

34 Ernest Street
Sunshine VIC 3020

6 July 2001

The Hon J. W. Howard MP
Member for Bennelong
GPO Box 59
Sydney NSW 2001

cc: all Federal, and Victoria State MP's

Dear Prime Minister

Working together against drugs

1. Earlier this year, apparently in response to concerns that illicit drugs are having on the Australian community, your government made a decision to fund another drug offensive to the amount of \$28 million. A substantial part of that money was expended on television advertisements, one of which concluded with the slogan, "*Drugs destroy lives: let's work together against drugs.*"
2. The first part of that slogan is of course obvious to everyone. What I and many others doubt is the sincerity of the proclamation, "*let's work together against drugs.*" You see, I tried to do that and I have paid, and am still paying, a very high price for my misplaced trust. I want members of parliament to know what happens to people who think that Federal and State governments are interested in exposing drug rings and official corruption.
3. In 1978, I provided SA police and later, politicians, with information that heroin was being imported through Southend SA, with full police protection. Because I persisted with this allegation in the face of inaction and outright hostility by all law enforcement and political authorities, my fishing vessel, house, and motor vehicle were at different times, destroyed or partially destroyed by arson; I was subjected to a primary and secondary trade boycott, larceny of my crayfish, and drowning or theft of my cray-pots; my family was terrorised and harassed; my daughter and her friend, both aged about 12, were terrorised in an attempted rape incident; and I was hospitalised following an unprovoked assault at Dartmoor, Victoria in 1983.
4. My persistence through 1984 culminated in a frame-up by the National Crime Authority in 1985 on drug, explosives and gun related offences. Numerous other NCA witnesses who have made similar allegations have met untimely deaths - some would say murdered.
5. I was gaoled in 1987 on drugs, explosives and firearms charges, served my sentence in full and was released from prison before appearing without legal representation in the Victoria Supreme Court to argue my appeal against convictions and seek a retrial to clear my name. On 6 May 1988, all my convictions were set aside and a retrial was ordered. The DPP filed a nolle prosequi on 30 June 1989. His decision denied me the opportunity to expose the false evidence, and the perpetrators of my frame-up.
6. In the "*Report of Mr D.M. Quick QC to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice with Respect to Dealing of the National Crime Authority with Mr Mehmed Skrijel and his Family*", dated 4 April 1995, Mr Quick, a Federal government appointed consultant states, "*there is substantial evidence upon which it is reasonable to base a strong suspicion that evidence was fabricated in order to incriminate Mr Skrijel on serious criminal charges involving drugs and explosives.*"

7. Now the matter of my frame-up is in the Victoria Supreme court, proceeding No. 5446 of 1993, *Skrijel v Mengler, Commonwealth of Australia, Cook and State of Victoria*. It has been there for the past eight years, because Attorney-General Daryl Williams is using every means at his disposal, including the allocation of millions of taxpayers dollars to defeat my claim that the NCA is corrupt, without regard to evidence supporting that fact which I have served on the defendants.

8. Today, 13 years after my successful appeal against all convictions, there is substantial evidence that the National Crime Authority was established as a criminal organization, and is a key part of a web of corruption that embraces government, the judiciary, and law enforcement agencies. Consider the following allegations, all supported by strong documentary evidence:

- (a) The NCA's Operation Southend, supposedly an investigation in 1985 of my allegations of heroin importation via Southend, in the SW of SA, was a cover for preparations to frame me on drugs, explosives and firearms charges.
- (b) Deputy Commissioner John Carl Mengler, former head of the NCA's investigative group in Melbourne, directed my frame-up under the supervision of Sir Max Bingham, with the cooperation of the VicPol Chief Commissioner, Mick Miller. The field work was carried out by VicPol officers on secondment to the NCA, Det. Sgt Ron Iddles and Det. S/C Ken Collins. They were assisted by NCA lawyer Rick McDonnell (now an employee of the Australian Prudential Regulation Authority), Crime Scene expert, S/Sgt Henry Huggins of the VicPol State Forensic Science Laboratory, fingerprint expert Sgt Gary Cook of the VicPol Fingerprint Bureau, and members of the Russell Street Special duties Unit, all hand-picked by Mengler. I believe Sir Max acted on instructions from Mr Norm Reaburn, former Deputy Secretary, Commonwealth A-G's department. This is not a complete list.
- (c) The NCA, SA police, Victoria police and AFP knew at the time I was framed, about the heroin connection between Southend and a house at 1 Goss Court, Torrens (SA), owned by Helen Bates, sister of Noel Bates (alias Bellini), then a major Melbourne heroin dealer, and former resident of Millicent, a town close to Southend. The occupants of the house, Nicholas Pahtsivanos (alias "*Nick the Greek*") and Cathy Skutt, and the buyer for Self Nominees at Southend, John Skutt (brother of Cathy Skutt), were also known by Commonwealth law enforcement agencies to have a direct involvement with drugs.
- (d) On 15 October 1985, following an NCA directed raid on my premises at Digby, Victoria, a green plastic drum stored in a shed on the premises was taken to Melbourne. On 17 October Chief Supt. Mengler contacted S/Sgt David Winter (deceased) of the Terrorist Explosive Section of the Victoria Police. Between 17 and 31 October 1985, the contents of the drum (several flares) were replaced by 26 plugs of gelignite and other explosive materials, covered by cannabis, and discovered on 31 October by a botanist asked to examine the cannabis.
- (e) On 15 October 1985, Sergeant Gary Cook, a VicPol fingerprint expert, photographed my latent palm-print on the lid of a coffee canister kept in the kitchen of my house at Digby. He subsequently alleged falsely in a statement, and in evidence at my committal hearing and trial, that the palm-print was developed on the black lid of the green plastic drum taken from my Digby premises.
- (f) About 15 October 1985, Sergeant Cook photographed my latent left thumb-print on a wooden object, and subsequently alleged falsely in his statement, and in evidence at my committal hearing, that the finger-print was developed on a Winchester Cooley rifle with a shortened barrel, serial no. 022019. The Cooley was not mine. In an affidavit sworn 21 September 1998,

Sergeant Cook identifies the wooden object on which he developed my latent print as the wooden fore-end of the shortened Cooley.

The Victorian DPP included in the hand-up brief prior to my 1987 trial, a book of photographs, one of which shows the .22 calibre Cooley and my licenced .22 calibre Gevarm on the workbench in the garage located on my Digby premises. The photograph shows that the wooden stock and fore-end are missing from the Cooley, a fact confirmed in a statement sworn by S/C Adrian Barry, the VicPol Firearms and Toolmark Examiner who examined the Cooley.

The Gevarm has a wooden stock and a wooden fore-end. White powder can be seen on the Gevarm but not on the Cooley. It is evident that my latent left thumb-print was developed on my own licenced Gevarm.

- (g) On 27 March 1986, the Melbourne Sun published a photograph of myself beside the page one banner headline, "*Fisherman flees drug gang*". The Sun reported that Hamilton City Councillor Greg Cook stated that I had been denied justice since raising the drug allegations in 1978, and accused the NCA of mishandling investigations arising from my allegations. He said that the NCA was either fed false information or was making false reports. The pickup of packages of drugs off the coast by some fishermen was, he said, "*an open secret in the district*" and many people had spoken to him about seeing drops made by ships, and deals completed on beaches. I was deluged with Australia wide calls from the media. The media interest might have precipitated an inquiry had it not been for an event that turned the attention of the media elsewhere.

At 1.01 pm, on 27 March 1986, 50 plugs of gelignite were detonated in the boot of a stolen 1979 Commodore parked outside the Russell Street police station in Melbourne. Many people were injured. Police-woman Angela Taylor was critically injured and later died. Chief Superintendent Mengler phoned the Bomb Task Force and stated I was an NCA suspect for the bombing. No-one believed him. The following day he repeated his allegation to the Chief Commissioner's staff officer and added that I had also threatened to blow up an NCA building. I was never interviewed on either matter, and knew nothing of Mengler's allegations until many years later when I read extracts from his diaries. In April 1990, Gerald Dempsey, SA Chairman of the NCA, publicly accused Mengler, then NCA Chief of Operations in SA, of throwing a bomb into his driveway.

- (h) Several weeks prior to my trial in March 1987, I provided my defence counsel, Mr Ivan Brewer with a list of 42 witnesses whose evidence would support my defence that I had been framed by the NCA. Some were VIP's, many were not. Mr Brewer, who had frequent conferences with Mengler during the proceedings, was persuaded to call no witnesses on my behalf, and even refused to examine the one witness I brought to court personally. I sacked him and said I intended to inform the court of my reason. He relented and agreed to examine the one and only witness whose evidence was, as the trial transcript shows, vital to my defence.
- (i) On 1 April 1987, the jury convicted me on three indictable offences, and was discharged. My defence counsel then entered into a secret agreement with the prosecutor to secure my conviction on the summary matter without requiring the prosecution to produce the shortened firearm and the false finger-print evidence. Pursuant to that agreement, my barrister sought and was granted leave from the trial judge to enter the plea himself. Contrary to my instructions, he entered a "*guilty*" plea. I protested loudly that I pleaded "*not guilty*" to the charge. The judge motioned furiously to me to be quiet, fined me \$200 and ordered that the

gun be forfeited to the Victorian Chief Commissioner. The debt was never collected, and was waived after I successfully appealed the conviction.

- (j) In November 1992, after finding the intrusion alarm installed at my Digby premises had been tripped, I found the shortened Winchester Cooley rifle, serial nr 022019, which Judge Nixon had forfeited to the Victoria Chief Commissioner on 1 April 1987, in the ceiling of the house, adjacent to a kitchen air vent. I photographed it on a copy of the 18 November 1992 edition of the Australian newspaper. A clear, enlarged copy of that photograph was given to the Joint Committee of the NCA in June 1995, when it was in Melbourne conducting hearings.
- (k) Former Justice Minister Kerr, on the advice of the A-G's department, rejected Mr Quick's recommendation that an inquiry under the Royal Commissions Act be established to investigate my alleged frame-up by the NCA, and on 2 June 1995, referred matters that required further investigation to Mr Barry Perry, the Victorian Deputy Ombudsman (Police Complaints). The VDO's enabling legislation specifically precludes investigation of allegations against the NCA by the VDO (see Annexure 1, ref. 6). I was not a participant in his review.

The 1997 "*Report of the Deputy Ombudsman (Police Complaints) on the Investigation of a Complaint made by the Commonwealth Minister for Justice in Connection with Allegations made by Mr Mehmed 'Mick' Skrijel that Members of the Victoria Police Fabricated Evidence against him*" (Annexure 1, ref. 10), was false and misleading. Its only purpose was to give the Federal government the outcome it sought. In a letter dated 17 November 1997, I explained to Mr Williams, in detail, the reason that the finding of the VDO in respect of the shortened Cooley was wrong, and the VDO knew it was wrong. Mr Williams did not reply.

- (l) Following the release of Mr Quick's report to me in June 1995, many people wrote to Justice Minister Kerr expressing concern at his response to the report. Most people withdrew their support after receiving a reply from Justice Minister Kerr, his adviser Mr Simon Overland, or Mr Keith Holland, an Acting Assistant Secretary working for Deputy Secretary Norm Reaburn of the A-G's department which implied that I was a convicted criminal. Scores of these letters came into my hands.

I wrote to Mr Kerr in August 1995, stating that letters which he, Mr Overland and Mr Holland were circulating contained false and misleading statements. I explained why they were false and misleading, and I asked that he publish the correct facts to recipients of the letters. My letter was ignored. I filed and served writ No. 7636 of 1995, alleging defamation against Mr Kerr, Mr Overland and Mr Holland. I handled the matter without legal representation.

The matter was settled in my favour with the payment of a substantial sum (taken from the pockets of taxpayers, of course), after I agreed to enter into a non-disclosure agreement intended to conceal the truth from the public. The agreement does not prevent my disclosure of the fact that in 1998, I deposited a cheque, number 10757 dated 19 October 1998, drawn on the Attorney-General's Department Official Legal Practice, Agencies Trust Account, Victoria Office, No 0100757 093 003 31693 2 at the Reserve Bank of Australia.

- (m) In July 1998, Master Evans handed down an important decision, supported by reasons, that granted me leave to join Sergeant Cook and the State of Victoria as co-defendants in my proceeding. The decision was upheld on appeal to Justice Eames. He too provided detailed reasons for his decision.

In 1999, a further matter was listed to be heard by Master Evans, but was deferred about 6 weeks pending the return of the Master from a period of illness. Minutes before the hearing, the file on the matter was taken from Master Evans and given to another Master whose subsequent conduct, including bias and partiality, and decision without reasons, were a disgrace to the Bench. I appealed the Master's decision to a judge. Again, a last minute replacement was brought in to give the defendants the decision they wanted. The unpublished reasons for the decision show that justice in Victoria is a commodity for sale.

Unlike NSW, Victoria has no Judicial Commission. Consequently I directed a complaint, set out in letters dated 8 November 1999 and 29 December 1999 to the Chief Justice, Mr John H Phillips. I received a brief, dismissive reply in which I was informed that only page 2 of the first letter had been received on the judges' fax. The 8 November letter addressed the possibility that the substitution of judicial officers may have been directed by the Chief Justice. The reply to the 29 December letter was not unlike the reply I received in May 1991 from Justice Phillips, then Chairman of the NCA.

My letter in May 1991 referred Justice Phillips to a large body of evidence indicating criminal conduct on the part of the NCA, and requested access to NCA reports on investigation of my allegations. Justice Phillips replied, *"It is for the [NCA] committee to decide upon the course of its investigations and contact the NCA accordingly."*

- (n) On numerous occasions, starting 1995, I sought and obtained legal representation. Without exception, representation has been withdrawn after the Commonwealth and Victorian government lawyers discovered the identity of my legal representatives. Consequently all appearances in court since the commencement of my proceedings on 1 April 1993 have been without legal representation. Deputy Commissioner Mengler, the first defendant, and Sergeant Cook, the third defendant, on the other hand, are at all times legally represented at public expense, generally by QC's.

9. Last year I filed and served on each of the defendants in my proceeding, an affidavit sworn 3 May 2000 in which I made an offer to withdraw my claim against each of the defendants, if the third defendant, Sergeant Gary Cook would accept an offer from me, the plaintiff, to participate in a demonstration that would establish once and for all whether my claim that the fingerprint evidence in respect of the shortened firearm was falsified. I could have requested that he do the same in respect of the false palm-print evidence that resulted in my imprisonment, but I decided to keep his task simple in order to secure his agreement.

10. My offer was this: Subject to appropriate safeguards, I would bring into court the shortened Cooley rifle, serial nr. 022019 that the NCA planted on my Digby premises on or about 15 October 1985, and on or about 18 November 1992, more than five years after it was forfeited by court order to the Victorian Commissioner of Police. I would place my left thumb-print on the gun, in the position that Sergeant Cook alleged he found it. He must then develop the latent fingerprint, and photograph it, exactly as he stated he did in his statement and in sworn evidence at my committal hearing.

11. If Sergeant Cook could produce a photograph that, in the court's opinion, was essentially the same as the photograph which he and the fourth defendant (the Victorian government) described as a photograph of my left thumb-print on the wooden fore-end of the shortened Cooley, I would withdraw all claims against each of the defendants, including the Commonwealth. If he could not do it, then the defendants would agree to admit liability and settle my claim for an amount to be determined by a jury.

12. The defendants refused even to discuss my offer. Instead they entered into a further criminal conspiracy to pervert the course of justice: official Victoria police records were altered to show that I have a criminal record. The result is that I now have a copy of my "*Criminal History Report*" dated 8 March 1995 which shows that I have no criminal record, and a "*Criminal History Report*" dated 8 May 2001 which shows I have a criminal conviction for possession of a shortened firearm.

13. A copy of the original record was enclosed with a letter dated 24 October 1995 to Senator Vanstone, then Shadow A-G and Minister for Justice. It was also delivered to the Joint Committee of the NCA, under cover of a letter dated 25 October 1995. The more recent "*Criminal History Report*" arrived unsolicited at my Melbourne home attached to a letter dated 12 June 2001 from the Victorian Government Solicitor. This was the first I knew of the revision. The instigator of this recent revision to my Criminal History report was, I believe, Mr Keith Holland, an Assistant Secretary in the Commonwealth A-G's department.

14. In the latter part of 1995, when the letters being distributed by the Federal government, wrongly implying I was a convicted criminal, were first brought to my notice, I contacted Mr Holland, then A/g Assistant Secretary, Security Law and Justice Branch of the Commonwealth A-G's department. I informed him that the Victorian Court of Criminal Appeal had, in the course of the hearing of my application for leave to appeal against the indictable offences, granted me leave to appeal in respect of the shortened firearm, notwithstanding the "*guilty*" plea entered by my defence counsel, and had set aside all my convictions and referred the indictable matters for retrial. It followed that I was not a convicted criminal. Mr Holland responded, "*We'll soon fix that.*"

15. Following my conversation with Mr Holland, the Victorian Supreme Court Registrar of Appeals, Mr Jack Gaffney, wrote to Mr Norm Bowman, Mr Holland's subordinate, on 12 October 1995 under the heading "*Re: Mehmed Skrijel*", referring to "*your telephone enquiry relating to the abovenamed*". A "*Notice to Certain Officials of Appeal Decision*" dated 16 May 1988 (distributed to the Solicitor to the Victorian DPP, The Director-General of the Office of Corrections, the Registrar, County Court Hamilton, and the Governor of Pentridge Prison), was enclosed.

16. The Notice confirms that I appealed all convictions including the conviction "*possess pistol without licence*", and it sets out the same information included by the Full court in its judgement handed down 6 May 1988, except for one important omission. Justice King, who handed down the court's judgement stated: "*The order of the Court is: leave to appeal is granted in respect of all convictions. The appeal is deemed to be heard instanter and is allowed in respect of all three convictions.*" The first sentence was omitted from the Notice. Therefore the important question in reading the judgement is whether the sentence "*leave to appeal is granted in respect of all convictions*", is inclusive of the summary offence.

17. To answer that question conclusively, it is important to note that I did not include the summary offence in my original or amended written application for leave to appeal because I was in prison without access to reliable legal advice. In these circumstances it appeared probable to me that the Victorian Supreme Court would reject an application in respect of a conviction based on a "*guilty*" plea, especially if I stated that the grounds were that the court accepted a "*guilty*" plea from my defence counsel in preference to my "*not guilty*" plea.

18. I decided instead to seek leave from the court to appeal my conviction on the summary matter when I appeared before the court, so that my arguments would be considered in the context of arguments that all my convictions were based on false and fabricated evidence. That is the reason Justice King states in his opening statement of the court's judgement: "*In this matter, my view is that these two appeals should be granted in respect of all three convictions and the appeal should be allowed in respect of all three convictions.*" One of the appeals referred to by Justice King was the

appeal I lodged against my convictions on indictable offences; and the other was my appeal against my conviction on the summary matter, made orally in the course of the proceeding.

19. The fact that I appealed against four convictions and the fact that the court referred to three rather than four convictions, indicates an error on the part of the court. It either erred in neglecting to state explicitly the outcome of the second appeal against the conviction on the summary matter, or it erred in its reference to three rather than four convictions.

20. That errors were made by the court is evident from the Court's "*Reasons for Judgement*". For example, the first sentence of the court's "*Reasons*" states: "*This is an application for leave to appeal by Mehmed Skrijel against convictions resulting from jury verdicts in the County Court at Hamilton on 1st April, 1987. The applicant was convicted on three counts, namely ...*" It is a matter of record that three of the convictions resulted from jury verdicts in the County Court at Ballarat, not Hamilton, and I was convicted on four counts, in that court on that day, not three.

21. The errors and inconsistencies made by the court should have been picked up by the Registrar of Criminal Appeals, whose job is to get things right before he distributes the "*Notice to Certain Officials of Appeal Decision*", particularly given the fact that he sat in on the proceedings for most of the two days of arguments. He had a further opportunity to pick up on any errors when a friend acting on my behalf wrote to the Chief Justice on 7 May 1990. Any doubt that my appeal against conviction on the summary matter was properly upheld should be removed by the reply to that letter, dated 9 May 1990 from the Associate to Chief Justice Young. In that letter he states he was directed by the Chief Justice to inform me: "*As matters stand Mr Skrijel has not been convicted of any offence.*"

22. If such advice was given lightly, without a thorough check of court records on which all other State records are based, then no one could ever be certain that the court's decision on any matter was final, and might not be altered because a bureaucrat like Mr Holland preferred a different outcome.

23. If the advice was given after all necessary checks, as people are entitled to expect, how can the revision possibly be justified when just three years ago the Commonwealth A-G's department settled my defamation claim arising from statements in letters signed by former Justice Minister Kerr, his adviser Mr Simon Overland and the real author of all the letters, Mr Keith Holland, implying I was still a convicted criminal? This criminal conspiracy between the Commonwealth and Victorian government lawyers to maliciously alter VicPol records to show that I have a criminal record had to be an act of sheer desperation born out of embarrassment at being unable to demolish the claims of an unrepresented litigant, even with support from a small army of lawyers, including eminent silks, all hired at huge public expense.

24. May I say with respect, Mr Howard, that it is important you intervene in this matter, if your government wishes to avoid the accusation that Mr Williams' acceptance of Mr Kerr's decision in respect of the Quick report, his response to the Victorian Deputy Ombudsman's report and his silence on the matters I raised in my letter to him dated 17 November 1997, and in the Victoria Supreme Court, reflect an official government policy of protection of corrupt public officials and the illegal drug trade.

25. If your advisers suggest you should not get involved because the matter is before the court, and therefore sub judice, perhaps they should be reminded that neither the Commonwealth nor the Victorian governments had such concerns when I commenced my proceeding on 1 April 1993. Deputy Secretary Reaburn of the Commonwealth A-G's department recommended to the A-G on 2 April 1993, the day after I filed my writ against the Commonwealth and the NCA's former head of its Investigative Group, that he establish an inquiry into my allegations.

26. As stated above, two enquiries were conducted spanning the period September 1993 through September 1997 when I received the report on the second of those enquiries by the Victoria Deputy Ombudsman (Police Complaints), from Mr Williams. Prior to each of them I expressed in writing my concerns that if I cooperated in the way that was apparently expected, my cooperation would be to the detriment of my proceedings. I was informed in each case that the inquiry would proceed with, or without my cooperation. It was patently obvious that neither the Commonwealth nor Victorian governments, two of the defendants in my proceedings, had the slightest concern about detriment to my proceedings.

27. In any event, sub judice is really a side issue. What is important is the government's response when confronted with extremely serious allegations of corruption and misconduct by its servants and agents. Should a government respond by promptly and thoroughly investigating the allegations, with a view to rooting out corruption before it spreads? Or should it use its immense powers and financial clout to silence allegations by destroying its accuser, even when that means covering up crimes and perpetuating practices that any civilised society would find abhorrent, if it knew about them?

28. If you believe, Mr Howard that the government's role is the former, then why am I the plaintiff in an action against two governments that has been in the court for eight years at enormous public expense, exceeding \$10 mill., I understand, and not a witness before a Royal Commission? Ironically the recommendation of Mr David Quick QC, that the government establish an inquiry under the Royal Commissions Act, into my allegation that I was framed by the NCA, was rejected by Justice Minister Kerr in June 1995, on the ground that it would cost too much. Yet Attorney-General Williams has evidently authorised his department to spend whatever it takes to defeat my claim.

29. On the premise that your government's invitation to "*work together against drugs*" was made in good faith, may I suggest that I be given an opportunity in the first instance to demonstrate before a Senate Select Committee, with the help of a few exhibits, exactly how I was framed by the NCA, and how I was convicted following a Kafka like trial with the help of the judge, prosecutor, and defence counsel. After hearing my evidence and examining exhibits, members of the Senate Select committee could then decide, hopefully in a bi-partisan way, whether the evidence warrants the establishment of an inquiry under the Royal Commissions Act, as recommended by Mr Quick.

30. As many people have become disillusioned by politicians and the political processes, your response is, I believe, important to all Australians. It gives you an opportunity to demonstrate to the community, not just myself, that you and your government really are opposed to drug trafficking and the corruption it breeds. If you decide to give me the opportunity, members of the Senate Select committee may wish to peruse the documents listed in Annexure 1. It lists submissions, exhibits and reports delivered to successive A-G's and Justice Ministers.

31. I also invite all members of parliament who read this open letter, and support open and honest government and a strong stand against corruption in government, to write and express your views. The ideal response would be a few honest words from the heart.

Yours sincerely

Mick Skrijel
Enclosures: 1

ANNEXURE 1

References

1. Comprehensive Summary of Evidence (58 pages) - a submission handed up to the Bench in the Court of Criminal Appeal at the hearing of an application from Mehmed Skrijel for leave to appeal against conviction - 18 April 1988.
2. "Mehmed Skrijel on the Scales of Justice" (31 pages) - attachment to letter dated 6 September 1988 to Justice Minister, Senator Michael Tate.
3. Grounds for A Royal Commission Into the Circumstances of the Arrest and Imprisonment of Mehmed Skrijel (25 pages) - Enclosure 1 with letter dated 7 November 1989 to Justice Minister, Senator Michael Tate.
4. Submission No 19 to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the National Crime Authority - a 12 page submission and nearly 300 pages of supporting evidence, ordered to be published and released by resolution of the Committee on 5 November 1990;
5. Submission dated 27 January 1995 to Select Committee on Unresolved Whistleblower Cases;
6. Circular letter dated 12 November 1995 addressed to all Federal Members and Senators, tabled in the Senate on 30 November 1995 - Hansard, page 4605;
7. *"The role of the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department in concealing crimes committed by the National Crime Authority"*, dated 16 September 1996 - Exhibit 1 (39 pages), formally accepted by the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the National Crime Authority at hearing of Mick Skrijel on 11 June 1997;
8. Letter dated 21 February 1997 from Mick Skrijel to Victorian Ombudsman - Exhibit 2, formally accepted by the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the National Crime Authority at hearing of Mick Skrijel on 11 June 1997;
9. *"Report of Mr D.M. Quick QC to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice with Respect to Dealing of the National Crime Authority with Mr Mehmed Skrijel and His Family"*, Vols 1 & 2, dated 4 April 1995;
10. *"Report of the Deputy Ombudsman (Police Complaints) on the Investigation of a Complaint made by the Commonwealth Minister for Justice in Connection with Allegations made by Mr Mehmed 'Mick' Skrijel that Members of the Victoria Police Fabricated Evidence against him"* - a report dated 21 February 1997 resulting from a formal reference by Justice Minister Duncan Kerr, read and endorsed by Attorney-General Williams.