From a life time working experience in the decorating and building business.
I knew the industry from the grass roots to the roof, and it was not long before I became aware that the Northampton company in which I was heavily committed had severe financial management problems.

Commencing work at the same time was a young lectrical ngineer, Roy Ellison, whose home was in Warrington but who travelled back and forward to Northampton each week end. The other key staff were all young people of ability although not deeply experienced
having worked mainly in the sheltered office of Dilson Electrics.

The company 'bosses' were my friend Ron Dilleigh, Neil Hodson nephew, the ompany ecretary was Miss Carol Trussler. All had ability. As often happens in smaller companies, loyalties become confused and strained under pressure and when there are financial difficulties, criticism of the 'boss', can be interpreted as disloyalty. Yet only ruthless internal criticism could offer any hope of pulling a company around when goodwill has eroded. The procedures for saving the company were too laborious to be effective and the company was forced into liquidation.

I set off wearily and completely downcast for my Newcastle home. For a short while I had transferred my loyalty from the Newcastle Magpie's to the Northampton Cobblers and even added the luxury of watching first class cricket to my leisure pursuits minor counties Northumberland Cricket. I also watched Northampton New Town grow.

In his book "The Price"
John Poulson pleads that he was a 'political prisoner' and although he produces no valid argument to substantiate such a claim, Here is, evidence to prove that the Poulson Affair became a political affair for reasons which are hard to define.

precisely

Certainly J.G.L Poulson, Sir Bernard Kenyon and Reginald Maudling were all aware, as early as 1968 that I was at risk of being charged in Wandsworth. A naive person might well ask how Maudling could have known, or for that matter, why anyone 'in the know' would have bothered to mention to him that I was in trouble in Wandsworth. What difference did it make to him?

Poulson gives the operative answer. In "The Price" he writes, "The truth is that I terminated his employment,.....concerned that no mud should stick to us in the wake of his turbulent career". A foretaste of things to come.

But Mr. Maudling was no ordinary business associate, he was a 'heart beat' a mere handful of votes from becoming leader of the Tory Party and Prime Minister, He certainly knew in 1968 of Mr. Poulson's financial troubles and of my 'trouble' in Wandsworth, because I had discussed the issues with him in the closing months of 1968.

Mr. Maudling's involvements with Poulson's Companies were causing great consternation in political circles in London following on his disastrous association with the Real Estate Company of America and the potential Poulson problems could wreck his political future.

In 'Nothing to declare The Political Corruption of John Poulson", Martin Tomkinson and Michael Gillard concluded, "There was no section of British Society that Poulson did not touch with his 'gifts'. Politicians, civil servants, local councillors, employees of nationalised industries-all proved equally vulnerable to the blandishments of the pompous architect with the ever open wallet'.

The involvement of Ministers and ex-Ministers of the Crown was established. The Poulson Affair was to be marked by the intervention of three Prime Ministers and the resignation of a Home Secretary. A back bench M.P. resigned, and three members of the House of Commons were censured by the findings of their peers.

Parliament established three major investigative bodies to examine aspects of the Affair and matters arising from it : -

1. The Lord Redcliffe Maud Committee on Local Government Rules of Conduct set up by the Prime Minister in October, 1973.
2. The Lord Salmon Royal Commission on Standards of Conduct in Public Life Set up by the Home Secretary in December 1974.
3. The Select Committee of the House of Commons on Conduct of Members ordered by a vote of the House of Commons 1st November, 1976.

Mr. Poulson could only have felt that he was a political prisoner if he did not know what a real 'political prisoner' was. Being a victim of political circumstances is a far cry from being a political prisoner. Certainly it is hard to imagine that any man responsible for creating an Affair with such far reaching repercussions could naively write, as he did ten years later, "Could all this have been due to nothing but generosity and misplaced good intentions."!!

Let me quote a political conclusion central to all the inquiries from the Report of the Royal Commission on Standards of Conduct in Public Life, paragraph 24, page 8. Dated July, 1976,

"We doubt whether Mr. Poulson would ever have been prosecuted but for his bankruptcy and his habit of meticulously preserving copies of everything he wrote or was written to him however incriminating these pieces of paper might be. It is disturbing that, had it not been for the combination of these two factors, Mr. Poulson and his accomplices might well still be carrying on their corrupt practices today."

Interpreted another way, Mr. Poulson and his accomplices, having sacked me in early 1969, would, to use Mr. Poulson's words, have avoided any of my Wandsworth mud from sticking to them. To use the Royal Commission conclusion, if they had avoided Bankruptcy, they would have carried on with all their misdeeds 'happily ever after'. No evidence of a political plot against Mr. Poulson! - Avoid bankruptcy - and be saved from exposure.

The enormity of the Poulson Affair, even though it was sensationalised, makes it obvious that, if it was only Poulson's Bankruptcy and folly that caused him to be found out, as the Royal Commission Report states, could we not conclude that there are some serious defects in the investigative departments of the police, income tax and audit departments of Central Government.?

During my two years of living and working in Northampton I had begun to rehabilitate myself and was wholly welcomed back into a normal speaking and lecturing routine. But at the back of my troubled mind, I was only too well aware that the Poulson investigators from the Board of Trade had already visited Dilson's Offices and interviewed Ron Dilleigh, while inquiries were under way following Ted Heath's Parliamentary announcement relating to Poulson's Affairs.

I had also been called on two occasions for questioning before the Poulson Bankruptcy Hearings in Wakefield; experiences which were amongst the most harrassing of any experienced by me up to that time. Muir Hunter, Q.C., was clearly a master of Bankruptcy proceedings and it seemed to me as I struggled, with the help of my newly chosen Solicitor, Tom Ogle, through a day, more like a Russian political trial than a British bankruptcy proceeding. Muir Hunter Q.C. was perhaps the most able man I have ever seen in any situation, he was the Sebastion Coe of the Bankruptcy hearings. Those of us who were inexperienced in such matters, and they included a number of the defence lawyers, were at a serious disadvantage.

I was also concerned that by the special nature of the Poulson Bankruptcy and the alarming amount of adverse National and International publicity surrounding my previous trials, by the time I got to my next trial, and remembering the 'threat' made as I left the Old Bailey, I would have NO chance of an objective trial. I believe that a free press is the main essential for the preservation of a free society. I have never complained at any time about the way the investigative press treated me those years, although I believe I often had reason for complaint.

I was certain that the publication by the Sunday Times of a colour supplement on the Poulson Bankruptcy, was a cruel blow to any fair trial for me, already smeared as I was by the Wandsworth trial, and clearly 'lined up against the wall' with Poulson, Cunningham and others.

I saw the justification for the supplement. Had the Crown Officers not decided to bury the "Dossier" in 1970/71 and had proceeded to fully investigate the Poulson Affair, the methods of the Law could have functioned normally. There need have been no injustice to anyone and especially to me who, by the time I was charged with the Poulson charges in 1973, had already been on the rack for and a half long, cruel years.

In 1971, after my Wandsworth acquittal, the New Statesman made reference to the Dan Smith situation on its front page, pointing out the dilemma that facing the kind of politician I was, and for whom there was no provision in our British political system.

The page was bitterly criticised at the time by a few journalists.

They knew the 'cover up' had taken place but were prohibited from writing their views openly, and assumed that I was part of it.

Another 'leak' was more amusing and it concerned the same colour supplement issue on the Poulson Bankruptcy. One of the pictures used was of the Annual Dinner of the Northumberland and Durham Association, held in London.

The purpose of the supplement and of the picture presumably being to show how I used my position as Chairman of that association to push the Poulson business on. The New Statesman mentioned that at the function were two well known journalists, Harold Evans, then Editor of the Sunday Times, and Sir Dennis Hamilton, the Managing Editor of Thompson Newspapers, who had been edged off the photograph.

I cannot excuse in any way Mr. Poulson's ill considered opinions formed at a time when he was under no pressure and as expressed in his book, 'The Price'.

Readers of Mr. Poulson's book would, if they accepted his arguments, be compelled to accept him as a practising Christian. He writes, "Having been guilty of anything worse than folly and over-generosity in my sins", "and also for trusting people who had every reason to repay the trust they violated, I have settled my personal score". "Nonesense", said Sir Bernard. "You ought to have a knighthood for what you're doing." "Could all this have been due to nothing but generosity and misplaced good intentions", "I have been a blind fool. I let my inherent sense of Christian charity, my natural generosity, lead me into giving presents....." But incalculably evil? "In my opinion, never."

I do not accept his view of himself, that he was an over-generous man motivated to great generosity by his deeply held Christian convictions thus, "a fool maybe!!..... incalculably evil, never".

I disagree with his view that he was a "political prisoner", and that he dealt with me and others from a background of "Christianity". (202) He writes of me, "Dan Smith was a man who grossly misused the confidence I was persuaded to place in him...Maudling was a rougish parasite....." Not much Christian charity there!!

Even his version of how we came to meet is completely untrue.

All the essential facts of the Poulson Affair were recorded by the Prosecution and the documents are still available for examination.
The prosecuting officers prepared a calendar which dealt with all the details of all the relevant meetings between Poulson and I, and the calendar gives the simple truth of the way Poulson and I were brought together.

		Code.
It began :	11. 61.	
	12. 61. A.L. Mallory (of J.G.L. Poulson's Middlesbrough Office engages in preliminary skirmish with T. Dan Smith.	1/1 2/2
	15. 01. 62. J.G.L. Poulson -T.D.S. vb need to meet and discuss.	4/7
	06. 02. 62. J.G.L.P. - T.D.S. T.D.S. to join J.G.L.P. Organisation.	5/8
	08. 02. 62. T.D.S. - J.G.L.P. Acceptance	7/10
	20. 03. 62. T.D.S. - Visits Pontefract	See 9/12.
	13. 03. 62. J.G.L.P. - T.D.S. "Find out what's gone wrong at Gateshead...will see you get your $1\frac{1}{2}$% !!	
	Percentage explained by	HV/12/19
	and	18/32.

No mention in this calendar of Harry Vincent - the Dorchester - or Bovis's London flat which, according to Poulson in 'The Price', was frequently used by me, and was where he and I were introduced, according to him. A complete contradiction of the truth.
These detailed prosecution 'diary' events cover 52 pages and the facts they contain are largely, if not entirely correct. These dates read alongside Poulson's written version of our original meeting and subsequent association reveal the complete fiction of his story.

He also argues that I betrayed his trust. "It is to my eternal shame that I never questioned how Smith was using his contacts", he pleads.

I subsequently learned the truth of the J.G.L. Poulson Empire and was shattered to have been involved in an association with John Poulson, of his seeking, which had led so many reasonable people, including myself, into a decade of disaster. I make no plea in mitigation for myself When J.G.L. Poulson and I arrived at our first agreement, both of us did so as hard headed business men doing a deal. No Christian Charity! I believed that the agreement was legitimate and honest.
I learned much too late in the day that it was not possible for such an agreement ever to have been completely honestly implemented, although it was typical of hundreds of other similar business relationships in both public and private life today.
But let me refer to Mr. Poulson's view of morality a decade later. He refers to a sitting of the Select Committee of Conduct of Members in the House of Commons, 10th February, 1977, when I answering a question put to me by an M.P. I replied, "I cannot recall at any stage any association with Mr. Poulson that ever came to commercial fruition for us." Poulson writes in 'The Price', "Nor can I, but for very different reasons from those he advanced. It was because Smith never provided me with any of the contracts and opportunities I paid him to supply". (71) Previously Poulson had written, "I never did find work in his area of Newcastle through him. Whatever else he did for me T. Dan Smith never involved me in his home province, or in helping him to realise his "New Basilia".

These answers clearly indicate Poulson's view that I should have got him work in Newcastle. My reasons for preventing him simple, It was part of my original agreement with him that, as I could not declare any interest in his architectural practice, I would never propose him for commissions that I could influence.

He seems to suggest even in 1981, after time to reflect, that I should have misused my position in Newcastle. What of Mr. Poulson's claim that he paid me and got nothing in return? Certainly the money paid to my companies amounted to £156,000, and this it was accounted for in court evidence. There was no mystery about it. The analysis showed that I personally got out less than £12,000. in eight years, or £2,000 per year. a year for the six years to which I was sentenced.

To illustrate the falseness of Mr. Poulson's assertion that he 'got nothing in return' and at the same time pose the question of the legitimacy of the work he did get, let me quote the evidence of A.V.Williams, the General Manager of Peterlee and Aycliffe New Towns. Mr. Williams in his evidence stated that on 1st August 1973. "The Peterlee contracts with Poulson were seven in number, and this amounted to a lot of work and a lot of money."

I was the instigator of the Poulson/Williams meeting and following that meeting, Poulson got "a lot of work and a lot of money". How could Poulson write more than ten years later that "Smith never provided me with any of the contracts and opportunities I paid him to supply."? How does he imagine his original meeting at Peterlee came about?

On my invitation, Poulson initiated through Sir William McEwan Younger of Scottish and Newcastle Breweries the building of the much needed Norseman Hotel in Peterlee. The Architect for the Hotel was J. G. L. Poulson.

An even simpler example of J.G.L. Poulson's complete failure to understand, even retrospectively, the nature of the offences which led him to his downfall, are the references to his final association with Alderman and Mrs. Cunningham.

Poulson writes, "I had also employed Mrs. Cunningham in one of my companies over which I had allowed Smith control, and I believe she drew a few hundred pounds one year on that account."

The truth was that I ended my association with Poulson in September 1969 an undisputed fact in the court evidence. Poulson's payments made to Mrs. Cunningham on the 21st October, 1969 were made on a new agreement, after I had ended my association with Mr. Poulson and were signed by Mr. Vivian Baker, Poulson's accountant. They were acknowledged by Mrs. Cunningham, on 11th November, 1969. The subsequent payments from Ropergate Services Limited, a Poulson Company, made out to Mrs. Cunningham were in three sums of £145. 16. 5d, paid by credit transfer and mysteriously ended as I was arrested in January, 1970. So much for the 'Poulson Company' he " allowed me to control". The Company which paid Mrs Cunningham was Ropergate Services and Mr Poulson's explanation of that situation was just another of his 'Christian' falsehoods."

Let me now clarify the difference between Poulson's version and my own, as to how we ended our association. The police evidence quoted in the Special Committee of the House of Commons gives the date of the ending of our association as September, 1969.

Poulson's book refers to this issue, 'The report of the Select Committee quotes Smith as saying, "I myself decided to end the association (with Poulson) in 1969." This, he says, was because he (Smith) had found it "Unsatisfactory". Poulson then explains, "The truth is that I terminated his employment, not the other way about, and solely because I had heard that he was to face a further investigation, in Wandsworth, and we were now deeply concerned that no mud should stick to us in the wake of his turbulent career." Poulson's explanation in that paragraph was the reason behind his decision to agree to the ending of the association. My Wandsworth charge was in January, 1970.

There was little Christian charity in the reasons given by Mr. Poulson for ending our association,- simply that " no mud should stick to us." Yet Poulson went on to write (160) "In January 1970 Dan Smith still in my emply, was acquitted in Wandsworth of having been associated with Sydney Sporle.....", having already written that HE HAD SACKED ME before Wandsworth to avoid "mud" CERTAINLY, I WAS ACQUITTED OF THE WANDSWORTH CHARGES, but IN JULY 1971. January 1970, was the date when I was first charged and there was a lot of mud available 'for sticking' at that time.

It follows that when he writes that in April 1970 he was, "Striving to meet committments made in better days: £20,000. to Dan Smith for his contracted consultancy in April", he was adding yet another fictional payment on an agreement long since ended, WHY would he pay me after I had been charged, and assert that he wanted "no mud to stick to us in the wake of his turbulent career."!! No, Sir.

His lack of sympathy and true Christian compassion, is evidenced when he refers to my acquittal on the Wandsworth charge when he wr tes "Smith himself walked free." and

"This, of course, made him êven more self confident and ambitious...." How, I ask, can a man, who suffered so much himself be so superficially glib? The facts show that as I walked out of the Old Bailey at the end of my second Trial, and before Poulson had known arrest, I was 'advised' by a senior policeman that it would not be long before we would 'meet again, next time with 'friend' Poulson." Wandsworth was the end of my political life, and for me the beginning of the Poulson Affair. Soon, I and my 'friend' were being called on by the Police to explain our activities, and from the moment of my first arrest until my release from Parole ten years later I knew no peace and little happiness.

Poulson's association with Cunningham was initiated by me and the relevant observations demonstrate the falseness of Poulson's claim that 'he got nothing for his money'.

If it had .. not been for Poulson's back door deal in October 1969 involving Mrs. Cunningham, of which I knew nothing, and so it was an agreement reached after I had ended my relationship with Poulson, I doubt that I would ever have agreed to plead GUILTY in 1974. It was the discovery of that deal which was the final straw that broke my already bending back and I miserably wondered if there was anyone in whom I could trust.

I am unconvinced that Andy Cunningham ever acted illegally, or intend to act illegally on behalf of Poulson in any public position he held. He was an able man and he wielded a good deal of local power. A word from him was sufficient to set in motion the wheels of decision. Whereas I had made an express exclusion of Poulson's practice from those authorities where I had power to influence, Andy Cunningham did no such thing. As a consequence of Andy's power and authority, Poulson received a range of appointments which, whatever the moral or legal merits of the commissions, could be directly attributed to my introduction of Andy Cunningham and Sid Docking to the Poulson practice.

Poulson writes about Andy Cunningham in a manner which would have shamed Mark Antony! Having written "But Cunningham later showed me that he knew how to feather his own very comfortable nest." he goes on to write, "Andy Cunningham, as far as I was concerned, was an innocent man, wrongly convicted." You pay your money and he takes your choice!!!

Why did Poulson sign agreements with Mrs. Cunningham in October 1969 after I had ended my association with him? Was it an act of generosity motivated by Christian charity? Of course, it wasn't.

The gains to Poulson of the Cunningham association are illustrated in MS book "After consultation we decided - to employ Poulson's firm because I had learned of a very good job done by him at the Durham Technical College".....
Two commissions in one paragraph!!

"Cunningham was chairing the meeting of the Felling Urban District Council whose members wanted to discuss with me two proposed housing schemes. At the meeting I was appointed....." Christian inspiration or hard business!!
Two more commissions!!

"I wanted to finalise plans for some offices we were building for his union in MIddlesbrough" Christian Aid!!
One more commission!!

Poulson's assertion that he got nothing for his money is so patently false. I want to turn to what I believed was an assumed legitimacy of the transactions which produced for Poulson very substantial amounts of work and income. I also want to examine his proposition that he was a'political prisoner.'

Having experienced a three year prison sentence I have sympathy for anyone who has a similar experience.

No matter what the individual crimes of those of us caught up in the Poulson Affair and certainly for those who received sentences, fines or suspended sentences, I was deeply saddened by their suffering. They were the fringe victims of a cruel, unfair and selective policy pursued by the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Incautiously I contributed to that suffering and I am full of regret, I feel especially sorry for the Bradford City Architects Secretary, and more so for Eddy Newby, ex Lord Mayor of Bradford, who in my view was unnecessarily cruelly and unjustly treated.

I cannot understand how the 'deeply Christian' J.G.L. Poulson can write on this aspect of the 'affair', "I was the only political prisoner to languish there" (Wakefield Goal). "T. Dan Smith, Pottinger and others enjoyed the rustic delights of roses round the door at Leyhill and Ford Open prisons. They were country gents; I was nearly killed." Enjoy three years in any prison!! Really?

I was in and out of many prisons during the three years I spent 'inside'. I returned to Armley Prison on three occasions, to Winson Green on two occasions, to Walton Prison in Liverpool on one occasion, to Wormwood Scrubs on five occasions, and to Bedford Prison on two occasions, and noticed no "roses round the door" at any of them.

Including my first Wandsworth Trial I was in the dock as a prisoner on four separate and, in addition, was called as a witness in the trials of Hadwin, Ward, Dews and Roebuck, and later in the trials of the Bradford City Architect and his Secretary, with whom I had never had any dealings, and of Eddy Newby ("a mouse"), according to Mr. Poulson).

We were all in different ways the victims of an unjust campaign of hysteria but, in the interests of truth, I only, attack Mr. Poulson in a way that I consider to be a fair and reasonable criticism of our association.

I still pay tribute to J.G.L. Poulson's ability. When I was released from prison, in several T.V. appearances I pleaded for his release but that does not stop me correcting his lies. He writes in his book,

"I took Smith to Sweden, to look at industrial housing". The truth is that I had gone to Sweden at the invitation of Crudens of Mussleborough in 1962 and I had almost finalised an agreement with Crudens and Skarne of Sweden in which we would have received a Public Relations and Advertising assignment. Additionally there were prospects of us negotiating a commission on sales. At that stage, I suggested to Skarne that John G.L. Poulson might be interested in an appointment, as consultant architect in Britain, for the system. They agreed, and I arranged for J.G.L. Poulson to travel to Sweden for the negotiations. I took him, he did NOT take me, as he so glibly wrote in his book.

J.G.L. Poulson wrote to me on this matter, "We would be delighted to be appointed as Consultant Architects and Engineers to the Skarne system in the U.K. Mr. Mallory has written to Mr. Axelson telling him that I will meet him in London on Wednesday 24th April, 1963." That is incontrovertable evidence so why falsify it to bolster up a false assertion that "he got nothing for his money"?

The result of Poulson's meeting with Axelson led to the break off of my advanced discussions with Skarne and, as a result, we lost two good clients in which we had invested our time and money. Bill Kirkup was again angry and questioned the benefits of our association with J.G.L. Poulson. Poulson had taken a good business opportunity from us and turned it into total failure.

Poulson's explanation for that failure was that "an import levy of £300. per house made it impossible for anybody to on earth to do so" - (produce an acceptable building cost figure). In fact, Skarne, in association with Crudens, proceeded to build houses throughout the U.K. at prices which were presumably suitable for Ministry of Housing building yardsticks. I had no further contact with either Skarne or Crudens. Poulson, through Construction Promotion Ltd., went on to associate with a system which had no chance of ever getting off the ground in Britain. It was on Poulson's trip to Stockholme that I first Poulson's 'white superiority'; the very attitude for which he critis~~ses~~ed Sir Bernard Kenyon, in his book. Poulson was converted to multi-racialism when he found that his Construction Promotion Company could develop substantial contacts in Black Africa and elsewhere !!

I have often been described as a dictator, of being intolerant of opposition and determined to get my own way. Press stories abound, as do reports of countless interviews I have given, in which I have been compared with John Wayne, Frank Sinantra and many other 'tough guys'. Strange that J.G.L. Poulson should refer to me in 'The Price' as, "a tall, small headed man with wispy hair, and dark compelling eyes, he gave an impression of weakness rather than strength. I found him womanly in some ways, though never enough to suggest effeminacy". As I possess pale grey eyes and weigh 11½ stones, I need expound no further.

Poulson refers to another occasion after a Bankruptcy hearing appearance at Wakefield and, following a tough examination ~~of~~ by Muir Hunter Q.C.. At the end of ~~his~~ hard day, I decided to call at Pontefract and visit Mr. and Mrs Poulson on my way back to Northampton, where I was living at the time. My specific reason was to give him a 'kindly' warning that I had been given by a 'policeman', along the lines "that Poulson and I would be going down for a long time". I thought that by my warning him in advance give him a chance to mentally adjust to the prospect.

Remember, that at that time, I had already faced the fairly formidable ordeals of trials in the Strand Law Courts and a trial in the Old Bailey, the very names of which still fills me with foreboding.

Mrs. Poulson answered the door and I left behind, in the car, a friend and business associate who was driving me back to Northampton. To say that I was shocked at John Poulson's appearance would be an understatement. He looked as ill as he does on one of the photographs included in his book. I at once realised that if I told him what I had been told, namely that we could get ten years, I am sure the shock would have killed him there and then.

I knelt down in front of him as he slumped in his chair, and said, "John, you must be prepared for a prison sentence, I guess you might get as much as two years." His wife consoled him, and I was on my way. His version of that meeting, "The sight (182) of this master intriguer begging for what crumbs of comfort I could give him made me feel physically sick". Poulson certainly was physically sick but for an entirely different reason to that which he gave. He looked as though he had only been released from Belson. Had I felt the need for comfort, I could not have sought any from J.G.L. Poulson, that night or at any subsequent meeting with him.

When next I met Poulson it was in Walton Prison, Liverpool, and he looked even more ill. He has admitted in his book that, "Dan Smith was affable". I was more than affable and, in discussion with Andy Cunningham who had a deep hatred towards Poulson, blaming him for his own predicament, I tried to justify my own view that we were not in prison to judge, but as prisoners.