

Subject: RE: letter from Senate community affairs committee
From: "Holland, Ian (SEN)" <Ian.Holland@aph.gov.au>
Date: 15/11/11 11:11 AM
To: 'Bob Buckley' <cnvnr@a4.org.au>

Dear Mr Buckley,

I think my earlier correspondence has not clarified things as much as I had hoped. I will pass you email on to the committee for consideration at a future meeting. The committee can advise you if it agrees to you sharing its correspondence (including the email) with others.

I can respond on one point.

The committee presumes that when someone submits a submission that, unless they make a request to the contrary, they wish it to be accepted and published by the committee. See the committee webpage here:

http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/wit_sub/bro_one.htm

It was that presumption to which I was referring when I stated that committees take into account the preference of submitters. I do not believe A4 provided any correspondence that expressed a contrary preference.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Ian Holland
Secretary, Senate Standing Committee on Community Affairs
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600
ph. 02 6277 3515

From: Bob Buckley [mailto:cnvnr@a4.org.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 15 November 2011 10:10 AM
To: Holland, Ian (SEN)
Subject: Re: letter from Senate community affairs committee

Dear Dr Holland

Is your letter and our correspondence on the issue also confidential or am I allowed to share your letter and this correspondence?

You say "Committees do take into account the preference of submitters and inquiry participants" but A4 was not given any opportunity to express a preference for how its submission would be treated once it was not accepted as a submission by the Committee. What preference did the Committee take into account? How was this submitter's preference expressed?

Is there a reason why the Committee did not point out in a timely manner that it regarded some adverse comments in our submission as not relevant to the terms of reference? Why did the Committee not inform A4 of its concerns about relevance of the offending "adverse comments" and allow us to revise our submission according to what the Committee believed were its terms of reference? Instead, the Committee simply consigned all of A4's concerns to a political (and bureaucratic) black hole ... thereby reinforcing one of the concerns raised in our "correspondence".

yours sincerely
Bob Buckley