

## HOUSE OF LORDS APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION

### MINUTES OF THE 33<sup>RD</sup> MEETING HELD ON 6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2005

Present: Lord Stevenson (Chairman)  
Lord Hurd  
Lord Dholakia  
Mrs Felicity Huston  
Baroness Dean  
Mrs Angela Sarkis  
Mr Jim Barron - Secretariat  
Ms Geraldine Alexander - Secretariat  
Miss Louise Blundell – Secretariat  
Ms Maggie O'Boyle – Press Officer  
Mr Peter Fish – Treasury Solicitor

#### Apologies

1. There were no apologies.

#### Chairman's update

2. The Commission had received a letter from the Prime Minister in response to its letter of 18 November, a copy of which was circulated to members. It was agreed that the Commission should reply to this letter, addressing in particular the Prime Minister's concerns about the stories in the press.
3. The Chairman explained that there was no agenda or papers for the meeting as the only item for discussion was the vetting of the party-political list.

#### Legal advice

4. The Chairman welcomed Peter Fish to the meeting. [REDACTED]

#### Consideration of names

5. The Commission agreed that it had no comment to make on 21 of the names.
6. It was agreed that the Commission could not support the nomination of [REDACTED] on the advice of [REDACTED]. However, the Commission would be willing to reconsider his nomination in six to twelve months.
7. The Commission considered the nomination of [REDACTED]. It was noted that he was known to [REDACTED], who did not take part in the consideration of his

nomination. The Commission had received [REDACTED]. It was agreed that the issues raised in the [REDACTED] which dealt with [REDACTED], should not have a bearing on its consideration. However, the controversy surrounding the [REDACTED] in particular was a separate issue because it raised a question about [REDACTED]'s standing in the community and his credibility as a peer. The Commission concluded that it was not minded to recommend that the Prime Minister went ahead with [REDACTED]'s nomination.

8. The Commission noted that some enquiries were outstanding regarding [REDACTED]'s nomination. It was therefore agreed that the Commission was not yet in a position to make a judgement on the propriety of his nomination. When coming to a judgement, it was agreed that it should take into account the impact that the [REDACTED] would have on [REDACTED]'s credibility.
9. The Commission considered the nomination of [REDACTED]. It was noted that [REDACTED] was acquainted with [REDACTED] and he therefore took no part in the discussion of his nomination. HMRC had confirmed that it had no objections to his nomination. There had been a number of [REDACTED], including his involvement in the [REDACTED]. The Commission agreed that it was content that this should not stand in the way of [REDACTED] nomination. However, it was agreed that the Prime Minister's attention should be drawn to the fact that there might be adverse comment if [REDACTED] was appointed.
10. The Commission agreed that the Prime Minister's attention should be drawn to the fact that [REDACTED] had made donations to other political parties as well as informing him that [REDACTED].
11. It was agreed that the letter to the Prime Minister should explain the issues that arose around the nominations of both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].