



Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London SW1A 2AH

11 July 1984

F E R Butler Esq
10 Downing Street

Dear Robin,

SIR PETER HAYMAN

1. Sir Antony Acland mentioned to you the other day the proposal by officers of The Order of St Michael and St George that Sir Peter Hayman might be warned that if there were any repetition of the offence for which he had recently been convicted and fined, there would be no alternative but to recommend that he be stripped of his honours.
2. At Sir Geoffrey Howe's request, Sir Antony asked Sir Robert Armstrong for advice on the policy and recent practice on the forfeiture of honours. On the basis of Sir Robert Armstrong's advice, Sir Geoffrey and Sir Antony agree that it would not be contrary to any precedent for Sir Peter Hayman to be warned as the officers of the Order have proposed, and Sir Antony would like to tell them this at a ceremony of the Order this afternoon. May Sir Antony take it that the Prime Minister would have no objection?
3. As further background, I attach a minute from Sir Antony Acland to Sir Geoffrey Howe and a letter to Sir Antony from Sir Robert Armstrong.

*Yours ever,
Michael Jay*

M H Jay
PS/PUS

MEMORANDUM

From PRIVATE SECRETARY.

To.....

17d 330601 100 Pads S&K 5/75

File note.

1. My letter to Robin Porter, + enclosure, has been passed to Sir R Armstrong's Office.
2. The Pos has spoken to members of the Order accordingly, and a written warning note will be sent to Sir Peter Hayman.
3. Sir R Armstrong's Office says that the words "connected with" in Sir Robert's letter of 9 July to the Pos should have read "connected with". This is a material difference, but since the action above had already been taken, the Pos decided there was nothing to be done.

Max Jay
12/vii/50



Security of State

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Secretary of State

From: Antony Acland

Date: 9 July 1984



SIR PETER HAYMAN

A 1. After seeing my minute of 27 June, you asked whether there was any information available on people who had not been stripped of their honours after conviction for a criminal offence.

B 2. I have consulted Sir Robert Armstrong, whose letter to me of 9 July sets out the policy on the forfeiture of honours by people convicted of criminal offences and gives two examples of people who were convicted and fined for offences, but not obliged to forfeit their honours. In the light of this, it seems clear to me that we would be departing from precedent to require Sir Peter Hayman to forfeit his honours. On the other hand, the arguments for warning him that a further offence would lead to the forfeiture of his honours seem, as I mentioned in my minute of 27 June, strong. If you agree, therefore, I shall ask Mr Butler - with whom I have already had a brief word on the subject - to check that the Prime Minister would have no objection to this course of action. I would then report back to the Officers of the Order before the Annual Service on Thursday 12 July.

Antony Acland

Antony Acland

PS/PVS

The Secretary of State
Agrees

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

LV Appleyard 10/7

Strictly Private

Copy to Sir Anthony Ackland

UXMORE HOUSE
CHECKENDON
NEAR READING
BERKSHIRE
CHECKENDON (0491) 080 658

July 25th 1984

My Lord,

A first act on returning from London is to say how enormously I appreciated all that you said to me and every single thing that you have done.

Let me repeat once again how bitterly ashamed I am for what I have done. You spoke to me very firmly and forthrightly but it was no more than I deserved.

The 'What I Deserve' video with its envelopes and instructions is quite superb and it was a

Foreign Service means so much to me
that all that you said so kindly
but kindly went right home.

Rosemary wants me to say
how greatly she too appreciated
all that you have said and all
that you have done.

Will you please say
to the officers of the order how
deeply sorry I am for what
I have done.

The care of a psychiatrist

and the kindness of way/^{friend} including
yourself, Kenneth Woodruff and
A lot of others have eased
things a bit but its really
up to me. My psychiatric
is very good.

We will, if we may,
keep in touch and I will let
you know as soon as our law
Rector takes up his post. We
would much appreciate anything

that you could say to him.

Yours with deep
gratitude from us both

Felix

FROM THE RT. REV. ROBIN WOODS, K.C.V.O.
TELEPHONE: TIRLEY 327

*I have replied.
P!, keep in the
strictly personal
papers.*

TORSE END HOUSE,
TIRLEY,
GLOUCESTERSHIRE
GL19 4EU

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL:

Sir Anthony Ackland GCMG, KCVO,
Foreign and Commonwealth Office,
Whitehall,
London SW1A 2AH

AW 27th July 1984

Dear Anthony,

I was sorry not to be further in touch with you yesterday when I was in London. It would have been good to have given you a verbatim report on my time with Peter Hayman, but I had to catch a train and I am now at home again.

I had an hour with Peter for most of which I brought in his wife. I certainly conveyed to him the very deep sense of sorrow that had been caused to the Sovereign and the Order and, indeed, the Diplomatic Service in general. I further conveyed to him the reprimand that was required in such a situation. He accepted both with extreme contrition. In fact my difficulty was that he was reduced to tears for most of the interview.

I brought in his wife who was waiting in the corridor into the private room and thereafter had a much more constructive conversation. She obviously is a great support. I conveyed to them that we were not going to recommend severe disciplinary action in the matter of his Knighthood. He, for his part, made further signs of penitence and regret and undertook to do all he possibly could to see that such a situation could never arise again.

I further talked to them about rehabilitation, both in the local community and the local church. I have now got into touch with Bishop Woolcombe who is a cousin of his and with the new Rector of his parish so that he can be re-engaged in the community. I am glad he has undertaken to have psychiatric treatment.

I hope this closes the matter and that to all intents and purposes his file now becomes dormant.

With so many thanks for your help.

Yours very sincerely,

AW

*PS. See attached copy of his
letter to me since the
interview. AW*



70 WHITEHALL, LONDON SW1A 2AS

01-233 8319

From the Secretary of the Cabinet and Head of the Home Civil Service

Sir Robert Armstrong GCB CVO

Ref. A084/1953

9 July 1984

My dear Antony,

We had a word before the weekend about policy on forfeiture of honours.

As I told you, I have a small Advisory Committee which considers whether to recommend forfeiture of honours of people who have been convicted of criminal offences. In relation to honours in the Prime Minister's list, it is our policy not to recommend forfeiture unless the offence carries a sentence of imprisonment or suspended imprisonment. Even in cases where a custodial sentence has been given, we could well recommend against forfeiture where the offence seems likely to be an isolated incident and does not call into question the reliability of the person concerned. On the other hand, if the person concerned is in a position of special trust in relation to the public and the offence calls in question his honesty in that context, then even mild custodial offences would probably justify a recommendation for forfeiture.

Blunt was of course a special case. He was not convicted, because he had been granted immunity from prosecution. But the offence which he admitted to having committed would undoubtedly have carried a heavy custodial sentence, if he had been tried and convicted.

We do not have records of criminal cases not involving custodial sentences where forfeiture is not considered. The two nearest cases that come to my mind are those of Sir James Dunnett and Sir John Gielgud.

Some years after his retirement Sir James Dunnett was [convicted on] a minor offence involving sexual blackmail. I

/understand

Sir Antony Acland KCMG KCVO

Should have read "convicted with" - corrected by Sir R Armstrong's office.

12/vii

understand that, shortly after Sir John Gielgud was given his knighthood, he was convicted on a minor homosexual offence. In each case the penalty was a fine and no question of forfeiture arose.

Yours are

Robert

has been
1. P.S.
2 H.G.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL



10 DOWNING STREET

From the Principal Private Secretary

11 July 1984

Dear Michael,

Thank you for your letter of 11 July. I am writing to confirm that the Prime Minister agrees that Sir Peter Hayman should be warned that if there were any repetition of the offence for which he has recently been convicted and fined, there should be no alternative but that he should be stripped of his honours, but that no such recommendation should be put forward at the present time.

I am copying this letter to Sir Robert Armstrong.

Yours ever,

Robin Butler

M H Jay, Esq

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL



PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Secretary of State

From: Antony Acland
Date: 27 June 1984

SIR PETER HAYMAN KCMG CVO MBE

1. I am sorry to trouble you with a personal and honours matter.
2. You will remember that some years ago Sir Peter Hayman was alleged to be involved in an organisation called The Paedophile Information Exchange, a homosexual organisation putting those inclined in touch with young boys. Sir Peter was not charged with any offence, but there seemed to be a good deal of circumstantial evidence of his involvement to some extent and he certainly did not bring any libel action, nor were there categorical denials that I am aware of. Since then he has been charged and convicted earlier this year of an act of gross indecency in a public place. This actually appeared to involve another consenting adult in a public lavatory. There was some publicity of this and one comment in the Daily Express asking whether he should be allowed to retain his knighthood and other decorations.
3. At the instigation of Lord Saint Brides, the Officers of the Order of St Michael and St George decided that they should discuss the matter under the chairmanship of the Prelate, the former Bishop of Worcester. The Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood explained that there had been two recent cases when Sir Anthony Blunt and Lord Kagan had been stripped of their knighthoods, the first for treachery and the second for a conviction of fraud.
4. As regards Sir Peter Hayman, Lord Saint Brides thought that the Officers of the Order should recommend that he be stripped, since to do nothing might offend Members of the Order, and possibly members of the general public, and appear ineffective. The Dean of St Paul's also took this view, largely because of his anxiety to protect young children, although Sir Peter Hayman was not specifically convicted of any charge in this respect. All those present said that their feelings were a mixture of repugnance and compassion and Sir Charles Johnson and I, taking into account the publicity and the sadness caused to Sir Peter's family, felt that compassion should be uppermost. The Prelate, Bishop Woods, suggested that Sir Peter Hayman should be given a formal warning by him to the effect that if there was any recurrence of these activities or if they came to the notice of the Officers of the Order with or without publicity there would be no alternative but to recommend the stripping of his knighthood. This latter point was strongly endorsed by all present. It was also suggested that a paragraph should be put in the Annual Report of the Order (this

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL



PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

would have to be very carefully drafted) saying that such a warning had been issued to a Member of the Order, although Sir Peter Hayman would not be named.

5. As regards procedure, if the Officers of the Order were to decide that Sir Peter Hayman should be stripped of his knighthood, a recommendation to this effect would have to be made to you and from you to the Prime Minister and from her to The Queen. For this reason I was asked to report to you and get your views on the proposed action. The Grand Master of the Order, the Duke of Kent, would be kept informed but does not have to give any formal approval. The matter is complicated since Sir Peter holds the CVO which is The Queen's personal order and for which she does not receive Governmental recommendations. If he were stripped of the KCMG he would have to lose the CVO and MBE also, so The Queen is to some extent involved anyway.

[REDACTED]

6. There are difficult moral and presentational issues here. I think that something needs to be done and that Bishop Woods' suggestion of a formal warning is not a bad one. This would enable Officers of the Order to say to those who feel outraged that the matter has not been ignored although those like Lord Saint Brides might prefer stronger action immediately. It so happens that The Queen will be attending the annual service of the Order on 12 July (she goes about once every seven years) so it is possible that the Daily Express might revert to the matter.

7. If you see no objection to what is proposed, I shall explain matters to Mr Butler and ask him to check whether the Prime Minister has any strong views. I am then required to report back to the Officers of the Order.

8. I repeat my apologies for having to bother you with a matter of this kind but since Ministers were involved in the recommendation of the original award they would be involved in the removal of it.

THIS IS A COPY
THE ORIGINAL HAS BEEN
CLOSED UNDER
FOI EXEMPTION NO. 40 and 41(1)

Anthony Acland

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Strictly Private

Copy to Sir Anthony Auckland

UXMORE HOUSE
CHECKENDON
NEAR READING
BERKSHIRE
CHECKENDON (0491) 680 658

July 25th 1982

My lord,

A first act on returning from London is to say how enormously I appreciated all that you said to me and every single thing that you have done.

Let me repeat once again how bitterly ashamed I am for what I have done. You spoke to me very firmly and forthrightly but it was no more than I deserved.

The 'Most Distinguished Order' with its enveloping and spiritual links ~~exists~~ containing as it were, the