



Home Affairs Committee

Oral evidence: [Reform of the Police Federation](#), HC 1163

Tuesday, 8 April 2014

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 8 April 2014.

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Keith Vaz (Chair), Michael Ellis, Dr Julian Huppert, Mark Reckless, Mr David Winnick.

Questions 130-269

Witness: **Sir David Normington GCB**, Chair, Independent Review of the Police Federation, gave evidence.

Q130 Chair: Sir David, thank you for coming. We are three minutes early, because we were very brisk with the Home Secretary, as you have been with Home Secretaries in the past. I have forgotten; how many Home Secretaries have you served under as permanent secretary?

Sir David Normington: Five in five years.

Q131 Chair: Right. In all that time, you must have had dealings with the Police Federation.

Sir David Normington: Yes, on and off.

Q132 Chair: When you, as permanent secretary at the Home Office, dealt with the Police Federation, did you ever have any inkling that there were all these difficulties and problems which you have identified in your excellent report?

Sir David Normington: I did not. I did not have a lot of detailed contact with them; I met them from time to time, but I did not know that behind the scenes there was all this difficulty. Indeed, I do not know whether there was this amount of difficulty at the time.

Q133 Chair: You have heard, I am sure, about the intended retirement of Steve Williams and Ian Rennie. At the time you conducted the inquiry—of course, it was Mr Williams who appointed you—was any indication given to you that either of them was going to leave before or immediately after the report was completed? Did you feel that they were deciding to go?

Sir David Normington: No. When I heard about it yesterday, I was very surprised. I was very, very disappointed. Steve Williams has been a staunch supporter of this process. He set it up, he ensured that we could go where we wanted to investigate the things that we wanted to investigate, and I had assumed he would want to stay to see it through—Ian Rennie, too, because the two of them have put a lot of work in since the report was published to try to ensure that it would be implemented.

Q134 Chair: So it came as a shock to you, as it did to members of this Committee?

Sir David Normington: It did.

Q135 Chair: I do not know whether you spoke to Mr Williams. I did and the Home Secretary did. Have you spoken to him?

Sir David Normington: He spoke to me yesterday afternoon, just before the announcement, to tell me.

Q136 Chair: Did you persuade him to stay on?

Sir David Normington: I didn't. By that time I think the die was cast. I asked him, "How will this reform programme be carried forward without you?" The implication was that it would be a problem, but he had made up his mind by that point.

Q137 Chair: You made 36 very powerful recommendations. The Home Secretary has just appeared before us and she wants them to be implemented in full. At the time you made those recommendations and looked at the culture at the Police Federation, you probably had not seen—or you might have—an e-mail or message from Mr Williams to his colleagues on the Joint Central Committee. If you have not, we can supply you with a copy today. It is dated 1 February and says, among other things: "Whilst accepting emotions are running high in the advent of inevitable change, at times I have genuinely felt that I have been gratuitously and cruelly bullied and humiliated." Had you come across this message before?

Sir David Normington: I have seen that message since. I had not seen it before—

Q138 Chair: Before your report was written?

Sir David Normington: No. But Steve Williams has been under sustained attack from within the Federation from the moment he decided to set up this review. There was a motion of no confidence in him at the last annual conference, and he has had to sustain a great deal of personal attack.

Q139 Chair: But this is the chairman of the Police Federation, and he says that other members of the Police Federation have been bullying him cruelly and humiliating him.

Sir David Normington: Yes.

Q140 Chair: That is a terrible indictment of the organisation, is it not?

Sir David Normington: Yes it is. What is so dismaying about it is that it happened immediately after we had published a report, in which we said that Federation representatives—some of them—had a tendency to target individuals rather than to argue about the issues. Within a few days of the report being published, they were at it again. It is a small number, but they have a history of targeting individuals.

Q141 Chair: What worries us is that, after he resigns and Ian Rennie goes, there is an election from the same people who sit on the committee, and they really should not be there. Surely this should be an election by every member of the Police Federation?

Sir David Normington: Of course we would prefer that, but they do not have the means at the moment to run an election, as we say in our report. That is why we say that all members should elect their chairman, but first they will have to put in place a mechanism for doing that. They ought to think very hard about whether they want to elect the next chairman in exactly the same way as they elected the current one, which is election from the 30 members of the JCC. That will just reinforce a sense that that body is distant from the members. There are alternatives: they could let any member of the branches put their name forward for election, or they could widen the suffrage.

Q142 Chair: Would you like to see something more than they currently have in respect of a successor to Mr Williams, even if they do not have the whole list of the membership and cannot conduct an election?

Sir David Normington: There are some stepping stones in our report that they could consider for the election—I should say “selection” because it is only partly an election—of the chairman and the general secretary. They need to think hard about this, because this is a very dangerous moment for the Federation. It could be that the resignation of these two people will allow the people who want to block reform to be elected.

Q143 Chair: So it could have the completely opposite effect?

Sir David Normington: It could have that effect. There are only 30 electors. That is a riskily small electorate.

Chair: Even smaller than the Civil Service Commission

Sir David Normington: Well, the Civil Service Commission is not elected—fortunately, otherwise I probably would not be in that role.

Q144 Chair: Finally from me, you are a distinguished civil servant; you have been around and had every job there is to have. Have you ever come across an organisation of this kind, with the kind of functions that it has, knowing full well that some of these officers represent other officers who go out and have to deal with the public every day? Has an organisation of this kind ever come across your desk before?

Sir David Normington: I think in many ways the Police Federation is a unique organisation, because it exists to represent police officers, who are there to serve the public. It has statutory underpinning as part of a deal by which the police's right to strike was removed. I do not think there is anything quite like this, but they are not fulfilling their part of the deal if they do not behave in a way that represents the best of policing, and they are not doing that.

Q145 Michael Ellis: Sir David, congratulations on your report; it is clearly a fine piece of work. I want to explore this attack on Steve Williams. You and others have spoken about it being part of a pattern, effectively, of personal attack. The e-mail the Chair referred to refers to bullying and intimidation. What sort of attack do you suppose Mr Williams has been subjected to that has resulted in him resigning precipitately? Can you expand on the sorts of threats and intimidation?

Sir David Normington: I do not know the details of what he has been through since the report was published. I have had occasional contact with him. My sense from talking to him yesterday—after all, he has to speak for himself—is that he has been worn down by the personalisation of opposition to the report. Actually, it starts with the moment when he is elected and it goes on though when he commissioned this report and since. I think he has just been worn down by it. There comes a point when you wonder whether it is worth it. It has a toll on you and your family, but I am afraid I do not know the precise details.

Q146 Michael Ellis: I understand that you do not know the precise details—perhaps we will have to ask Mr Williams to come back in—but do you happen to know from your conversations with him whether he has been in receipt of intimidatory messages—text messages, e-mails?

Sir David Normington: I'm afraid I do not know.

Q147 Michael Ellis: If you don't know, then I—

Sir David Normington: I think that what caused this e-mail actually occurred face to face at the committee. It was not done behind his back. It was done to his face, I think, but I do not know.

Q148 Michael Ellis: Do you think that this is actually a very retrograde step for the Police Federation, in as much as the old guard, if I can call them that, have effectively ousted someone who might have been a reformer for the Police Federation; and what they may now do, in seeking a replacement from within their own ranks, is pull up the drawbridge, having

thrown a detractor off the balustrade, and try to proceed with the same processes that you criticised so ably in your report?

Sir David Normington: As I said to the Chair, I think that this is a moment of great danger for the Federation. I think it is possible, but not certain, that for those who do not want change or who want to push the changes into the long grass, this is their chance to regain control. However, there are a lot of people in the Federation who want to change it, including the members. There are a lot of people in the branches around the country who want to change it. I would say that this is their moment. It is in their hands to elect a Joint Central Committee that wants to take the organisation forward. The whole committee is up for election in May, and some of the people are elected from the branches. This is the moment for the branches—we heard from them, and there are many who want change—to step forward.

Q149 Michael Ellis: You are urging a new broom.

Sir David Normington: Of course do not want to interfere in their electoral process, but I do want them to elect someone who is going to take the report forward, because it is interests of the Police Federation and the police.

Michael Ellis: And in the public interest.

Q150 Dr Huppert: Sir David, you have been around a long time; what do you think would be the likely consequences if the Federation did not accept your recommendations, or at least the vast majority of them?

Sir David Normington: There are two or three possibilities. One is that there is some internal revolt. I think there is quite a movement from the members—great dissatisfaction and also quite a movement for reform—that could burst out into the open. Of course, most of the Federation's statutes and so on are in legislation and in regulations, and it is of course within the gift of the Home Office, and therefore the Home Secretary and her colleagues, to change the Federation themselves. It is in the hands of Parliament if it wants to do that.

My message to them has always been that it is much better for an organisation like this to change from inside, because the worst thing is for the Government to change you, but that is an option.

Q151 Dr Huppert: I think we would all like to see improvements made internally, but if that does not happen and the revolt that you talk about does not happen—certainly the police officers I talk to are very alarmed about what they hear—do you think the Home Secretary would have any option other than to impose change from without?

Sir David Normington: I had better not write the Home Secretary's script.

Chair: Pretend you are back to being Sir Humphrey—back to being the permanent secretary.

Sir David Normington: I should not. She has a lot to do.

Chair: Dr Huppert wants to know what you think she should do.

Sir David Normington: I think there is a great deal of concern among the public—and that is represented in Parliament—about the situation the Federation faces. In those circumstances, I think there is quite a demand for reform. I am sure the Government will listen to that. I think there will be quite a groundswell of support in Parliament for changes.

Q152 Mr Winnick: The letter sent by Steve Williams on 1 February to the Joint Central Committee makes reference to Paul McKeever: “We all saw what happened to our friend and colleague Paul McKeever, and with a young family I do not intend to let the same thing happen to me.” Were you aware, when you were doing your report, of bullying and harassment?

Sir David Normington: We were told of examples of bullying of staff members and we were told about the targeting of some more public figures, so yes, to some degree, we were. The implication here was that Paul McKeever suffered that; I did not know that.

Q153 Mr Winnick: So would you say there is a history of bullying and a culture where it is simply accepted for the reason that sometimes it is accepted, because employees are frightened for their jobs?

Sir David Normington: I think a culture had grown up of some bullying and targeting of individuals, yes.

Q154 Mr Winnick: But not as bad as what has now been revealed?

Sir David Normington: As we did this review, we were increasingly surprised and shocked at what people were telling us. I did not know about all that before I did the review. I had no idea what we were taking on when we started out. I did not approach it on the basis that that was what the Federation was like.

Q155 Mr Winnick: Let me ask you this question. We are Members of Parliament. Obviously, we are concerned with what is happening in the Police Federation, otherwise we would not have an inquiry, but, first and foremost, we are concerned with the conduct of the police as it affects society and our constituents. You know of course some of the negative things that have occurred that have made the headlines. Do you feel, Sir David, that the bullying culture that exists within the Police Federation, as is alleged and as seems to be the case, has some impact in some instances—I am choosing my words carefully—on the way in which the police conduct their duties as police officers?

Sir David Normington: I too want to be a bit careful about this.

Mr Winnick: I understand.

Sir David Normington: There is some relationship between those two things, I think. I am not quite sure which way round it is, but, if you see your representatives behaving like that, in a sense it reinforces that certain behaviours in the police are acceptable. I do want to say—I know everybody says it, but I think it is true—that it is a minority of people. It is not the majority of people in the Police Federation and it is not the majority of the police. What is so dismaying about this is that a small number are tainting the whole organisation. That is what has to stop. It is really important that the police have a powerful voice that stands for the best standards in policing.

Q156 Mr Winnick: It is a very small minority involved in all this.

Sir David Normington: Yes, it is a minority.

Q157 Mark Reckless: Sir David, if the implication is that this bullying had anything to do with Paul McKeever's death, is that not a matter for criminal investigation?

Sir David Normington: It might be, but I just do not know anything about that, I'm afraid. It had never been suggested to me at any point.

Q158 Mark Reckless: I do not know whether you were ever the responsible accounting officer at the Home Office, but the treasurer of the Police Federation wrote to all the regional treasurers—this is part of the materials we published on our website today—saying, “You should also be aware that the Secretary of State has the power to ask to see all Federation accounts.” Given the concerns about these accounts and the repeated and now long-term refusal to allow them to be audited, do you not think that the Home Secretary should now ask to see them?

Sir David Normington: If the Federation does not publish them itself, then she should, yes.

Q159 Mark Reckless: Forthwith?

Sir David Normington: Yes. I am very interested to hear what the treasurer, who is coming after me, will say about the availability of those accounts. We gave them a few months to publish their accounts, and I would like to see that done. The best way to stop the Home Secretary asking is to do it yourself. One of the things that frustrates me is that the Federation creates drama and suspicion by its secrecy. We do not know what there is to hide or to reveal. They need to come out and tell us.

Q160 Mark Reckless: Following your report about some of the structures of the Police Federation, I have heard it variously said that, as the constables are about 80% of the ranks represented, it does not make any sense to have this equal three-way split; but on the other hand, some people say to me, “Actually, the constables act as a union within a union in any event.” What is the right way to resolve that?

Sir David Normington: Our report is very clear that this structure of a third, a third and a third, which goes from the bottom of the organisation right up, is out of date, not democratic and very expensive, because it means that you have very large numbers of inspectors representing a very small number of inspectors. Nobody in the Federation wants the inspectors or the sergeants to leave, but there has to be some recognition that the constables represent 77% of the members and should therefore have more representation.

There are two ways of doing that. In the representative bodies, we suggest that they should at least have 50%. But actually, of course, if you have some national elections you solve that problem at a stroke, because you give everybody a vote and then the people who are in the majority can vote for who they like. That has happened, I think, in Northern Ireland and it has not resulted in them voting for a constable—that does not follow. People, when given the chance to vote, eventually vote for the best person, which I think is a good thing.

Q161 Mark Reckless: Understandably, you have said that you are not especially keen to embroil yourself in Federation elections, but would you see electing a larger number of women and perhaps ethnic minorities as being one important way to improve the culture of the Police Federation?

Sir David Normington: Yes, although I do not see why many women would want to represent people in this organisation with its present culture, frankly. But if they did, I think it would change. At the moment, the number of women in the top body is because there are reserved seats for women. Long term, that is not a sensible way of going, but if we just removed them, there would probably be two women in 30, perhaps. There needs to be some serious work in nurturing not just women but black and minority ethnic police officers.

The Federation represents the police service as it was 20 years ago in terms of its mix: it is mainly male, white and middle-aged. There have many more younger officers, women and BME police officers, coming in. They want to make their way; they don’t want to come into the Federation. The big task is to encourage some of them to become representatives. That will require tremendous sustained effort.

Q162 Chair: Thank you. Sir David, thank you very much for your report. You are telling this Committee that there is a sense—it is not a good metaphor—of drinking at the last chance saloon by the time of the Federation conference. If they do not implement your recommendations, you would expect Parliament or the Home Secretary to intervene. Is that what you are telling us?

Sir David Normington: I think that is the risk. I am not in a position to ask Parliament or the Home Secretary to do that. That is the risk for the Federation. It is better that they reform themselves.

If I may say one last thing, conference is a chance for the branches and the members who want change—91% of members want change—to demand it of the leadership. The blocking people are in the Joint Central Committee, and there needs to be a real demand from below for change.

Chair: Sir David, thank you for coming in.

Examination of Witness

Witness: **Martyn Mordecai**, Treasurer, Police Federation, gave evidence.

Q163 Chair: Mr Mordecai, good afternoon and thank you very much for coming in to see the Committee. We have a vote at 5.30 pm, so we hope to complete your evidence by then. Were you as surprised as the Committee was to hear of the resignation of Steve Williams and Ian Rennie? Or did you expect it after you saw the memo from Steve Williams of 1 February?

Martyn Mordecai: If I can refer to the memo first, I had not seen that memo. I was on annual leave at the time. When it was alluded to today was the first that I was aware of it. In relation to the surprise, yes, I was surprised. I was not in the office because I was dealing with other matters, but I was surprised when I saw the e-mail resignation of Ian Rennie and Steve Williams.

Q164 Chair: You said that you had not seen the memo. That is a message to the joint central committee. Are you a member of the joint central committee?

Martyn Mordecai: I am indeed.

Q165 Chair: Even though you were on holiday, does that mean you do not get e-mails?

Martyn Mordecai: I was trying not to check. Was that an e-mail? Can I clarify?

Q166 Chair: I don't know, but I would imagine that, even if you are on holiday, you would have got a copy of this message from Mr Williams. No?

Martyn Mordecai: May I see it? I don't mean to be obstructive.

Q167 Chair: Yes, of course. You don't recognise it.

Martyn Mordecai: I do not recognise this at all, Chair.

Q168 Chair: How close is your office to Steve Williams's office in Leatherhead?

Martyn Mordecai: Two doors away.

Q169 Chair: Two doors. So when you came back from your holiday, nobody came up to you when you went to get your coffee or tea, "Actually something pretty big has happened. Steve has said that he is being humiliated and cruelly bullied in a gratuitous way by other members of the central committee."

Martyn Mordecai: No, Chair, this is the first that I have seen of this.

Q170 Chair: You do not know any examples of Steve Williams, your chairman who was two doors away from you, being treated in an inappropriate way? This is the first that you are hearing of this?

Martyn Mordecai: I am aware that Steve has been under an awful amount of pressure. If we go back to the decision that he made to implement the independent review, it was a decision he made quite quickly. Criticism was levelled at him for that. I would be lying to say that it was not. There were people who disagreed with it and people who supported it. The issues were worked through.

Q171 Chair: We know all that and we understand, but when you are chairman of the Police Federation it is not a walk in the park, is it? It is a pressurised job. He is not saying he was pressurised; he was saying that he was cruelly bullied and humiliated, and none of that reached your door.

Martyn Mordecai: No. I am aware he has been under pressure, but no specific examples have been given.

Q172 Chair: Whose office is between yours and his?

Martyn Mordecai: Just a meeting room.

Q173 Chair: How often did you meet Steve Williams?

Martyn Mordecai: In passing, Steve will come into my office and chat. I was aware he was under huge pressure, but no actual examples of this word “bullying”.

Q174 Chair: So Ian Rennie resigned and announced his retirement after the conference. Is there no information from him as to why he has gone?

Martyn Mordecai: No; I had a conversation with Ian on Wednesday night. I am aware that he was feeling tired. He just felt—I am trying to think of the appropriate word—that he did not have the support any more of the joint central committee. I said goodbye to him at lunchtime on Thursday, because he was travelling back up to Manchester. The first I knew about his intention to resign was when the e-mail came out yesterday.

Q175 Chair: That is very odd, isn't it? Presumably you work very closely with the chairman and the general secretary. As treasurer, you are a very senior officer.

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q176 Chair: And nobody said anything to you. You went to Leatherhead and everything was pressurised, but there was nothing untoward.

Martyn Mordecai: Nothing beyond what normally happens, in terms of yes, there is a huge amount of pressure. There are people, as Sir David has referred to, that are not resistant to change, but you have to manage the change process—

Q177 Chair: Do you support the changes?

Martyn Mordecai: Yes, I do fully support the change process.

Q178 Chair: Why have you not joined in with the other two in resigning then?

Martyn Mordecai: Because I want to see the change process through.

Q179 Chair: So you think that Steve Williams should have stayed on?

Martyn Mordecai: I am sorry to see him go. The decision to retire from the police service is an individual decision.

Q180 Chair: Of course, but what is in the best interests of the police service? Do you think it is best that he does what you are doing, which is to see the changes through? You have signed up to these changes. You are a reformer—is that right?

Martyn Mordecai: I am. I would like to see those changes through—yes, I would.

Q181 Chair: So you presumably were on the phone, saying, “Steve don’t do this. You must stay.”

Martyn Mordecai: I have not had a conversation with Steve about this. I have not actually spoken to him since he announced his retirement.

Q182 Chair: Have you tried to ring him?

Martyn Mordecai: I e-mailed him yesterday, but I haven’t tried speaking to him on the phone.

Q183 Chair: No member of the central committee has gone to the chairman and said, “Think again. This is a bad idea.”

Martyn Mordecai: Not to my knowledge.

Q184 Chair: Do you think that is odd?

Martyn Mordecai: I do not know if anybody has spoken to him. This is the sort of thing I am trying to answer, Chair—

Q185 Chair: But general behaviour—it is the chairman of your organisation.

Martyn Mordecai: I think it is sad that Steve has gone. It is a decision that he has clearly made after discussion with his family, but likewise, I think this is an opportunity as well—this is a golden opportunity. As Sir David has referred to, this is our report. We have commissioned it.

Q186 Chair: Sorry, what is an opportunity? Sir David has just given evidence to us saying he was very disappointed. I, as Chairman of the Committee, and members of the Committee are very disappointed, and the Home Secretary accepted it, because it happened. You are saying that we should welcome this resignation and retirement because it gives you a golden opportunity to do what?

Martyn Mordecai: No, I do not welcome the resignation. I am sad that Steve has made that decision to retire.

Q187 Chair: But you do not want him to stay on. You would not want him to reconsider.

Martyn Mordecai: Once people have made that decision—I have seen it with other people; I saw it with Paul McKeever. Once Paul made that decision to retire—you just see the stress go from them and the relief. It is hard to drag people back from that. I do not think that there are people within the joint central committee that will not drive the changes forward. That is the most important thing. That is why I am staying. I am not going.

Q188 Chair: Even though you do not communicate with any other colleagues on these issues, you still want to stay.

Martyn Mordecai: I still want to stay. I want to see these changes through, that is assuming I am re-elected.

Q189 Chair: You mentioned Paul McKeever. In this letter—in this message—Steve Williams said: “We all saw what happened to our friend and colleague Paul McKeever”. Was that pressure or was there bullying of other members of Federation staff?

Martyn Mordecai: I think Paul was under a huge amount of pressure.

Q190 Chair: From these people.

Martyn Mordecai: Potentially from these people. I can't comment—

Q191 Chair: Can you remember how many?

Martyn Mordecai: I have no idea how many. What has been read out to me, this letter—today is the first opportunity I have had to see this.

Q192 Chair: Right. Let me look now at your role as treasurer. As treasurer, one would have imagined that you would know the number of accounts and the amount in individual accounts. Why did you not know, as treasurer, how much money was in the No. 2 accounts?

Martyn Mordecai: In relation to the No. 2 accounts, the No. 2 accounts have to be set up as trusts. From our counsel's opinion, there is a view that depending on the wording of the trust, they might not fall within regulation 20 of the Police Federation financial regulations and therefore, they would not be disclosable to me. Since I sent out this request—

Q193 Chair: You did not think it was your job, as treasurer of the Federation, to try and find out how much money was in each of these accounts that was held locally. You did not think that you had the authority or that it was your job.

Martyn Mordecai: I have been trying to find out for a while how much is in these accounts.

Q194 Chair: When did you first start?

Martyn Mordecai: Probably when I started off, in about 2009 or 2010.

Q195 Chair: How did you seek the information?

Martyn Mordecai: Initially, I was asking for people to be open. We need to have a discussion about these No. 2 accounts, the services that are being provided—

Q196 Chair: But did you not write to people and say, "I have taken over as treasurer. I am keen to know how much money is being held locally."

Martyn Mordecai: Not at that point. In relation to the amount that is held locally, I knew how much was being held locally in relation to the subscription income fund. Would it help if I explained how the funding structure of the Federation works?

Q197 Chair: I think we know. We just want to know what you did. An explanation of the structure, I think we are aware of. You did not, until March this year, and after the Normington report, write to all the branches. Have they all now written back with their information?

Martyn Mordecai: There are 15 joint branch boards that run No. 2 accounts. Twelve of them have disclosed the information to me, and three of them have declined.

Q198 Chair: Which are the three?

Martyn Mordecai: North Yorkshire, which stated that it has an old trust and is outside regulation 20 of the Police Federation financial regulations. Malcolm Mills from Leicestershire has said that he would prefer to appear before the Home Affairs Committee and explain its trust. Derbyshire, whose treasurer is Mr Adam Galley, e-mailed me at lunchtime on Sunday to say that he had met with their executive, and Derbyshire felt that they have given me sufficient information. Everyone is aware that I am appearing in front of you today.

Chair: Those three branches have refused to do so.

Martyn Mordecai: Correct.

Q199 Chair: How much money does the Police Federation have nationally?

Martyn Mordecai: In relation to?

Q200 Chair: Anything. How many accounts do you control, Mr Mordecai, as treasurer?

Martyn Mordecai: I am treasurer for the joint fund. I collate all the information that comes in. You are aware of the funding mechanism, how it works and how it remains at local level. I can tell the Committee that, in relation to the subscription income funds—28 joint branch boards have their member services accounts in those, and three of those joint branch boards charge nothing at all, as has been referred to—there is £29,598,230, including assets; I should have gone to Specsavers.

Q201 Chair: How many credit cards are issued by the Federation to members in your office?

Martyn Mordecai: For the joint central committee, I would issue credit cards to those who require them.

Q202 Chair: How many have them?

Martyn Mordecai: Nearly all the 30 members.

Q203 Chair: So you are telling this Committee that, at the moment, the Federation has £29.5 million in assets.

Martyn Mordecai: In relation to what is outside the 43 joint branch boards.

Q204 Chair: Yes, and in terms of the 43 minus three?

Martyn Mordecai: The No. 2 accounts?

Chair: Yes. Minus North Yorkshire, Leicestershire and Derbyshire.

Martyn Mordecai: The No. 2 accounts stand at £4,566,248. In relation to the overall picture of the Police Federation of England and Wales, the total amount of money that is in the accumulative fund, which includes assets, equates to £107,287,467.

Q205 Chair: What is the cash at the bank?

Martyn Mordecai: As of 31 December 2013, it is £21,911,995.

Q206 Chair: So you would understand why Sir David Normington suggested that some or all of the members ought to have some of that money back.

Martyn Mordecai: I have been arguing this for ages. The funding structure of the Federation is archaic; it is fundamentally wrong. That is one of the reasons I want to stay.

Q207 Chair: Let me say this finally. Members of the Federation who have talked to me about you say that you are pretty tough on claims being made. Anecdotally, when you are away on holiday, there is a little notice put on your door saying that the treasurer is away. Do you think that you have conducted your job effectively as treasurer, even though you do not know a lot of information as to how many assets are being held?

Martyn Mordecai: Yes I do. When I inherited the position of the national treasurer, if you look at the accounts you will see that the expenditure was outstripping the income—the subscription income. I had to put a number of control measures in place in very quick time to stop the rot becoming permanent and there are a number of issues in relation to the budgets that I introduced, the budget controls that I introduced and a number of other measures that brought about the fact that—

Q208 Chair: Do you wish you had worked harder than you did to try to get this information on the No. 2 accounts out?

Martyn Mordecai: I worked extremely hard, Chair. It took its toll to get as much information as I did. This has taken its toll—

Q209 Chair: What do you mean, “It took its toll?”

Martyn Mordecai: This takes a toll on my health; I have to be honest that it has taken a toll on my health.

Q210 Chair: So have you been bullied, Mr Mordecai?

Martyn Mordecai: No. I have to say that I have not been bullied. I have been subject to rigorous comment and I accept that as the nature of the job—

Q211 Chair: From who, Mr Mordecai?

Martyn Mordecai: Just colleagues who don’t want to disclose the No. 2 information—

Q212 Chair: So they have been nasty to you?

Martyn Mordecai: I wouldn’t put it as “nasty”, no. It is just the nature of the job—

Q213 Chair: Abusive?

Martyn Mordecai: On occasions, yes.

Q214 Chair: Because you have asked for information that you thought was needed, colleagues of yours have been abusive to you because you have asked for genuine information about the accounts they hold. Is that right?

Martyn Mordecai: Occasionally, yes.

Q215 Chair: Well, this Committee would find that totally unsatisfactory and we are sorry that you have had to be put through that.

Q216 Michael Ellis: Mr Mordecai, you have disclosed that there are £107 million of assets in the Police Federation and £22 million effectively in the bank account.

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q217 Michael Ellis: Do you have any financial qualifications of your own?

Martyn Mordecai: No, I don't. I have underneath me two very good members of staff who are qualified accountants and three account technicians.

Q218 Michael Ellis: Don't you think it's rather odd that the treasurer of an organisation with £107 million in assets and £22 million in the bank account does not have any financial qualifications of his own?

Martyn Mordecai: Well, one of the recommendations of Sir David's report is to do away with the role of the deputy treasurer and to introduce a director of finance. But I have to say, sir, that I inherited a deficit; I have turned that deficit around into a positive.

Q219 Michael Ellis: Federation branches failed to co-operate with Sir David in providing him with the information that you now, in large part, have. Is that right?

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q220 Michael Ellis: And three of them are still failing to co-operate?

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q221 Michael Ellis: Knowing that you were appearing before this Committee?

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q222 Michael Ellis: Did you sign off on a guerrilla war-style contract, a blitzkrieg-type contract, which was with Gaunt Brothers Ltd? Did you sign off on that contract?

Martyn Mordecai: No, I didn't. It was not my signature on the contract.

Q223 Michael Ellis: Did you know about the contract?

Martyn Mordecai: I was aware of the contract. I was not happy. My understanding is that the current chairman, Mr Williams, introduced the Gaunt Brothers to Mr McKeever, about using them. I was cited on the contract. I was concerned, first of all, about using them, period—I make no bones about that—and I was likewise concerned that within the contract there was no break clause. I insisted, as I do with all my contracts now that we deal with them, that we have a break clause.

Q224 Michael Ellis: Was there no break clause in this contract?

Martyn Mordecai: Not in the first one that I was cited on.

Q225 Michael Ellis: The Jon Gaunt Brothers Ltd contract was broken after two months, wasn't it?

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q226 Michael Ellis: Is it right that the remuneration was £10,000 a month?

Martyn Mordecai: Chair, I am bound by confidentiality agreement with that contract—

Q227 Chair: We will release you from that, as you are addressing a Committee of the House of Commons in terms of our public inquiry. So I release you of that responsibility.

Martyn Mordecai: Sir, can you just repeat the question?

Q228 Michael Ellis: Was the contract with the Gaunt Brothers £10,000 a month?

Martyn Mordecai: The contract with the Gaunt Brothers was £15,000 a month.

Q229 Michael Ellis: £15,000 a month? And that has been described by another witness before this Committee as a guerrilla contract. Do you agree that it set the tone for a highly personal and political attack on the Government of the day?

Martyn Mordecai: The words that are being used in relation to the schedule—I don't think it was about personal attacks. I think it was raising at the time a number of issues that were affecting the welfare and efficiency of our officers, and that has a direct impact on affecting the public, and that is the main thing.

Q230 Michael Ellis: Is it correct that the late Mr McKeever wrote a letter opposing the use of this company and that he was ignored by the heads of the three federations when they later went on to use them?

Martyn Mordecai: My understanding is that that is correct, sir, yes.

Q231 Michael Ellis: I thought you said in answer to my earlier question that it was Mr Williams you were referring to who disapproved.

Martyn Mordecai: No, I disapproved.

Q232 Michael Ellis: Are you confirming that the late Mr McKeever wrote a letter asking Police Federation bodies not to use this company, but they ignored that?

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct.

Q233 Michael Ellis: As far as that contract is concerned, did you then or do you now agree that it was a wholly inappropriate way for the Police Federation to conduct its business?

Martyn Mordecai: I come back to what I have been open about from the word go: I never wanted to use them in the first place.

Q234 Michael Ellis: Did you fly to Italy, or any other place, in order to source special slates for the luxury police headquarters at Leatherhead?

Martyn Mordecai: No sir.

Q235 Michael Ellis: Do you know who did within the Police Federation?

Martyn Mordecai: Yes—the previous treasurer and deputy treasurer went to Italy, but it was nothing to do with the slate.

Q236 Michael Ellis: What was it to do with?

Martyn Mordecai: It was to do with the toilet pods.

Q237 Chair: The what?

Martyn Mordecai: The toilet pods. If you go into a hotel room, you will have a separate bathroom and shower cubical area. The pods were sourced from Italy because it was cheaper to bring them across from Italy than to produce them in this country.

Chair: Thank you so much.

Q238 Michael Ellis: Was it an appropriate use of Police Federation funds for such equipment to be sourced from Italy and for the treasurer, previous or otherwise, and his deputy to fly over there personally in order to source that?

Martyn Mordecai: Well, it was cheapest way of doing it, and that was about value. I am very, very proud of Leatherhead—

Chair: And the pods, no doubt.

Martyn Mordecai: And the pods. I am very proud of Leatherhead. The decision to build it was made back in 2001. Surbiton was no longer fit for purpose; all we were doing

was knocking through walls to extend offices. We would never have survived any disability discrimination action or anything like that. The decision about building Leatherhead was made prior to me coming on to the JCC. The final decision was made in about March 2005 and we went ahead and built it. I became the deputy treasurer in 2008 and was asked to take on responsibility for the building, which I did quite happily. It was running at a deficit and I have turned that into a profit. I am immensely proud of my staff—all the staff.

Q239 Michael Ellis: Mr Mordecai, you have access to tens of millions of pounds within a Police Federation that, by all accounts—as this Committee has discovered and Sir David Normington outlined—has very cryptic, very ambiguous arrangements indeed for its finances. You are a powerful man within that organisation, so do you not think it has been incumbent upon you to ensure that Sir David received the co-operation that he ought to have had? Do you not think that it ought not to have taken this amount of time for the figures to be disclosed?

Martyn Mordecai: The figures that I have disclosed to you, with the exception of the No. 2 accounts, I have always been aware of. I supplied some of the figures to Sir David myself when I gave my own evidence in August. There is nothing there that has not been disclosed before in relation to the F45s and the end of year audited accounts; the issue has been the separate No. 2 accounts. I have been arguing for ages that we need to get to grips with them.

Q240 Michael Ellis: Do you have a nickname within the Police Federation?

Martyn Mordecai: You are talking about the use of the word “Fingers”, sir.

Q241 Michael Ellis: Yes. Your nickname is Fingers.

Martyn Mordecai: Well, it is not a nickname I actually like to use, but I have been called Fingers, yes, sir.

Q242 Michael Ellis: Why do you have that nickname?

Martyn Mordecai: I think because when I took over in 2008-09, particularly in 2009, things needed getting to grips with very quickly, and I had to get my fingers on everything to bring it all under control.

Q243 Michael Ellis: Is it because you have access to and control over such large sums of money?

Martyn Mordecai: No, I disagree with you on that one. Yes, I have access to a huge amount of money, but I am responsible. I hate spending money, everybody knows that. I am not a great lover of spending any money.

Q244 Michael Ellis: But you do not have any financial qualifications and a large amount of money has been spent on what the press have described as “luxury” headquarters in Leatherhead, with hotel-style accommodation and all the rest of it.

Martyn Mordecai: The conference centre at Leatherhead is purpose-built; it is a fine building and fit for purpose. You use the word “luxury”. I invite the Committee, please, to come down to Leatherhead. Please come down, see what we do there and see the work that is done. If you think that I have a luxury flat, then please come across and view it.

Chair: Mr Mordecai, I have been down to Leatherhead, and the rest of the Committee will take up your invitation to come and see for ourselves.

Q245 Mr Winnick: You joined the police force 35 years ago?

Martyn Mordecai: I did, sir.

Mr Winnick: And you had various responsibilities as a constable, then as a sergeant. Your present position dates from 2008?

Martyn Mordecai: From 2008 as deputy treasurer and from 2009 as treasurer.

Q246 Mr Winnick: I will not press you on the matter, but would you like to tell the Committee what salary you receive? Because you are full-time, of course.

Martyn Mordecai: My salary is defined by the Police Federation regulations. I receive an enhancement on my substantive rank to that of a Metropolitan police inspector.

Mr Winnick: What would that figure be?

Martyn Mordecai: Just over £51,000, in relation to my salary—I am a top-rate sergeant, so that is £41,000, and there is a further enhancement to top-rate inspector, which takes it to just over £51,000. On top of that, I receive an enhanced allowance of just over £10,000.

Mr Winnick: Rounding it up?

Martyn Mordecai: Rounding it up would take it to just about £63,000.

Q247 Mr Winnick: Reference has been made to the fact that, despite your very heavy responsibilities financially, you have no qualifications. Is it the position that your predecessors were police officers, like yourself, and would not necessarily have had the qualifications associated with being responsible for large sums of money?

Martyn Mordecai: That is correct. If I can refer you back to Sir David Normington’s report, in chapters 6 and 7 he refers to the work that I have done in turning the Federation around.

Q248 Mr Winnick: Has anyone questioned your competence?

Martyn Mordecai: Not personally, no.

Q249 Mr Winnick: May I turn for a moment to the wider issue? Much has been said about the bullying culture at the Federation HQ—the letter that has just been quoted, from the outgoing chair, and the resignation of the general secretary, who has been accused of various things. When you became a full-time official of the Police Federation, were you aware beforehand of that kind of culture?

Martyn Mordecai: No.

Q250 Mr Winnick: And how soon, once you became the treasurer, were you aware that such bullying was going on?

Martyn Mordecai: I cannot put a time line on it. With what I inherited when I came into the position, within a couple of years—I say a couple of years, but in a very short space of time—I worked out that we were in trouble. The Federation was losing money fast, the expenditure was outstripping the income and I had to get to grips with that. The way I did so—the way that it had to be brought about—did cause a number of issues. I had to tighten up on a lot of expenditure and we started to introduce tendering processes. All that was alien. When I first came in, in 2005, as one of the representatives of the Metropolitan sergeants, I became the training secretary. The first thing that I introduced, because at that stage we were delivering training throughout the country, was a tendering process for the hotels. That had not been done before.

Q251 Mr Winnick: Because of time, I will ask only a couple more questions. Has anyone accused you yourself of bullying?

Martyn Mordecai: No.

Q252 Mr Winnick: When you discovered the sort of culture that you say you were not aware of before, did you take any action? Did you raise it with your colleagues and say, “This is unacceptable”, and the rest?

Martyn Mordecai: I would not have tolerated it. I feel to a certain extent that I am shadow boxing here, because I have not had any specific examples beyond what the Chair has given to me or what I was listening to with Sir David. We have got a bullying and harassment policy. All the managers have been trained and all the executives of the Joint Central Committee have been trained in it.

Chair: Trained to prevent it?

Martyn Mordecai: Trained to prevent it, recognise it and deal with it.

Q253 Mr Winnick: My final question: do you think that there is a real future for the Federation, and that it is capable of reforming itself and becoming an organisation once again to be respected?

Martyn Mordecai: Absolutely. This is a golden opportunity. I accept what has happened over the past 24 hours, but this is a golden opportunity for us. This is our report, and we commissioned it. Nobody is speaking negatively about it. Everybody is happy to embrace change, and everybody is happy to take the recommendations forward. Sir David has alluded to it. We are working hard; we have not had this report on 20 January and just sat there and done nothing with it. We have had a number of meetings, and we are having further meetings tomorrow and on Thursday to deal with it. Another one has been scheduled—

Chair: Thank you. We are very grateful to hear that.

Q254 Mark Reckless: If everybody is so keen to drive forward Sir David's recommendations, why have people been bullying Steve Williams and driving him from office—previously described as the old guard who did not want to implement the recommendations?

Martyn Mordecai: I do not know why Steve has finally decided to retire. He has put out correspondence that says—I do not know whether it is a discussion he has had at home. I assume it is going to be a discussion he has had at home with his wife. I do not know why he has made the final decision now, but that will not prevent the recommendations from going forward. Like any major project, there may be some slippage, possibly—

Q255 Mark Reckless: Everyone on the JCC is fully behind all the recommendations, are they?

Martyn Mordecai: Everyone is behind the recommendations. There is going to come a point, particularly in relation to the finances, when I am going to have to ask Parliament to change the regulations. I need to make sure that those regulations are right when I come before Parliament and ask the Home Secretary to make the changes. It is no good me coming to the Home Secretary and saying, "Please can you make these changes?" and I am trying to bang a square peg into a round hole. Then I will be back six months later asking the Home Secretary to put them right.

Q256 Mark Reckless: So you are telling this Committee that there is no old guard. No members of the JCC are working against Sir David's recommendations?

Martyn Mordecai: No. We are all working hard to achieve what the recommendations are showing. I am looking forward to conference. I am looking forward to people seeing the positive attitude that has been taken to Sir David's report.

Q257 Mark Reckless: Why did people fight so hard to avoid disclosing No. 2 accounts?

Martyn Mordecai: This is something I have been battling with. I have always argued that, in relation to our members' services, we can get better deals for our members in relation to life insurance because of the bulk buying power that we have with over 125,000 members. I have been subject to a lot of resistance to change for that, because what happens at a local level, at a joint branch board level—I need to emphasise that there is nothing illegal about these No. 2 accounts.

Chair: Not as far as you know. You did not even know how much was in them, Mr Mordecai. I would caution you against making a statement of that kind.

Q258 Mark Reckless: And why would people resist disclosure so strongly if you could get better value centrally? What are they getting? How are they benefiting out of it being done locally?

Martyn Mordecai: Each of the joint branch boards, with the exception of three of them, will put a levy on their member services. If you are having insurance and you are, for the sake of argument, paying £10 a month at base level—that is the insurer's level—the joint branch board may put a levy of 50p or £1. I do not know the exact figures, but it would be up to them to put a levy. That would be the additional income for them that, as I referred to today, is sitting in the No. 2 accounts.

Q259 Mark Reckless: What do they do with that money?

Martyn Mordecai: That assists them to run their offices and provide members of staff and additional facilities in relation to running their offices.

Q260 Mark Reckless: Are you wanting to assure the Committee that none of that has been taken by anyone for personal benefit?

Martyn Mordecai: I would hope so.

Q261 Chair: But you don't know, do you? That is the point.

Martyn Mordecai: I don't know for certain.

Q262 Mark Reckless: We infer from what you said before that all but three of the federations locally filed their No. 2 accounts. Have they all audited them?

Martyn Mordecai: The audited ones I have had for the latter part of this year, with the exception of the three that I have mentioned.

Q263 Mark Reckless: When you wrote to the regional treasurers on 23 January, you said that the third phase of this process was: all No. 2 and any other accounts held under regulation 20 for the years 2007 until 2012 to be audited and filed with the JCC and chief constables by 17 April 2014. Are you on track with that?

Martyn Mordecai: It is work ongoing. I know that there have been some delays with some of it, but it is continuing.

Q264 Mark Reckless: You have less than 10 days to complete it.

Martyn Mordecai: I accept that. I think there may be some delays with some of it.

Q265 Mark Reckless: The first year or two of those accounts predate your time as treasurer and for one year as deputy treasurer. You raised concerns about what was going on with spending at the Police Federation before you came in. What do you think we are likely to find when those 2007 accounts are filed and properly audited?

Martyn Mordecai: Hopefully nothing beyond the fact that you have the income and expenditure in relation to the No. 2 accounts. In relation to the joint branch boards which, as Mr Edwards referred to last year, do not have a No. 2 account, everything is incorporated into their No. 1 account, so they are audited every year, and I have that information.

Q266 Mark Reckless: Do you consider that, given the scale of concern—Sir David mentioned that there may not be dodgy things going on, but that people are concerned that there may be because people are refusing to disclose them—it would be sensible not just to report those accounts to the relevant chief constables and to the JCC, but to publish all those accounts going back to 2007?

Martyn Mordecai: Some of the joint branch boards have already decided to do that. I am aware that Greater Manchester has now decided it will go online and you will see there that their No. 1 account is already up and published online.

Mark Reckless: Unless everyone does that, suspicion will continue to be cast on the Federation as a whole.

Martyn Mordecai: There is a real will to publish these online.

Q267 Chair: Mr Mordecai, it would be very helpful to the Committee if you could write to us with all the information that you have mentioned, breaking it down according to each of the regions and joint boards. Could you let us have the addresses of the three branches that have refused to co-operate with you? We will be writing to them formally and asking for this information, because some of the information that you have given us, although I am sure it is right, we took down very quickly. You said that the accumulated fund for the No. 2 accounts

was £4 million. In evidence to us last week, John Tully said that the Metropolitan Police Federation accumulated fund sat at £4.6 million. If that is just the Met, and if you add all the other 12, it is considerably more than that, isn't it? If you have got it now, that's fine.

Martyn Mordecai: The net current assets of the Police Federation of England and Wales in total at joint branch board level come to £29,598,230, and the Met's £4.6 million is part of that.

Q268 Chair: It would be extremely helpful if you wrote to us as soon as possible—by midday on Thursday—with all that information and the names and addresses of the secretaries of the three branches that I have mentioned, with the document. What worries and puzzles me, Mr Mordecai, is that you have had a very difficult situation over the past 24 hours with the resignation of your chairman and your general secretary, for the reasons that we have seen in the memorandum that has been sent, of which you have absolutely no knowledge. That really puzzles us, bearing in mind the close-knit way in which the Federation operates. You know, because you were a friend of Paul McKeever, of the pressure on him. You alluded to that pressure today. Sadly, the last chairman of the Federation died in mid-office and the present chairman has resigned. Are you confident that the future will be brighter?

Martyn Mordecai: Yes.

Q269 Chair: Why?

Martyn Mordecai: Because I am determined, along with everyone else. This is a golden opportunity for the Police Federation. No one is against change. It is about driving the change forward in a managed process. The time scales that have been set by Sir David are very challenging. We are not saying that they are not challenging, but like any other project it needs to be properly debated and thought through correctly. There will come a time when I need to approach the Home Secretary about changing the regulations on financing. We need to get it right.

Chair: We understand. You told us that. Thank you very much for coming today. We will write to you for further information.

