

DRAFT



## BOMB AT THE GRAND HOTEL, BRIGHTON

My Lords,

With the leave of the House, I shall make a statement about the bombing at the Grand Hotel, Brighton . The statement is as follows:

An evil group has once again planned and carried out a mindless attack on innocent people in pursuit of their aims. They have deliberately struck at the heart of our nation. But, my Lords, they will find that they have simply strengthened the overwhelmingly united resolve of a Government, Parliament and people determined to preserve their free democracy, so long the envy of the world.

Shortly before 3 o'clock on the morning of Friday 12 October a bomb exploded in the Grand Hotel, Brighton. The hotel is next door to the Brighton Conference Centre where the 1984 Conservative





Party Conference was to be concluded later that day. The Prime Minister and senior members of her Cabinet were among the many people in the hotel at the time.

Preliminary indications are that the bomb consisted of about 20 lbs of commercial explosive and that it exploded on the sixth floor of the hotel causing the middle part of the building to collapse and rendering the whole structure unsafe.

Four people died as a result of the explosion: they were Sir Anthony Berry, Member of Parliament for Southgate; Mrs Jeanne Shattock; Mr Eric Taylor; and Mrs Roberta Wakeham. Thirty-two people were injured of which [ ] are still detained in hospital.

Responsibility for the attack was claimed by the Provisional IRA in a message received by the Press Association in Belfast at 12 noon on Friday, nine hours after the explosion occurred.





I know that your Lordships will join me in offering our deepest sympathy to those who have been so tragically bereaved as well as our heartfelt desire that those injured may soon be restored to health.

My Lords, I cannot express too profoundly my admiration of the courage, dedication and selfless devotion to duty shown by the police, the fire and ambulance services, the hospital staff and all those involved in those difficult and dangerous hours immediately after the explosion occurred.

Naturally, there has been much discussion about the nature of security arrangements in place at the time of the explosion. The Chief Constable of Sussex Police has appointed the Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire to enquire into this aspect and I do not believe that it would be right for us to speculate on the outcome of this enquiry.





I have already made known my own view that total, impregnable security is not compatible with the free society we enjoy. We must recognize that moves in that direction would call into question the entire basis upon which public life in this country is conducted. But I can assure your Lordships that the circumstances of this outrage are being studied with meticulous care and the scope for improvements in security arrangements will be explored to the full.

My Lords, that concludes the statement.



E.R.

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

TO BE CHECKED  
AGAINST DELIVERY

STATEMENT: TUESDAY 16 OCTOBER 1984

BOMB EXPLOSION AT THE GRAND HOTEL, BRIGHTON

My Lords,

With the leave of the House, I shall make a statement about the bombing at the Grand Hotel, Brighton.

Shortly before 3 o'clock on the morning of Friday 12 October a bomb exploded in the Grand Hotel, Brighton. The hotel is next door to the Brighton Conference Centre where the 1984 Conservative Party Conference was to be concluded later that day. The Prime Minister and senior members of her Cabinet were among the many people in the hotel at the time.

Preliminary indications are that the bomb consisted of about 20 lbs of commercial explosive and that it exploded on the sixth floor of the hotel causing the middle part of the building to collapse and rendering the whole structure unsafe.

Four people died as a result of the explosion: they were Sir Anthony Berry, Member of Parliament for Southgate; Mrs Jeanne Shattock; Mr Eric Taylor; and Mrs Roberta Wakeham. Thirty-two people were injured of which seven are still detained in hospital.

Responsibility for the attack was claimed by the Provisional IRA in a message received by the Press Association in Belfast at 12 noon on Friday, nine hours after the explosion occurred.

I know that your Lordships will join me in offering our deepest sympathy to those who have been so tragically bereaved as well as our heartfelt desire that those injured may soon be restored to health.

My Lords, I cannot express too profoundly my admiration of the courage, dedication and selfless devotion to duty shown by the police, the fire and ambulance services, the hospital staff and all those involved in those difficult and dangerous hours immediately after the explosion occurred.

/Naturally



E.R.

Naturally, there has been much discussion about the security arrangements in place at the time of the explosion. The Chief Constable of Sussex Police has appointed the Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire to enquire into this aspect and I do not believe that it would be right for us to speculate on the outcome of this enquiry.

I have already made known my own view that total, impregnable security is not compatible with the free society we enjoy. We must continue to search for improvements in security arrangements but without calling into question the entire basis upon which public life in this country is conducted. I can assure your Lordships that the circumstances of this outrage are being studied with meticulous care and the security implications will be explored to the full.

An evil group has once again planned and carried out an attack on innocent people in pursuit of their aims. They have deliberately struck at the heart of our nation. But, my Lords, they will find that they have simply strengthened the overwhelmingly united resolve of a Government, Parliament and people determined to preserve their free democracy, so long the envy of the world.

That, my Lords, concludes the statement.



**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, no, I do not think that the noble Lord's suggestion is one which we ought to follow. The observations of the noble and gallant Lord, Lord Lewin, to which the noble Lord refers, I think were made from his memory, and I have to say that the documentary evidence does not support them.

**Lord Boston of Faversham:** My Lords, I am sorry to pursue this point with the noble Minister. As he has said, and as has been reported, his point about documentary evidence appears to be correct; but my question and the noble and gallant Lord's observation was directed to his recollection of a verbal communication to the war Cabinet.

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, I understand that the noble and gallant Lord's recollection of the verbal communication is confined to the noble and gallant Lord.

**The Earl of Kimberley:** My Lords, would my noble friend not agree that if a warship is carrying surface-to-surface missiles with a range of several hundred miles, it really makes not the slightest difference in which direction it is steaming—it is a threat to our forces?

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, again, my noble friend's knowledge of these matters is a good deal greater than mine. I am sure that my noble friend is correct. It is perhaps worth recalling that units of the Argentine air force had attacked units of our fleet the previous day.

**Lord Renton:** My Lords, is this matter not now best left to the judgment of history, which will be that the whole of the Falklands effort on our part was a remarkable success?

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, I am grateful to my noble friend. I wholly concur with his view.

**Viscount St. Davids:** My Lords, is the noble Lord aware that as a student of naval history I have never yet seen a single plan of a naval battle in which every single vessel on both sides did not frequently change course? Is he aware that these changes of course have never made anybody think that any such vessel had ceased to be hostile? Is he aware that nobody previously has ever thought that there should be any possible reason to communicate all these changes of course to the Prime Minister?

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, that is the view of the Government.

**Lord Jenkins of Putney:** My Lords, if I may add a word of support to my noble friend on the Front Bench—

**Noble Lords:** Question!

**Lord Jenkins of Putney:** My Lords, may I ask the Minister whether he is aware that not only was the steamship apparently steaming away and towards its home base, but it was 150 miles outside the exclusion zone? What is the purpose of having an exclusion zone if one attacks warships outside it?

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, the position of the "Belgrano" inside or outside the exclusion zone had nothing to do with the threat that she posed to our task force.

**Lord Paget of Northampton:** My Lords, a question to which we are entitled to an answer here, is why this action was discontinued while two Argentine destroyers remained afloat?

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, that is an interesting question but outside the scope of this one.

**Baroness Seear:** My Lords, would your Lordships not agree that this discussion has now gone on long enough?

**Lord Hatch of Lusby:** My Lords, is it not the case that on 4th May, in her answer in another place, the Prime Minister asserted categorically that the conduct of the war was in political hands? Is it not also the case that since that time there has been a constant and premeditated cover-up of the facts of the sinking of the "Belgrano"? In view of the loss of life on the "Belgrano" and the loss of life two days later in the retaliatory bombing of the "Sheffield", if the Prime Minister did not know the course of the "Belgrano" at the time that she ordered its torpedoing, should she not have asked?

**Lord Trefgarne:** My Lords, it is indeed the case that the conduct of the war was the responsibility of the war Cabinet under my right honourable friend the Prime Minister. But the conduct of the battle was not; that was the responsibility of the commanders on the spot. There is no truth in the suggestion that my right honourable friend the Prime Minister telephoned the commander of the "Conqueror" and ordered him to fire the torpedoes.

## Grand Hotel, Brighton: Bomb Explosion

3.14 p.m.

**The Lord President of the Council (Viscount Whitelaw):** My Lords, with the leave of the House, I shall make a Statement about the bombing at the Grand Hotel, Brighton.

Shortly before 3 o'clock on the morning of Friday, 12th October a bomb exploded in the Grand Hotel, Brighton. The hotel is next door to the Brighton Conference Centre where the 1984 Conservative Party Conference was to be concluded later that day. The Prime Minister and senior members of her Cabinet were among the many people in the hotel at the time. Preliminary indications are that the bomb consisted of about 20 lb. of commercial explosive and that it exploded on the sixth floor of the hotel causing the middle part of the building to collapse and rendering the whole structure unsafe.

Four people died as a result of the explosion: they were Sir Anthony Berry, Member of Parliament for Southgate; Mrs. Jeanne Shattock; Mr. Eric Taylor; and Mrs. Roberta Wakeham. Thirty-two people were injured of whom seven are still detained in hospital. Responsibility for the attack was admitted by the



[VISCOUNT WHITELAW.]

Provisional IRA in a message received by the Press Association in Belfast at 12 noon on Friday, nine hours after the explosion occurred. I know that your Lordships will join me in offering our deepest sympathy to those who have been so tragically bereaved as well as our heartfelt desire that those injured may soon be restored to health.

**Noble Lords:** Hear, hear!

**Viscount Whitelaw:** My Lords: I cannot express too profoundly my admiration of the courage, dedication and selfless devotion to duty shown by the police, the fire and ambulance services, the hospital staff and all those involved in those difficult and dangerous hours immediately after the explosion occurred.

Naturally, there has been much discussion about the security arrangements in place at the time of the explosion. The Chief Constable of Sussex Police has appointed the Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire to inquire into this aspect and I do not believe that it would be right for us to speculate on the outcome of this inquiry.

I have already made known my own view that total, impregnable security is not compatible with the free society we enjoy. We must continue to search for improvements in security arrangements but without calling into question the entire basis upon which public life in this country is conducted. I can assure your Lordships that the circumstances of this outrage are being studied with meticulous care and the security implications will be explored to the full.

An evil group has once again planned and carried out an attack on innocent people in pursuit of their aims. They have deliberately struck at the heart of our nation. But they will find that they have simply strengthened the overwhelmingly united resolve of a government, parliament and people determined to preserve their free democracy, so long the envy of the world.

**Lord Cledwyn of Penrhos:** My Lords, we are very grateful to the noble Viscount for making that grave Statement. On behalf of my noble friends I join with him in total condemnation of the appalling act of violence committed in Brighton last Friday. In a free society, a criminal attack upon one political party is an attack on all other parties. An attempt to kill or injure the Prime Minister and the members of an elected government is a profound affront against everything in which we believe and which we value in this country. We join with the Leader of the House in conveying our deep sympathy to the relatives of those who lost their lives and our best wishes for a speedy recovery to those who suffered injury.

This wicked and grave act will have its repercussions. I note what the noble Viscount said about the review of security arrangements. This is not the time to ask detailed questions. The noble Viscount has said—and I quote him—that the matter is being studied with meticulous care and that the security arrangements will be explored to the full. Can he clarify that? Does it mean that the Government are holding an inquiry in addition to the local one being

held in Hampshire? If so, can he indicate its nature and scope? In the meantime, can the noble Viscount say whether advance warning of the threatened IRA action was received by any agency of the Government and how explicit it was?

We welcome the Prime Minister's decision to hold a meeting with Dr. Garret FitzGerald and hope that it will be able to make some progress. We have also noted Dr. FitzGerald's own firm reaction to Friday's terrible events. In the meantime, after security is tightened and necessary additional precautions are taken, we must not allow this act of barbarism to interfere with our democratic duties, responsibilities and liberties in a free society.

**Baroness Seear:** My Lords, it is not possible to find words to express fully the feelings aroused by the Statement that the noble Viscount the Leader of the House has given us this afternoon. May I nonetheless endeavour to express on behalf of all Members of the Alliance on these Benches our horror at the barbarous and hideous act that took place last Friday in Brighton, as well as our horror that human beings can behave to each other in this way, our deep respect for the way that members of the Government and people attending the conference faced the horrors of that morning, our profound sympathy for the people who are still suffering loss and deep pain as a result of the bombing, and our great admiration for what the public services, the police, the hospital and fire services, have done since Friday morning, under the most difficult and challenging circumstances.

May I also say how heartily we agree that, horrible though this occurrence has been, it should not be allowed in any way to interfere with the way in which we conduct our political affairs in this country. If politics has become more dangerous, we must, of course, take all the sensible steps that we can to make it safer but not allow ourselves to be diverted from our main purpose.

**Viscount Whitelaw:** My Lords, I am most grateful to the noble Lord, Lord Cledwyn, the Leader of the Opposition, and to the noble Baroness, Lady Seear, the Leader of the Liberal Party, for what they have said. In general terms, I hope that they would feel it right for me to say to them that their support, their sympathy and their encouragement this afternoon must re-emphasise what I have said—that those who perpetrate such actions will meet with the implacable hostility of a united Parliament and people together with the Government. That, at this particular moment, is a great encouragement to my right honourable friend the Prime Minister. I am, if I may say so on her behalf and on behalf of the Government, very grateful to the noble Lord and to the noble Baroness for what they have said. May I also thank them for what they have said about the work of the services concerned. I am grateful for their words of commendation.

In answer to the detailed questions of the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition, I would say that the Chief Constable of Sussex made the request for the Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire, Mr. Hoddinot, to conduct this inquiry. It is therefore the chief constable's inquiry, and it is a matter for him in the



first instance. The chief constable has, however, decided that, in a matter of such national importance, it would be right for him to make available to the Home Secretary a copy of the report. Your Lordships will understand that it may well not be appropriate for all the details of such a report to be made public. However, the chief constable is aware that it may be appropriate in the national interest to make public some of the report's general conclusions. I can undertake, on behalf of my right honourable friend the Home Secretary, that this will be his determination with the chief constable.

As to the question of advance warning, as I am sure the noble Lord will appreciate, it would be wrong, I think, for me to stray into areas which will be covered by the inquiry and into various intelligence considerations to which it would be better for me not to refer this afternoon. On the point that the noble Lord made about my right honourable friend the Prime Minister's meeting with Dr. Garret Fitz Gerald, I should perhaps say that the Government, too, were grateful for the firm view expressed by the Taoiseach on that occasion. It helped us again at a difficult time. I do not think that it would be appropriate for me to say anything further, except to remark that, naturally, my right honourable friend is determined to meet the Taoiseach as properly arranged.

**Lord Cledwyn of Penrhos:** My Lords, I wonder whether I may pursue one point. In answering my question the noble Viscount referred, to the inquiry that is being conducted in Hampshire. While we welcome that action, and while, of course, we understand that the findings of the inquiry cannot be published in full—we nevertheless await it with great interest—in view of the gravity of what took place, does the noble Viscount really believe that a local inquiry is sufficient to cover this matter? Will he not consult his right honourable friend the Prime Minister and his other right honourable friends with a view to considering at least whether some broader inquiry, taking into account all the national implications of what took place, should be held?

**Viscount Whitelaw:** My Lords, I am sure that the noble Lord will appreciate that the inquiry will be conducted by the Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire in Sussex, taking all the evidence of what happened in Brighton. That is his purpose. I think that it is right—the noble Lord will, I think, agree that it is right—that a senior officer from another force should be charged with that particular inquiry. That is the first step. I think that I would answer the noble Lord by saying that it is the first step. Of course, I shall, without any commitment at this stage, report to my right honourable friends closely concerned what the noble Lord has said. I think it right, however, that in the first instance the first report should be to the chief constable who conducted the operations on the spot. Obviously, thereafter there will have to be consideration of what further action may be necessary.

I was also perhaps remiss—if so, I apologise to your Lordships—in that I did not mention at the same time that the security arrangements at the Palace of Westminster, which are, of course, a matter for the House authorities, have already been the subject of

discussions with the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police. Some changes for tightening security have already been made.

**The Lord Bishop of Rochester:** My Lords, in the absence of the most reverend Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury may I say, on behalf of these Benches, how grateful we are to the noble Viscount for his full and careful Statement. What happened so tragically at Brighton has had the positive result of uniting the nation in concern, in grief and in prayer. May I ask the noble Viscount whether he is aware of the Archbishop of Canterbury's initiative in calling together Church leaders. Is he aware that the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Scottish Moderator, the English and Scottish cardinals and the secretary of the British Council of Churches have just issued a statement expressing their profound thankfulness for the escape from assassination of the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Crown, their heartfelt sympathy for those bereaved or injured, and their admiration of the work done by the public services? The Archbishop has requested me to say that they have together asked that prayers should be said next Sunday in all churches throughout the United Kingdom in thanksgiving for the preservation of our lawfully constituted Government and in commemoration of those killed or maimed in this outrage.

**Viscount Whitelaw:** My Lords, I am most grateful to the right reverend Prelate the Bishop of Rochester for what he has said and for the message that he has conveyed from the most reverend Primate, the Archbishop of Canterbury. I know that my right honourable friend the Prime Minister and, indeed, the whole Government will be very grateful for what he has said. I hope that he will convey to the most reverend Primate on behalf, I am sure, of my right honourable friend the Prime Minister and, through myself, those in this House, our thanks for what he has said and for what the Archbishop and other church leaders plan to do next Sunday. I should like to thank the right reverend Prelate very much.

### Business of the House

**Viscount Whitelaw:** My Lords, I beg to move the Motion standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Moved, That leave be given to the Lord Seebom to advance the Motion in his name from Tuesday the 23rd of October to Monday the 22nd October, and to the Lord O'Brien of Lothbury to advance the Motion in his name from Wednesday the 24th October to Tuesday the 23rd of October.—(*Viscount Whitelaw.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

### Business

**Lord Denham:** My Lords, it may be for the convenience of the House if, with the leave of the House, I announce that subject to the progress of business the Report stage of the Ordnance Factories and Military Services Bill may be adjourned for dinner at approximately 7 p.m. for a short period.



## Ordnance Factories and Military Services Bill

3.31 p.m.

Report received.

Clause 1 [*Transfer schemes*]:

**Lord Lloyd of Kilgerran** moved Amendment No. 1:

Page 1, line 11, after ("liabilities") insert ("other than intellectual property rights and liabilities relating thereto").

The noble Lord said: My Lords, it is my privilege to move the first amendment to this Bill. It is an amendment concerning matters of the utmost importance relating to the defence of the realm, and to the provision of the best possible equipment, secret or classified, for the armed forces. It concerns inventions, designs and know-how so vital to the provision of such equipment. The amendment also concerns the Royal Ordnance factories' contracts involving inventions, designs and know-how, in particular in collaboration with United Kingdom firms and foreign firms; and also the nature of the foreign business undertaken by the Royal Ordnance factories.

In my submission the difficulties in which the Government have found themselves on this Bill arise from Clauses 1 and 2, which give powers to the Secretary of State to make schemes for the transfer of what is termed in the Bill "prescribed property". The word "property" is not defined, but will include, of course, land and factories and machinery. However, I am not concerned with property of that kind. I am concerned with property known by a rather high-sounding phrase as "intellectual property". As your Lordships will know, the term "intellectual property" covers patents, inventions, know-how, technical information, drawings, designs, copyright and trade marks. The Ordnance factories have achieved an international reputation in designing, developing and, indeed, manufacturing equipment for the armed forces. In my submission it is highly desirable, therefore, that great care should be taken that property involving and being concerned with equipment for the armed forces should not be dealt with in the same way as ordinary real property such as land and machinery.

The scope of the activities of the Royal Ordnance factories was set out in the annual report for 1982-83. The report refers to the association of staff—the factories have highly technical staff with a fine reputation—and it indicates the association of the Ordnance factories with industrial companies both in the United Kingdom and abroad. The report goes on to detail the kind of projects associated with the equipment of the armed forces, and concludes by saying:

"The products, and others, have been developed with industrial partners, and it is specially important that we continue to develop these associations with large defence manufacturers in a number of countries, and to build new ones. The wide range of capabilities of the Royal Ordnance factories is without doubt a major attraction to these companies in the United Kingdom and abroad".

Your Lordships will see, therefore, that this property which is known as intellectual property has unique characteristics. It is impossible to evaluate what is its real value, not only in financial terms but in providing the best possible equipment to our armed forces both at the present time and in the future. Yet

as far as I am aware the Government have given little or no indication as to the type of schemes which they intend to introduce for the purposes of the transfer. In my submission the Government should disclose far more information to indicate that the nation's interest in these matters will be protected adequately.

I do not propose to give your Lordships a long dissertation on the main difficulties arising from transferring intellectual property. Of course, there is the field of patents; and as a result of the co-operation of the staff of the Royal Ordnance factories with other firms a large number of patents exist. Earlier this year the Minister in the other place indicated that he would soon be publishing a list of patents—they number something of the order of 200 to 300 patents—and that this list would be open to public scrutiny. As far as I am aware nothing has transpired yet, although it was indicated at that time that the information regarding patents would be available some time in April. Also in February of this year the Minister said that a list of Royal Ordnance factories' products, which would include the making of parts for other contractors, was being prepared, but no information about that has yet been disclosed.

What we on these Benches are asking is the subject of my amendment. The amendment is a simple one. It suggests that after the word "liabilities" the definition of property should exclude,

"intellectual property rights and liabilities relating thereto",

so that further steps can be taken to safeguard matters arising from the transfer of intellectual property.

A large number of questions arise in relation to the transfer of patents owned not only by the Royal Ordnance factories alone but also, probably, in collaboration with United Kingdom firms and with United States firms. In the Patents Act there are sections, which I do not propose to read, dealing with security and safety matters arising from patent applications, and, therefore, relating to the inventions concerned. I should like to know whether Sections 22 and 23 of the Patents Act 1977 are being adequately catered for by the Government.

In regard to the services of the Crown, under the Patents Act the Crown has very extensive powers, in Sections 55 to 59, to ensure that the Crown has available to it inventions of all kinds, intellectual property of all kinds, so that the best type of equipment can be available for manufacture for the services of the Crown. Another question I should like to ask is whether, in the view of the Government, those sections of the Patents Act are adequate to preserve the important powers which the Crown now has to maintain the supply of the best possible equipment for the armed forces.

Need I say that in a matter of this kind it is inevitable that the European position must be considered? There are sections of the Patents Act, from Section 77 onwards, dealing with the position of European patents. I have looked at all those sections in relation to this Bill and I find that there is a considerable lacuna—to use a moderate term—in the Act at present and a failure by the Government adequately to take steps for the purposes of protecting their position in relation to defence matters. I, therefore, beg to move this amendment to exclude from Clause 1 the property



## PROGRESS OF THE INVESTIGATION

### Speaking Note

My Lords, I know that the Sussex police and those assisting them are doing all they can to further urgently the investigation of this atrocious offence. They are pursuing with the greatest diligence a task of enormous proportion in very difficult circumstances. Because of the state of the building the sifting of debris will continue to be a protracted, difficult and dangerous task. However, a considerable amount of debris has already been examined and a number of items sent for forensic analysis.

2. The police are pursuing over 600 lines of enquiry. They are making enquiries into all those who may have stayed in or been working in the hotel up to the time of the explosion. More than 300 statements have already been taken from members of the public. Priority is being given to tracing those who occupied rooms in the area of the explosion in the weeks before. Everything possible is being done to bring to justice those responsible for the attack.

### Long-delay timing devices

3. It is not yet established what device was used to set off the explosion. It is certainly possible that a long-delay timing device may have been used. [IF ASKED: I understand that the police have been aware for some time that the IRA have the capability of using such devices].

### Arrested persons

4. I understand that one man was arrested under the Prevention of Terrorism Act in Liverpool on Friday, and that another man was arrested under the same Act in Brighton on Sunday. The police are now satisfied that neither was involved in the bomb attack. (See Background Note A for details).



E.F.

Palace of Westminster security

The security arrangements at the Palace of Westminster, which are a matter for the House authorities, have already been the subject of discussions with the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police. Some changes have already been made.



BACKGROUND NOTE A

ARRESTS FOLLOWING BOMB INCIDENT

Two men, both born in Northern Ireland but living in Brighton, were arrested under the provisions of the Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act on 12 October<sup>and 14 October</sup> on suspicion that they may have been involved in the explosion at the Grand Hotel.

The first man was arrested at Liverpool Airport at 5 pm on Friday 12 October and transferred to Brighton for questioning later that day. The second man was detained in Brighton on the morning of Sunday 14 October. Both were released from the provisions of the legislation at 12 noon on Sunday 14 October the police having been satisfied that they were not involved in the incident.



THE PREVENTION OF TERRORISM (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT 1984

The Prevention of Terrorism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1984, which re-enacted with minor adjustments in the 1976 Act of the same name, gives the police exceptional powers to arrest and detain anyone whom they have reasonable suspicion is or has been concerned in terrorism connected with Northern Irish or international affairs. The supplemental Temporary Provisions Order sets up a security control at the ports in Great Britain and gives the police power to examine people coming from or going to Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland or the Islands.

In addition the Secretary of State has the power to make an order excluding a person from being in Great Britain or the United Kingdom if he is satisfied that that person has been involved in Northern Irish terrorism. (International terrorists would be dealt with under the immigration legislation.)



E.J.

DETAILS OF CASUALTIES

Of the 32 people injured in the explosion 7 are still detained in the Royal Sussex hospital, Brighton. Details of their conditions are as follows:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Injuries</u>	<u>Condition</u>
Frances Day	Lacerations to face, arms and legs	Stable, comfortable and cheerful
Mabel Delamotte (aged 72)	General shock, lacerations to face, arms and legs	Stable, comfortable and under observation
Mr Donald McLean	Badly fractured ankle	Stable. undergo surgery
Mrs Muriel McLean		Poorly, In intensive therapy unit.
Mrs Margaret Tebbit	Appears to be paralysed from the neck down	In Intensive Therapy Unit. Comfortable and cheerful
Mr Norman Tebbit	Broken ribs. Deep gash on left thigh	Stable
Mr John Wakeham	Severe injuries to lower legs	In Intensive Therapy Unit. undergo surgery. Stable.



Security arrangements at the Grand Hotel

As your Lordships know, at the request of the Chief Constable of Sussex Mr John Hoddinot, Deputy Chief Constable of Hampshire, is conducting a full enquiry into security arrangements at the Grand Hotel and at the Conference Centre. It would not be right for me to comment on those arrangements while Mr Hoddinot's enquiry is in progress.

Will there be a public enquiry?

It would not be appropriate to hold a public enquiry into sensitive security arrangements. The Government fully endorses the decision of the Chief Constable of Sussex to seek an independent appraisal of these arrangements from a senior officer of another force.

Was there any warning of/intelligence about an attack?

No warning was given by those responsible for the attack. As your Lordships know, it is not the practice to discuss intelligence matters in your Lordships' House, and in any case the House would not expect me to comment on such matters in advance of the results of the enquiry.

Is a further attack likely?

The police remain constantly vigilant in the face of possible terrorist attacks, and will take all measures in their power to prevent any further attack of this nature.

Noraid

It is deeply regrettable that a small minority of Irish-Americans should be prepared to give financial support to the use of violence by terrorists. By doing so they can only help to prolong Northern Ireland's agony and cause more deaths and more suffering to those bereaved and injured as a result of terrorist violence.

Will the results of Mr Hoddinot's enquiry be made public?

I must emphasise, My Lords, that the request for Mr Hoddinot's assistance was entirely the decision of the Chief Constable of Sussex, to whom the report of the enquiry

/will be



**E.R.**

will be submitted. The Chief Constable has, however, decided that in a matter of such national importance it would be right for him to make available to the Home Secretary a copy of the report. Your Lordships will understand that it will not be appropriate for the detail of such a report to be made public. However, the Chief Constable is aware that it may be appropriate in the national interest to make public some of the report's general conclusions.