

Dear Mr Chafer ...

Thank you for your recent email ... I intend that my emails on the subject should be considered as submissions to the inquiry ...

My submissions indeed deal with a substantial element of the implied terms of reference ... namely, by extension, the substantiation of the validity of all matters relating to democratic elections in Australia ... thus ANY process discovered that could be interpreted as attempted fraudulent conduct should be exposed and condemned ... to do otherwise would suggest that parliamentary sanction is being given to that fraudulent conduct ...

I look forward to reading the Committee's Report in due course ...

PETER MAKEIG

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Makeig

Sent: Thursday, 3 April 2003 9:04 PM

To: Chafer, Russell (REPS)

Cc: Georgiou, Petro (MP); Danby, Michael (MP); Bartlett, Andrew (Senator); Brandis, George (Senator); Mason, Brett (Senator); Murray, Andrew (Senator); Ray, Robert (Senator); Forrest, John (MP); Panopoulos, Sophie (MP); Melham, Daryl (MP)

Subject: Re: SUBMISSION 180 to the Committee

Russell Chafer
Secretary
Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters
CANBERRA ACT

FRAUDULENT MATERIAL being PROPAGATED by COMMITTEE ?

Dear Mr Chafer ...

Thank you for your email of yesterday ...

I would like to add the following ...

I question the basis given by the Committee for shelving my earlier submission ... that is, that the detailed complaint about a fraudulent submission from ADC was ... "outside the terms of reference ... ".

I submit that an implied requirement ("Terms of Reference", if you like) of ANY Parliamentary Committee is that it seeks by all proper means to deal with matters before it with integrity and thoroughness. That implied duty must surely encompass a careful review of past Committee performance, if there is any suggestion whatsoever, that there had been a gross error of judgment leading to a miscarriage of justice ... or even more alarming, a possible covered-up fraud. It is my belief that such a review is well and truly part of your implied "Terms of Reference".

In the light of the above submission, I formally request that you advise the Members that there is an important issue that appears to have been poorly handled. Rectification is morally mandatory.

I would be pleased to be advised the date of the next Committee meeting. Is there a meeting schedule ? Are meetings open to the citizenry ?

PETER MAKEIG ... a concerned citizen.

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Makeig

Sent: Wednesday, 26 March 2003 10:23 AM

To: Chafer, Russell (REPS)

Subject: Re: SUBMISSION 180 to the Committee

Dear Mr Chafer ...

Thank you for your response to my query regarding the apparent censoring of a portion of a significant submission to your Committee ...

My reading of the papers before me indicates that another organization (ADC) submitted material to your committee, and that submission misrepresented the position of CEC ... it appears that a fraudulent statement purporting to be a quotations from a CEC document was accepted at face value by your committee without reference to its quoted source.. And that fraudulent statement was published in your report ...

This is a matter of fair procedural conduct. If a citizen or organization considers that it has been misrepresented and possibly defamed by the publication of inaccurate material in a Government Standing Committee Report, I believe that a public opportunity needs to be given to correct the flawed findings of the Committee. Otherwise, the whole tenor and credibility of the current Standing Committee's Report would be in jeopardy. Indeed, all future reports from the Standing Committee would be tainted.

While it is perhaps understandable that your committee did not fully cross-check every reference to verify material in all submissions, the situation here is different.

Your committee received a notification from CEC that there was a fraudulent reference to which CEC objected. The precise nature of that fraudulent material was provided.

Having received that alert, it would be quite improper for the Committee to sit on its hands and hope that the matter would fade away. The very least the Public could expect in these circumstances is a careful review by your Committee, in the light of the allegation of fraudulent material being accepted and published by you. If the accusation is found to be true then a retraction and an apology for the faulty bureaucratic procedures should be issued.

Thank you again for your reply to my earlier email. I look forward to receiving a more focused response to the matter contained herein.

PETER MAKEIG

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Makeig

Sent: Tuesday, 18 March 2003 4:31 AM

To: Committee, EM (REPS)

Cc: All.members.of.the.committee...P.Georgiou.MP@aph.gov.au; Danby, Michael (MP); Bartlett, Andrew (Senator); Mason, Brett (Senator); Ray, Robert (Senator); Forrest, John (MP); Panopoulos, Sophie (MP); Melham, Daryl (MP)

Subject: SUBMISSION 180 to the Committee

The Secretary ...

I note that Submission 180 refers to several Appendices attached to a covering letter dated January 2003 ... These appendices appear to be missing from the Committee's website, and thus the submission is incomplete as a record of the Committee's work ...

I believe the public interest can only be properly served if all submissions, in their totality, are made available for public scrutiny. In a free democracy no legitimate interest is served by withholding information of value to the community. Your committee was set up, amongst other objectives, to probe for the truth without fear or favour, for the advancement of our society ...

Please advise why the documents mentioned are incomplete, and how long it will be before they are made available on your website for the interest of the public ...

PETER MAKEIG