an issue which we’ll be returning to† in the next two weeks or so?: (. ) Robin Cook, thank you.
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IR: Sarah Montague
IE: Stephen Wilkinson, a Labor candidate who switches side to Lib Dem
01 IR: .hh One of Labor’s election candidates has defected to the Liberal Democrats. On the very day the election is expected to be called, Stephen Wilkinson, Labor’s candidate for Ribble Valley has said, he’s become disillusioned with Tony Blair’s increasingly authoritarian party. Well, Stephen Wilkinson joins us on the line. Good morning Mr. Wilkinson?
08 IE: Mcht Good morning.
09 IR: En, can you tell us more of your reasons for- eh switching to the Liberal Democrats today.
11 (0.3)
12 IE: (Oh yes) it’s not just today. It’s a case of:: I’ve been: considering joining the Liberal Democrats for quite a long period of time. (0.2) And (0.2) I felt that the Labor party has become much more authoritarian that there is- a total lack of interests, ehm individual rights within the country. (.) An I- I don’t agree with identity cards. That’s (with background noise) I seriously oppose them. (.) Eh the idea of people being locked in their own home ( ) proper portrait I think it’s ridiculous. hh. I- I just physically didn’t feel I can continue to be part of the Labor party. [h While its view =
23 IR: [w- why on earth
24 become a Lab-
25 IE: = has changed (dramatic).
26 IR: Why on earth become a Labor candidate.
27 IE: .h Well- (. ) things evol-ive as time goes on. I- I- (. ) e- looked to becoming a Labor candidate quite a long time ago, = if you bear in mind the selection process has been going on for over a year now. (. )
30 [The Labor party’s ( ) change.
31 IR: [But you were selected December I understand. You were selected in December? Would that be right? =
34 IE: = No I was actually selected in: (. ) August last year.
35 (0.3)
36 IR: Ri::†ght. An- but but since then your view:s have changed that dramatically.
37 IE: My- my views have- have changed over a period of time.
38 E:hm: (. ) party because of what’s happened in terms of the war in I†raq. (0.2) Partly because of the things that are changing now in terms of civil liber†ties. h I- I’ve seen what’s happened within the Liberal Democrats and the positive things that they’r- that they are doing. (. ) Eh I- I have to say unlike a lot of people who change in politics, this isn’t a development of self-interest. I- I’m not looking at eh, standing as a candidate for th- for the Liberal Democrats from thee- in the forthcoming election.
39 [(.) I (says says) it feel-
40 IR: [But Mr. Wilkinson, what- what people are going to find very stra:nge is that you are referring to things that we have known about for an awful long ti:me. h And you have become a Labor candidate and yet on the day: that an election is expected to be ca:llled, (. ) you decide to switch sides. =
41 IE: = >Yeah I would (ha)ve actually left the Labor party earli:er. Unfortunately a close friend of mine h.<, who was within the Labor party died fairly recently. I planned to actually hand in my resignation then, (. ) but didn’t feel that it was appropriate. What I tri:ed to do is- is leave the people with liberal value within- th- the Labor party I have a great deal of respect for, h trying to actually select an- an alternative candidate before the election. (. ) And they have time to do that. As the majority of the press haven’t actually been done yet, [so they’ll be =
42 IR: [h
43 IE: = to actually put out what they need to. =
44 IR: = An- when did you dec:i:de that you wanted to switch from the Labor to the Liberal Democrats.
45 (0.4)
46 IE: I think- w- within a matter of- last- the last month or so, but progressively so.
47 IR: But wh(h)y de(h)cide j(h)ust today(h).
48 (0.2)
49 IE: Well why not today. You have to decide some time.
IR: It is- as you must- e- e- you must accept that the timing does seem extraordinary as I say the day that we are expecting the election to be called.

IE: Well, I mean my decision wasn't made today. (. ) Thee-thee election may well be called today, and I would anticipate it probably will be. h My decision to leave th- the Labor party didn't actually just physically happen today. The timings might seem inappropriate for you. I- I can't actually help that. (. ) If I want vote Lab- Liberal Democrat, which I do::, (0.2) then it's appropriate that I should resign from the Labor party. Resign in the group (working) terms of county councilor 'cause (I was a) county councilor. h A:s (. ) I'm- I'm tell my electoral agent which I ha:ve. But- that's- that's what I try I'm doing.[=(. ) I think that's reasonable way to be he:id. =

IR: [= There's been a suggestion that-

IR: There's been a suggestion that one of the reasons you are doing this is being that you weren't re-selected for your council seat. h And that th- this may be a result of sour grapes e- e- because of that.

IE: Well I mean that was inevitably going to be something that people would say. And there's NO- no doubt I was-(. ) disappointed with the local party that I wasn't re-selected and I'm not going to prete:nd: otherwise. (. ) A:n-

IR: Have you had any promises from the Liberal Democrats about your future.

IE: No I haven't. °No. ° I mean I ha:- at the moment I don't actually have any (. ) plans on re-entering politics, other than campaigning for the Liberal Democrats in the forthcoming election.

IR: Stephen Wil[°kinson°

IE: [Which- which as I have said, it isn't like an awful lot of people who: who move from one party to another. It's quite clearly I have moved from self interest. (. ) And not least I wish (if) as a member that joins the
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114 Labor party (was it) (worrying so) ↑recently.
115 IR: Mcht well- =
116 IE: = "No it’s indignant. "
117 IR: We- I should say eh we did ask to speak to the Labor
party about this but haven’t as yet put anybody forward.
119 Stephen Wilkinson, many thanks.
Tuesday 5 April 2005: BBC radio 4 "Today Program": 0716 Michael Meadowcroft (03:50.8)

IR: Sarah Montague

IE: Michael Meadowcroft, who advises countries on how to run elections

01 IR: Mr. Ye:on says eh we should (borrow) in a major plan change finally get the official lands as we are in general election today. And to judge by the soaring number of applications for postal ballots, it'll be in an election in which, ever more of us will cast our vote by post from home. Only yesterday there the High Core Judge Richard Moray said postal voting is wide open to fraud. He made the comments as he ruled there had been wide spread fraud in six Birmingham Council seats, one by Labor last year. And he strongly attacked the government's attitude to the problem, accusing it of being not only complacent, but in denial about the failings of the system. The Judge said the scale of fraud in last year's council elections would disgrace a (benigner) republic. Well somebody knows about (benigner) republic, this is Michael Meadowcroft. He advises them on how to run elections properly. He used to be an MP, and over the years he has led or been a member of forty seven missions to thirty one countries, helping them run election. And he joins us now from the Congolese capital Conchater. Eh m- Mr. Meadowcroft, good morning.

24 IE: Good morning to you.

IR: What do you make of what Richard Moray, the Judge said yesterday about the postal voting in Birmingham. Is it- are they comments you recognize.

29 IE: I certainly do; and: eh comments which bear out the predictions that I and other made before. Thee (.) mad dash towards postal voting which (resolved in) all postal balance and in one third of thee English election last year, we predicted it in detail. And it's been born now, because you can not. make absentee voting secure. It is impossible. The only way you can have secure voting is to
36 designate a polling place, h which is monitored by party agents and by independent observers. [>Either way you =
37 IR: [Bu-
38 IE: = can do it.< And >that is what< we recommend a:lwax's, h in new >and emerging democracies<.
39 IR: But of course this is ehm one of the reasons m- m- postal voting has been introduced, is to try to get the turn-out hi-
40 higher. And it has been show:n that it does increase turn-out.
41 (0.3)
42 IE: But if it increase(d) turn-out of legitimate votes, or the fake votes, I don't know↑, I can't tell, nobody can tell. And what is more: to say that you can .h deal with th- the malaise which is affecting politics in Britain elsewhere, h by tinkering with the system rather than tackling the disease itself, .h seems to me to be rema:rkable.
43 [(.) And ( )-
44 IR: [So there is absolutely no way you can make a postal vist-
45 e- e- sy- postal voting system secure.
46 (0.3)
47 IE: NO, no way at all. First answer if you only have a patriarchal society for instance, that's not just a certain minority that have that situation. How can you stop somebody around the kitchen table think give me your ballet (vote). You can't do it. Are we going to have police calling door to door to check if they are doing it secretly at home? You can't do it. How can you avoid .h people picking up twenty envelops in the student accommodation and- and using those. You can't. There's no way of doing it. =
48 IR: = But these wrong [things-
49 IE: [How do you stop people calling at (old) people and saying do- would you like me to help you fill in your postal vote. It can't be stopped.
50 IR: These we:re of course all things that were looked by: at by the electoral commission.
51 IE: hhh Well the electoral commission is held a- h. in a- in a-
52 ex:ceptionally vulnerable position. .h Again (.) arou:nd the wo:rd we would never e- e:- (I say permit) to never
recognize the possibility of an election being legitimate. If-
the electoral commission is not in charge of the elections,
with the authority to do that. In Britain, the electoral
commission has only got advisory powers. If Now if you
have an electoral commission which recommends other
independent body against postal voting, and the
government overrides it, I think the only thing left for
the electoral commission frankly, it is the power of their
embarrassment. And they really should resign, in
defence of Britain electoral system.

IR: You think Sami Yeon the head of the commission should
resign.

IE: I- I think they all should- to- to say look, If you don’t
give us the authority, to be able to:: insist on: proper
electoral practice, what is the point of its being there.

IR: Michael Meadowcroft, we’ll leave it there, many thanks.
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[50] Tuesday 5 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0655 Lord Bichard (03:59.0)

IR: John Humphrys

IE: Lord Bichard, chairman of the new Legal Services Commission

01 IR: The legal aid system is in a mess, that people who really need it aren’t getting it. And vast amounts are paid out to people who could well afford to put their own bills. Well, that at least is what many believe. Lord Bichard says it is wrong. He’s the chairman of the new Legal Services Commission, which has just come into existence. And he’s on the line now. Good morning to you.

08 IE: Good morning John. [And it’s not Lord, it’s Sir. =]

09 IR: [°what°-]

10 IE: = ([ ] hehehehe. (. ) (Think you might have noticed.)

11 IR: [Oh::, I apologize. I’ve promoted you though. I will le-]

12 IE: I do- no doubt I do beg y[our pardon. =

13 IR: [hehehehe

14 IE: = I’m so sorry about that. Sir Michel Bichard, [°( )°.

15 IE: Yeah,

16 Michael Bichard. =

17 IR: = Indeed. [R(h)ight. (hh) Ok, tell us what your job is.

18 IE: [hehe

19 IE: Eh well I’m chairman of the: eh Legal Services Commi†ssion, [it’s-

21 IR: = [And what does that do: =

22 IE: = It’s- it’s eh provides su†pp ort for people who:: need help to understand their legal ri†ghts. It’s a- .hh helps people to protect their ri†ghts. >And it’s a- helps people at risk of being accused or are accused of criminal offenses. hh

26 IR: Mcht .h now, legal aid, it is a controversial area, isn’t it. =

27 IE: = Yes.

28 IR: And why.

29 IE: Mcht well I think i- it always will be a controversial area because there’ll always be people who think that the the wrong people are getting legal aid. .h E:hm I think in a civilized society, we do have responsibility to ensure that everyone who: needs help to protect their ri†ghts gets it. And of course there will be times when unpopular people h. e:hm unp- unpopular at particular time, get help, and
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that will be controversial.

IR: You are thinking there I take it of asylum seekers
[in ( ) cases.

IE: [I thought you were probably going to: e- think of =

IR: [Ehm.

IE: = asylum seekers. I mean I think that’s just one example. I
think there are other. Eh I- as I say I think
it’s a sign of a civilized society that you support those.

IR: Hh But if it’s a highly controversial area politically and
you are spending a- as I gather we are about two hundred
million pounds on: legal aid for asylum seekers and people
say well, h actually many of them shouldn’t be here
anyway. So what are we doing using money for that. You
know the argument very [well.

IE: [Yeah.

(0.2)

IE: Eh well I mean I- I think a- a number of points need to be
made about the asylum seekers. Eh: h I mean the
number of: eh asylum seekers is reducing and therefore the
legal aid that’s eh provided for them will reduce probably
from two o five two o six. h And the time that has been
taken in dealing with eh asylum seekers eh cases is reduced
dramatically. It’s down about two months now whereas it
was about twenty months eh. h a few years ago. Eh:hm but I
wouldn’t want the discussion about the legal services
commission to be dominated by: asylum seekers. I mean:
we produce we offer, h e:hm support to two million
people eh every year some two billion pounds of public
money. h And the majority of that money is going to
people who need help in: in area such as domestic
violence, housing, welfare rights, h or people who have
found themselves at risk of being accused of criminal
offenses.

IR: Doesn’t the government want to cut that back. Doesn’t:
Lord (Fullback) have plans to eh cutting .h two- two
hundred million $poumds ("or something like that").

IE: [h Well I’ve never yet worked in the-

eh eh- an area of the public service whether there is a
balance to be struck between the priorities and the
resources. I mean clearly we do need to have regards. That’s just how much money the public purse can afford for legal aid, and ensure that is going to the highest priority areas. And that means the legal services commission is gonna be, as you expect them to say:, increasingly efficient in the way that it goes back to its work, [and] deliver high quality services to everyone.

IR: [.h

IR: But is there a- is there a- a- (fine-art) pot of money so that if I happen to be unlucky, and I’m one of those who’ve been beaten by my spouse or something I have a very very strong case. And I need legal aid. But it may: just be that all the money has been spent. Is that how it works.

IE: No. It’s- there is a- a budget for: for the Legal Services Commission which (be) we need to keep within. But eh .h we seek to ensure that everyone who has a reasonable case, .h and who needs to have support in: eh protecting their rights, they get that. [And I think that’s =

IR: [Bu-

IE: = generally the situation.

IR: But HOW can you- (. ) guarantee that if you’ve run out of money at a particular point in the year. =

IE: = Well it’s ourselves to make sure that the priorities and the resources are balanced not just .h once a year or once every three years but th- on on a ongoing base of showing the course of the year. Hh.

IR: Mcht Sir Michael Bichard, from again the polities

IE: [hehehehehehe

IR: = of Lords, no doubt he’ll come one day, many [thanks.

IE: [Oh, come on. Thank you John.
And we were talking earlier about electoral fraud voting. A senior judge has made a most extraordinary attack on the postal voting system. He said the government should be condemned for complacency in the face of fraud which would disgrace a (benigner) republic. Well, the Electoral Commission is the body that advises governments on voting matters. Peter Wardle is the Chief Executive. We were concerned earlier, Mr. Wardle that we had nobody from your body on the program. So: delighted to welcome you? What do you make of all of this.

mcht hh well the Electoral Commission as eh must been reported over the last few days, made serious recommendations to government last year, about tightening up the law, on, postal voting. We particularly recommended that there should be individual identification of voters so that votes could be identified as having been cast by the person entitled to it. And also that the government should bring new offenses relating to undue influence. (Personation) that's pretending to be someone you are not. And (fraudent ply) applications postal vote. The government has accepted some of those recommendations. It said it's considered some of the others. Eh but we haven't yet seen legislation.

Mcht so: given that your recommendations were not adopted, should we be in the position we are today where everybody can have a postal vote if they wish. Should the government be encouraging postal voting.

Mcht .h well I think postal voting itself ehm is here to stay. I mean thee thee evidence from all thee research we've done over the last year or two, .h when postal voting has been on thee increase is that- voters (.) like the choice and convenience. And as I have said before, there is a
balance to be struck here, between voters actually wanting
to vote and having a system they are prepared to engage,
and keeping that system in- i- i- the integrity of that
system secure. h The difficulties we’ve got, is that in
certain places we have seen allegations of fraud.
IR: [But a
lot more than allegations of fraud, we’ve got a court case,
and we’ve got a judge talking about banana republics.
IE: But on the other hand, in many areas of the country, the
north east is one where they’ve conducted an all postal
referendum last year, h very successfully, and we haven’t
seen any allegations. =
IE: = Nonetheless:-
IR: [It does seem to be a- It does seem to be a
difference between different experiences. h And-
IR: [Yeah, but that
proves that the system isn’t working. And th- the judge said
that- you- you know what the judge said of course, unless
the system is changed, he said fraud will continue
unabated. Well we can’t have that, can we.
IE: Well the electoral commission as I’ve said, have made it
quite clear, that we want to see changes, if postal voting is
going to-
IR: [Yes, but those changes haven’t been made. So can we
have a fair election.
IE: .hh We think that on balance we can. And the reason for
that, is that, (°e- w-°) partly because of the Birmingham
case, there are plenty of people out there, the police, the
political parties themselves, those who run elections, the
government I know has encouraged electoral eh returning
officers to take further steps to check on the integrity of
postal voting within the current system. .hh And, on
balance, we think, that enough is-, there is enough- enough
awareness of the risks, enough steps that have been taken,
[(. ) to make sure that the =
IR: [Well-
IE: = postal voting at the moment, can be run successfully. =
IR: = But- but we’ve got th-
IE: [However, we do need to change [the =
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IR: "but-°
IE: = system for the future. =
IR: = Well indeed. (£) But I mean we've got an election coming up in a matter of weeks. (£) And we've got a judge delivering a one hundred and ninety two page judgment, .hh in which I haven't got time to list all the thing he's- he's said, but you'll know what they are. Postal votes, .h applications are hopelessly insecure†, short of writing, steal (me) thee envelops in which they have †sent, .h ehm couldn't have been eh leh leh m- more clearly identifiable. >There have been< widespread theft of postal †votes, .h and so on and so on and so on. You seem, = if I may suggest it, to be just a little bit complacent about †this.
IE: .hh Well at thee end of the day, thee electoral- the Parliament set up thee Electoral Commission to give it independent advice, on how thee electoral system should run. We've given that advice. We've made clear that (there are) a number of areas, and some of these areas are the ones that the judge has looked at very in-
[in great detail in Birmingham, =
IR: [And thee advice wasn't accepted. =
IE: = Thee advice hasn't been accepted, ()-
IR: = So shouldn't you resign. That's- that's the point that was made earlier on this program. Should th- shouldn't should not the commission-, you are the chief executive, slightly different, I know, but, shouldn't the commission resign, given that your recommendations have not been accepted. =
IE: = .hh Well the commission has made a number of recommendations in a number of areas. Many of them have been accepted. They haven't been implemented by Parliament yet. And we don't at the moment feel, that the risks of the system, UK wide, taking it across the country as a whole, not just in Birmingham, but the risks of the system is such, that there is a- there is a sufficiently serious problem to say that it is completely broken down. .hh Ehm: yo- the judge's has made his views plain, in relation to thee issues he's looked at in Birmingham. But I mean it is
difficult, to extrapolate from that and say that the situation in Birmingham is replicated across the whole country. =

IR: = But the judge's view clearly is that the government has been complacent. Is that a view that the electoral commission shares. And after all you are meant to be entirely independent, I have no need to remind you that, of the government.

IE: We would certainly have preferred the government to take an action on the recommendations which may we've made which they have accepted, earlier than now. And also: to have accepted some of the recommendations which at the moment they simply say they'll consider.

IE: Mcht they haven't yet taken the action we'd like them to take.

IR: Mcht Peter Wardle, many thanks.
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Britain’s biggest female prison, Holloway (03:47.5)

IR: Sarah Montague
IE: Sir David Ramsbottom, the previous chief inspector of prisons

01 IR: The time now quarter past seven. The chief inspector of
02 prisons, Anna Owls says Britain’s biggest
03 women’s prison Holloway is still suffering from
04 fundamental problems. She said that four out of seven
05 recommendations she made three years ago, have not
06 been carried out. She said standards of cleanliness were
07 unacceptable and that parts of the jail have serious
08 infestations of lice, pigeons and insects. And she described
09 how prisoners use sanitary towels as in private seats on
10 filthy toilets, and using (to plant) gaps under doors to keep
11 out rats. Well ten years ago, the previous chief inspector
12 Sir David Ramsbottom walked out of an inspection in
13 Holloway and disgusted at the conditions. And he joins me
14 on the line now. Good morning, Sir David?

IE: Good morning.

16 IR: What do you make of this latest report from Anna
17 Owls.

IE: Well, (hh) I’m obviously very sad to see it, because . . .
h two things about it struck me particularly. First of all I was
very sad to know, that yet again the Director of General, has
said, since the inspection the prison has continued to
move forward. That is exactly what his predecessor said
several times after all my inspections. And what his
predecessor has said. And it’s quite clear from what I
know as I have seen, that they have not moved forward. So
what (on earth) the Director of General’s say. He
says it after every inspection. The second thing is that in
nineteen ninety five, it was quite clear for me that the real
basic reason why nothing was moving forward, was
because nobody was in charge of women’s prisons. I
recommended that over and over and over again.
Eventually they put someone in charge of women’s
prisons. But now: they’ve removed them. And if they
don’t have somebody who is overall responsible for
moving things forward, it will not happen, because
governors of prisons can not do what is required on their own. They require: assistance from their seniors.

IR: It has to be said that the Chief Inspector (the Account Chief Inspector of prison Anna), she: says that Holloway has undoubtedly improved, although obviously not to the extent that they had hoped.

IE: Exactly. Well I mean each time there were no doubt there were things that are improved each time when I went there. But some of the basic fundamentals, such as cleanliness (h), ehm have not moved forward.

IR: What needs to be done, do you think.

IE: Well, I say, I think that you’ve got to put somebody in charge of women’s prisons, who is responsible for seeing, overseeing that recommendations that have been made are implemented and are consistently maintained. Because each time an improvement is made under one governor, you’ll find how the governor comes along and they fall away: (£). And you don’t get the consistent improvement that is needed.

IR: One of the things that Anna has criticized three years ago was that girls were being kept at Holloway. Now that’s something you- you- looked at too.

IE: Yes I did. And I was appalled that they were there, because Holloway was completely unsuitable as a place to have girls. And what worried me = of course when I went there was to find that very often the girls were being held, particularly the girls on remand, were being held in the same dormitories as senior women who had serious criminal records. Now again worries me is that the question of the girls is that they are a small number of minority in there. But they do need specialist treatment, in spec- staff who have been trained to look after them. And the bit that disturbs me at this time was Ann saying that they have not been trained. Now the promise to get the girls out of Holloway was made by Jack Straw, it was being made by Martin Narrow in several times. It was indeed promised by Michael Howard before Jack Straw. Again, we don’t see: consistent progress.
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75 IR: [°Sir-°
76 IE: Sir David Ramsbottom, many thanks.
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Britain’s biggest female prison, Holloway (03:47.5)
IR: Sarah Montague
IE: Sir David Ramsbottom, the previous chief inspector of prisons

01 IR: The time now quarter past seven. The chief inspector of
02 prisons, Anna Owls says Britain—Britain’s biggest
03 women’s prison Holloway is still suffering from
04 fundamental problems. She said that four out of seven
05 recommendations she made three years ago, have not
06 been carried out. She said standards of cleanliness were
07 unacceptable and that parts of the jail have serious
08 infestations of lice, pigeons and insects. And she described
09 how prisoners use sanitary towels as in private seats on
10 filthy toilets, and using (to plant) gaps under doors to keep
11 out rats. Well ten years ago, the previous chief inspector
12 Sir David Ramsbottom walked out of an inspection in
13 Holloway and disgusted at the conditions. And he joins me
14 on the line now. Good morning, Sir David?
15 IE: Good morning. =
16 IR: = .h What do you make of this latest report from Anna
17 Owls.
18 IE: Well, (hh) I’m obviously very sad to see it, because (.h)
19 two things about it struck me particularly. First of all I was
20 very sad to know, that yet again the Director of General, .h
21 has said, since the inspection the prison has continued to
22 move forward. .h That is exactly what his predecessor said
23 several times after all my inspections. And what his
24 predecessor has said. .h And it’s quite clear from what I
25 know as I have seen, that they have not moved forward. So
26 what (on earth) the Director of General said after every inspection. The second thing is that in
27 nineteen ninety five, it was quite clear for me that the real
28 basic reason why nothing was moving forward, was
29 because nobody was in charge of women’s prisons. I
30 recommended that over and over and over again.
31 Eventually they put someone in charge of women’s
32 prisons. But now: they’ve removed them. And if they
33 don’t have somebody who is overall responsible for
34 moving things forward, it will not happen, because
governors of prisons can not do what is required on their own. They require: assistance from their seniors.

IR: It has to be said that the Chief Inspector (the Account Chief Inspector of prison Anna), she says that Holloway has undoubtedly improved, although obviously not to the extent that they had hoped.

IE: Exactly. Well I mean each time there were no doubt there were things that are improved each time when I went there. But some of the basic fundamentals, such as cleanliness, ehm have not moved forward. =

IR: = What needs to be done, do you think.

IE: Well, I say, I think that you've got to put somebody in charge of women's prisons, who is responsible for seeing, overseeing that recommendations that have been made: are implemented and are consistently maintained. Because each time an improvement is made under one governor, you'll find how the governor comes along and they fall away: (£). And you don't get the consistent improvement that is needed.

IR: One of the things that Anna has criticized three years ago was that girls were being kept at Holloway. Now that's something you- you- looked at too.

IE: Yes I did. And I was appalled that they were there, because Holloway was completely unsuitable as a place to have girls. And what worried me = of course when I went there was to find that very often the girls were being held, particularly the girls on remand, were being held in the same dormitories as senior women who had serious criminal records. Now ehm what again worries me is that the question of the girls is that they are a small number of minority in there. But they do need specialist treatment, in specially staff who have been trained to look after them. And the bit that disturbs me at this time was Ann saying that they have not been trained. Now the promise to get the girls out of Holloway was made by Jack Straw, it was being made by Martin Narrow in some- mis- several times. It was indeed promised by Michael Howard before Jack Straw. Again, we don't see: consistent progress.
75  IR:  Sir-
76  IE:  Sir David Ramsbottom, many thanks.
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[54] Friday 25 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0751 Labor misleading election campaign leaflets (06:57.0) [interview starts from 01:30]
IR: Sarah Montague
IE-1: Professor Coho (background, public listener)
IE-2: David Cowling (background, BBC commentator)
IE1: Labor MP Steven Pound
IE2: Liberal Democrat party chairman Matthew Tailor

01 IR: Has the Labor Party been sending out deliberately misleading campaign leaflets? One of our listeners in Hemel Hempstead? Professor Coho contacted us about a Labor leaflet, he had received through his front door.
02 IE-1: This pamphlet which is- () has the title of ‘lib de:ms’ in their own wo:rs, h. e:nds qui- quite ofteny with th: the sentence () I quo1 te, () it only takes one in fifty people to switch their votes from Labor to Lib Dem h., and the Tories will wi:n. Well, () if you look at the BBC ( ), that appears to be totally untrue, >so I'm w- wondering what on earth is going on () in the Labor Party†, h. when they: issue a pamphlet like that.
03 IR: Mcht, well we ask(ed) David Cowling, who is editor of BBC political research, what he made of the figures.
04 IE-2: The mathematics of Hemel Hempstead’s: () election:n eh are very simple and straightforward. >In: two thousand and one, Labor’s majority of the Conservatives were three thousand seven hundred and forty two.. hh So they would need to loT::se () to the Liberal Democrats three thousand seven hundred and forty two votes if nothing etlse happened before they lost the seat to the Conservatives hh..
05 Now instead of () one in:: fiftyT, which is two percent, in one in fi::ve of Labor’s voters in two thousand and one would have to shift hhh. eh to the Liberal Democrats, if nothing else happened before Labor lost the seat to the Conservatives, >so hh. ehm some of them will do: it by the mathematics of thee eh the expressive in that pamphlet.
06 IR: Well, join me here in the studio is the Labor MP Steven Pound, and on the line we have the Liberal Democrat party chairman Matthew Tailor? = Good morning to you both?
07 IE1: Morning.
08 IE2 [Morning.
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IR: [.hh
34 IR: Steven Pound, how can you justify this claim in the Labor (. eh leaflet.
35 IE1: Well, very very easily. >I mean (the argument) you’ve just heard is attractive and persuasive. Eh m unfortunate it is also utterly and totally wrong. Eh the two major mistakes that have been made, that is firstly, you’re basing the argument on the two thousand and one figures >when, .h the opinion polls have changed a lot since.
36 > (There) are figures are based on current polling. .hh Secondly, (. ) turn-out. (. ) The minute you put turn-out into the equation of mathematics school out of the window. And that is where the one in fifty figure, .h is not only right, but absolutely correct. [And that =
38 IR: [But-
39 IE1: = is the [( ) we’re making.]
40 IR: [hold on, ] hold on a second. Before we go to Matthew Tailor, I just want to make a point about, first of all, = on the polling there have been, hhh according to David Cowling, thir- over thirty polls since the start of the election campaign, very few, which show Labor and Tories level pegging.
42 [There’s only one that I can think of. >And you] =
43 IE1: [Ehm. Yeah. Yeah. ]
45 IR: = seem to .hh use that as the starting point, fro: m which you then say one in fifty [voter which is extraordinary.]
47 IE1: [Now- ju- you- you- ]
49 >You’re< you’re talking about general national polling. What we’re talking about is specific regional and subregional polling. Thi:s leaflet is put out in Hemel Hempstead. This leaflet has been put out in areas whe::re (. ) there has been a real danger (. ) of the Liberal Democrats letting the Tories in the ba[ck.
51 IR: [I have a- =
53 IE1: = That’s what it’s about.
55 IR: = I have a quote from the Labor press officer saying that this is about Hemel Hempstead, but this is based on national opinion polls which were out about a month ago when the leaflets were published.
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IE1: (But undoubtedly I’m in agreement with thee eh Labor press officer as not eh a common experience, but- (. ) let’s- eh- (. ) [I think that (mean-) ]

IR: [Sorry you were- ] I thought you were saying that it was po:lls in Hemel Hempstead [= which was suggest you were no: t in ( ).]

IE1: [Yeah. It’s the local- no no ]

IE1: It’s in lo:cal areas where there is a real conce:rn. (. ) >I mean< th- th- what this is a:ll about is this who:le election was some text about this- >whole election I think that people don’t seem to realize is that< .hh it’s- doesn’- (you) don’t have to be a travelodging Hemel Hempstead, h suc:umb to the briefing counter moment with the bla:ndishments h o the Liberal Democrats. = But the reality is that, if you do vote Liberal Democrat, you do hh. spend the (knot) with them, you do run a real risk waking up h. with a pain in the jug in a vein, h. and a black cake with a blue rosé [(.] tossed =

IE2: [.hh]

IE1: = contem:ptuously over the teeth made.

IR: (£) Well, listening to that, as I said is the Liberal Democrat party chairman† Matthew Tailor. Matthew Tailor, what do you make of that argument. (£) =

IE2: = i- e- well hu:h I- I think I (made to) all listeners which is eh Labor being caught at not telling the truth h. Ehmm the simple fact is that in about a third of the country, thee battle is between Labor and Liberal Democrats. There is no chance the Conservatives winning h. in those Labor (hardens) a::nd eh therefore Labor’s claims nationally that somehow .h switching through Liberal Democrats (led to Tories) isn’t true. .h In thee eh another third of the country there are Liberal Democrat-Tory battTles >and actually< .hh eh the best thing Labor voters can do is eh switch to Liberal Democrats if they want to see change h. A:nd, thee e:ven (in) those seats like eh Hemel where .h eh Labor and Tories (. ) are are relatively close. Eh Labor are peddling completely untruth. E:h i- i- y- ask people who switched the order (has it) simply does’t lead to lots of- h. Tories seats winning? Indee:d, if you look at the national
opinion polls, the Conservatives are now averaging the same rate they got in their last general election, which was their second worst Conservative defeat in history and led to William Hague resigning this Conservati(ve () lose.

[Go back to this- ] = Is this true? This un- clear statement in the Labor leaflet = it =

[Yeah ] [Yeah ]

IE2: = takes one in fifty people to switch their vote from =

umhum

IE1: = Labor to Liberal Dem(<, and the Tories will win. That is just plain wrong.

IE1: [.h If it is said at the end in some areas I conceive that that will be more accurate. But the fact remains, in the context that they lower turnout. And =

[huhuhuhuh ]

IE2: = in the sub-regional [areas, really does =

huhhuh]

IE1: = [make a huge difference.] = And it could happen. .h =

IE2: [.hhh ]

IE1: = You know, and the idea that Matthew Tailor I'm sorry I mean like Matthew as a decent ( ) you can't treat the electorate with the sort of contempt, that he: has. = Now we actually say that we'll do this, =

[But isn't that treating =

no we'll do [that. ]

IR: = [ting thee () e ] {electorate ( )}

IE2: {.h h. }

IE1: {No, it isn't. }

IE1: The Tories could win on May the fifth. That is a fact.

[The Liberals can't win, =

IR: [Matthew Tailor. ]

IE1: [.h ] but Liberals can let the Tories in.

IE2: [Well ] [It-

IE2: Well, huh actually, if you look at the national opinion polls, there is not a jot of evidence Tories could win? Every political analyst () has concluded that's the case.

Even [( )] =

IE1: [That's a Conservative ( )] =
The simple fact is, that people don’t like Michael Howard aren’t turning to him. In large parts of the country, people aren’t in the race against Labor anyway. And in large parts of the country voting Liberal Democrat will get a Liberal Democrat MP. People are intelligent enough to look at their own local area, work out how things are that they know:, that on thirty three percent which is where the Conservatives averaging at the moment that is as bad as it was last time.

And in places like [Hemel Hempstead one in fifty is a fact.

I’ve bibs- I- = It’s not- it’s not a fact. It’s actually untrue. It’s one in i- i- e- o- [on a basement it would be one i]n fi:ve in Hemel = [euh euh ah huh huh ]

Hempstead and [you just give analysis] {somewhere.}

[only two thousand one ]{on the same time.]=

{Ste- Steven Pound. Ste- }

Steven Pound, [if you] wan- if you want the public, to =

[yeah ]

trust, politicians [. cl]aims like this are not gonna help. =

Mcht well claims like this, will not help if people attack them and then try:: to make a party political point out of it. [(But this is) ( ). And (£) I’m sorry, th(h)is is the m(h)athematics of i(h)t. (£)

[eh huh huh huh huh huh huh N(h)o, i(h)t is(h)n’t S(h)[t(h)e]v’ en. D(h)on’t y(h)ou] g(h)o =

[uh, (where d’y pull) ]

th(h)ere, =

[Yeah, tha- that just doesn’t [lie:

[Huh y(h) ( ) (w(h)ell)] [huh huh [huh huh °huh huh huh°

[(£) Matthew

[Tailor, =
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189 IE1:  [even if politicians do.] = [
190 IR:    = and [t(h)e ]ven Pou(h)nd, th(h)ank =
191 IE2:    = [Oh    ]
192 IR:    = y(h)ou b(h)oth. (£)
193 Hump = Oh, what did he just say that? Final comment, even if
194 hrys:  polit(h)ici(h)ans d(h)o::?
195 IR:    [S(h)ays they do. =
196 IE1:    [I-
197 Hump = [Huh huh   ] =
   hrys:
198 IE1:    = [°I can’t hear that.°] =
199 IE2?:  = [HUH HUH HUH huh huh
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IR: Sarah Montague

IE: Wendy Chamblor, the UN acting High Commission of refugees

00 (background noise, cassette rolling?)

01 IR: .hh the United Nation's acting High Commission of refugee:s is in Darfur Sudan. She's Wendy Chamblor and she joins us on the line from there. Hh. Good morning.

02 (0.3)

05 IE: Good morning.

06 IR: What have you found on your trip to: Sudan.

07 IE: Mcht. (.) well we came in yesterday >we actually what we< found was the very best and the very worst. .hh eh let me explain yesterday as we were- (. ) coming in our helicopter h. eh into Zalingee eh which is ae- a very sma:ll dusty village in the middle of eh west Darfur. .hh We saw: as we looked out of the window of the helicopter eh village after village that had been completely destroyed, in (as the) helicopter (bed) (toward) Zalingee .hh we saw this- (. ) this- va:st camp of eh h. of eh e-e- ta:rs an- worthy, where the displaced people who had been chased, chased running for their lives frankly from these villages. .hh had collected for security in in- in- town. .hh eh but we also saw the he:st. =

We saw (. ) the African Union who were offering protection and we saw h. (. ) my UN colleagues from (. ) UN refugee agency were there, .h in a- i- i- i- in great risk to themselves frankungalow. [E:h] other engi:os and other UN agenc:ies =

23 IR: [.hh]

24 IE: = h., providing protection and assistance to these very vulnerable people. =

26 IR: = You say at great risks to themselves, how danger:ous is the situation no::w there. = I mean are thee African Union is- successfully managing to keep the peace?

29 (0.2)

30 IE: .hh Thee African Union is doing what they ca::n, they are very much respected by the people and very appreciated by the people = in where they a:re, there is e:hm security. But they can't be everywhere. .hh An- an- neither can we:. .h Eh what we are doing to help the African Union and
to help the people. h We’ve got (does) small teams of mobile protection officers that we dispatch h outside of the camps where people are basically secure h. to the villages where people still are, h And where there’s, where they are quite vulnerable to attack. h And we are (,) are finding the strand of the vulnerable people, h ah with a nine one one if you will. A:h when- when they are in trouble, we can call the African Union to come in, if they are in danger of being attacked, h hh we find these ehm h e:h groups of women that- may have been raped an- and beaten = and we h. provide immediate assistance an- and get them thee h. kind of eh eh protection (,) they need.

IR: Wendy Chamblor, thank you.
Well the Liberal Democrats have had: (.) a stuttering matter of launch, thanks to the model of the figures, (.) their tax revenue:es? . (They are) awkward for the leader Charles Kennedy ("we- dip") be put on the defensive at the end of the first week's campaigning. (.) especially when, as- everyone has been pointing out h., not without some sympathy, h he's been showing some signs, (.) of sleep deprivation that is the lot of any new father. .hh And the news isn't exactly playing into his hand? President Chirac has been reporting, h he's facing a pretty rough fight in this European referendum, which comes at the end of next month?< .hh The Liberal Democrats are of course by far, the most Euro enthusiastic, of the main parties. .hh Labor aren't making the European question a central part of their campaign h.. Even the Conservatives are downplaying >it compared with< the last couple of campaigns. .hh So how: upfront (.) will the Liberal Democrats be:. (.) h Charles Kennedy, good morning.

Mcht. James a very good morning to [you. (.)]

[How:: ] upfront will you be about your enthusiasm for Europe and all its works?

= Well: we've just eh come from our morning press conference, = today where we've been discussing environmental policy where ]=

[Indeed ]

= we've been pointing over there hh. on a number of fronts, policy fronts? .hh by definition the environment is a classic example of (.) something that can't just be the subject of h. national decision making? .hh it doesn't recognize (.) national-owned issue, = it need international co-operation, = so .hh there's- there is a good practical example if you want more .hh effective action (.) on climate change and so on, globally of course you need
initiatives but *my goodness*, .h you certainly need eh activity (.) at a Europ[ean Union level.] =

IR: [.hh ] = Ye:s, the argument isn’t about (.)

initiatives than about co-operation (.) eh where it’s necessary indeed. B- presumably: ehm so:me legal framewo†rk which covers different countries >because if you say†< .hh environment doesn’t respect bo:rders. Hh. The argument however is much deeper. It’s whether hh. this country:: ehm ha:s control over its own policy >(it’s) very important areas<. .hh (. ) It’s something tha(t)- (. ) many people as you well know fee:l (. ) extreme:ly strong about. And they fee:l there’s (. ) a li:ne, .h which when it’s crossed, (. ) changes the nature of the country, really fundamentally. .h We’re not talking here about, .h you know ma:ed (zeno) folks, we’re talking about .h ordinary people who think (. ) it’s gone too far. Now how do you persuade them, .h that they are wro:ng >if that’s what you believe<.

IE: Mcht we:ll on a number of fro:nts I thi†nk. I think first of a:ll, .h you point to:: the lo:ng-term strategic self-interest of our country. .h And I fee:l that a Britain that was disengaging .h on moving away: from the top table of decision making within EurTope, .h is going to be: a Britain: which politically is weaker in the woTrld.. h Eh and economically is probably (. ) going to find itself, increasingly: (. ) at a- (. ) a disadvantageous result. .hh That’s the first thing. The second thing is, .hh look at the history book (loui) since the end of second world wa:[r, (. ) ] there has been European initiative after European =

IR: [Ehm] IE: = initiative h.. Britain (. ) inevitably has tended to come rather la:te, and rather gradually to accept whatever the hh. the development of the momentum has been. .h And then was found an awful lot of entertainment British politics arguing with the fa:[ct we don’t let =

IR: [°Ye°

IE: = the (groan grow[th.] = so l) hate to see is making that =

IR: [Ye:s but- ]
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IE: = same mistake (here) again. =
IR: = Ok, but eh there was the other side of the argument
(which) say if you look at the history books h., o::h w- w-
what was produced in the common market >as it was then<
called >was a common< agricultural policy which has
been in many respects a disaster not least incidentally .h
for w- what we used to call the third-world. .hh The
common fishery’s policy? by common conse\nt of many
Europe MP\ts, .hh and coastline area ( ) Britain would
agree\+, .h ehm has been catastrophic for the British (.)
fishing industry. = So they would say that the history .h of
the way that EU has deve{l}oped, .h does\n’t (.) eh persuade
them h. that further integration (.) is a good idea (.) or
indeed other countries in Europe.

IE: Well I would say two things. = And I don’t disagree. = I’ve
made, as you know all the criticisms of the common
fishery policy in the CAP myself. [( )]
IR: [And ref-] reformers
failed in many ways. I mean reformers are extre\rmely
slow and in the CAP:, .hh it only e- e- was- pulled kicking
and screaming into refo:rm, because when you bring in
east European countries you don’t have a reform, the thing
goes bankrupt. =
IE: = Well precisely so:, and it’s- significant has it known
that, .hh than\nkfully h. e::hm you and I I suppose eh .h both
been brought up in a world that was- dominated by the
(high and cut) and the domination of those central own
eastern European countries by the S[oviets]. .h We are =
IR: [.hh ]
IE: = now, .h eh dealing with a world in which, that has go::ne,
democracy: has been implanted an- [taken ro]ot? =
IR: [.hh ]
IE: = And of course, so many of these countries are queu-
queuing up to jo:in the EU. = Both the new ones that
[have no:w ] come in and =
IR: [.hh ]
IE: = we welco\nme. .h A\nnd, many others who remain (ask for
this). But I think y- you get back to this po:it, .h I mean l-
I often liken it. To my own political circumstances, .h here
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I am putting myself off personally as well as the party, hh
for (. ) re-election to the House of Commons? I don't
actually instinctively agree:: with the basis of the election
system itself, = I'd like to see that chaŋged? .hh And I
certainly don't agree with an awful lot of the policies, .h
that come out of the House of Commons under success of
governments. But, I still put myself forward, because I
want to engage and I want to a[ргue the] c[a: ]se (. ) =
[.hh ] [bu-]
= for a different approach from the within.
I[.h]
[Now that's- my view, should i- (e)xactly be the British
attitude towards the Еuropеan Union. =]
[e- ] = But there's a
sense in which you may be seen to be .......
(interview not completely recorded)
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[57] Thursday 14 April 2005: BBC radio 4 “Today Program”: 0810-Andrew Lansley and John Reid-hospital cleanliness (13:06.0)

IR: John Humphrys
IEO: Lesley Ashley, actress (background)
IE1: Andrew Lansley, Shadow Health Secretary
IE2: John Reid, Health Secretary

01 IR: Who would have thought a few years ago that clean hospitals would become an issue = a big issue, .h at a general election. It’s not so very long ago† that we took it for granted that our hospitals are clean. Now we have not only bugs but (. ) super bugs including .h the deadly MSA. Kills thousands of people a year. .h Today, a Clean Hospital’s Summit will be held in London organized by the Patients’ Association? hh And attended by many of the great and the good in politics and the health service. .h I’ll be talking to the politicians in a moment. .h But let’s hear first, from someone. h who herself has been hit (. ) by: a super bug, the actress (. ) Lesley Ashley.

13 IEO: When I went into: eh the Chelsea Westminster Hospital with broken rib, .h and collapsed lung, .h a::nd while I was there, I contracted M<SSA>. .h Eh obviously I’v- I’ve never heard of MRSA or MSSA h.. Eh and they:- didn’t know that I had it. >Eh it was only after I’ve been< .h ehm discharged a::nd, (. ) through the night, l- I lost the feeling of my legs h. ehm ehm got rushed into Charring Cross Hospital, .h where:re they took biopsy and (grew a) culture and then told me that I had a MSSA.

23 IR: Which is one of the super bugs.

24 IEO: Which is one of the super bugs and luckily for me, .h if you could say luckily. .h e::hm that was: sensitive to anti-biotics, MRSA is: resistant.

27 IR: You’r- you’re still in a bit of state. =

29 IEO: = Well the damage had already been done on my spi::ne? E::hm (. ) the pressure was twenty percent e- ehm (. ) o- on my spine, .hh eh which meant th’t basically I’ve had to: learn to walk again.: =

32 IR: = .h Why did it happen to you. I mean was the hospital dirty? = [or-
IE0: [.hh Well I think- you know it’s not- you can’t pinpoint one hospital >I think it’s been ha:ppening:< (. ) for a whi:le. = In fact you know, .h there’s been sci:entific evidence of- of: eh hospital .hh e:hm bugs for- for over twenty years. .h Ehm unfortunately it’s just got wor:se and worse >but now:: .h I mean I’m- I’m so pleased th’t this- this is- ehm (. ) this subject of MRSA and MSSA i- is ehm an election issue, be[cause-]

IR: [And who do you blame.

IE0: Well, I mean it’s just not completely Labor’s fault because unfortunately they in:herited it, but’hm unfortunately (£) they’ve d(h)one nothing about i(h) t. (£) .hh E::hm so the cutbacks in the hospitals ar- really showing that: they are getting filthier and filthier. .hh =

IR: = And your message behin- (b) talking to the two .hh e:h h. th- the Health Secretary and its opposite at the moment, e:h w- your message to them?

IE0: E:h well have to- (_) they have to put a matron back h↑ere, a:nd: standards have to be brought up to what they we:re before. .h Eh these bugs into da- into our hospitals. >.h E:hm it- they are so easy to catch now.

IR: Lesley Ash, many thanks and good luck.

IE0: Thank you. =

IR: = Mcht .hh Well, as I say: we have Andrew Lansl↑ey, the Shadow Health Secreat↑ry and John Reid, the Health Secreat↑ry, on the line? Mr. Lansl↑ey, this isn’t one where you could blame the government is it, because it was you that changed the system, .h when you were in power, a:nd we’re paying the price for it.

IE1: (e-) Yes, good morning. [.h E::hm =

IR: [“(Good morning.)”]

IE1: = no: actually I think Lesley is absolutely ri:ght in what she says, that of course e:h m- (metacillin) resistant e:h (stafly coke) was about:, before nineteen ninety se↑ven. .h But as you said in your introduction, .h ehm eight years ago?:, it was a much lesser problem: in hospitals than it is toda[y. The num-

IR: [Well I didn’t actually say that (£) in my
introducti(h)on? (£), but-, but nonetheless it existed a:nd
you, and you changed the way: .hh eh hospital cleaning
was- car(ri)ed out so therefore, you bea(r)d a very large
part of the re[sp]onsibility.

IE1: [No, it doesn't. It's not that it isn't simply
accurate. .h Eh m the point is and indeed if the government
thought that was the ca(se, .h then a year ago↑ they
wouldn't have written in the department of health's annual
report, .h that in thei(r view, they will now: kno(w hospitals
with poor standards of cleanli(ness. .h Fact is they were
utterly complacent the::n, and they've remained
complacent over eight years. h Ah:nd unfortunately, the-
the same is still true now:. .h Yesterday the government
published their manifesto, and n(o)where in it, .h eh was a
commitment of two hundred and twenty seven seven
commitments, .h was anythi(ng:, directly related to
infection control or hospital cleanliness. .h And the simple
fact is, .h I can- I could give you an enone:rmous list of the
thi:ngs that were recommended to be do(ne by the
National Audit Office report, .h fi:ve years ago. >They<
haven't been done. There's no national infection control
manual, .h they haven't eh brought (bed crepany) levels
dow(n, to eighty two percent >in fact< they've go(ne up.
They haven't sh- ensured the advice on hand wash(ing. (.)
(h across the NHS has been appli:ed consistently? .h They
haven't invested an isolation fi( multi:ty (in) less than a
quarter of the: hm h hospitals across the country have the

°isolati(ion facility that they should have.°

IR: [Alright I- I take your point. You've got a] lot of eh a big
list of things that they could have done but my point to
you::, is that the t(i:me and a lot of people belie:ve this the
time to destroy:: .hh these super bugs was in the early
nineties, w- only five percen: of the bacteria: the::n were
resistant to anti-biotics. .h And you didn't- the Tory
government didn't even keep records about it. = What was
going on. = And you were forcing hospitals to contract
out, .h cleaning services. = That is the reality, isn't °it:. =

IE1: = Well there was a voluntary surveillance scheme at the
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112 time, otherwise how can [the country ( )-]
113 IR: [Voluntary, yeah.]
114 IE1: Well, ye:s, ok:. A:nd, a:nd, as the problem got wo:трse, it
115 shifted to a mandatory surveillance scheme, that’s
116 absolutely right. [h The national(.) but- but fi(v)-]
117 IR: [And the government now does publish
118 statistics] so we know what is goin[g on.]
119 IE1: [huh ] Well hang on a
120 min†ute, .h they don’t publish the statistics in the National
121 Audit Office the last four five years a†go, which is more
122 comprehensive statistics, = they don’t publish statistics .h
123 by individual:l clinic:l department. .h And as we: eh
124 learned at the weeke::nd, eh Great Omen Street as just one
125 example a:n- I don’t br- eh say Great Omen Street ha:s any
126 wo:rth of problem (. ) anywhere else less than many. .h Eh
127 but- they ha- they had reported h. twenty three instances
128 of MRSA bloodstream infections? H. But they have
129 reco:rded in the hospit:al, .h over three hundred and fifty
130 [instances of MRSA infection. .h And let me- =
131 IR: [Alright,(.) what: (0.2) what would you do
132 IE1: = [sorry let me bring one point about [contra]ct cleaning =
133 IR: [m-]
134 IE1: = because, .h frankly if you go around the country, .h there
135 are hospitals that have good cleaning, (. ) and poor
136 cleaning. .h But there is absolutely no co-relation between:
137 >whether it is contracted or in health. .h Half of the be-
138 hospitals with the lowest de-MRSA ra†te, .h have
139 contract[ed out cleaning. .h Ha:lf of the hos]pital:als =
140 IR: [Alright, first thing you would-]
141 IE1: = with the worst have in health cleaning. = John Reid and
142 l. .h were both at the Queen Alexander Hospital in
143 Portsmouth? .h and there are problems there and we
144 discussed them with the hospital both of us? .h But it isn’t
145 about (. ) contracted cleaning? ’cause
146 we[’re having health (screening)]
147 IR: [Alright, (0.2) very: ] very quick thought from
148 you then, >obviously you don’t agree with Lesley
149 Ash(ley) ’cause she said bringing back matron< meaning
150 putting them in charge of the team. [( ) (Lesley Ash)
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151 IE1: [I do: agree with it. =
152 IR: ]
153 IE1: [But the- (.) what is the su-
154 IR: I do- I do: agree with
155 Lesl[ey Ash.] = And we published Michael Howard and =
156 IR: [Alright.]
157 IE1: = I published, .h just last week h., how we’re gonna put
matron in cha:†rge and give (.) the matron the ability to
have uniform’s poli†cy, the model clinic contract
implemented which isn’t in more than half of the
hospi†als, h twenty-four-hour-a-day seven-day-a-week
cleaning. And nurses themselves told the Nursing
Ti:me, .h that they: don’t ha:ve access to cleaning on the
wards tw[enty four hours a day seven] days a week? .h =
158 IR: [Ok? We- than(k)-]
159 IE1: = And they don’t have time to clean beds between
patients. = F[or ];y =
160 IR: [Righ(t)?]
161 IE1: = percent of nurses, .h said they don’t have ti:me (. ) to
clean bed between patients.
162 IR: = [Eight years of Labor government-]
163 IE1: = [Ok? Thank you: very much. ]
164 IE1: That’s what you should ask John Re[id. Wh]y: is that true:. =
165 IR: =
166 IR: = I’m: about to ask that very thing, Why is that the case,
167 Mr. Reid? (0.2)
168 IE2: Which of the many:: [h. ( ) They can not make it =
169 IR: [Well let’s deal with the last ( ).
(They don’t) ( ) [proper†ly, you don’t have a m[odel ] =
170 IE2: = right [( ) (0.2) [Yeah]
171 IR: = ( ) contract, no time- (-) to clean between patients, and
so on.
172 IE2: Lo- le- let me just make it absolutely plain right from the
start John. I do: not, and have never regarded this as a party
173 political issue. This bug doesn’t [ ]
174 IR: =
175 IE2: .hh No I don’t think it is. Now I think the summit tod†ay
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190 (. ) eh has specifically gone over this way† = The Patients'
191 Association that is involved? h. in- in >(that)< saying
192 Lesley Ash apply this, >that< this shouldn’t be a party
193 [( ) issue.
194 IR: [ Wel- it’s on the front page of the Tory party manifesto,
195 [ so it is de-〈facto, it is (.) [the (true) area] (.) eh- =
196 IE2: [ Wel- (. ) {the- [there may be-
197 ?: {ka (. ) ka
198 IR: = an issue.
199 IE2: John there may be some people who want to make it a
200 party political issue, but let me just tell you:, .h eh that I
201 have made separately (.) untogether .h e:h off the reckon .h
202 was both Andrew Lansley† the Conservative and Paul
203 Buster eh we- we- discussed this in- in an attempt .h to get
204 what the patients actually want is to try; and get .hh ways
205 of diminishing the growth of the super bug?, .h we have
206 been trying (now) forty year we led the wo:rd? (. ) .h
207 Twenty years ago some of the Europeans killed this off
208 when it was very: e::h very new? ( (NHS) ) =
209 IR: And you had ( ) which is to do[., which is why it’s-] =
210 IE2: = [ .h °that’s-° ]
211 IR: = a political issue, of course it’s a politica[l issue. You’ve =
212 IE2: [It is not-
213 IR: = got dirty hospitals and the government that has been
214 running those hospitals for the last eight y†ears h. has
215 qu†estio jakns to answer.
216 IE2: John it’s not a party political issue. That’s the point
217 [( )
218 IR: [ Wel alright, I’ll call it a political issue then, [right.
219 IE2: [.h It is a
220 political issue, what I’ve been trying to do:, .h and I hope
221 to do after the summit is (.) today as we†ll, is to listen to
222 the experts and see, what is that we should have been
223 doing: [that we haven’t been doing. =
224 IR: [“uh‖m°
225 IR: = W[ell haven’t you done that already.
226 IE2: [.hh
227 IE2: Wel- yes I have, and I’ve brought in last year, in the last
228 fifteen months I’ve brought in twenty (.) three (.) different
initiatives. Indeed the last party political attack that was made in May, by Andrew Lansley and his colleague was the (acquisition) and initiative a month. So, let me tell you some of the things we’ve done? But then I will tell you why: we have got up to the position where we want to learn (more) more and more. [.h We (al)-

IR: [B’t why don’t you also tell us why you didn’t do [what the NAO, the National-

IR: [che

IR: = Audit Office said you should have done.

IE2: Well we brought back (matron) which is the big demand four years ago. [Isn’t-

IE2: [che

IR: [Without the power that she needs.

IE2: [Or he needs.

IE2: [No that’s not true.] That’s not true; because two years ago, in the Matrons’ Charter, we gave the (perlor), .h we: eh I (owe load) the two-tier (a cheap (cleaning contract so that: we- we no longer substitute cheapness from cleanliness? .h l- l: eh involved the front-lined nurses in drawing up the contract so that they had specific (lines with) authority? .h The NHS is: reduddled, eh sorry has introduced eh a new hand-washing and hygiene regime th’ perhaps, .h we should never h’ve eh allowed to diminish an and: in a (rolling) synaptic biotic? .h I put the chief nursing officer, .h in- in charge of this? I put more money: into res search. .h Ehm I can go through a whole list of things but actually, what people want to know tod:ay; is if having brought all these experts together, all of the NHS staff and patients, .h if there are recommendations that come out of them, (where I act to) th:em, >.h< and the answer is ve:s. Indeed my frustration has been: .h that every time I hear of a new th:ing, .h e:hm through the erupted, = we’ve set erupted assessment unit to look sp- sp- specifically and very quickly, .h eh any new ideas like steaming cleaning of beds and so on. .h My frustration is I want them to happen over night.

IR: [Ehm, but the problem is there is an endemic faul:it in this syst:em, if you ha:ve, as we do: ha:ve, a target-driven .hh NHS, .h the:n
the beds must be kept full all the time. That is the absolute imperative. Every bed, it is kept full all the time, you are going to have this problem. If you don't have proper isolation units, you are going to have this problem. That's the root of it, isn't it.

IE2: Well, if government targets, was the cause of MISE, =

IR: = I didn't say it was the cause of it. =

IE2: = Well if- if they were- the major cause of it John, and a major contributive factor, then first of all, we would not have had it spreading from four percent resistance, to thirty one percent resistance. And that (spread) can actually, in the five years before the Labor government commend. That is a matter of fact. The second thing is, that there would be a correlation-ship of some sort, between the hospitals reaching their target by the big (supers) and so on, and the ones with the highest MISA rates. There is no such correlation, in fact in many ways it's the opposite correlation. And the third thing is, the suggestion that the answer to reducing potential death or illness from MISA, might be not to reduce the waiting list, when we know: that thousands of people die, waiting on operations on a long waiting list, suggests that you have to do both together, you have to reduce the waiting list, and at the same time you have to tackle MISA. Now, those who say: it's (with) government targets are the same as those (what) you say: it's all about dirty hospitals. It isn't just about dirty hospitals. S- in some of those clean hospitals, which give good clean ratings, there is still wide spread of MISA. >One of the reasons, let me give you an =

IE2: = example [John, thousands of people] thousands of =

IR: [yeah- very quick one ]

IE2: = people visit our hospitals every day: and every hospital. All of them (are) carrying MISA. [(and-)]

IR: [I]

IE2: (don't) (that), but- [there we are]

IE2: [An- and- always have done, but it wasn't always resistant John. It was only]
four percent resistant, and if you listen to the Netherland’s expenses this morning, .h they tell us forty years ago Britain led the wo†ld, .h twenty years when this started to become resist†ant, we took British methods, and we (ham-) [hh and when you do =

Alright, [fi-

= it, you can reduce it. And look at London, just i- (hard want there) is paying off now. .h There’s been a drop of twenty percent in one y†ear, .h [( )ly]

IR: [Now: some people say that’s because of the way you calculate the figures.

[°(but- but- well- yeah)°

IE2: [No it’s not. This is on a scientifically based assessment, =

IR: [Alright,

IE2: = because we now take the blood omen (faction)s. It can be fudd†led .h it is science to do this. .h It is scientist who do this..h We’ve get a six percent for the first time in fifteen years, I’m not claiming this is beat by any means John. .h But I want the summit today: everyone, irrespective of the politics, whether they are a provi†der (.) or a patient, .h give us the ideas and I promise you like the twenty odd things that we’ve already done, .h I will make sure these are done as well if they are effective, that is all I want, and that’s to defeat this. .h It isn’t the biggest problem in the NHS†, but it is an important one, .h and instead of just-blaming on the staff or (inductive voice lose), .h let’s get there and tackle every single one of the contributive factors and do what our European colleagues- did h.

[twenty years ago. [°(That is to defeat th[is.]°

IR: [John- [John R†eid, thank you very much::: =

IE2: = Thank you John.
Thursday 10 March 2005: Irresponsible Behavior-2-1-1
IR: Jim Naughtie
IE0: Tony Blair, Prime Minister
IE1: David Davis, Conservative Home Affairs spokesman
IE2: Hazel Blares, Home Affairs Minister

01 IR: It's ten minutes past eight. The last battle of the Prevention
02 of Terrorism Act Bill's about to begin? The government's
03 concessions to the Opposition, .h and its own rebellious
04 back benchers?, .h gave it:, slightly more comfortable
05 majorities in the Commons last night? .h And it its now:
06 challenging the Lords to back down. But, ministers' refusal
07 to introduce a so-called Sunset Clause† .h that would
08 effectively turn the bill into a temporary act, .hh is still a
09 sticking point for many Peers, as it is for the
10 Conservatives. Last night in a BBC interview†, Prime
11 Minister accused the: irresponsible behavior.
12 IE0: For the Conservative Party, .h to take this position,
13 watering this legislation when-, (. I am advised, as they
14 know perfectly well, .h that this legislation is necessary, (. to protect our security, I think is irresponsible, and it is
15 wrong, and they should stop it now. .h We- we- we- we-
16 this is being to and fro, to the House of Lords and House of
17 Commons. = The House of .h Commons is now, it's
18 directly elected body, spoken very clearly the majority as
19 large ( .h in favor of this legislation, .h and, (.) we don't
20 want it to water down.
21 IR: Much Prime Minister, speaking, last night. Well I asked the
22 Conservative Home Affairs spokesman David Davis hh., if
23 he thought, that in the e:nd, .h there would be, an act, on
24 the statute book.
25 ()
26 IE1: I simply don't know, what e:h what, is the case, at the
27 moment. = Is the government, .hh itself frankly, has
28 pois(on)ed in a position by: .h e:h its: later- later arrive(al)
29 of this problem. = It should h’ve fixed this problem, .h
30 fifteen months ago when .h Lord Newton, .h commented
31 on the old act and said, it's inadequate, it's failing, .h it
32 needs some replacements and put up some proposals. (.) It
33 failed to do that, a:nd, >it suddenly finds the job in a rush.
And we had all the same rush with the Parliament. Now, (.) I don't really (know) wh(a)t Prime Minister want to do. Eh as: e:h Michael Howard has suggest† ed, h., some of us are fearing that he is deliberately playing this way for political reasons, = >But<, .h (. ) if he is serious, then he should, he he's he should look at this, .h constructively and see what outcome, he can have. We- bear in mind, (.) we've already offered hi:m h., eh th- this is the thi:rd of the offers. = The first offer was h., we agreed to: suppo:rt an extension of the current law. .h We were told that wouldn't wo†:rk, so we said 'okay we will give you some primary legislation on top of that'. That was turned down too. .hh And so we came up with thee Sunset Clau†:se. And w- if you remember last week when I announced it, .h it was eh called: a climb down. And then suddenly they changed their mind. .h Now what we are trying to do: is to, give the government, some cover for the next, seven eight nine moi†:nths, nine months it turns ou†:t..h E:h but (et) the same time, deal with something very fundamental at the heart of this. = >There's lots of talk about the end of, .h presumption of innocence and the end of (physical corpus).< = .h What it's really about, is actually stopping, miscarriages of justice.

IR: You say you wanted (.) give the government some cover for seven eight or nine month. I thought you were supposed to be:, .h the Home Secretary or the senior figure in government after- probably May the fifth. =

IE1: = Yeah. Ok well tha- that would be us. And: (0.2) mcht under those circumstances, .h we will completely rewrite this bill. .h You see we think there are much better ways of-

IR: [I was going to ask you[: ] if =

IE1: [Yeh]

IR: = you would repeal it if you got into power [, ('cause that's an) important question.]

IE1: [Well i- i- if- (. ) I th- I'm- ] =

IE1: = I'm expecting frankly a Sunset Clause to be honest, and it will automatically repea:1† h., e:h in November, but in- at the mean ti †: me, we are putting into- into place a who:le
series of things, = the right to use (it) (second)

communication, .h a new way of handling sensitive h. e:h

intelligence, the n- the new repor- proposal the government

igno:red. .h Eh new charges, like eh (Acts for)

(parentage) terrorism, .h like associating [with terrorist =

IR: [.h

IE1: = >organizations<. .h A:ll these things allow you actually
to put in prison, (0.2) the people who a[re: ] =

IR: [.h Right, ]

IE1: = actually trying to commit terrorist act. No- no- not tag
them, .h not put them in their own ho↑mes, but put them in

prison.

IR: = if you win the May elect[ion ], one way or another =

IE1: [Ehm]

IR: = this this legislation goes. =

IE1: = Oh yeah, and we’ll [.] but we’ll replace it with something
better, something which will be mo:re effective, .h eh

against- against terrorism. = But- but- most importantly,

avoid miscarriages of justice. Remember, terrorists are

very often, trying to provoke, an excessive reaction from

the state. = >The reason they are trying to do that<,.h is to

get mo:re recruits themselves. We think, in the long run,

that’s what this bill will do. .h In the [short ] run =

IE1: [°Ri↑ght, ° ]

IE1: = we’re trying to make it wo:rk, eh ah but: but (actually

said) the government, >you’ve got to come up with

something better<.

IE1: <Are you against these control orders in principle>,

[because] i- I =

IE1: [.h ]

IE1: = mean this is a fundamental question. =

IE1: = >Ehm.< =

IE1: = .h Sometimes it seems that if you are arguing about the

way of opera↑[tion and], there’s been a >big debate< =

koh ]

IE1: = about that.=

IE1: = >Yeah.< =

IE1: = But a:re you against them if[n principle ] as an =

IE1: [.h Loo(k)-, ]
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IR: = indefensible assault in civil liberties or whatever phrase
[you choose °(to use) °.

IE1: [THER- ther- there are two:: principles in play here. Control
orders aren't principle, they are tac[cic.] There are two:: =

IE1: [hhh.]

IE1: = (. ) principles in play. One is the presumption of
innocence, the:: right to (Haweys Corpus). = These are- (-)
lo:ng-standing, under several hundred year old (. ) h British
principles of justice, .h which, and the reason they exist, is
to avoid miscarriages of justice, aro:. avoid the wron:ng
person, .h having >a control order. Remember,< .h these
control order are not minor things. They can destroy your
life. They can destroy your joTb, they can destroy your
relationship with family and fri:ends, .h eh because if you
are isola:ted you can't contact them, .h in- in the real
harm. = So on the one hand you've got (to) preventing
miscarriages of justice, .hh on the other hand you've got to
dealing with terrorism. [.h Now ] and- and we think =

IR: = that thee control orders are actually rather ba:d
compromises (in outsta:nd), and what we are trying to do:
in the last few days, .h a whole series [of amendments] =

IR: [h h. ]

IE1: = which are quite technical. = .h They are not, were
described in your- on your program, (this point of) (ripping
the guts out of) the bill. .h They are actually trying to make
the bill [workable at least for a time.

IR: [.h

IR: But there's a: eh an important point here, [.h ] do =

IE1: [>Ehm<]

IR: = you regard anything (. ) which overrides that principle of
(Haweys Corpus) which you've (. ) just described, as
unacceptable. [(. ) Or do you th]ink, that because of- =

IE1: [ h h. ]

IR: = [the other principle†, they] =

IE1: [° h h. ° ]

IR: = need to protect the country against terror[sm ], it =

IE1: [°h. °]

IR: = can be justified in this day and age. Which is it. There
has to be a choice. =

IE1: = >Now okay okay (one-)< (who) the choice is never as
clear as that. = It can be justified, .h and indeed for
two generations, there's no end to this so, .h we've got to get it
right. >This isn't a question of just sort of< .h >rub a stamp
every year<. >We've got to get it< right, right from the
beginning. .h Now, under some circumstances (as) you
have to do that, .h but it's the last thing you do, not the
first thing you do, in a one day rush through Parliament,
three or four day rush through the House of Lords.

IR: If this is a: a waTr (.) that's going to go on for two
generation[s, ] .h do you believe that it is (.) =

IE1: = [>°Ehm°<]

IR: = of sufficient seriousness, to justify, legislation, of some
sort, which would, effectively suspend Havey's Corpus.

IE1: = It could [do.

IR: = Or not.

IE1: It could do. We actually, w- th- th- the irony is this, we
don't know:, mcht, how many people, would be: covered
by: this law. = Th- the Prime Minister at the other
day:†, said several hundred people. (. ) And the Home
Secretary said ten or twenty. We don't actually have: either
the piece of data we need to have, .h for Parliament.

[Both (has upon to) make that decision is one =

IR: [.h

IE1: = aspect, but only one aspect .h of the desperate rush, that
I'm afraid the government itself has created. .h This is a
political emergency first, .h and (only) a terrorist ( ) the
second.

IR: .hh David Davis, the Conservative spokesman on Home
Affairs, we're joined now by the Home Office minister
Hazel Blares, good morning.

Good morning.

Would you be prepared to see this bill fall (0.2) and without to the fall-back position. Mcht rather than concede, a Sunset Clause.

I think that we’ve made some dramatic movements in the last week or so, eh around judicial involvement? Eh we’ve offered annual renewal, of this legislation, as well as independent review, as well as a three months review back to Parliament. And we offered to consult with the police about. Continuing to look at=

= prosecution. And I think what we’ve got now, eh is some measured law, a good legal framework, to deal with what we’ve always said, eh a small number of people that we can’t prosecute through the traditional criminal justice system. And I have to make the point, eh that these are preventative orders. What we’re =

Mcht .

= trying to do, is prevent something happening in the =

= future.

= E[hm.

[And we have to have a legal framework that does protect. Eh th-the people in this country. =

= Can I repeat the question, eh would you be prepared to see the bill fall, rather than concede (to) a Sunset Clause.

[think that what we’ve got to do today; that is say to the House of Lords, look we’ve offered the annual renewal here, [.ehm and we’ve got all the safe guards here.] The =

= Sunset Clause says that the Sunset Clause should expire in November. Eh Frank Dobson made some very practical points in the House yesterday, [.h] that by the time =

= possibly we have an election, eh we then have a summer recess, we’d only have weeks [to look at legislation. =

= Well hang on a minute. “We’d only have weeks to look
at legislation" remind us how- eh quickly you’ve tried to
rush this through. .h I mean the la:st person, .h to say:,.
that eh the timetable between now and November is too
short to produce measured legislation is surely a minister
who was trying to do this in the time scale that is even
opposed in Parliament.

IE2: .h It’s- it’s not a- a time scale tha- that we would have
wanted. What we’ve got here [h., is that- (.) we’ve-

IR: [Well it’s the one: you’ve got

by your own efforts.

IE2: No we have a time scale because we had the House of
Lords’ decision from the sixteenth of
December, h we have to respond to thati,

IR: [.h Because as David Davis pointed out, you didn’-
act- on the Lord- Newton Committee .h
recommendations, .h which predicted precisely what was
going to happen, .h and gave you the opportunity as a
government, .h to correct the legislation, to avoid, .h in
precisely this kind of mess whether it’s political or
constitution. You didn’t take that
eh advice. You ended up with a Law Lords’ judgment
which many people saw: coming. .h And then you say oh
dear we’ve got a legislate in a hurry. Isn’t that
incompetence. =

IE2: = No we waited properly, for the outcome of our legal
system in this country >and< don’t forget, the Court of
Appeal unanimously upheld the power for provisions, and
it was only when it came to the House of Lords that they
decided they were incompatible. .h Now because we’ve =

IR: [.hhhh

IE2: = responded properly, [to the decisions of the]

IR: [h h h. ]

IE2: = Courts in this country, eh which is a bit of irony
considering some of the discussion that’s gone on in the
last few weeks? We waited for the legal system to take its
courses, we had since the sixteenth of December, .h
we’ve come up with what I think is a good legal
framework, of control orde:rs, trying to prevent acts of
terrorism, that could damage this country enormously. And
let's just say now, we've got the decision of the elected
House. Now say to the House of Lords, >that< think how
far we've moved, an- and let's have this legislation on the
statute book. so that we can protect people in
th[is country.

IR: [.h Ehm. (. ) eh can we just- eh clea:r one thing up before
we move on. Absolutely no: Sunset Clause, is that the
government policy.

IE2: hh Well, we feel that we really ha:ve moved enormously h.
eh in terms of the annual renewal of this legislation, h and
independent eh re- eh review of it†, every twelve
month? h If there is a deroga†tion, you have to review the
deroga†tion every twelve month†, h eh and a three
monthly report to Parliament. Goodness me, h you know
we are putting in pl[ace,] a who:le ra:[nge of checks and =

IR: [.h ] [Wel-

IE2: = balance here.

IR: Mhh h. (.0) no Sunset Clause? Yes or no.

IE2: Well we want the House of Lo:rds to: consider carefully
today how far we've moved h., ehm an- an- an- to be
[sensible on this issue. =

IR: [Well-

IE2: = Give us [the bill, get it on the statute book, and then =

IE2: = let's take it fo[ward.

IR: [I have to say, I mean I don't want to get
into business of repeating a question again and again, but it
must be fairly obvious everyone's listening, h everyone
who was listening, h that you've got the Sunset Clause up
your slee:ve, and if you've got to, you'll put it on the table

IE2: .h No I- l- I think today: that the House of Lords, h should
recognize that the elected chamber by a signif[icant
majority, [.h has voted for the legislation as it stands now.]

IR: [.h Hang on, you've made that point, yeah, ]

But you see-, loo- look at wha:t you were saying yourself
in the wind-up speech, e::h eh last night in the
Commons, .hh you said that this bill was necessary to se:nd
a message to the terrorists. [The Pri]me Minister, hang =
IE2: on, the Prime Minister talked about a clear signal. We are talking here about people who are said by the Prime Minister and by the security agencies to be highly trained, determined people, fanatics perhaps, terrorists who are determined to attack this country. Are you really saying that this kind of legislation is all about, sending a message to them, so that they will behave differently, sending a signal. Surely it's about the ways in which a democratic country can imprison people and punish them if they are doing wrong. Talk about sending a signal to people, what signals are they going to recognize.

IE2: Mcht this legislation is about having some practical measures, in which we can control people who we know pose a serious and significant threat to this country.

IR: [So it’s not about sending a message to terrorist.]

IE2: But it is also about saying that we are clear about what we want to do: We want to try make the UK the most hostile environment we can for terrorist opera(tion). We’ve been successful in doing that so far, that’s one of the reasons why we haven’t seen the kind of atrocity that’s been out there.

IR: [because we have been, very determined, very clear, =

IE2: about the measures that we’ll take, not just in terms of =

IR: [.h

IE2: the control orders, but attacking terrorist [financing, eh =

IR: [.hh

IE2: th- all the infrastructure that underpins them. I think we’ve just got to be very clear, [that these control orders =

IR: [w-

IE2: are what we need to prevent the kind of thing happening. =

IR: = Mch hh. (. eh:m (0.2) you say that the changes ehm introduced over the last few days, in response to (. ) criticism, ehm have improved this legislation. Do you think it’s a better bill, h as a result of the changes that have
been forced on you.

IE2: Well I think certainly the issues around consulting the police about ongoing eh prosecution are important. because we've always said that prosecution is our preferred method, and we have prosecuted people for [terrorism].

IR: [What about the involvement of the judges. Does the government now accept that it's better to have that in the bill than- than not as once the case?]

IE2: Eh what I think we- we set at the outset that we've thought these matters were properly. eh a decision for the executive because they: eh entailed review of intelligence, not just evidence. And again I don't think that points come over clearly enough, that this is about an assessment of a risk, because they are preventative orders. But we did recognize, firstly for the derogated =

IR: [.hh hh.]

IE2: = orders, eh th- the sanctions could be quite (. ) dramatic, and therefore, eh judges ought to make the deci[sion? ] =

IR: [.hh ]

IE2: = And for the other orders we think there en there should be judicial involvement. That would reassure people that we are not acting as an arbitrary ex[ecutive ] here.

IR: [Righ(t).]

IR: .(.) Finally, what many of your critics want is an indication that you are not acting in an arbitrary way?, want to give yourself time to produce more considered legislation, hh is a date (. ) on which (. ) this legislation (. ) would lapse. Is that, absolutely, ruled out, by: the Home Office, and the Prime Minister.

IE2: W- what we've said is we want to bring forward legislation eh about possibly offenses preparatory terro[rism. =

IR: [So the answer is no.]

IE2: And to look at that, ehm and you know we're really gonna try today, to get our legisla[tion ] on the statute book. =

IR: [Yeah]

IE2: = That's what I want to see happe[n.

IR: [But you ha-]

But you haven't ruled
IE2: °.h° Well, we think we’ve done enough? E:hm we want the Lords to recognize that we’ve done enough to move in that direction? h. [Eh but we are absolutely determined to =

IE2: = get our legislation, that can control the possibility of- the kind of atrocities that people undoubtedly h. eh (are) planning, an- trying control that and prevent it happen.

IR: Hazel Blares, thank you.
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IR: Sarah Montague
IE: Stephen Twig, the School Minister
(background introduction and speeches omitted)

01 IR: Tim Collins. Well I asked the school's minister Stephen
02 Twig whether it wasn't too early to tell whether so much
03 money, = five billion pounds, .h should be invested in city
04 academies.
05 IE: While I was visiting an academy earlier this week, the
06 academy at Peckham, which replaced the Warwick (part)
07 school, .hh and one of the pupils said to me .h that we
08 should have opened the academy years ago. .h He felt he
09 had been let down by us not opening the academy
10 sooner. .h I don't think we can leave .h failing school:ls
11 continue to fail, .h some of the most deprived
12 communicates in this country. Academies are about meet
13 real educational need, .h in some of those most deprived
14 communities.
15 IR: So why is it, that so many of them are at the bottom of the
16 league tables.
17 IE: It's not at all surprising that in the test results for fourteen
18 year-olds academies are towards the bottom. .h Most of
19 these academies have only been open for one year or
20 two:. .h For the three year period that's been tested, .h most
21 of the children weren't in an academy. We would expect
22 them to be: having very challenging results at this stage.
23 What we want to ensure, is the highest quality of teaching
24 and learning, in all these academies. .h And every
25 indication that I've had from the visits I've made, .h but
26 also from (off-stead's) initial reports into h. the academies
27 that have been open for two yea↑rs, .h is that we're getting
28 some really high quality, head-teachers and teachers, into
29 these academi[es.
30 IR: [>But hold on a second.< You've got ni:ne
31 out of the eleven: city academies that were included in
32 these tests came at the bottom two hundred schoo:ls. .hh
33 Now, .h you can argue look it's- that it's too early to tell
34 whether there has been an improvement. = But if that's the
35 case then it's too early to tell whether you should be

548
IE: There are two tribes of academy. There are those that are brand new schools and clearly none of them were in these test results. There are those that replace existing schools, by their nature, are struggling or failing schools that have languished at the bottom. = And that's the case with all the schools. That have been referred to in the results that are published today. What I think is we can't simply leave communities being failed by their local education service. One of the best indicators is the number of parents who are choosing to send their children to these academy schools, and the numbers are very very impressive indeed.

IR: As the Education Select Committee says, you've got a plan to put five billion pounds in which is an awful lot of money because these are expensive schools, to expand this program to two hundred schools. Why not go to perhaps thirty or fifty schools while you're assessing whether they are working.

IE: What we want to do is to learn from the evidence how these schools operate in practice and that is why we have a piece of research in place. We will have the evidence from that research as the program expands. And if there are lessons that we can learn along the way, then of course.

IR: [Have you are you saying you've got the evidence now.]

(0.2)

IE: The evidence we have now is of schools that are failing their communities and of communities that are being failed by the education service. [That is why: we've gone to this radical new approach.]

IR: [Yes, but do you have the evidence that these schools are making a difference. I'm talking about un- do you have some un:published evidence that we have not seen that proves that these schools work.

IE: We do have evidence from GCSE results which overall...
for the academies have improved above the national average. I don’t want to read too much into that because we are starting from the very low base with these schools, but there are some evidence that there are already improvement. I am convinced that the resource that we are putting in is a very worthwhile resource to get better education, for some of the most deprived communities in our country.

IR: Your policy across the whole of secondary schools relies on, the workforce agreement that you had agreed with unions. The National Association of Head-teachers has now pulled out of that. What are you going to do about it.

IE: Can I say first of all that I very much regret the decision that has been taken by the National Association of Head-teachers yesterday, at their special conference. But I need to make very clear, that this does not affect what is a statutory entitlement, for teachers, to have planning preparation and assessment time from this September. That will go ahead. And we will carry on, with all of the other unions that remain signed up to this agreement, with local government, because it’s so important, for children’s education, that this agreement moves forward.

IR: (Of) they say they just don’t have the money to do it.

IE: We’ve put a great deal of effort into ensuring that the money is there. So for example, in the financial settlement for the coming year, primary schools are getting more money than secondary schools because we recognized, to carry out the agreement, primaries would need that extra money. And I think the majority—

IR: [So are you saying that they are wrong, that they do have the money and can do this.

IE: I recognize that there are issues in some parts of the country, but all of the evidence that I’ve seen, is that the majority of schools, are quietly getting on with the task, of remodeling their workforce, so that teachers can have that ten percent planning preparation and assessment time, and children can benefit, from that.
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IR: = What does remodeling their workforce mean because eh, David Hart had said heads are simply not prepared to make staff redundant in order to give teachers this preparation time. Is that what you mean by remodeling.

IE: Mcht no not at all. What we mean by remodeling is bringing in new specialists into school so for example, what some schools are doing, is providing the ten percent time for the broad teaching workforce by bringing in sports specialist to improve the quality of physical education in school sport. For years we have been told that teachers are overburdened and overworked with too much paperwork and bureaucracy. What this agreement does is to give teachers that guarantee of ten percent time, for planning for preparation and assessment. Children will benefit from that.

IR: [eh-°]

IR: Stephen Twig, thank you.

IE: Thank you very much Sarah.
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IR: Jim Naughtie

IE: Graham Allen, Labor MP in Nottinghamshire

01 IR: It’s now thirteen minutes past seven. What’s going on in Nottinghamshire. The Chief Constable says he hasn’t enough officers to cope with murder investigations and violent crime. Yet we know that police funding’s at record level of the coming financial year. It’s gonna go to twelve billion pounds. So what’s the problem. Is it paperwork and bureaucracy as it’s sometimes claimed? Is it the way forces are using the money in deploying their officers. The comments of the Chief Constable, Steven Greejn, have certainly irritated Graham Allen who’s Labor MP from Nottingham North who’s speaking to a Home Office minister Hazel Blears today and joins us now. Mr. Allen, good morning.

IE: [Morning Jim.

07 IR: [.h Ehm, presumabl:: ey- you: believe that the Chief Constable is just telling it as he sees it.

11 IE: Mcht well, there’s a lot of people in Nottingham will fighting back against the serious crime that undoubtedly exist in our city but, talking down Nottingham, demoralizing your own workforce and this constant excuse finding really has got no place in that fight back. We need: inspirational leadership and motivation, to actually take on these bad guys, rather than this constantly running to the national newspapers, complaining about how bdg things [are. °We°] =

18 IR: [.hWell-]

23 IE = need to get in there be positive.[h (In a-) If Ste]ve =

29 IR: [It may well be that-]

36 IE: = Green has got some problems about .h bureaucracy or anything else, .h he can as he know:s,.h use me† or anybody e†ise or get in front of Home Ocer- Office offici†als,.h or ministe†rs,.h and we will do our level best,.h But just to-.h see these things appear:.h in a Sunday newspaper,.h makes it look as though,.h eh that’s where the action is rather (than) on the ground, where our communities are fighting so ha::rf[d, ] against some of the =
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IR: [°e-° ]
IE: = worst villains in the UK. =
IR: = Well it may be., I can’t speak for him, but may well be
that, he thinks that, h ehm i-] it’s time to express his =
IE: = [hhhh. ]
IR: = frustration: with- you know the government say “well there
are more policing- numbers, there’s more money”, h (s) all
the rest of it. h When in fa:ct, he is struggling against the
system where the Home Office target mea:ns that more
police have to spend their time hh [eh ] doing =
IE: [Ehm.]
IR: = bureauc[ratic jobs of various so†rts, some no doubt are =
IE: [.hh
IR: = important, but some, [.hh that he maybe rega:rded =
IE: [e-
IR: = [a: ]s pointle†ss,
IE: [Yeah. ]
IR = and instead of having people at the scene of a crime.
IE: Indeed, and if eh there a:re problems in the way.; I w- w- I
can assure you Jim that we’re all working as a community, as
a council, eh as members of parliament to try to eradicate a:ll
those problems. h But we don’t- it doesn’t help us, any of
us, h to see those things going straight into the newspapers
rather than h If you want to (.) solve the problem about
extra bureaucracy†, h then make sure you get your message
in front of [ministers], make sure you put your MPs to =
IR [hh. ]
IE: = work >as< we all willingly do. =
IR = Well, [hh.
IE: [But this constant running, (.) h to: e:h
[newsapers, ]
IR [You say constant.] =
IE: = Well >I think it’s a:t< .h in the Daily Mail before there is a
sort of = I wish thee .h policing strategy was effective as
Steven Green’s own (.) personal media strategy. [.h
IR: [Do you
think it’s got to do with the election. =
IE: = I think s- eh some of this- eh that’s the question mark
really which I’ll be raising to Hazel Blears. = Is this
appropriate for someone in: h. the chief constable's position
h.. e:h (. ) possibly weeks before an election, (.) to be:
featured on the [front page of: the leading =
[hh
]
Conservative newspaper h., making highly political points,
which he hasn't made to me. I have spoken to Steven
Green. h. a dozen times in the last three or four w\'eeks. .h
He's never mentioned the problems th'(t) he now says that
(are) so important that they need to go on to the front page of
Sunday Telegraph. =
Eh- well, on the other hand, i- i- if you want attention
drawn to this, he's gone the right way about it, because, we
are discussing it now? [Then people will discuss it quite =
[No thee thee-
= properly.
These things are too serious Jim. This isn't about filling
newspaper space or the air time on the Today Program. =
These are- things that affect my constituents' lives every
single day of their lives. = Many live in fear†, .h because of
thee eh way that the drug barons are lording it in certain
places of Nottingham. .hh And we are now fighting back. We
have a tremendous community effort. .h And, b- above all,
led by the officers on the ground, the superb officers. .h in
the Nottinghamshire constabulary. .h And they see the guy;,
who is meant to be leading this h., eh behaving like the man
on the terrace, rather than the manager of the team.
Well, we'll be discussing this further after eight o'clock,
Graham Allen, thanks very much.
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[61] Thursday 28 April 2005: Britain in Europe
IR: John Humphrys
IE1: Simon Butby, who runs the Britain in Europe campaign
IE2: Oliver Letwin, Shadow Chancellor

IR: It is not very likely that Britain will join the Euro. Well now there is a surprise. What is surprising perhaps is (that) the man who’s finally said so is Tony Blair, the man who has fought for it for so long. Some say he regarded it as one of the cornerstone to his time in office, and when he leaves office, the man is likely to move into Number ten assuming there will be election of course (.) is Gordon Brown. And he, of course, is the man who has put so many obstacles in the way of joining. So, that’s that then, all over for Britain and the Euro. I’ll be talking, to the Shadow Chancellor Oliver Letwin in a moment? First Simon Butby who runs the Britain in Europe campaign, bit of blow for you Simon Butby or did you expect this.

IE1: Well it’s always disappointing to hear bad news that Britain is further than ever away from the heart of Europe. But as you just said, it can hardly be surprising. Britain’s chances of joining the Euro in the foreseeable future have long been dead, and I can totally understand why Labor are just trying to remove any ambiguity to nail down, a potentially weak flank in advance of next week’s general election.

IR: [And why has it long been dead, do you think?
IE1: Mcht, well I think that—eh some years ago the government didn’t want to confront some of the hostility in the certain sections of the newspapers. (And once they—)
IR: [So was it cowardice then.
IE1: Mcht, well I think that perhaps was a lack of bravery as a more charitable way of putting it. But what I would say, is if back in nineteen ninety six—seven, when Labor were going for that general election, if they’d said that they were effectively ruling out the prospects of joining the Euro for three Parliaments which is now, more or less where we will be, there would have been a terrible outcry. But the
fact that the ehm Prime Minister has said what he said yesterday and there's more of a...a whimper than a bang shows how far the argument has been lost. = And it asks questions as to whether there will be a referendum on the European constitution if as I hope, the government is re-elected.

IR: Now, doesn't it suggest too that the never going to happen. I mean can you see any circumstances in which it might happen. = Clearly not if we get a Conservative government, eh under Gordon Brown government?

IE1: Mcht well it's certainly in Britain's long term strategic interests to be: eh close to our leading trading [ table ]

IR: [Ah but I'm saying can you see the circumstances.

IE1: Well the a- u- this argument swings about- and it has done for generations, in certainly no circumstances where the Conservative's to be elected, or because of course they effectively rule out the Euro for ever. More than that, they continue to argue that we should re-negotiate the terms of our membership. And of course they have been playing on some of the fears raised in the newspapers, to drag Britain further and further away from the top [ table =]

IR: [Right.]

IE1: = and closer and closer to the exit door, which would be utterly disastrous for our country.

IR: Simon Butby, many thanks. Oliver Letwin as I say is on the line. = They shot your fox, Mr. Letwin.

IE2: Awh totally unclear I have to say what the Prime Minister's position is. Our position is as you mentioned [ Well pretty clear, he doesn't want to go into Euro now. It's all over. ]

IE2: [Well our position is certainly perfectly clear? We're against the Euro. We: believe:ve that: the Bank of England is the right set of people to set interest rates (.) for Britain. But what the Prime Minister just said is eh as you quoted, it doesn't look very likely does it. =
>Now< h before the ninety seven election he said (. ) he had love for the pound. .hh Eh then in eh two thousa\textsuperscript{nd}, we were told by hi\textsuperscript{t}m. .h I think I'm quot\textsuperscript{ing}, "to rule out to the Euro in the next Parliament is foolish (and) backwa\textsuperscript{rd}. I shall have no part in that\textsuperscript{t}, either in the next election, o:r in the future?" = So he said h., in two thousand he'd never rule i[t out?]. .h And then he told us =

IR: [Yes. ]

IE2: = in two thousand and three\textsuperscript{r}, that he had a pa:th which is clea:\textsuperscript{r}, .h eh something we- want to do, = I'm quoting again, = "we've got a process in place to move the obstac\textsuperscript{t}les. .hh It's eh entirely un:clea:\textsuperscript{r} (. ) opposite (two) positions.

IR: [But why is it entirely unclear. I mean what- what he did. (Will he send) to the Chancellor, now set the tests, eh if we pass the tests that you have se\textsuperscript{t} h., eh given all the other things, = all those other- eh triple lock and all that, .h we (will) join the Euro. .h Well the Chancellor said we haven't passed those te\textsuperscript{t}sts, (0.2) and that's it. Entirely sensible, [isn't it. _

IE2: [So-

IE2: = So why didn't the Prime Minister say:: eh yesterda\textsuperscript{y}, not it doesn't look very likely, but we won't join the Euro. [(…Conservatives say…)

IR: [Because we might pass the tests at some time in the future presumably.

IE2: Oh I see so ac\textsuperscript{tually the Prime Minister-

IR: [Or ( ) pass the test.

IE2: Actually in your view the Prime Minist\textsuperscript{er isn\textsuperscript{t} ruling-

IR: [No not my view

I'm- I'm- I'm offering you a(h) (£)(if you) you ask [me =

IE2: [haha [Jo:h:n,

IR: = a question and I'm telling you who (wa::nt) eh

[th- th- th- the answer might be:. (£)

IE2: [Bu- but John the im-

IE2: The implication of what you've just said is that actually the Prime Minister isn't ruling it out. (. ) [Now-

IR: [No (£) I've no idea

( ) of course. (£)
Precisely. None of us has the [slightest idea, [whether the Prime Minister is ruling it out or not ruling it out, h and that’ bad for Britain. It’s bad for our economy, it’s bad for our business, h they don’t know: whether under a Labor government if one were re-elected h, eh they would or wouldn’t see the Euro. If they vote Conservative, and there’s a Conservative government, it’s very clear, there will not be (. ) Britain join Euro because we think the Bank of England is the right h set of people to run interest rates for this country.

And you- you have said, in- indeed you have said unlike Labor, and this is in your manifesto, unlike Labor, and the Liberal Democrats, we will not join the Euro. h Well [but- (. ) ]

[Correct.]

I(h)- The problem is now: you have the Prime Minister himself say: we- we won’ [( ) either. Well we- we pro- we probably- (£) when ]

[No:, we’ve just- we’ve just discovered we don’t ( ) what the Prime Minister said.]

= we(£) ha ha it is unlikely that we will join the [Euro.

E- e- e- I have learned that when the Prime Minister says it’s unlikely that something will happen, h it very often presages the exact opposite happening. Al- when the Prime Minister (he) said (in) h every one was to be led to suppose that-eh he wasn’t going to raise national insurance before the last election, h it was followed immediately after the election by raising national insurance.

Yeah but the fact is in this particular case he- he has firmly planted the impression, very firmly indeed that we are not going to join [the Euro.

W- w- what an interesting term of phrase John, he’s firmly planted the impression, = Yes, but he hasn’t said the words, has he. [.hh
[Well he has said it's unlikely that we'll join the Euro, (that's ( )]

That's very different from saying he won't do it.

Uhm we but-

[And it's intended to be different, because he intends that if he then does it, he and you have him on this program, and you say, "you said Prime Minister that you wouldn't do it", he can say to you "Oh no I didn't John. I just said it doesn't look very likely well now it is likely indeed it's happening". =

But my- my opening question to you was that he has shot your fox and that is effectively what he's done, hasn't he, because then- then now::.. you don't- have any great electoral advantage if you ever did from your European position. Simon Butby said .h eh your only position seems to be to move us further and further away from Europe, and ultimately, perhaps even to pull out altogether.

Well I disagree with every part of that statement John. Eh first of all we haven't bee::n e:h highlighting this particular h. issue [in our =

[( )]

election campaign which is about schools, hospitals, and: h public services [and ta]xes,

[Immigration and so on. .h Butt, e:h eh I believe we do have a significant electoral advantage derived from what the Prime Minister has now do]ne, because it again raises the issue of trust. Instead of actually saying clearly openly straightforwardly we won't join the Euro, o]r equally clearly and straightforwardly we will? What he's saying is (. ) speculatively it doesn't look very likely, which is [inten ]ded in your words to plant an =

[>Righ(t)<.]

= impression, without actually saying some[thing clear, that's a very ] wrong =

[Well let me suggest you:]
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192 IE2: = thing to do.  
193 IR: [Let me suggest you where you've planted impression. You want to pull out, [eh of thee: eh or =  
195 [((sound of turning paper))  
196 IR: = re-negotiate as I think you would put it the fisheries policy which you regarded as immensely damaging to Britain's interest. The fact is, if they won't let you re-negotiate you have absolutely no choice but to go along with it or ultimately, to pull out of Europe. Now clear that one up for us [if you will.  
203 IE2: [No no no no, absolutely not. We: are committed, to having a referendum on the constitution. We are committed to campaigning for a no-vote in that referendum. We believe that there's every chance (of) Conservative government could persuade the British public, to vote no (.) in such (.) a referendum on the constitution. We will then have the basis for negotiation, because we will be able to exercise the veto, against that constitution.  
213 IR: Oliver Letwin, many than[k]s.  
214 IE2: [Thank you very much.
[62] Tuesday 08 March 2005: speed bumps
IR: John Humphrys
IE1: Robert Gifford, executive director at the Parliamentary Advisory Committee for Transport Safety
IE2: Tim Yeo, Conservative Transport spokesman

01 IR: Quarter past seven? The Conservatives want to abolish speed humps. They are putting forward an amendment to the Roads Safety Bill, which will take them off the roads in a couple of years. Their Transport spokesman Tim Yeo is with us? We're also joined by Robert Gifford who is executive director at the Parliamentary Advisory Committee for Transport Safety? lobby group on road safety issues. And you must give a rather a fan of these things. Do you think they work.

02 IE1: Yes. Well, the research tells (that) England, we first of all we should remember that road humps have been around for twenty years now. Eh, and research tells us that they reduce valid mortalities, between seventeen and fifty nine percent. There are hundreds of pedestrians and cyclists alive today: who otherwise would have been killed by cars going too fast for the roads they were driving down. So they really are a success story. We've got to think very carefully about their removal.

03 IR: What about the idea that the way people speed up and slow down when they are traveling along a road with humps, is actually more dangerous than people concentrating consistently at a lower speed.

04 IE1: Well, there's no evidence that that happens. I mean there's plenty of advice and guidance from the department about both the height of a road hump and the spacing of a road hump to prevent that happening. Uhm; there is anecdotal evidence that: what one might call the young boy racer does adjust to that. But I think he would probably do that anyway, and: the humps are just eh: you know further encouragement, so I'm I'm sorry to say ( )I(h) ( ) don't think there's any research evidence that says that's the problem.

05 IR: And you really can be as specific as you-
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35 IE1: [keh]
36 IR: = you’ve just been on the question of the percentage of-
37 hh. a reduction in fatality rates, .h uhm uh which are
38 directly attributable to humps. =
39 IE1: = Yes we ca: n, because local authorities are a: sked to:
40 think very carefully where they should place humps. E:h
41 they have to do bfo:re and after analysis, and therefore
42 they are able to show:: that- you know in the three years
43 bfo:re a measure was put in,.h >there were that many
44 fatalities and that many serious injuries and three years
45 afterwards there were that many, = and that show::s that
46 humps wo:rk, humps are a success story. .hh Clearly not
every road hump is the right hump in the right place. I’m
48 not going to defend every single one. .h But I am going
to say that we should think very carefully about: their
whole (fair) removal which this proposed Clause appears
to do.:
52 IR: Robert Gifford many thanks. Tim Yeo, they a:re a success
53 story, why on earth you’re trying to get rid of them. =
54 IE2: = .hh Eh well good morning it. Im- improving road
55 safety is one of the three key aims of our roads policy,
56 along with cutting congestion, .h an- and reducing the
damage vehicles do to the environment. Killing three
58 thousand people a year:, wouldn’t be tolerated in the rail
59 ways, wouldn’t be tolerated in the air o:r at sea, so .hh we
60 won’t tolerate it on the roads either. .h An- and we’ll
61 make sure that part of our road spending, .h i- is
62 specifically to meeting, t- to making those roads that
63 have been identified by the AA, .h eh on the list, e:h as-
as the most dangerous one, making those
64 one’s safety[. () safer.
66 IR: [.h [Yeah, but that doesn’t quite address the
67 question, >tht< these things work, why get rid of them. =
68 IE2: = .h Well our approach to- safety will be evidence based.
69 = We want to use the limited resources in the most
effective way:. .h E:h speed bumps certainly make two
70 of our key policy aims actually worse. They h. eh
71 increase the pollution on a street when cars stop and
72 sta:rt, that makes the air quality worse? .h They certainly
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make congestion worse? Because instead of traffic
flowing, h freely, = perhaps slowly but freely along a
street, it has to stop and start. = So they completely fail
on those two criteria. [..h
IR: [But they keep people alive. =
IE2: = Well, as far as thee evidence about that is concerned, =
we are certainly prepared to examine it. = The purpose of
this amendment, which we will not press to a vote if it
gets debated, .h it is to explore the evidence. = It's
what's, .h eh called in th- in- in the jargon, a probing
amendment. .h I'm aware that the chairman of the
London Ambulance Service h. e::h said in- in two
thousand and three, that hundreds of deaths .h eh may be
cau[ed by ambulances being delayed h. eh in: getting to
hospitals. = The .h the eh a one minute delay in getting to
a .h cardiac (rest) patient h. eh may be the difference
between life and death. = So the evidence is by no means
a[ll the one way. .h [Eh (at least)- (. ) (least) ] =
IR: [But- [Can I- Can I just- just (to)-]
IE2: = also said that h. e:h dri- speed bumps increase the
response times h., eh tha- their vehicles were involved in
going to emergency.
IR: Can I just for the record so tht listeners can- can hear it
(rega:d what I: understand to be the text of your (.)
amendment, which read as follow:s, .hh no new speed
humps intended for traffic-calming purposes should be
constructed on any public road or highway. Within two
years of the commencement of this Act, (. ) every
highway authority should ensure that all speed humps hh.
constructed for traffic-calming purposes shall be
removed from all public roads within their area. So are
you saying that you don’t actually (. ) mean that.
	{(paper
turning))}
IE2: {.hh In-
in- } in common with dozens of amendments that
are tabled in Parliament everyday, the purpose of this is
to force the minister to do something which he wouldn’t
otherwise do:. .h And that explain:ns the reasons for his
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113 policy.
114 IR: So you don’t actually mean the amendment.
115 [You just want to- (.) generate discussion.]
116 IE2: [I- w- ou- our poli]cy (.) is not to construct new speed humps. We think that’s eh unjustified (with) it doesn’t meet the aims of our policy,
117 = those aims can be mar- met far more effectively, .h in other ways. = As I’ve explained it actually makes .h congestion and pollution worse. .h Eh as far as the removal of existing speed humps are concerned, .h we want to examine the argument, the costs and so on to see whether that’s an effective way:; .h of using resources to improve safety. .h But this amendment as I said in co- in common with dozens of others, is intended to force
118 [a debate.] It’s intended to make sure the =
119 IR: [°.hh° ]
120 IE2: = minister, .h sets up the reasons why, .h they are having a policy, which makes congestion worse, which makes pollution worse, which delays ambulances reaching patients, and which delays police vehicles getting to emergency.
121 IR: [Tcht, Tim Yeo, thank you.]
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Thursday 7 April 2005: IRA-2 David Trimble
IR: Jim Naughtie
IE0: Ian Paisley Junior, Justice spokesman for the Democratic Unionists
IE-1: Dominic Bradley, SDLP’s West Minster candidate for Newry and Armagh
IE: David Trimble, leader of the Ulster Unionist

IR: Mcht. Jerry Adams says th’ although he wants to justify what he calls the arm struggle by the IRA, he can’t do so: any
longer. .h So the election campaign in Northern Ireland, .h begins with question about what effect (. ) the Sinn Fein
president statement will have on the Republicans and Nationalist? .h and indeed about what the IRA will say
formally .h in response. (b) .h On the Unionists si:de, of politics, there is (. ) of course, deep suspicion. Ian Paisley
Junior is (. ) Justice spokesman (. ) .h for the Democratic Unionists.

IE0: We have never (. ) accept the wo t rds, or the waffle †, or the (piled heart ringing) tones of Jerry Adams, .h no matter how:
e:::h pains worthy he seems to think they are. We have always said, where is the base, where is the action, how are these words backed up. = And you’ll see in the text of the statement, = if you take time to study it, .h there’s not a word about decommissioning, not a word about h. e:hm the procedured cri † me, = there’s not a word about Northern Bank? = And these words, (. ) no matter how it (pa:ss), or no matter how it (perceive), they might actually sign to this (act). We will not be buying (. ) this statement or these words. We want actions.

IR: Mcht. .h Ian Paisley Junior. Dominic Bradley † a member of the Northern Ireland Assembly and the SDLP:s West Minster candidate for Newry and Armagh, .h said his constituents had greeted Mr. Adams’ statement (. ) with skepticism.

IE-1: I’ve been speaking to (. ) people on the street in Newry and Armagh. .hh and I must say that there’s a certain amount of (. ) skepticism, .h that this statement has been delivered in the month- month of an election. .h And there’s a result (. ) of sustained pressure. (. ) .h But the: people are saying to me:, that these actions, are not (worth account). And they (. ) want
to know (0.2) that the IRA is actually (0.2) ending all the
(activity), (. ) and ending its participation in organized crime,
once and for all.

IR: .h uhm Dominic Bradley of the Nationalist SDLP. We are
joined by David Trimble, leader of the Ulster Unionists. Yes
Mr. Trimble, good morning. .h

IE: [Good morning. =

IR: = Ehm i- obviously, there is an election: o:n? Equally
obviously the republican (. ) movement in Northern Ireland
is- being under huge pressure in recent months because of
thee .h bank robbery and the McCartney murder h.. E::hm (.)
but do you think that, these words (. ) could (. ) be a sign of (. )
progress?

IE: .hh Well I think (. ) eh Mr. Bradley is quite right to: be:
skeptical eh eh being if- rather cynical about the timing of it?
(. ) E::h for our part, we remember, that ba:ck in May of two
thousand, the IRA made a promise to us, .h that they get rid
of their weapons completely in a ma(tt)er, .h they said that
would maximize public confidence? .hhh And h. we had a
few gestures, but ah no fundamental change. And that’s the
question, are we going to see a fundamental change. .h And I
think people quite rightly are going to say, .h well let us see
[what =

IR: [.hh

IE: = actually happens. .hhh I have a suspicion (. ) that this
statement coming at this time isn’t actually end of the
electorate in Northern Ireland, but as end of the government
(. ) in London. (. ) And I think its objective is to try to
dissuade the government from exploring other possibility. =
you see over .h the last few weeks, the government h’s .h eh
been saying to the Republican Movement, .h eh th’t they
have to do something or else (. ) the government will >( )<
saying .h that eh if they don’t (. ) achieve progress with
Republicans then they have to explore other ways forward. .h
And I think the objective of this, .hh eh is to keep the
government on o- on the hook, that they have them. Eh one
thing that’s been quite remarkable is how (it) despite
everything that’s happened, (. ) over the last few years we had
the assembly collapsed nearly three years ago, we had all the things that the Republicans have done since then in terms of (balance) and criminality. But yet the belief has still existed within the government, in the good faith of these people.

IR: Yes.

IE: [And that’s the objective here] to try keep it’s =

IR: [Well-]

IE: = crucial, that the government emancipates itself eh from the spell that [Mr. Adams has cast on them.

IR: [D’y-

IR: Do you think it’s possible, that Mr. Adams means it.

IE: hhhh We gave him, I don’- I don’t know, eh nor did I know: when he made similar promises to us years ago. But we gave him the chance to prove it. () Eh and what he did prove was that there was a limit to how far the republican movement was going to go. And for the last three years, since the collapse of the assembly, we’ve come up against that limit time and time again. = It’s not just once. hh There have been three distinct attempts over those years, to achieve progress every one of which, has foundered on the refusal of the republican movement, to change fundamentally. Gestures they’ve made, they’ve reduced the level of violence, they’ve done some decommissioning, but they’ve refused to wind up the private army. [And I doubt if =

IR: [Ok.

IE: = there’s going to be a fundamental change now.

IR: .h () David Trimble? Thank you very much.
NOTES

1 In Conversation Analysis, there are `adjacency pairs' in interactions, such as question-answer, summons-answer, request-action, invitation-acceptance/rejection, etc. The turn by the first speaker, i.e. the question, summons, request, or invitation in previous examples of adjacency pairs, is called the first pair part; while the turn by the recipient (or the second speaker), i.e. the answer, answer, action, or acceptance/rejection in previous examples, is called the second pair part.

2 In later part of this thesis, `questions' and `question turns' are used interchangeably when referring to the IR turns in the news interview.

3 In a strict sense, there is difference between `response' and `answer' to a question: `response' only indicates `responding to' a question, without necessarily providing the `answer' to the question; while `answer' indicates an `answer' has been provided for the question. However, in this thesis, these two terms are not always strictly distinguished. I have been trying to use these two terms in their strict sense wherever possible; however, there are some cases where these two terms are used interchangeably just to refer to the IE's turn—either `answer turn' or `response'. Therefore, `answer turn' in this thesis does not in any case indicate that an `answer' has been provided for the question; it simply refers to the IE turn.

4 Transition-relevance place (abbreviated as TRP in CA) is where the speaker's utterance is considered grammatically, pragmatically, and prosodically complete, and therefore it is ok then for the transfer of speaker-ship in the next turn.

5 There are various unit-types with which a speaker may set out to construct a turn. Unit-types for English included sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical constructions. (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974:702)

6 Pre-expansion comes before first pair part as preparation for it, such as pre-invitation, pre-offer, pre-request, etc. For example, before a speaker gives an invitation, he/she often checks first whether the to-be-invited person (people) will be free for the invitation or not—this sequence of checking the appropriateness of invitation is pre-invitation. Pre-expansion is something that leads up to the intended sequence of interactions.

7 Goffman introduced the footing concept in order to explore the nature of involvement and participation in social interaction. He suggested that there are varying forms and degrees of participation. Speakers, for example, may take up various footings in relation to their own remarks. They may convey distinctions between the 1) animator, 2) author, and 3) principal of what is said. The “animator” is the person who presently utters a sequence of words. The one who originated the beliefs and sentiments, and perhaps also composed the words through which they are expressed, is the “author”. Finally, the “principal” is the person whose viewpoint or position is currently being expressed in and through the utterance. (Clayman, 1992: 165)

8 Although this implication is not applicable in today's society any more, it was
working at that time of example, when most people only had children after marriage.

9 Initiative refers to ‘the extent to which the question is enterprising rather than passive in its aims’. It can be achieved through use of preface, asking more than one question within a single turn at talk, or asking a follow-up question. (Clayman and Heritage, 2006: pp11-12)

10 Directness is ‘the extent to which the question is blunt rather than cautious in raising issues’. By contrast with directness, indirectness in questioning is achieved either by self-referencing phrases or other-referencing phrases. (Clayman and Heritage, 2006: pp11-12)

11 Assertiveness is ‘the extent to which the question invites a particular answer and is in that sense opinionated rather than neutral’. It is achieved through either a question preface or negatively formulated question. (Clayman and Heritage, 2006: pp11-13)

12 Adversarialness is ‘the extent to which the question pursues an agenda in opposition to’ the IE or his/her party. (Clayman and Heritage, 2006: pp11) (In their study, they define it as ‘the extent to which the question pursues an agenda in opposition to the president or his administration.) It can be encoded in the preface or in the design of question. When the IR is posing either an oppositional or critical stance within the question, adversarialness is displayed.

13 Accountability is ‘the extent to which the question asks the president to justify his policies or actions’. It is usually achieved through ‘why did you’-type questions or ‘how could you’-type questions. (Clayman and Heritage, 2006: pp11-13)

14 Gestalt: to be simply put, people perceive or interpret a single object or issue in different ways.

15 There is an element of ‘agenda shift’ in this experience description because the topic in the description is people’s life changes whilst the topic in the question turn is about ‘trust’. The subject matter of whether people should vote for or against Labour is not changed, but the basis of the argument is changed—the IR’s argument based on ‘trust’ and the IE’s based on ‘the achievements in people’s lives under Labour’.

16 Insertion is also used in cases other than indirect answers, see section 7 of the same chapter for examples.

17 This is similar to how the IE responds to a ‘communicative avoidance-avoidance conflict’ in Equivocation Theory (Bavelas 1990). Also see chapter 5.
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