



ETHICS COMMITTEE

REPORT NO. 186

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018
RELATING TO AN ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT****Introduction and background**

1. The Ethics Committee (the committee) is a statutory committee of the Queensland Parliament established under section 102 of the *Parliament of Queensland Act 2001* (the POQA). The current committee was appointed by resolution of the Legislative Assembly on 15 February 2018.
2. The committee's area of responsibility includes dealing with complaints about the ethical conduct of particular members and dealing with alleged breaches of parliamentary privilege by members of the Assembly and other persons.¹ The committee investigates and reports on matters of privilege and possible contempts of parliament referred to it by the Speaker or the House.
3. This report concerns an allegation that Mr Patrick Collins committed a contempt of the Parliament in his role as the Secretary of the Pine Rivers Liberal National Party (LNP) State Electoral Council (SEC).
4. On 16 October 2018, an email was circulated to LNP members concerning the vote on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. The email was sent by Mr Collins in his role as the Secretary of the Pine Rivers LNP SEC and advised LNP members of a motion that was passed unanimously at the Pine Rivers SEC on Monday 15 October 2018. The resolution stated:

Like all LNP members we believe our elected representatives must abide by our party's values at all times. The Pine Rivers SEC calls on State Council to dis-endorse elected members of the LNP who support the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018.
5. The email was sent to the electorate offices of all LNP members of the Queensland Parliament.
6. An SEC consists of all members that reside within a State electorate boundary. It elects office bearers, coordinates with local branches, contributes to policy formation, sends delegates to State Council and State Convention, preselects candidates for State elections and assists the endorsed candidate's campaign.
7. On 16 October 2018, the Member for Pine Rivers wrote to the Speaker making two allegations of contempt against Mr Collins. In her complaint, the Member for Pine Rivers stated that the email constitutes a contempt as it is an attempt to intimidate LNP members of the Legislative Assembly, as well as to disadvantage those members because of their conduct in the House.

¹ *Parliament of Queensland Act 2001*, section 104B.

The referral

8. On 15 November 2018 the Speaker made the following statement in the House:

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 16 October 2018, the member for Pine Rivers wrote to me alleging that the secretary of the LNP Pine Rivers SEC deliberately committed a contempt of the parliament by assaulting, threatening, intimidating or disadvantaging a member in an email to LNP members. I wrote to the secretary of the Pine Rivers SEC seeking a response to the allegation. The secretary, Mr Patrick Collins, responded on 9 November 2018. In his response Mr Collins tendered an apology and provided some explanation for the basis for his conduct. Standing order 269(4) requires—

In considering whether the matter should be referred to the committee, the Speaker shall take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter. No matter should be referred to the ethics committee if the matter is technical or trivial and does not warrant the further attention of the House.

Honourable members, in my view, this is a very important matter and in no way can be considered technical or trivial. I did not find Mr Collins' explanation adequate and, while acknowledging his apology, on balance, I have determined that there are sufficient questions of fact to be determined against the evidence such that it would be prudent to refer the question as to whether there has been a contempt to the Ethics Committee.

I wish to emphasise that my role is not to determine whether there has been proven fault—a breach of privilege—but, rather, whether there are sufficient issues in play to warrant the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. In relation to the potential contempts, it is right for the committee to consider whether the conduct complained of could be considered an improper interference with the free performance of members' duties as members of parliament. The Ethics Committee will also, no doubt, take into account Mr Collins' apology in its deliberations.

I remind members that standing order 271 now applies, and members should not refer to these matters in the House.²

Definition of contempt

9. Section 37 of the POQA defines the meaning of 'contempt' of the Assembly as follows:

- (1) *"Contempt" of the Assembly means a breach or disobedience of the powers, rights or immunities, or a contempt, of the Assembly or its members or committees.*
- (2) *Conduct, including words, is not contempt of the Assembly unless it amounts, or is intended or likely to amount, to an improper interference with—*
 - (a) *the free exercise by the Assembly or a committee of its authority or functions; or*
 - (b) *the free performance by a member of the member's duties as a member.*

Nature of the contempt of assaulting, threatening or intimidating a member of the House

10. Standing Order 266(2) provides that examples of contempt include:

- (9) *assaulting, threatening or intimidating a member or an officer of the House acting in the discharge of the member's or the officer's duty); ...*
- (17) *assaulting, threatening or disadvantaging a member on account of the member's conduct in the House or a committee;³*

² Record of Proceedings, 15 November 2018, p 3661.

³ Standing Order 266(2), Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly, available at <https://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/documents/assembly/procedures/StandingRules&Orders.pdf>

11. In a 1993 Privileges Committee Report on a Matter of Privilege – Alleged intimidation of a Member, the committee noted that merely attempting to intimidate or threaten is of itself not necessarily a breach of privilege, that the threat or intimidation will only be contempt if it constitutes an improper means to influence members in their parliamentary conduct.
12. In addition, Erskine May states:

*Conduct not amounting to a direct attempt improperly to influence a Member in the discharge of their duties but having a tendency to impair their independence in the future performance of their duty may be treated as a contempt.*⁴
13. McGee notes, however, that not all interference is improper:

*A distinction must be drawn however, between members or outside persons properly seeking to influence other members, and attempts to influence members' actions which are intimidatory and may be held to contempt. All members, when they speak in debate, try to influence their fellow members; so do all lobbyists when they are advancing their interests. Such conduct is perfectly proper. There is no contempt in respect of attempts to influence members, even by bringing pressure to bear on them (such as to withdraw support from them at the next election), unless there is a threat to do something which is improper in itself or which is of such an extraordinary or exaggerated nature that it goes beyond an attempt to influence the members and becomes an attempt to intimidate.*⁵
14. The former Select Committee of Privileges of the Queensland Parliament noted, in its report on the alleged intimidation of a member, that the tendency to impair independence referred to in Erskine May "is not to be merely coincidental. It must be precisely what the person accused of contempt intended by their conduct."⁶

The committee's proceedings

15. The committee has established proceedings for dealing with privileges references, which ensure procedural fairness and natural justice is afforded to all parties. These procedures are set out in chapters 44 and 45 of Standing Orders. The committee is also bound by instructions regarding witnesses, at Schedule 3 to Standing Orders.
16. On determining to proceed with the inquiry into this referral, the committee wrote to Mr Patrick Collins, Secretary of the Pine Rivers LNP SEC (Mr Collins) and the Member for Pine Rivers, inviting submissions which addressed the elements to be established in considering the alleged contempt of assaulting, threatening or intimidating a member of the House.
17. Mr Collins responded with a submission. The Member for Pine Rivers did not provide information additional to that provided to the Speaker. The committee found that with the material provided by the Speaker and Mr Collins' submission to the committee it had sufficient information to deliberate on the allegations.
18. The committee applied the two elements to be established in regard to the alleged contempt:
 - Firstly, was there conduct that can be classified as designed to threaten or intimidate a member on account of their conduct in the House, or conduct that otherwise disadvantaged a member on account of their conduct in the House, and
 - Secondly, whether the conduct amounted to, or was intended to or likely to amount to, an improper interference with the free performance of the member's duties as a member.

⁴ Erskine May, *Parliamentary Practice*, 24th edition, Butterworths, 2011, p 265.

⁵ David McGee, *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, Third edition, 2005, p 652.

⁶ Privileges Committee, Report on A Matter of Privilege – Alleged Intimidation of a Member, 12 November 1993, p 7.

Element 1 – The resolution constituted threatening, intimidating or disadvantaging LNP Members of Parliament on account of their conduct in the House (i.e. their vote on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill)

19. The Macquarie Dictionary defines a ‘threat’ as:

a declaration of an intention or determination to inflict punishment, pain or loss on someone in retaliation for, or conditionally upon, some action or course.

20. The Macquarie Dictionary defines a ‘disadvantage’ as:

absence or deprivation of advantage; any unfavourable circumstance or condition.

21. In her correspondence to the Speaker, the Member for Pine Rivers stated that the email constitutes a contempt as it is an attempt to intimidate LNP members of the Legislative Assembly, as well as to disadvantage those members because of their conduct in the House.

22. The Member for Pine Rivers also stated:

...the motion passed by the LNP Pine Rivers SEC must be viewed in the context of comments made recently by Mr Gary Spence, the State President of the LNP. At a LNP party room meeting [in] September 2018 Mr Spence told LNP Members that they could be putting themselves at risk of having their preselection to run again at the October 2020 State Election overturned by the LNP State Council.

23. In his correspondence to the Speaker, and submission to the committee, Mr Collins stated that he sent the email in question in his role as the Secretary of the Pine Rivers SEC, and implies that the email was thus sent by the SEC. Mr Collins noted that the purpose of the email was to inform LNP members of the Parliament of the passing of the motion by the SEC and that it had requested a debate at the next State Council.

24. Under the LNP constitution the State Council is bound to consider such motions as State Electorate Councils may submit, by at least 30 days’ notice given to the Party Secretary.

25. Mr Collins stated in his correspondence to the Speaker that his email should not be viewed as an attempt to assault, threaten, intimidate or disadvantage for the following reasons:

- a) *The motion was not an assault in accordance with the definition in the Criminal Code of Queensland*
- b) *There is no threat to the LNP Members in that the motion does not have any certainty of outcome. Further, the motion is incapable of achieving the outcome it purports to seek. The SEC cannot remove a Member’s preselection. The LNP state Council cannot either. Even if the motion were debated and passed by the State Council, it would be of no practical effect. The motion is purely a gesture of future debate.*
- c) *The email contained a motion passed by the SEC. The motion requested the LNP’s State Council to consider whether Members who hold LNP membership should continue to be preselected Members of the LNP if they act in a way contrary to the policy framework of the LNP. The wording of the motion did not direct the termination of the party membership of certain Members, it called for a debate about the topic. The difference is subtle but relevant. Asking for a debate, rather than directing an outcome, means that the motion cannot be considered a threat. No possible threat can be inferred into a motion calling for a debate. It’s not certain the motion will succeed in commencing a debate about the matter. Moreover, it is not certain that even if the debate was commenced, whether any such motion would succeed. There is no reasonable potential that the motion will be carried, given that the LNP party room confirmed that there would be a conscience vote of the Bill;*
- d) *As the LNP Members of Parliament know the procedure of the LNP with respect to the handling of these types of grievances, it was clear to them that the motion was not a threat or intimidation, it was only a call for a possible future debate...*

26. These reasons were reiterated by Mr Collins in his submission to the committee.
27. Mr Collins also submitted to the committee that the Member for Pine Rivers has no standing to make the complaint as she was not a recipient of the email of 16 October 2018 to LNP members of Parliament.
28. Under Standing Order 269, however, any Member of Parliament has standing to make a complaint to the Speaker as to actions that may constitute a contempt of the Parliament. It is for the Speaker to determine whether or not to refer any matter to the Ethics Committee.
29. Specifically in relation to the allegation of a contempt in accordance with SO266 (17), Mr Collins stated that the email he sent does not assault, threaten or disadvantage a member 'because of' their conduct, as the email was sent before the Bill was debated in the House. Mr Collins argued that SO266 (17) gives examples of acts that are in reprisal for (i.e. a response to) a Member's conduct after the fact, and so it cannot apply in this matter.
30. Mr Collins' interpretation reflects a narrower reading of the example of contempt at SO 266(17) than is intended. 'Because' does not have the same meaning as 'on account of' used in the example, which encompasses an intent to influence future action, as well as a retaliation in response to past action. The definition of threat is clearly forward-looking, as the Macquarie definition makes clear.
31. The examples of contempt listed at SO 266 are not exhaustive. The definition of contempt is as defined in s 37 of the *Parliament of Queensland Act 2001*, and new examples may arise over time. Indeed, new examples of actions which may constitute contempts of Parliament have been added to SO 266 this year.
32. Mr Collins argues that the resolution passed by the SEC merely called for a debate on the issues. However, it is clear that the resolution (as advised in the email) expressly calls upon the State Council to disendorse members as a result of their vote in the House. Debate is not mentioned.
33. Mr Collins further argues that because the motion is not capable of achieving the outcome it purports to seek, it is not a threat to the LNP parliamentary members: the SEC does not actually have the power to disendorse an LNP Member, and nor does the State Council.
34. However, whether or not a threat can be carried out is not material to whether or not it is a threat, under the definitions of 'threat' discussed above.
35. Mr Collins' claim that the LNP members of Parliament would have known that the process would involve a debate, and so it would have been clear the email was not a threat to them, is not relevant. Mr Collins is not in a position to know the state of mind of the LNP members of Parliament.
36. The committee finds that the email sent by Mr Collins to LNP members of Parliament advising of the Pine Rivers SEC resolution was a threat in respect of LNP members' conduct in the House.

Element 2 – the conduct amounted to or was intended to or likely to amount to an improper interference with the free performance of the member's duties as a member

37. As noted at paragraph 13 above, McGee explains that not all interference is improper:

There is no contempt in respect of attempts to influence members, even by bringing pressure to bear on them (such as to withdraw support from them at the next election), unless there is a threat to do something which is improper in itself or which is of such an extraordinary or exaggerated nature that it goes beyond an attempt to influence the members and becomes an attempt to intimidate.⁷

38. Mr Collins stated in his submission to the Speaker that his intention in sending the email was only to refer to a debate in the future by another body and that the email was not a threat, nor an attempt to intimidate members: it was an advice to LNP members of a resolution made by the Pine Rivers LNP SEC.

⁷ David McGee, *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, Third edition, 2005, p 652.

39. In relation to the issue of improper influence and internal party politics, the former Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee considered the question of what was 'improper' conduct in the context of the then Leader of the Opposition nominating that a Member be discharged from a committee, allegedly as a disciplinary action against that Member with regard to internal LNP policy directions.⁸
40. That committee established a test based firstly on the dictionary definition of 'improper', which included that it was 'inappropriate' and 'incorrect'. The committee also noted judicial commentary that:
- The term 'improper' is not a term of art, but simply refers to conduct which is inconsistent with the proper discharge of the person's duties, obligations, and responsibilities.*⁹
41. In his correspondence to the Speaker, Mr Collins argues that:
- ...it is appropriate, permissible and healthy in a democracy for attempts to be made to influence the opinion and actions of Members. Having reviewed the material submitted to the Health Committee about the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018 it should be apparent that many citizens expressed their views with a variety of suggested and alluded outcomes for Members who did not agree with them. Some Groups have promised to campaign against members who supported the Bill. Likewise, another group has threatened to campaign against Members who did not support the Bill.*
42. The committee was required to consider whether the attempt to influence the LNP members' vote by way of a threat to seek members' disendorsement is improper – that is, of *such an extraordinary or exaggerated nature that it goes beyond an attempt to influence the members and becomes an attempt to intimidate.*
43. On one view, internal party machinations can properly involve bringing political pressure to bear upon other members to vote in a particular way. The party system, and an expectation with regard to voting on party lines, are accepted mechanisms in our parliamentary democracy.
44. On another view, it is an extraordinary act for a body outside of the Parliament to seek to influence members' votes in the House by way of threats of disendorsement from the party, when the parliamentary party had announced to the public its decision to allow its members to vote in the House according to their conscience, and not be bound to a party position.
45. The committee notes the timing of the email being sent to Members was the morning of the debate on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. This is evidence that there was an intent to influence LNP members' behaviour (voting) in the House when the bill was debated that day.
46. Further, Mr Collins, as the Secretary of the Pine Rivers SEC, was the office bearer responsible for communicating the decision of the Pine Rivers SEC and for the timing of that communication. Holding a position such as Secretary of a State Electoral Council carries with it certain responsibilities, such as for conveying decisions in an appropriate manner.
47. However, the committee acknowledges that when the Speaker wrote to Mr Collins in respect of the alleged breach, Mr Collins apologised. He reiterated his apology in subsequent correspondence to the committee.
48. Mr Collins also pointed out to the committee his inexperience with regard to his role as secretary of the SEC:
- I am an ordinary person with no legal training and only a layman's understanding of the political process. I was appointed interim secretary of the Pine Rivers SEC only a few weeks before the meeting in question and this was the first meeting I attended as secretary.*

⁸ Integrity, Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee, Report No. 110, Matter of Privilege Referred by the Speaker on 11 June 2010 Relating to the Discharge of a Member from a Parliamentary Committee, September 2010.

⁹ *Willers v R* (1995) 125 FLR 22 at 225; Corporations Law (repealed) s 229; *Southern Resources Ltd v Residues Treatment & Trading Co Ltd* (1990) 56 SASR 455.

49. Mr Collins' apology to the Speaker and to the committee, coupled with his inexperience in the political process and his role as SEC secretary, indicates a lack of any knowledge that the behaviour could be viewed as an attempt to intimidate or improperly influence Members of Parliament.
50. The committee considers that the circumstances of this alleged breach as outlined above, are such that the conduct was of an extraordinary or exaggerated nature that it went beyond an attempt to influence the members and became an attempt to intimidate. Although meeting the threshold for 'improper', the committee considers that this conduct falls at the lower end of the spectrum and acknowledges the apology and lack of experience on the part of Mr Collins. The committee considers these to be mitigating factors that support taking no further action in relation to the matter.

Conclusion

51. The committee finds that Mr Patrick Collins did threaten LNP Members of the House in the email he sent to them on 16 October 2018; and that this behaviour constituted an attempt to improperly interfere with the freedom of members of the parliament to perform their duties. However, the committee considers the extenuating circumstances identified by Mr Collins, and his apology, as mitigating factors. The committee recommends no further action be taken.

Conclusion

On the information before it the committee finds that on the matter of privilege in relation to Mr Patrick Collins, that the elements of contempt are met.

Recommendation 1

The committee recommends that the House take no further action.



Joe Kelly MP
Chair

May 2019

Membership — 56th Parliament

Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair
Member for Greenslopes

Ms Leanne Linard MP
Member for Nudgee

Mr Mark McArdle MP
Member for Caloundra

Mrs Melissa McMahon MP¹⁰
Member for Macalister

Mr Tim Nicholls MP
Member for Clayfield

Mr Ray Stevens MP
Member for Mermaid Beach

Contact

Telephone: 07 3553 6610

Facsimile: 07 3553 6614

E-mail: ethics@parliament.qld.gov.au

Internet: www.parliament.qld.gov.au/ethics

Subscribe: www.parliament.qld.gov.au/subscribe

¹⁰ The Member for Macalister was appointed to the committee under Standing Order 272 as a substitute member of the committee.

EXTRACT OF MINUTES –**INQUIRY INTO A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY
THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018 RELATING TO AN
ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT****Ethics Committee**

Meeting No. 13A

Thursday 6 December 2018, 12:00PM

Committee Room 1, Parliamentary Annexe and via teleconference

Present

Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair
Mr Tim Nicholls MP, Deputy Chair
Ms Leanne Linard MP
Mr Mark McArdle MP
Ms Melissa McMahon MP (substitute for Ms Nikki Boyd MP under SO 202)
Mr Ray Stevens MP

Apologies

Ms Nikki Boyd MP

In attendance

Ms Bernice Watson, Committee Secretary
Ms Ciara Furlong, Assistant Committee Secretary

Welcome and apologies

The meeting commenced at 12:00pm.

Members were advised of correspondence from the Leader of the House appointing the Member for Macalister, Ms McMahon to replace Ms Boyd on 6 December 2018 under Standing Order 202 and from the Speaker, appointing Ms McMahon to replace Ms Boyd under Standing Order 272 for the committee's consideration of the matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 15 November 2018 relating to the alleged assaulting, threatening, intimidation or disadvantaging a Member.

Correspondence

The committee noted the register of incoming and outgoing correspondence.

EXTRACT OF MINUTES –

INQUIRY INTO A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY
THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018 RELATING TO AN
ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Ethics Committee

Meeting No. 13C

Thursday 6 December 2018, 12:22PM

Committee Room 1, Parliamentary Annexe and via teleconference

Present

Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair
Mr Tim Nicholls MP, Deputy Chair
Ms Leanne Linard MP
Mr Mark McArdle MP
Ms Melissa McMahan MP (substitute for Ms Nikki Boyd MP under SO 272)
Mr Ray Stevens MP

Apologies Nil

In attendance

Ms Bernice Watson, Committee Secretary
Ms Ciara Furlong, Assistant Committee Secretary

Inquiry 8 – Matter of Privilege referred by the Speaker on 15 November 2018 (Pine Rivers LNP SEC)Discussion ensued.Resolved

That the committee write to Ms Boyd and Mr Collins in the terms of the draft letters provided.

Moved: Mr Kelly Seconded: Mr Nicholls

EXTRACT OF MINUTES –

INQUIRY INTO A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY
THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018 RELATING TO AN
ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT**Ethics Committee**

Meeting No. 15C

Thursday 14 February 2019, 1:38PM

Committee Room 1, Parliamentary Annexe

Present

Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair
Mr Tim Nicholls MP, Deputy Chair
Ms Leanne Linard MP
Mr Mark McArdle MP
Ms Melissa McMahon MP (substitute for Ms Nikki Boyd MP under SO 272)
Mr Ray Stevens MP

Apologies Nil

In attendance

Ms Bernice Watson, Committee Secretary
Ms Ciara Furlong, Assistant Committee Secretary

Inquiry 8 – Matter of Privilege referred by the Speaker on 15 November 2018 (Pine Rivers LNP SEC)

Discussion ensued.

Resolved

That the committee write to Ms Boyd and Mr Collins, requesting that any additional submissions are received by 22 February 2019, failing which the committee will move to resolve the matter on the information already provided.

Moved: Mr Stevens Seconded: Mr McArdle

EXTRACT OF MINUTES –

INQUIRY INTO A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY
THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018 RELATING TO AN
ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT**Ethics Committee**

Meeting No. 16C

Thursday, 28 February 2019, 1:03PM

Committee Room 1, Parliamentary Annexe

Present

Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair
Mr Tim Nicholls MP, Deputy Chair
Ms Leanne Linard MP
Mr Mark McArdle MP
Ms Melissa McMahon MP (substitute for Ms Nikki Boyd MP under SO 272)
Mr Ray Stevens MP

Apologies Nil

In attendance

Ms Bernice Watson, Committee Secretary
Ms Ciara Furlong, Assistant Committee Secretary

Inquiry 8 – Matter of Privilege referred by the Speaker on 15 November 2018 (Pine Rivers LNP SEC)Discussion ensued.

Resolved

That the committee proceed to consider a draft report on the matter.

Moved: Mr Kelly Seconded: Mr Nicholls

EXTRACT OF MINUTES –

INQUIRY INTO A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY
THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018 RELATING TO AN
ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Ethics Committee

Meeting No. 19A

Friday, 26 April 2019, 10:03AM

Room 5.30, Parliamentary Annexe

Present	Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair Mr Tim Nicholls MP, Deputy Chair Mr John-Paul Langbroek MP (substitute for Mr Mark McArdle MP under SO 202) Ms Leanne Linard MP Ms Melissa McMahon MP (substitute for Ms Nikki Boyd MP under SO 272) Mr Ray Stevens MP
Apologies	Mr Mark McArdle MP
In attendance	Ms Bernice Watson, Committee Secretary Ms Natasha Mitchenson, Assistant Committee Secretary

Inquiry 8: Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 15 November 2018 (Pine Rivers LNP SEC)Discussion ensued.The committee requested that the secretariat make amendments to the draft report as per the committee's discussion and for the draft report to be considered at the committee's next meeting,

EXTRACT OF MINUTES –

INQUIRY INTO A MATTER OF PRIVILEGE REFERRED BY
THE SPEAKER ON 15 NOVEMBER 2018 RELATING TO AN
ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Ethics Committee

Meeting No. 20A

Thursday, 2 May 2019, 1:05PM

Committee Room 1, Parliamentary Annexe

Present

Mr Joe Kelly MP, Chair
Mr Tim Nicholls MP, Deputy Chair
Ms Leanne Linard MP
Mr Mark McArdle MP
Ms Melissa McMahon MP (substitute for Ms Nikki Boyd MP under SO 272)
Mr Ray Stevens MP

Apologies Nil

In attendance

Ms Bernice Watson, Committee Secretary
Ms Natasha Mitchenson, Assistant Committee Secretary

Inquiry 8: Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 15 November 2018 (Pine Rivers LNP SEC)

Resolved

That the committee adopts the report and authorises its tabling.

Moved: Mr Kelly Seconded: Mr Nicholls

Extracts certified correct on 7 June 2019

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Joe Kelly'.

Joe Kelly MP
Chair