

*will be considered by the Director of Public Prosecutions.*” In particular, I have been asked if I would have expected in the reply from the Chief Constable to the Secretary of State [pages 15375 -15376] to set out that there was only one alleged link so as not to misinform the family. I would not. He was responding to the point and he was saying if there’s that allegation, it’s included in the investigation and that is all there is to it.

27. It went as far as he could possibly go without infringing his independence. He wanted to provide the Secretary of State with whatever information he could factually. This would have been usual.
28. At that time there were lots of crimes and murders in the Northern Ireland that the Secretary of State did not get involved in but because this became a political hot potato she was involved. And the people that had made it exceptional, they had a following and publicity and dealings with the various others. They wanted to bring as much pressure to bear as possible and therefore this became a high profile case.
29. I have also been referred to document dated June 2000 at page 39675. I had, of course been retired for a number of years at this point. I have been asked to comment on the to the fourth line down;

“It is alleged that an officer phoned the individual and advised him how to go about destroying forensic evidence and thus avoid detection.”

I have been informed that this was the link between the police officer and the defendant referred to at point 5 of Diane Hamill’s letter and I have been asked if I would have expected the Chief Constable to provide the Secretary of State with these details of the allegation either privately or in correspondence at the point when she was writing to the Hamill family

30. Again my response is when an arrest or an investigation is carried out, that is purely a police matter, perhaps with the ICPC involvement. Once the papers are submitted to the DPP, that is the police role completed unless the DPP put out a request for more information or better particulars. They’d have done the job and