

THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

THE SENATE

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

**POSSIBLE PENALTY OR INJURY IMPOSED ON WITNESSES
BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUPERANNUATION**

(57TH REPORT)

OCTOBER 1995

© Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia 1995

ISSN 1038-9857
ISBN 0 642 23463 9

This document was produced from camera-ready copy prepared by the Committee of Privileges, and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House, Canberra.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Senator Baden Teague (**Chairman**) (South Australia)

Senator the Honourable Margaret Reynolds (**Deputy Chairperson**) (Queensland)

Senator Bruce Childs (New South Wales)

Senator John Coates (Tasmania)

Senator Christopher Ellison (Western Australia)

Senator Jim McKiernan (Western Australia)

Senator Bob Woods (New South Wales)

The Senate
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction	1
Conduct of the inquiry	2
Background	3
CHAPTER TWO	
Comment	9
Conclusion	11
Finding	11

POSSIBLE PENALTY OR INJURY IMPOSED ON WITNESSES BEFORE THE SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUPERANNUATION

Introduction

2.1 On 17 December 1993, the following matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges:

Having regard to the Eleventh Report of the Select Committee on Superannuation, whether witnesses who gave evidence to the select committee were subject to any penalty or injury in respect of their evidence, and whether any contempt was committed in relation to those witnesses.

2.2 The reference to the Committee was given precedence by the then President of the Senate, Senator the Honourable Kerry Sibraa, following consideration of the report of the Select Committee on Superannuation referred to in the terms of reference.ⁱ The report drew attention to two complaints. The first, by Mr Kevin Lindeberg, alleged that he and his wife had been subject to discriminatory behaviour by the Queensland Professional Credit Union Board, as a result of his giving evidence to the Senate Select Committee on Superannuation in Brisbane on 29 April 1993 in relation to its inquiry into the operations of the Queensland Professional Officers' Association Superannuation Fund (QPOASF)ⁱⁱ. Similarly, the Superannuation Committee reported that Mr Des O'Neill had written to it, alleging that the QPCU had refused to accept his application for membership as a direct consequence of his giving evidence at a hearing of the Superannuation Committeeⁱⁱⁱ. The Queensland Professional Credit Union (QPCU) is a body associated with the Queensland Professional Officers' Association Superannuation Fund.

2.3 The Superannuation Committee wrote to the Chairman of the QPCU, Mr Cec Lee, seeking responses to the issues raised by Mr Lindeberg^{iv}. Mr O'Neill's letter of complaint was received by the Superannuation Committee after it had already sought information on Mr Lindeberg's letter. Mr Lee responded to the Committee on 15 December 1993^v. Having examined all the documents, the Superannuation Committee concluded that Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill might have been subjected to penalty in respect of evidence given to its inquiry into the operations of the Queensland Professional Officers' Association Superannuation Fund and, therefore, pursuant to the Privileges Resolution of the Senate of 25 February 1988, resolved to report these facts and its conclusion to the Senate^{vi}.

2.4 The report gave a detailed account of the eligibility of Mr Lindeberg and his wife to remain full members of the Credit Union, and attached as appendices correspondence with the Committee from Messrs Lindeberg, O'Neill and Lee, together with the rules of the QPCU. In addition to including all relevant documents in its report to the Senate, the Superannuation Committee later tabled, thereby making public, a substantial number of documents relating to the very complex issues leading to the giving of evidence by Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill on the question of certain superannuation transactions involving a superannuation fund run by the QPOA and QPCU. This matter was the subject of a special report of the Superannuation Committee^{vii}. The Committee of Privileges commends the Superannuation Committee on its thorough and helpful

investigation of the matter which led to this Committee's consideration of possible contempt.

Conduct of Inquiry

- 2.5 The Committee of Privileges first met to examine the matter early in February 1994, and wrote at that stage to the Chairman of the Superannuation Committee, the Secretary to that committee, and to Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill seeking submissions. The Committee of Privileges had already received an earlier, unsolicited, submission from Mr Lindeberg^{viii}, but invited him to make any further comments he may wish. The Committee pointed out at that time that because of its considerable workload it would not be able to undertake detailed inquiries for some time. Nevertheless, it sought submissions to enable it at least to begin its deliberations while completing other references.
- 2.6 Before the Committee was able to take the matter any further, the Committee received advice from both Senator Woodley and Mr Lindeberg^{ix} that Mr Lindeberg was the subject of defamation action by Mr Gordon Rutherford, the General Manager/Director of QPCU. A demand was made to Mr Lindeberg that he sign and return an apology prepared by solicitors acting for Mr Rutherford and give a written undertaking that he would not repeat his statement or make any similar statements. He received the letter on 8 April 1994 and a response was demanded by 15 April. He was advised that if he refused to do so action would be taken to recover damages for defamation^x.
- 2.7 Following its consideration of all submissions, the Committee then determined to seek from Mr Gordon Rutherford, General Manager of the QPCU, and also from Mr Cec Lee, Chairman of the Credit Union, who had previously responded to the Superannuation Committee, submissions on the matter. Responses were sought from Mr Rutherford and Mr Lee by 20 June 1994. Mr Lee made a substantive response dated 17 June^{xi}. Mr Rutherford indicated that he had nothing to add to Mr Lee's submission but advised that he had initiated legal proceedings for defamation against Mr Lindeberg^{xii}.
- 2.8 Following consideration of these responses, and in accordance with its normal practice, the Committee decided at its meeting of 30 June 1994 to write to all persons involved, making available to each all relevant submissions. Responses were sought and received by 1 August 1994^{xiii}.
- 2.9 The Committee, having examined the public responses, wrote again to all persons involved, and in particular sought responses from Mr Rutherford and Mr Lee to questions deriving from its consideration of the submissions before it^{xiv}. Two of the questions involved details of police investigations concerning the QPCU. Most questions were answered, but in November 1994 the QPCU sought an extension of time for response until the police matter was resolved^{xv}. This occurred on 28 June 1995 when the Committee received advice from Mr Rutherford, as General Manager of the QPCU^{xvi}, that completed the outstanding matters before the Committee.

2.10 The full documentation relating to the inquiry is tabled in a volume accompanying this report. For reasons explained at paragraph 2.11 below, most of these documents were published by the Committee of Privileges on 31 August 1995, and were sent to persons involved in the inquiry. Further material received since that time has been taken into account in the finalisation of this report.

Background

2.11 On 20 November 1992, Mr Des O'Neill made a submission to the Superannuation Committee, asking that it investigate the Queensland Professional Officers' Association Superannuation Fund (QPOASF)^{xvii}. Mr O'Neill's submission alleged, *inter alia*, that funds had been improperly transferred from the QPOASF to four beneficiaries on 31 January 1987^{xviii}. The QPOASF was established on 11 June 1985 under a trust deed between the QPOA and Messrs C A Lee, W J Higham and D Martindale as trustees^{xix}. It was sponsored by the QPOA and the Professional Officers' (Queensland) Credit Union (now the QPCU) for the benefit of employees of those two organisations.

2.12 The Superannuation Committee took evidence in Brisbane on 29 April 1993 from, among others, Mr O'Neill and Mr Lindeberg, who appeared together^{xx}. On 31 May 1993, Mr Lee and Mr Rutherford responded to the matters raised^{xxi}. That committee experienced some difficulty in reaching conclusions about the legality of the 1987 transfers because four Benefit Payment Request forms which, it was claimed, had been tendered in evidence by National Mutual Ltd, the Trust administrators, to the Commission of Inquiry into the Activities of Particular Queensland Unions (the Cooke Inquiry) had disappeared^{xxii}. Nevertheless, the committee in a special report on the QPOASF concluded that:

the original trustees of the QPOA Superannuation Fund have a record which, in a number of respects, is open to criticism. It is possible they did breach trust law at the time of the extraordinary transfers in January 1987, but at best it appears they were not properly mindful of their duties as trustees or, if they were mindful, elected to disregard them^{xxiii}

and

what occurred in the QPOASF reflected poorly on the employer body and its trustee representatives. The maladministration, sloppiness of record keeping and the propensity of certain persons to become involved in conflicts of interest were inexcusable^{xxiv}.

The Benefit Payment Request forms have not since been located.

2.13 The Eighth Report of the Superannuation Committee was presented to the President of the Senate on 20 August 1993^{xxv}. On 19 August, notices of motion from Mr Lindeberg, seconded by Mr O'Neill, were hand delivered by Mr O'Neill to Mr Gordon Rutherford, General Manager, QPCU^{xxvi}. The notices of motion, lodged for discussion at the Annual General Meeting of the QPCU to be held on 28 October 1993, read as follows:

Re: Notices of Motions for 28 October 1993 AGM

In accordance with the notification the following notice of motions is submitted for debate at the AGM to be held on Thursday 28 October 1993:

- 1."That the Returning Officer for ballot of directors no longer be any director or employee of the credit union, and that the Returning Officer be an appropriately qualified independent outside person, and that the QPCU Limited Constitution be altered accordingly to give effect to the change."
- 2."That in light of evidence given at Parliament House Brisbane on 29/4/93 and 31/5/93 to the Senate Select Committee on Superannuation (SSCS) in its investigation into extraordinary withdrawals from the Queensland Professional Officers Association Superannuation Fund (QPOASF) on 30/1/1987 which breached the Trust Deed and caused a significant financial detriment to the Fund, this meeting of QPCU shareholders calls on the Chairman of Directors, a trustee of the QPOASF at the time the breach occurred, to stand down from the QPCU Board in the interest of the QPCU's public and financial standing."
- 3."That in light of evidence given at Parliament House Brisbane on 29/4/93 and 31/5/93 to the SSCS in its investigations into extraordinary withdrawals from the QPOASF on 30/1/87, and evidence from National Mutual Life that the NML Benefit Payment Request forms indicated that the four people had "resigned their employment" to access monies, this meeting of shareholders calls on Mr Gordon Rutherford, General Manager and QPCU Director, to fully explain his actions being one of the aforementioned people, against the fact that he never ceased his employment with the credit union at the said date and remained employed throughout."
- 4."That this meeting of shareholders calls on each Director to inform the meeting whether any action of his own volition has been taken to satisfy himself of the truth of the matter concerning the contradictory evidence given to the SSCS at Parliament House by QPCU Director and General Manager Mr Rutherford and National Mutual Life in accessing superannuation monies. If no action has been taken this meeting seeks an explanation as to the reasons why."
- 5."That this meeting of shareholders calls on each Director to state whether he was aware or informed that the Cooke Commission of Inquiry while investigating the QPOA had subpoenaed QPOASF

documentation from National Mutual Life to investigate the extraordinary withdrawals from the fund before the QPCU Board authorised the expenditure of \$92,000 of credit union funds at the Inquiry."

6."That this meeting of shareholders calls for an explanation concerning the appearance of QPCU Directors Lee and Rutherford at the Senate Hearing in Parliament House Brisbane on 31 May 1993:

(i)why did they send statements on 29/4/93 rather than attend personally when first requested;

(ii)did the QPCU pay for their legal representation, and if so, what was the cost to the credit union;

(iii)if the credit union paid the fees, on what basis was it done."

Motion moved by: Kevin Lindeberg 064435

Motion seconded by: Desmond O'Neill^{xxvii}

2.14As their terms indicated, the notices were highly critical of the Board and were heavily based on what purported to be matters raised during proceedings of the Superannuation Committee. Mr Lindeberg was a long-standing member of the QPCU. Mr O'Neill, as seconder of the motions, appears not previously to have been a member of the QPCU. He applied for membership of the credit union on 17 August 1993^{xxviii}, two days before submitting the notices. The credit union's rules provide for two categories of membership for persons within the "common bond": shareholding and depositing. Both categories of member are eligible to vote but only shareholding members are entitled to borrow money. The Board has full power to reject any application for either form of membership. No qualifications are prescribed for depositing membership. Qualifications are prescribed for shareholding membership and the Board has the discretion to grant shareholding membership to members who formerly qualified but ceased to be eligible. The rules of the QPCU are included as Appendix B to the Superannuation Committee's Eleventh Report. Basically they require shareholding members to be members of the QPOA or associated members, for example, spouses, children, parents etc. In addition, the discretion to grant membership of the QPCU is very broad^{xxix}. It is clear that Mr Lindeberg and his wife, and Mr O'Neill, were eligible to be both depositing and shareholding members of the QPCU.

2.15It is not clear to the Committee why Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill submitted the notices so long before the annual general meeting, although Mr Lindeberg has explained that they "were supplied in time for circulation to the entire list of shareholders"^{xxx}. Rules governing the QPCU stipulate that only seven days' notice is required^{xxxi}. It has been drawn to the Committee's attention that a similar time for giving notice has been imposed for the 1995 AGM, a sixty-seven day requirement regarded by the person raising the

matter as "unprecedented"^{xxxii}. Regardless of the reasons for forwarding the notices, the problem for Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill was that they submitted them before the Superannuation Committee had made its report: as previously mentioned, the Superannuation Committee's Eighth Report, on the QPOASF, was presented on 20 August 1993. Thus neither Mr Lindeberg nor Mr O'Neill had access to the report before preparing and submitting the relevant notices.

2.16 On 1 September 1993, Mr O'Neill was advised that his Credit Union membership had been refused, and the money which he had deposited when making his application was returned to him. On 3 September, Mr O'Neill telephoned Mr Rutherford, seeking the reasons for the Board's refusal of membership. Mr Rutherford gave him no explanation^{xxxiii}. On the same day Mr O'Neill wrote to the Queensland Office of Financial Supervision (QOFS), requesting that organisation to investigate the reasons for the rejection of his application for membership of the QPCU. On 22 September the QOFS responded to Mr O'Neill rejecting his suggestion that a breach of the financial institutions legislation had occurred and advising him to take the matter up with the QPCU direct^{xxxiv}. The Committee observes that Mr Gordon Rutherford was at that stage a member of an advisory committee to the QOFS^{xxxv}.

2.17 The annual general meeting of the QPCU proceeded as planned on 28 October. Legal advice had been received that Mr Lindeberg's motions were "not proper motions" and could not be proceeded with at that meeting^{xxxvi}. Mr Lindeberg attempted to raise the matters associated with the superannuation fund but had only limited success^{xxxvii}. It is his statements at this meeting which form the basis of the defamation action now being undertaken by solicitors acting for Mr Rutherford^{xxxviii}.

2.18 On 16 November 1993, Mr C Lee, Chairman of the QPCU, wrote to Mr and Mrs Lindeberg, informing them that they were no longer eligible for membership of the credit union. They were advised to sign termination of membership forms and return the forms to head office. They were further advised that their failure to terminate their membership within 14 days would result in the automatic closure of their accounts. No reasons were given for the termination of membership of either Mr or Mrs Lindeberg^{xxxix}.

2.19 On 20 November, Mr Lindeberg wrote to the Superannuation Committee, enclosing the relevant documents and asking that Committee to investigate his grievance that the QPCU Board had expelled him as a reprisal for the evidence he gave to the Superannuation Committee^{xl}. The Superannuation Committee sought a response from Mr Lee, who did so on 15 December 1993. Mr Lee's letter declared that, when Mr Lindeberg ceased to be an employee of the Union in August 1990, he ceased to be "eligible for membership of the QPCU" and further asserted that Mr Lindeberg's evidence to the Superannuation Committee had nothing to do with the Board's termination of his membership. The letter went on to say that, while the Board could have taken action in relation to his membership since August 1990, it did not do so until it was "quite satisfied all outstanding matters had been dealt with and completed ie. at the conclusion of the 1993 Annual General Meeting, where a report on Mr Lindeberg's

remaining Superannuation matters had been received and adopted by Members at the Annual General Meeting. To have contacted Mr Lindeberg any earlier in this regard may have led to the Credit Union's motives being questioned^{xli}.

2.20 In the meantime, on 3 December, Mr Des O'Neill wrote to the Superannuation Committee advising of the refusal by the credit union to accept his membership^{xlii} — for which he was clearly qualified as a result of his being an officeholder of the Queensland Professional Officers Association. The Superannuation Committee did not at this point seek further advice from Mr Lee, but decided to make a report on the matter to the Senate on 16 December. As indicated above, the matter was referred to this Committee on 17 December.

CHAPTER TWO

- 3.1 As the account given in chapter one indicates, both Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill claim that action was taken against them in respect of their membership of the Queensland Profession Credit Union as a consequence of their having given evidence before a Senate committee. Their claim revolves around whether they have been penalised or injured, or deprived of a benefit, on account of their evidence before a committee under paragraph (11) of Privilege Resolution 6. If this fact were to be proved, the act of refusing and depriving persons of their membership could be held to be a contempt of the Senate.
- 3.2 Although the QPCU Board could lawfully exercise its discretion to refuse or remove from membership^{xliii} and in a letter to the committee an offer was made by the Chairman of the Board to entertain further applications for membership^{xliv}, neither factor would absolve the Board or its officers from liability for commission of a contempt. The question therefore for the Committee of Privileges to consider was whether the penalty imposed on Mr and Mrs Lindeberg, and the injury to Mr O'Neill, in that they were denied membership and the attendant benefits of an organisation to which they were all entitled to belong, was on account of their having given evidence to a Senate committee.
- 3.3 As all the submissions demonstrate, the relationship between officers of the QPCU and Messrs Lindeberg and O'Neill was strained. Mr Lindeberg had been an employee of the QPCU until May 1990, when he was dismissed by that organisation for reasons which are set out in various submissions. The dismissal was finalised in August of the same year^{xlv}. There has been some conflict between Mr Lindeberg and the QPCU as to those reasons^{xlvi}. Mr O'Neill's involvement with the organisation appears to have come from his executive membership of the Queensland State Service Union which was to amalgamate with the QPOA on 1 January 1993^{xlvii}. Mr O'Neill was concerned that any irregularities within the QPOA should be finalised prior to the amalgamation^{xlviii}.
- 3.4 In 1991 both Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill participated in the proceedings of the Cooke Commission of Inquiry into the activities of particular Queensland credit unions in respect of QPOA activities. It is clear from evidence before the Committee of Privileges that, while each had separate interests in QPOA/QPCU activities, they were in regular contact with each other. Each has also been active in relation to the Queensland Whistleblowers Association and has given evidence before the two Senate Select Committees on Public Interest Whistleblowing. The Queensland Whistleblowers Association made a submission to this Committee on Mr Lindeberg's behalf^{xlix}.
- 3.5 It was Mr O'Neill who initiated the Superannuation Committee inquiry into the QPOASF executive or leadership, and he and Mr Lindeberg gave joint, public, evidence, to which the QPCU Chairman and General Manager were required to respond, on 29 April 1993. The response was made on 31 May 1993, and the Committee reported on 20 August 1993. It is not for this Committee to make a judgment as to whether their concerns were justified other than to refer to the Eighth Report of the Superannuation Committee which expressed grave reservations as to the activities of persons involved with the QPOASF.

- 3.6 Mr Lindeberg's membership of the QPCU, and that of his wife, could have been withdrawn at any time at all, both before and after Mr Lindeberg was finally dismissed on 2 August 1990. It appears that Mr O'Neill was not a member of the QPCU until he attempted to join the credit union on 17 August 1993. It is not clear to the Committee whether he was a depositing member or a shareholding member; however, the difference is immaterial for present purposes, as Mr O'Neill appears to have been eligible in his own right for shareholding membership as a member of the QPOA. Both shareholding and depositing members can vote at any annual general meeting. Two days after he made application to join the credit union, Mr O'Neill delivered the notices of motion for the annual general meeting of 28 October 1993, as outlined at paragraph 1.13 above.
- 3.7 Mr O'Neill's application was refused on 1 September 1993. So far as the notices delivered by Mr O'Neill were concerned, the QPCU executive received legal advice that "matters pertaining to the functions and administration of the Queensland Professional Officers' Association Superannuation Fund were ultra vires the credit union (i.e. the scope of or the powers of the credit union)". It is presumably on that basis that the motions were not proceeded with. Notwithstanding that advice, responses were made in the Chairman's report to similar matters raised by Mr Lindeberg at the annual general meeting in the previous year.
- 3.8 In an attempt to ensure that the matters were further debated at the 1993 annual general meeting, Mr Lindeberg raised them during discussion on the Chairman's report. It is the comments which he uttered at this point which have subsequently led to Mr Rutherford's defamation action against him. Little more than a fortnight after that meeting Mr Lindeberg was advised that his membership of the QPCU, and that of his wife, would be terminated.

Comment

- 3.9 The Committee has found itself attempting to determine a serious question of possible contempt of the Senate as part of wider disputes between persons within an organisation. The Committee does not intend to go into any further detail about the grievances raised by Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill, and the QPCU response to them, other than to observe that, as in other cases, they constitute a pattern of claim and counter claim which has been a feature of inquiries of this nature. The evidence in the submissions and documents gives sufficient indication of the disputes that were occurring within the organisation for a considerable period, culminating in the refusal of QPCU membership to Mr O'Neill, the termination of Mr and Mrs Lindeberg's QPCU membership and action for defamation taken by the General Manager against Mr Lindeberg based on matters Mr Lindeberg raised at the 1993 annual general meeting of the QPCU little more than a fortnight before the termination.
- 3.10 The Committee was particularly concerned, however, about matters raised by Mr Kevin Childs, who in November 1994 advised the Committee that, at the annual general

meeting on 27 October 1994, a motion concerning the withdrawal of membership of Mr and Mrs Lindeberg, and the refusal of Mr O'Neill's membership, was not discussed on the basis of advice from the directors that "the meeting was prohibited from discussing this matter as it was before the Senate Privileges Committee"ⁱⁱ. This, in the Committee's view, was either a misunderstanding or a misuse of a principle which may have application in other circumstances. Although the Committee had advised all persons involved in the matter that submissions made to the Committee were not to be released without the Committee's permission, this in no way precluded the subject-matter being canvassed in another forum.

3.11 Furthermore, if the parties wished to ensure that there could be no transgression, they could have sought such permission to release submissions before the meeting occurred. Indeed, the Committee's advice on this question was again sought by Mr Childs in respect of the 1995 annual general meeting of the QPCUⁱⁱⁱ. As a result of his approach to the Committee it decided to publish a volume of all relevant documents, which have been distributed to all persons making submissions to it.

3.12 The Committee also makes a further point. Several of the submissions from the persons affected by the QPCU action, and other submissions in their support, have suggested that the Committee should take action and examine matters beyond its terms of reference. Like the Superannuation Committee, the Committee of Privileges is not prepared to act in judgment, or as arbiter, on the conduct of the QPCU or other organisations' affairs^{liii}. As with all cases of this nature, the Committee is required solely to determine whether Mr Lindeberg and his wife and Mr O'Neill were penalised or injured on account of their evidence before the Superannuation Committee.

3.13 The Committee does not accept the reasons put forward by Mr Lee as Chairman of the QPCU for the withdrawal of Mr Lindeberg's membership. It considers the explanation provided by the QPCU disingenuous and draws attention to the comments made in Mr Lindeberg's submissions to this Committee in respect of them. The Committee has little doubt that such a withdrawal was, as Mr Lindeberg asserts, a reprisal for Mr Lindeberg's attempts to have matters of concern to him aired, notably at the annual general meeting of the QPCU on 28 October 1993. The QPCU's refusal of membership to Mr O'Neill was, in the Committee's view, to ensure that another person with detailed knowledge of the Queensland Professional Officers' Association Superannuation Fund and a supporter of Mr Lindeberg's efforts to call the credit union directors and management to account at that meeting would be prevented from attending and participating in the annual general meeting.

3.14 The matters raised in the notices of motion were the subject of a critical report of the Superannuation Committee, based on evidence given to that committee. However, such matters had been canvassed widely in other forums, including the annual general meeting of the QPCU the previous year. The Committee of Privileges has been unable to establish that the penalty and injury which undoubtedly were caused to Mr and Mrs Lindeberg, and to Mr O'Neill, were on account of their giving evidence to that committee.

Conclusion

3.15 The Committee of Privileges has concluded that the refusal of membership of the QPCU to Mr O'Neill was a preventive measure to ensure that the notices of motion which he had submitted on behalf of himself and Mr Lindeberg were ineffectual, and that he would be unable to attend the annual general meeting of 28 October 1993 to give support to Mr Lindeberg. It has further concluded that the reprisal against Mr Lindeberg, of terminating his membership of the QPCU and that of his wife, was taken, not because Mr Lindeberg had given evidence before the Senate Select Committee on Superannuation, but because he wished to ensure that the matters he had raised in evidence, which by the time of the meeting had been canvassed in the Eighth Report of that Committee, were given a public airing at a meeting of affected persons.

3.16 So far as the QPCU's offer to consider restoring membership is concerned, given the perception by both Mr Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill that their reputations have been harmed by the arbitrary actions of the QPCU executive, the Committee considers that such a restoration of membership for Mr and Mrs Lindeberg and Mr O'Neill may right a wrong and accordingly would be proper.

Finding

3.17 The Committee of Privileges has determined not to make a finding that a contempt of the Senate has occurred.

Baden Teague
Chairman

ENDNOTES

- i. Superannuation Committee, Eleventh Report, 16 December 1993, Parliamentary Paper No. 431/93.
- ii. *ibid.* p. 9.
- iii. *ibid.* p. 55.
- iv. *ibid.* p. 59.
- v. *ibid.* p. 61.
- vi. *ibid.* p. 7.
- vii. Superannuation Committee, Eighth Report, presented to the President on 20 August 1993 and tabled in the Senate on 30 August 1993 (Parliamentary Paper No. 152/93).
- viii. Volume of documents, p. 2.
- ix. *ibid.* pp. 44,57.
- x. *ibid.* p. 46.
- xi. *ibid.* p. 65.
- xii. *ibid.* p. 74.
- xiii. *ibid.* p. 75.
- xiv. *ibid.* pp. 133,136.
- xv. *ibid.* p. 145.
- xvi. *ibid.* p. 224.
- xvii. *ibid.* p. 165.
- xviii. *ibid.* p. 165.
- xix. Superannuation Committee, Eighth Report, p. 2, para. 1.8.
- xx. Superannuation Committee *Hansard*, 29 April 1993, p. 41.
- xxi. Superannuation Committee, Eighth Report, p. 23, para. 4.1.
- xxii. *ibid.* p. 27, paras 4.20 and 4.21.

- xxiii. *ibid.* p. 35, para. 5.12.
- xxiv. *ibid.* p. 63, para. 10.10.
- xxv. *Journals of the Senate*, 30 August 1993, p. 403.
- xxvi. Volume of documents, p. 39.
- xxvii. *ibid.* p. 39.
- xxviii. Superannuation Committee, Eighth Report, p. 57.
- xxix. Superannuation Committee, Eleventh Report, p. 17. See especially 7(b).
- xxx. *ibid.* p. 9
- xxxi. *ibid.* p. 44, Rule 37(ii)(g).
- xxxii. Volume of documents, p. 227.
- xxxiii. Volume of documents, p. 39.
- xxxiv. Superannuation Committee, Eleventh Report, pp. 56 and 57.
- xxxv. *ibid.* p. 57.
- xxxvi. Volume of documents, p. 20, para. 4.1.13; p. 156.
- xxxvii. *ibid.* p. 19.
- xxxviii. *ibid.* pp. 46, 157.
- xxxix. Superannuation Committee, Eleventh Report, p. 12.
- xl. *ibid.* p. 9.
- xli. *ibid.* p. 61.
- xlii. *ibid.* p. 55.
- xliii. *ibid.* pp. 23 and 24 (rule 10 and rule 12(c)).
- xliv. Volume of documents, p. 65.
- xlv. *ibid.* p. 5.
- xlvi. *ibid.* See pp. 5,6 and 65.
- xlvii. Superannuation Committee, Eighth Report, p. 2, para. 1.9.

xlvi. Volume of documents, p. 124.

xlix. *ibid.* pp. 62-64.

l. *ibid.* p. 156.

li. *ibid.* p. 149.

lii. *ibid.* p. 227.

liii. Superannuation Committee, Eighth Report, p. 4, para. 1.17.