

House of Representatives

Committee of Privileges

**Report concerning the possible discrimination against a
witness who had appeared before the Standing Committee
on Industry, Science and Technology**

JUNE 1994

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

MR R W SAWFORD, MP (CHAIRMAN)

HON A S PEACOCK, MP (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

MR K J ANDREWS, MP

HON R J BROWN, MP

MR P R CLEELAND, MP

HON A C HOLDING, MP¹

HON L S LIEBERMAN, MP

MR P J McGAURAN, MP

HON L B McLEAY, MP

HON D W SIMMONS, MP

MR A M SOMLYAY, MP²

1. Nominee of the Leader of the House
2. Nominee of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition
from 24 February 1994

The complaint

1. On 23 March 1994 Mr A.R. Bevis, MP, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, raised as a matter of privilege the possible discrimination against a witness who had appeared before his committee. Mr Bevis advised that on 6 December 1993 during the course of its inquiry into Government purchasing policies his committee had taken evidence from a Mr Peter Pool at an in camera hearing. Mr Bevis said that as a result of the evidence given by Mr Pool, the Committee had sought and subsequently obtained certain documents from the Minister for Defence.
2. Mr Bevis informed the House that Mr Pool had written to the Committee on 15 February 1994 claiming that on a visit to the offices of Army Materiel in Canberra on 21 December 1993 he had been denied access on the grounds that he had appeared before the Committee. Mr Pool alleged that he was also told that, because of his appearance before the Committee, Army officers would no longer talk to him or have anything to do with him, his company or his products. Mr Bevis said that he had written on behalf of the Committee to Mr Ken Brown, a person who was present when Mr Pool was allegedly denied access to the Defence premises and that Mr Brown's reply had lent some support to the allegation that access was denied and that this may have been as a result of correspondence concerning Mr Pool's evidence. Mr Bevis said that he was of the view that there was prima facie evidence of a breach of privilege in relation to the matter¹ - Attachment A.
3. On 23 March 1994 the Acting Speaker, Mr Jenkins, advised the House that he was prepared to allow precedence to a motion, whereupon Mr Bevis moved the following motion:

That the question of whether Mr Peter Pool was discriminated against or penalised on account of his participation in an inquiry conducted by the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology be referred to the Committee of Privileges² - Attachment B.

Relevant law

4. Standing Order 362 of the House provides as follows:

All witnesses examined before the House, or any committee thereof, are entitled to the protection of the House in respect of anything that ~~may be said~~ may be said by them in their evidence.
5. Section 12 of the *Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987* deals with the protection of witnesses. It provides that a person shall not, by fraud, intimidation, force or threat, by the offer or promise of any inducement or benefit, or by other improper means, influence another person in respect of any evidence given or to be given before a House or a committee, or induce another person to refrain from giving any such evidence. Under the Act a person shall not inflict any penalty or injury upon, or deprive of any benefit, another person on account of the giving or proposed giving of any evidence before a House or a committee.

The penalties are \$5,000 for natural persons and \$25,000 for corporations. It is also provided (by subsection 12(3)) that the section does not prevent the imposition of a penalty by a House in respect of an offence against a House - in other words the statutory provision does not preclude proceedings for contempt from being pursued.³ While no action has ever been taken to prosecute a person under the provisions of section 12 of the 1987 Act, each House has considered such complaints in terms of its power to punish contempts - for example in the *Berthelsen* case (1980).

Conduct of inquiry

6. The Committee invited Mr Pool, Mr Ken Brown, Mr Bevis and the Secretary, Department of Defence, to lodge written submissions. Mr Bevis' submission outlined the details of Mr Pool's involvement with his committee's inquiry. A detailed submission was received from Mr R.N. McLeod, Acting Secretary, Department of Defence. Mr Pool informed the Committee that he did not wish the matter to be taken any further and Mr Brown advised that he did not wish to make a submission to the committee.
7. The Committee also received a memorandum from the Clerk of the House on the matter - see Attachment C. It sets out the basic constitutional and legislative provisions relevant to the complaint and summarises precedents.

Evidence received

8. The submission from the Department of Defence confirmed that Mr Pool was indeed denied access to officers of Army's Materiel Division on 21 December 1993. It states that Mr Pool did not have a previously arranged appointment on that day, although Mr Brown did. The submission states that at that time officers of the Division were in the process of preparing a response to questions raised by the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology - questions which were a consequence of the committee's discussions with Mr Pool. The submission further states that the "Division had had difficulties in their business relationship with Mr Pool for some time" and "The officers contacted felt that it would be inappropriate to have personal discussions with Mr Pool while they were in the course of preparing a further report for the Minister for Defence on issues arising out of Mr Pool's appearance before the Standing Committee". Statements from two officers (Messrs D. Lewis and G. Cooper) involved in the matter were attached to the submission, and it was denied that Mr Pool was informed that Mr Cooper had been instructed not to admit him because he had appeared before the parliamentary committee or that Mr Pool was told that officers of the Division would not talk to him or have anything to do with him, his company or its products. The submission concluded "The unwillingness to agree to have discussions with Mr Pool was motivated solely by a desire of the officers to avoid any possibility of compromise, at a time when they were working on a submission to the Minister in relation to the matters they anticipated that Mr Pool wished to discuss".

9. In view of Mr Pool's desire that the matter not be proceeded with, the Committee was not in a position to test his claims further.

Conclusion

10. In the circumstances the committee must inform the House that, noting Mr Pool's position on the matter as put to the committee, it has been unable to make a finding on the reference.

ROD SAWFORD
Chairman

27 June 1994

NOTES

-
1. House of Representatives *Hansard*, 23 March 1994, p. 1935.
 2. House of Representatives *Hansard*, 23 March 1994, p. 2025.
 3. House of Representatives Practice, pp 673, 708.

PRIVILEGE

Mr BEVIS (Brisbane) (12.10 p.m.)--In the course of the inquiry into government purchasing policies, the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology took evidence from Mr Peter Poole at an in camera hearing on 6 December 1993. The committee sought and subsequently obtained certain documents from the Minister for Defence (Senator Robert Ray) as a result of the evidence given by Mr Poole.

On 15 February 1994, Mr Poole wrote to the committee and stated that on a visit to the offices of army materiel in Canberra on 21 December 1993 he was denied access on the grounds that he had appeared before the committee. Mr Poole also alleged that he was told that army officers would no longer talk to him or have anything to do with him, his company or his products because of his appearance before the committee.

I subsequently wrote on behalf of committee to a Mr Ken Brown, who was present when Mr Poole was allegedly denied access to the defence premises. Mr Brown's reply lends some support to the allegation that access was denied and that this may have been as a result of the correspondence from the committee concerning Mr Poole's evidence.

It appears to me that there is prima facie evidence of a breach of the Parliamentary Privileges Act. Accordingly, Mr Acting Speaker, on behalf of the committee I request that you give consideration to allowing precedence to a motion so that this matter can be referred to the Privileges Committee. I seek leave to table the two letters in question.

Leave granted.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER--I will consider in detail the matters that the honourable member for Brisbane has raised and report back to the House at a later stage.

23 March 1994

CURRENT HOUSE HANSARD

Page: 2025

PRIVILEGE

PRIVILEGE

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! Earlier today the honourable member for Brisbane (Mr Bevis) raised a matter of privilege on behalf of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology. The honourable member advised the House that the committee had received a letter from a Mr Peter Pool, who had given evidence to the committee claiming to have been denied access to a defence establishment. Mr Pool claimed that his involvement with the committee inquiry had been cited as the reason for not denying him access and that he had been told that army officers would no longer talk to him because he had appeared before the committee. The honourable member stated that the committee had subsequently written to and received a letter from a Mr Ken Brown, who was present when Mr Pool was allegedly denied access to the defence premises, which lent some support to Mr Pool's claims.

I have considered the information provided by the honourable member and the letters from Mr Pool and Mr Brown which the honourable member tabled. The punishment or imposition of a penalty on a person on account of having given evidence to a parliamentary committee is a well-established category of contempt. In addition, the Parliamentary Privileges Act provides for substantial penalties to be imposed on persons for offences in respect of witnesses or prospective witnesses. Having considered the information provided by the honourable member and having regard to the rules and practices of the House in these matters, I have concluded that a prima facie case exists. Accordingly, I am willing to allow precedence to a motion in respect of the matter.

Motion (by Mr Bevis) agreed to:

That the question of whether Mr Peter Pool was discriminated against or penalised on account of his participation in an inquiry conducted by the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

**INQUIRY CONCERNING THE POSSIBLE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST A
WITNESS WHO HAD APPEARED BEFORE THE STANDING COMMITTEE
ON INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

Memorandum by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE REFERENCE

On 23 March 1994 the House of Representatives agreed to the following resolution:

That the question of whether Mr Peter Pool was discriminated against or penalised on account of his participation in an inquiry conducted by the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

The matter was raised in the House on 23 March by Mr Bevis, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, who said, *inter alia*, that during the course of its inquiry into Government purchasing policies, the Committee had taken evidence from a Mr Peter Pool at an in camera hearing on 6 December 1993. Mr Bevis said that the Committee had sought and subsequently obtained certain documents from the Minister for Defence as a result of the evidence given by Mr Pool. Mr Bevis said that on 15 February Mr Pool had written to the Committee and he stated that on a visit to the offices of Army Materiel in Canberra on 21 December 1993 he had been denied access on the grounds that he had appeared before the Committee. Mr Pool had also alleged that he was told that Army officers would no longer talk to him or have anything to do with him, his company or his products because of his appearance before the Committee. Mr Bevis said that he had written on behalf of the Committee to another person who was present when Mr Pool was allegedly denied access to the Defence premises and that this person's reply lent some support to the allegation that access was denied and that this may have been as a result of correspondence concerning Mr Pool's evidence. Mr Bevis said that he felt that there was prima facie evidence of a breach of the Parliamentary Privileges Act.

The Acting Speaker, Mr Jenkins, responded to the matter later in the day, stating that he was prepared to allow precedence to a motion, whereupon Mr Bevis moved the motion quoted above.

GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO PRIVILEGE AND CONTEMPT

A detailed explanation of the law and practice of the House relating to privilege and contempt is set out in House of Representatives Practice¹. The nature of privilege is explained and the area of absolute privilege or immunity described, with particular reference to the *Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987*. Reference is also

made to the power of the House to punish contempts and the following definition of contempt is quoted from May²:

...any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as contempt even though there is no precedent of the offence.

More information on this point is set out at pages 701-3 of House of Representatives Practice³.

Section 4 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987 provides:

Conduct (including the use of words) does not constitute an offence against a House unless it amounts, or is intended or likely to amount, to an improper interference with the free exercise by a House or committee of its authority or functions, or with the free performance by a Member of the Member's duties as a Member⁴.

In effect this provision sets a threshold: to be a contempt an action must amount to or be intended or likely to amount to improper interference with the free exercise by a House or a committee of its authority or functions or with the free performance by a Member of the Member's duties as a Member etc.

PARTICULAR REFERENCES RELEVANT TO THE MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE

Protection of witnesses

The success of committee inquiries is influenced greatly by the ability to obtain information from witnesses. Witnesses participating in 'proceedings in Parliament' enjoy absolute privilege in respect of this participation - for example they may not be sued or prosecuted for what they say. But more generally, the importance of the protection of witnesses has long been recognised. In 1892, and following a case in which a person had been dismissed by his employer after giving evidence to a Select Committee, the British Parliament enacted a Witnesses (Public Inquiries) Protection Act, which provided for fines or imprisonment of those who punished or injured witnesses. It also provided for the payment of compensation.

Standing Order 362 of the House provides as follows:

All witnesses examined before the House, or any committee thereof, are entitled to the protection of the House in respect of anything that may be said by them in their evidence.

May states:

"Any conduct calculated to deter prospective witnesses from giving evidence before either House or a committee is a contempt ... On the same principle, molestation of or threats against those who have previously given evidence before either House or a committee will be treated by the House concerned as a contempt ... Such actions have included assault or a threat of assault on witnesses, insulting or abusive behaviour, misuse (by a gaoler) or censure by an employer."⁵

Section 12 of the *Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987* provides for the protection of witnesses. It provides that a person shall not, by fraud, intimidation, force or threat, by the offer or promise of any inducement or benefit, or by other improper means, influence another person in respect of any evidence given or to be given before a House or a committee, or induce another person to refrain from giving any such evidence. Further, under the Act a person shall not inflict any penalty or injury upon, or deprive of any benefit, another person on account of the giving or proposed giving of any evidence or any evidence given or to be given, before a House or a committee. The penalties are \$5,000 for natural persons and \$25,000 for corporations.

It is also provided (by subsection 12(3)) that the section does not prevent the imposition of a penalty by a House in respect of an offence against a House - in other words the statutory provision does not preclude proceedings for contempt from being pursued.⁶

Intent

In such cases the Committee of Privileges is always likely to want to have regard to the intentions of any persons involved in a possible contempt. I point out, however, that the matter of intent is not itself conclusive in determining whether a contempt has been committed. Section 4 of the *Parliamentary Privileges Act*, dealing with contempts, refers to conduct that:

".... amounts, or is intended or likely to amount to an improper interference".

This confirms that it is not necessary to establish an intent to cause improper interference, technically it would be sufficient to establish that certain conduct amounted or was likely to amount to improper interference. Whether, in practice, regard should be had to the matter of intent is of course for the judgment of the committee, and ultimately the House.

Improper interference

I also note that it is possible that otherwise legal acts may still be held to amount to a contempt. In the *National Coal Board* case in 1976⁷ the House of Commons Committee of Privileges dealt with a case where an employee of the National Coal Board, who had given evidence to a select committee, had been declared redundant by the Board. In the event the Committee of Privileges found that there was no evidence indicating that the person's treatment was adversely affected by his having been a witness, but I note that, even though the act of declaring the person redundant may itself have been lawful and proper, this would not mean that a contempt could not have been found. Similarly in the 1989 'Drugs in Sport' case⁸, the Senate Committee of Privileges looked at a request by a person that another person (who had been a witness to a Senate committee) should leave his house. Again, there was no suggestion that the request to leave was itself improper, the real question was whether the conduct amounted to a penalty or punishment on account of the other person's involvement with the Senate committee (and see below).

The words "improper interference" in section 4 of the Parliamentary Privileges Act may be seen as a reflection that Members and others involved in modern parliamentary life are, quite properly, subjected to many representations from persons or organisations seeking to influence their thinking or action, but also as a recognition that there is a point beyond which conduct seeking to influence persons etc becomes improper interference. The point that needs to be borne in mind is that such conduct could, in all other ways, be quite proper.

PRECEDENTS

The cases of which I am aware which are most relevant are as follows:

House of Representatives

Bethelsen case

In 1980 the Committee of Privileges reported on a reference concerning the alleged discrimination against and intimidation of a witness, Mr D E Bethelsen, who had given evidence to a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence. On the evidence before it, the Committee of Privileges was not satisfied that a breach of privilege had been proved against any person but found that Mr Bethelsen had been disadvantaged in his career prospects in the public service. The Public Service Board was asked by the House, on the recommendation of the Committee, to do all within its power to restore the career prospects of Mr Bethelsen and to ensure that no further disadvantage was suffered by him. ⁹

Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee

In 1991 the Committee reported on a case which had arisen from an inquiry by the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs into corporate practices and the rights of shareholders. It was alleged that Mr Winston Willis, a person who had had a submission made on his behalf to the Committee, had been subject to intimidatory threats in relation to the submission. The matter concerned the position of minority shareholders in a Queensland company. Disagreements had persisted about the running of the company and Mr Willis had caused concerns to be put to the Parliamentary committee, and also to the National Companies and Securities Commission and the Business Council of Australia. The Chairman of the Company and the Company Secretary subsequently wrote to shareholders and references were made to the fact that until complaints were settled it was most unlikely that a proposed restructuring would go ahead. The Committee accepted that Mr Willis felt intimidated as a consequence of his involvement with the Committee inquiry. It said however that although this perception was genuinely held it was not evidence that intimidation or improper interference was intended or attempted. (The claims of intimidation were denied strenuously by the Company Chairman and Secretary.) The Committee also noted that it had received no proof of adverse effect as a result of the actions complained of in so far as the Committee inquiry was concerned. It found that on the evidence available to it no contempt had been committed.

Senate

Four precedents in the Senate are worthy of mention.

Drugs in Sport Inquiry

In June 1989 the Senate Committee of Privileges reported on a reference following receipt by Ms S. Howland, a witness to the inquiry into Drugs in Sport, of a note from Mr G Blood, the owner/occupier of the house in which Ms Howland lived. The note was to the effect that she should look for alternative accommodation, and it was received by Ms Howland the day after she had given evidence to the Committee.

The Committee took evidence from Mr Blood and from Ms Howland. It found that Mr Blood had not committed a contempt and concluded that he had had no intention either to interfere with Ms Howland in the giving of evidence or to penalise her for the giving of evidence. The committee heard evidence to the effect that Mr Blood had been concerned about the effect that the publicity and attention associated with the drugs in sport issue had had on his right to privacy and that he had not wanted the situation to escalate beyond his control. ¹⁰

Select Committee on the Administration of Aboriginal Affairs

Two matters were referred to the Senate's Committee of Privileges in relation to this inquiry.

In June 1989 the Committee of Privileges reported on a reference from the Senate which followed reported resolutions of the Aboriginal Development Commission relating to the presentation of papers and submissions to parliamentary committees and to public statements by members or officers of the Commission. The ADC had also passed a resolution of no confidence in Mrs S McPherson (Chairman of the ADC) and a senior officer, Mr M. O'Brien, was transferred from a position he held. The concern was that these actions followed and were connected with the giving of evidence to the Select Committee. ¹¹ The reference was reported on in separate parts. The Committee found that one of the resolutions of the ADC had not been passed with the intention of interfering with witnesses and therefore no contempt had been committed. On another ADC resolution the Committee found that as the members of the ADC were not sufficiently aware of the implications and ramifications of the resolution, no contempt of the Senate had been committed and that an explanation and apology, contained in a further resolution of the Commission and tabled by the President of the Senate on 20 October 1988, should be accepted.

In relation to the resolution of no confidence in Mrs McPherson, the committee concluded that a finding that a contempt had been committed should not be made and, in relation to the proposed transfer of Mr O'Brien, the committee found that no contempt had been committed in that any penalty or injury caused to Mr O'Brien was not inflicted in consequence of his giving evidence to the Select Committee. ¹²

In December 1989 the committee reported on the treatment of Mr M. Pope, a witness to the Select Committee and a former employee of the ADC, who was forbidden from visiting ADC offices without prior approval, and this action was said to be "in the light of the allegations [he had] made to the Senate Select Committee". The Committee of Privileges found that there was adverse treatment of Mr Pope, although to a minor degree, that this was partially in consequence of his having given evidence to the select committee and that therefore a contempt had been committed, although it did not constitute a serious contempt. In the light of apologies to the committee and the Senate, the Committee of Privileges recommended that no further action should be taken. ¹³

Community Affairs Committee (1992)

In this case the Senate Committee of Privileges considered allegations of intimidation of witnesses in relation to the Community Affairs Committee inquiry into the implementation of pharmaceutical restructuring measures. In a report presented in April 1992 the Community Affairs Committee had drawn attention to complaints which had been made to the Secretary of the Committee about a solicitor who had allegedly intimidated a person or persons because of evidence given to the Committee. The Committee of Privileges invited submissions from a number of persons who had been involved with the Community Affairs Committee inquiry, including three pharmacists from the Port Macquarie area and two solicitors. The Committee of Privileges apparently experienced considerable difficulty in eliciting substantive responses from those contacted. This included those who had apparently complained to the Standing Committee on Community Affairs that they had been intimidated. The Committee of Privileges reported that no finding of contempt could or should be made against the solicitor against whom the assertions had been made, or against his clients.

Joint Statutory Committee on Corporations and Securities

In September 1992 the Standing Committee on Corporations and Securities reported to the Senate in connection with a Mr James Gaffey, an officer of the Australian Securities Commission. Mr Gaffey had appeared before the Joint Committee on 11 October 1991 concerning the use immunity provisions of the corporations law. Mr Gaffey had stated that he was an employee of the ASC but that he was appearing before the Committee in a private capacity. In May 1992 the Committee was advised that Mr Gaffey had been charged under section 61 of the Public Service Act with misconduct, the ground being given that he had "made a submission to the Joint Committee on Corporations and Securities at variance with the submissions of the ASC".

The matter was referred to the Senate Committee of Privileges which found that contempts had been committed by the laying of a charge against Mr Gaffey. It noted that in laying the charges the Commission had been advised by the Australian Government Solicitors Office. In the circumstances the Committee of Privileges did not recommend a penalty - the charge had been withdrawn, and the Australian Securities Commission had apologised. The Committee of Privileges did draw attention to the number of cases of interference with witnesses arising from the

activities of public bodies and recommended that training be provided in Parliamentary matters to address the lack of understanding that it believed existed.

THE TASK BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

As I see it, the Committee of Privileges would need to seek to establish the facts in this matter, and then to reach whatever conclusions it may in light of the facts. The facts that would be relevant would include confirmation that evidence had been given to the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology by Mr Pool and details of the conduct complained of by Mr Pool. Relevant facts would then need to be considered in light of the principles mentioned above, with regard to existing precedents and with regard to the provisions of the *Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987*.

L M BARLIN
Clerk of the House

3 May 1994

NOTES

1. House of Representatives Practice (2nd edition), AGPS, Canberra 1989 (chapter 19).
2. May (21st Edition) p 115.
3. Op cit pp. 701-3.
4. Act No. 21 of 1987.
5. May, p. 131
6. House of Representatives Practice, pp 673, 708
7. HC 274 (1975-76)
8. PP 461 (1989)
9. PP 158 (1980)
10. PP 461 (1989)
11. PP 461 (1989)
12. PP 461 (1989)
13. PP 461 (1989)

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Parliament House - Canberra

Thursday, 5 May 1994

PRESENT: Mr Sawford (Chairman); Mr Peacock; Mr Andrews;
Mr Brown, Mr Cleeland; Mr Holding; Mr Lieberman;
Mr McGauran; Mr Simmons; Mr Sinclair

The meeting opened at 11.06am.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 March were confirmed.

.....(section deleted)

.....(section deleted)

.....(section deleted)

Reference concerning alleged discrimination of Mr Pool

Mr Lieberman advised the Committee that he was a member of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology. He said that he had not participated in the discussions on the complaint by Mr Pool, but would withdraw from the consideration of the reference if the Committee felt that was desirable. The Committee agreed that there was no need for Mr Lieberman to withdraw.

The Chairman presented a letter from Mr R.N. McLeod, Acting Secretary, Department of Defence, dated 26 April 1994.

Resolved (on the motion of Mr Cleeland) - That the letter be received as evidence.

The Chairman presented a letter from Mr A.R. Bevis, MP, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, dated 14 April 1994.

Resolved (on the motion of Mr Simmons) - That the letter be received as evidence.

The Committee deliberated.

Resolved (on the motion of Mr Holding) - That Mr Pool and Mr K. Brown be advised that if they wish to present submissions they should do so by 20 May.

At 12.16pm the committee adjourned until a date to be fixed.

Confirmed.

CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Parliament House - Canberra
Thursday, 9 June 1994

PRESENT: Mr Sawford (Chairman); Mr Brown; Mr Cleeland;
Mr Holding; Mr Lieberman; Mr Simmons; Mr Somlyay

The meeting opened at 11.23am.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 May were confirmed.

.....(section deleted)

Reference concerning alleged discrimination against Mr Pool

The Chairman presented a letter from Mr Pool, dated 7 April 1994.

Resolved (on the motion of Mr Somlyay) - That the letter be received as evidence.

The Committee deliberated.

.....(section deleted)

At 12.05pm the committee adjourned until a date and time to be fixed.

Confirmed.

CHAIRMAN