<u>Email from Lex Greensill CBE to the Treasury Committee – 14 May 2021</u>

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to collate our relevant records as to our meetings with Lord Myners, which is now attached in PDF format and organized as follows:

- **Correspondence 1: Initial meeting request**
- **Correspondence 2: Initial meeting arrangements**
- **Correspondence 3: Lord Myners feedback on Greensill meeting and draft statement**
- **Correspondence 4: Clarifications surrounding Lord Myners' statement**
- **Correspondence 5: Follow-up meeting request**
- **Correspondence 6: Final statement of Lord Myners**
- **Correspondence 7: Further discussions around use of statement**
- **Correspondence 8: Breakfast and dinner meetings with Lord Myners, discussions on package**
- **Correspondence 9: Lord Myners Update**
- **Correspondence 10: Mr Cameron**

We have applied redactions where we consider appropriate to protect personal information.
In you reviewing the attached, we thought it was also important to draw attention to a few matters falling out of Lord Myners' evidence which, in our view, need to be corrected:

- Lord Myners has said (Q34) there was only one meeting with me. There were two. The second was on 3 September (see Correspondence 5, email from Lord Myners to myself on 17 July). There was also a breakfast with Greensill's Chairman, Mr Maurice Thompson.

- There seems to be confusion between myself and Lord Myners as to who requested our initial meeting. I can see that Lord Myners said (Q18) that I requested the meeting and that in the attached (Correspondence 4, email of 12 July) that Lord Myners had, contrary to this, insisted it was he who had arranged the meeting on his own initiative. Although my evidence given to the Committee was based upon Lord Myners' assertion in his email, I have consulted further records which should now correct our collective confusion: my office had indeed initially reached out (see Correspondence 1) to have a meeting with Lord Myners and that, once we had, it was a meeting actively courted by Lord Myners.

- Lord Myners said (Q18) that my business "*had the elements of a ponzi scheme*" and was "*even more worried about Greensill*" post his meeting with me on 12 July 2019. I would like to draw attention to his contrary conclusions in his email of 12 July (Correspondence 5) and Lord Myner's feedback of the first meeting (Correspondence 3): "*I had not heard or seen anything that I found inappropriate and that, indeed, I had been very impressed by the company*".

- Lord Myners was content to have a statement provided to our investors on an as-needed basis (Correspondence 4) to allay any concerns pertaining to Greensill which might have been caused by the Press reportage on his Parliamentary questions. Such a willingness to have a statement used in the context of investors and potential investors would presumably be absolutely contrary to any belief of his that there was anything unsavoury about our business. Indeed, I would also draw your attention to his email of 14 July at (Correspondence 7) where Lord Myners is proactively being helpful in advising upon the optics of full repayment of maturing bonds and that there was nothing, in his view, "*funny*" about new bonds refinancing the old. Lord Myners concludes that same email with the words "*I am at your service. I am a straight dealer.*"

- Lord Myners has said (Q18) that he asked over 30 questions about Greensill in Parliament. I would like to add though that after 10 June 2019 he asked no further questions until 22 June 2020.

- Lord Myners has said (Q47) that "*I decided that I did not want to be a part of it [Greensill], because I felt it was a highly questionable business*". I would draw your attention to his email to myself of 7 October (Correspondence 9) where he advised, contrary to his evidence, that he could not proceed for health reasons (some 3 months after discussions commenced).

I hope the attached helps in dealing with this issue.