



House of Commons
Committee on
Standards and Privileges

**Conduct of Mr Julian
Brazier**

Fourth Report of Session 2006-07

*Report and Appendices, together with formal
minutes*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 12 June 2007*

HC 682

Published on 13 June 2007
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

The Committee on Standards and Privileges

The Committee on Standards and Privileges is appointed by the House of Commons to oversee the work of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards; to examine the arrangements proposed by the Commissioner for the compilation, maintenance and accessibility of the Register of Members' Interests and any other registers of interest established by the House; to review from time to time the form and content of those registers; to consider any specific complaints made in relation to the registering or declaring of interests referred to it by the Commissioner; to consider any matter relating to the conduct of Members, including specific complaints in relation to alleged breaches in the Code of Conduct which have been drawn to the Committee's attention by the Commissioner; and to recommend any modifications to the Code of Conduct as may from time to time appear to be necessary.

Current membership

Rt Hon Sir George Young Bt MP (*Conservative, North West Hampshire*) (Chairman)
Rt Hon Kevin Barron MP (*Labour, Rother Valley*)
Rt Hon David Curry MP (*Conservative, Skipton & Ripon*)
Mr Andrew Dismore MP (*Labour, Hendon*)
Nick Harvey MP (*Liberal Democrat, North Devon*)
Mr Brian Jenkins MP (*Labour, Tamworth*)
Mr Elfyn Llwyd MP (*Plaid Cymru, Meirionnydd Nant Conwy*)
Mr Chris Mullin MP (*Labour, Sunderland South*)
The Hon Nicholas Soames MP (*Conservative, Mid Sussex*)
Dr Alan Whitehead MP (*Labour, Southampton Test*)

Powers

The constitution and powers of the Committee are set out in Standing Order No. 149. In particular, the Committee has power to order the attendance of any Member of Parliament before the committee and to require that specific documents or records in the possession of a Member relating to its inquiries, or to the inquiries of the Commissioner, be laid before the Committee. The Committee has power to refuse to allow its public proceedings to be broadcast. The Law Officers, if they are Members of Parliament, may attend and take part in the Committee's proceedings, but may not vote.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at: www.parliament.uk/sandp. A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Dr Christopher Ward (Clerk), Dr Susan Griffiths (Second Clerk) and Miss Michelle Owens (Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk of the Committee on Standards and Privileges, Journal Office, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6615.

Contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Report | <i>Page</i> |
| Conduct of Mr Julian Brazier | 3 |
| Appendix 1: Memorandum from the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards | 4 |
| Appendix 2: Letter to the Clerk of the Committee from Mr Julian Brazier, 8 June 2007 | 16 |
| Formal minutes | 17 |
| Reports from the Committee on Standards and Privileges in the current Parliament | 18 |

Conduct of Mr Julian Brazier

1. We have received a memorandum from the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards concerning a complaint against Mr Julian Brazier, Member for Canterbury, made by Mr John Mann, Member for Bassetlaw and Mr Kevan Jones, Member for North Durham. The complaint relates to a dinner in the House held by the Patron's Club of Canterbury Conservative Association, in relation to which Mr Brazier, the sponsor of the function, was alleged not to have complied fully with the requirements of the Banqueting Regulations. The Commissioner's report is reproduced at Appendix 1.

2. In accordance with our usual practice, we have shown Mr Brazier a copy of the Commissioner's report. He has subsequently submitted a memorandum to us, which is reproduced at Appendix 2.

3. The Commissioner has concluded¹ that the terms in which the annual "dinner for members and their spouses in Parliament"² is referred to in invitations to prospective new members of the Patron's Club is a breach of paragraph 5.3 of the Banqueting Regulations. He also considers, given the proportion of the Club's annual income that is contributed to the Association and the centrality of the annual dinner to the activities of the Club, that there is "a strong argument"³ that the function is playing a direct part in providing resources to it, in breach of paragraph 5.1 of the Banqueting Regulations.

4. Mr Brazier fully accepts the Commissioner's report as to both fact and finding, and has apologised unreservedly for the breach of the Banqueting Regulations.⁴

5. We agree with the Commissioner that the complaint should be upheld. Having regard to the specific circumstances of this case and to Mr Brazier's unreserved apology, we do not recommend any further action to the House in relation to the complaint.

1 Appendix 1, para. 17.

2 Appendix 1, WE 5, p. 14. These events are in practice held in the House of Commons, see WE 4, p. 13.

3 Appendix 1, para. 19.

4 Appendix 2, p 16.

Appendix 1: Memorandum from the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards

Contents

| | <i>Page</i> |
|---|-------------|
| Complaint against Mr Julian Brazier | 5 |
| The Complaint | 5 |
| Relevant Provisions of the Code of Conduct and Rules of the House | 5 |
| Third Report of the Committee on Standards and Privileges, Session 2006-07 | 6 |
| My Inquiries | 6 |
| Mr Brazier's Response | 7 |
| Findings of Fact | 8 |
| Conclusions on the Complaint | 8 |
| Handling the Implications of the Committee's Third Report | 10 |
| Written evidence received by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards | 12 |
| 1. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr John Mann and Mr Kevan Jones, 24 April 2007 | 12 |
| 2. Section 5 of the Banqueting Regulations | 12 |
| 3. Letter to Mr Julian Brazier from the Commissioner, 26 April 2007-06-07 | 13 |
| 4. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr Julian Brazier (without enclosures), 8 May 2007 | 14 |
| 5. Sample letter of invitation to join Mr Brazier's Patrons' Club (without attachment) | 15 |

Complaint against Mr Julian Brazier

The Complaint

1. On 26 April 2007 I received a letter of complaint against Mr Julian Brazier (the Member for Canterbury). The letter came from two other Members, Mr John Mann (the Member for Bassetlaw) and Mr Kevan Jones (the Member for North Durham).¹ In it, they complained that a dinner held in Dining Room A on 18 April 2007 by the Patrons' Club of the Canterbury Conservative Association and sponsored by Mr Brazier, had breached the Banqueting Regulations. These prohibit the use of the private dining rooms for "*direct financial or material gain by a ... political party ...*". Mr Mann and Mr Jones alleged that, according to the last two sets of accounts of the Canterbury Conservative Association, its Patrons' Club was "*a net and significant contributor to its fundraising*".

Relevant Provisions of the Code of Conduct and Rules of the House

2. Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct provides:

*"Members shall at all times ensure that their use of expenses, allowances, facilities and services provided from the public purse is strictly in accordance with the rules laid down on these matters, and that they observe any limits placed by the House on the use of such expenses, allowances, facilities and services."*²

3. Use of the House's private dining facilities is governed by the Banqueting Regulations, which are laid down by Mr Speaker following advice from the Administration Committee. The Regulations explicitly permit use of the facilities for "*political functions*", subject only to all relevant declarations of interest.³ However Regulation 5.1 says that:

"... the private dining rooms are not to be used for direct financial or material gain by a Sponsor, political party, or any other person or outside organisation."

Regulation 5.3 says:

"The private dining rooms may not be used as an inducement to recruit new members of outside organisations or non-parliamentary associations."

1 The text of their letter is at WE 1.

2 Approved by the House on 13 July 2005 (HC 351, Session 2005-06).

3 Section 5 of the Banqueting Regulations is appended at WE 2. Regulation 5.5 refers.

Third Report of the Committee on Standards and Privileges, Session 2006-07

4. The interpretation and application of these provisions was examined by the Committee on Standards and Privileges in its Third Report of the current session (HC 431). The report was prompted by a succession of complaints by Mr Jones and Mr Mann against a total of 26 Members. The Committee's report, published on 29 March 2007, provides the backdrop to the current complaint.⁴

5. In its report, the Committee strongly expressed the view that: *“practice generally in respect of use of the private dining facilities of the House by organizations raising funds for political parties has given the impression that House facilities have been used improperly for party fund raising, and is in need of reform...”*⁵

It continued:

*“We believe that political clubs that are engaged in fund-raising for a political party should in future not be allowed the use of House facilities.”*⁶

6. The Committee went on to observe that:

*“... the current distinction inherent in the Banqueting Regulations between direct fund-raising by political parties, which is specifically prohibited, and indirect fund-raising, which by implication is acceptable, is unsustainable.”*⁷

It therefore proposed that the Banqueting Regulations should be amended in a way that would prohibit political parties from benefiting financially in any way from events held in the private dining facilities. Specifically it recommended to the Administration Committee and Mr Speaker the amendment of paragraph 5.1 of the Regulations by adding after the word *“direct”* the words *“or indirect”*.⁸

7. Following the Committee's report, its recommendation was conveyed to Mr Speaker, who remitted it to the Administration Committee for consideration. I understand that the Committee and Mr Speaker are currently considering the matter, as part of a wider review of the Banqueting Regulations.

My Inquiries

8. After receiving the complaint by Mr Jones and Mr Mann against Mr Brazier, I wrote seeking his response. The text of my letter is at WE3. I also informed the House's

4 Although the report was published in typescript form and thus available on 29 March, the final sitting day prior to the Easter recess, printed copies were not available through The Stationery Office until the following Monday, 2 April, by which time the House was in recess.

5 Third Report of Session 2006-07, HC 431, para 9.

6 *Ibid.*

7 *Ibid.*, para 11.

8 *Ibid.*, paras 12-13.

Director of Catering Services of the complaint. She confirmed that the dinner which is the subject of the complaint had been booked by Mr Brazier on 18 December 2006 for the Canterbury Conservative Association. Mr Brazier had stated on the booking form that he did not have any declarable interest relating to his sponsorship of the function. The final invoice price for the dinner was just over £46.00 a head.

Mr Brazier's Response

9. Mr Brazier replied on 8 May (WE4). He accepted immediately that his Patrons' Club did raise funds for the Conservative Party, although it was also a social organization and provided him with contacts useful for his constituency work. Its members were recruited at his personal invitation. Mr Brazier enclosed a copy of a typical letter of invitation,⁹ which says:

"The Club meets twice a year—once in the spring with a dinner for members and their spouses in Parliament and once in the summer or autumn for a cocktail party in the constituency, usually at my home."

This letter goes on to refer to previous and pending events in the House.

10. According to Mr Brazier, there are approximately twenty members of the Club at any one time, who currently pay an annual fee of £250. In return they receive invitations to these two engagements a year, and a personal and quarterly newsletter from Mr Brazier.

11. Mr Brazier said that the surplus made by the Club each year, typically £2-3,000, is simply transferred into the accounts of the Canterbury Conservative Association. The accounts submitted by the Association to the Electoral Commission for the financial years ending 31 December 2004 and 31 December 2005 show net income to the Association from the Club of £2,577 and £2,460 respectively.

12. Commenting on the complaint, Mr Brazier said:

"I did, indeed, sponsor the event on 18th April. My understanding has been that the distinction between a direct and indirect fundraising event is that the former involves a specific charge for the event, whereas the latter does not. (Indeed it is hard to think what else the distinction could mean). We have never charged any separate fee for the annual dinner, other than cost price for additional (i.e. second and subsequent) guests."

13. With regard to the implications of publication of the Committee's Third Report, Mr Brazier added:

9 This is reproduced at WE 5.

“On the Monday before the event, I received advice via Party channels that the use of the House of Commons Dining Rooms would no longer be suitable for Patrons Clubs because a tightening in interpretation was occurring. It being too late to cancel or move the event, I notified members that evening that this was likely to be the last occasion that we could meet in the House of Commons, something we all felt was rather sad.”

14. In the remainder of his letter of 8 May, Mr Brazier sought my advice on the implications of the Committee’s Report for an event due to be held in the House on 6 June 2007 by a different body, the Canterbury Industrial Consultative Council (CICC). The Refreshment Department, the Registrar of Member’s Interests and I have received many similar requests for advice from Members since the report was published. I refer later in this report to the advice we have given and suggest how matters might be handled pending decisions about any amendment of the Banqueting Regulations.

Findings of Fact

15. There is no dispute between Mr Brazier and the complainants about the facts of this case. Mr Brazier sponsored an event for his Patrons’ Club in a private dining room at the House on 18 April. The cost per head of the event was just over £46.00. The event was one of two functions held annually by the Club, to which its twenty or so members each pay an annual subscription of £250. From its surplus funds, the Club is a substantial net contributor to the Canterbury Conservative Association, its net contribution recently averaging around £2,500 a year.

16. The event on 18 April had been booked by Mr Brazier four months earlier. It took place on the evening of the third day after the House returned from the 2007 Easter recess, just short of three weeks after publication of the Committee’s Third Report of the current session into earlier complaints by Mr Mann and Mr Jones of alleged misuse of Parliamentary dining facilities, and two days after Mr Brazier says he received advice via Conservative Party channels about the implications of that report.

Conclusions on the Complaint

17. As the sample letter of invitation to prospective members of the Club at WE5 makes clear, the Club’s annual dinner at the House is a major feature of its social calendar. It is held out as one of the attractions of joining the Club. It is difficult not to see the fact that the dinner is held at the House as adding to the Club’s attractiveness, in short as being part of the inducement to join the Club. **This constitutes a breach of paragraph 5.3 of the Banqueting Regulations.**

18. The dinner sponsored by Mr Brazier on 18 April was not separately charged for. In that sense he believed (as the remarks I have quoted in paragraph 12 above indicate) that it did not constitute the use of the House’s private dining rooms for direct fund-raising by a political party. As my memorandum to the Committee on the earlier

complaints by Messrs Jones and Mann indicates,¹⁰ he was far from alone in holding that understanding of what was permissible under the Banqueting Regulations.

19. It is clear, however, from the evidence, that Mr Brazier's Patrons' Club has over a number of recent years contributed an average of some £2,500 annually to the funds of his Conservative Association. With just 20 members paying an annual subscription of £250 each, this means that roughly half the annual income of the Club goes to the Association each year. Fund-raising is therefore a major (though not the only) purpose of the Club. As I have already pointed out, the annual dinner in the House is a major activity of the Club; it is therefore clear that the event contributes indirectly to a significant fund-raising effort for the local Conservative Association (in whose name the room was booked¹¹). There is also, in my view, a strong argument for regarding its centrality to the activities of the Club, as, in substance, playing a direct part in providing resources to the local Conservative Association, in breach of paragraph 5.1 of the Banqueting Regulations.

20. I am clear that the event on 18 April falls squarely into the category of those which, given the approach to the interpretation of paragraph 5.1 of the Banqueting Regulations favoured by the Committee in its Third Report, constitutes what in the Committee's view is an unacceptable use of the private dining rooms for fund-raising by a political party. **I have no hesitation in recommending that the complaint be upheld.**

21. That said, the Committee will also wish to consider whether it is realistic to have expected Mr Brazier to have cancelled the dinner following publication of the Committee's Third Report. That report was published on the final day before the Easter recess. Printed copies were not available through the Stationery Office until the following Monday, by which time the recess had begun.

22. The House resumed on Monday 16 April, two days before the dinner. It was at that point that Mr Brazier says that he learned of the report. I do not think it was unreasonable of Mr Brazier to conclude that, at that point, it was too late to cancel or move the event, bearing in mind not only the disruption that would have been caused to those due to attend it, but also the fact that, under the terms and conditions of use of the House's private dining facilities, cancellation of a confirmed booking at less than 3 days notice incurs (unless the Banqueting office is able subsequently to re-let the room, which might be thought unlikely) a penalty of "*full charge menus and room hire (where applicable), based on latest number or minimum numbers, whichever is the greater*".¹² Even had Mr Brazier cancelled the event the day the Committee's report was published, he would have lost the full deposit of £280.

10 Appendix 1 to the Committee's Third Report of Session 2006-07 (HC 431)

11 See para 8 above.

12 Banqueting Regulations, para 8

Handling the Implications of the Committee's Third Report

23. This further complaint by Mr Mann and Mr Jones raises the question how best to handle the implications of the Committee's conclusions in its Third Report. Since the publication of that report the Registrar of Members' Interests and I have been approached by many Members seeking advice on the report's implications for bookings they already hold in the House's private dining facilities. The advice we have given is as follows.

24. The Committee's report did not change the Banqueting Regulations. A decision on changing the Regulations in the light of the Committee's recommendation in that report (see paragraph 6 above) is a matter for Mr Speaker and the Administration Committee. Unless and until the Regulations are changed, the formal basis for using the private dining rooms remains unchanged.

25. However, the Committee's conclusions, in particular that the distinction between 'direct' and 'indirect' fund-raising is unsustainable, indicates that it is likely to take a broader, rather than a narrower view of what constitutes 'direct fund-raising' in relation to future complaints.

26. With that in mind, Members sponsoring functions in the House (who are personally responsible under the Regulations for ensuring that the function is in compliance with them) would from now on be wise to be fully cognisant of both the ways and the full extent to which any outside interest might be benefiting financially, and reach a decision on whether to sponsor it in the light of that. They would also be wise to ensure that, where a specific charge is levied, participants are only charged the direct costs so there can be no basis for assertions that a profit has been made from the use of House facilities and, where access to the function is in effect conditional on payment of a subscription to an organization (such as when the cost of attendance is included in the subscription), satisfy themselves of the consistency with the Regulations of any wider objectives and activities of the organization.

27. In practice this has boiled down to advising Members that where a body on whose behalf they are sponsoring an event in the private dining rooms has made donations to a political party, the Member may be vulnerable to a complaint if the event proceeds. If they wish to avoid any risk of a complaint, they should cancel their booking in the House and hold the event elsewhere.

28. In a number of instances, however, Members have bookings which cannot be cancelled without incurring a financial penalty. Paragraph 8 of the Banqueting Regulations provides for an ascending scale of charges where an event is cancelled at 60 days or less notice, the amount charged being greater the shorter the notice given. I do not think it reasonable, given the long history of such events, to require Members to cancel events in circumstances which would leave them with a personal financial liability of this nature.

29. In my footnote to paragraph 193 of my memorandum attached to the Committee's Third Report, I suggested that any new guidance issued to Members, following consideration by Mr Speaker and the Administration Committee of the Committee's recommendations, should apply to all bookings made after the date on which the guidance is promulgated to Members. The question remains as to how to handle any further complaints relating to functions held under the existing Regulations. I suggest that the Committee sets a cut-off date, after which, in considering complaints that political parties have benefited inappropriately from functions held in the private dining rooms, it will:

- i) look only at the consistency of the function with the provisions of the Banqueting Regulations, and no longer have regard to historic custom and practice in this matter; and
- ii) assume that the sponsor of the function has satisfied him or herself that, in acting as sponsor, they are acting in a manner fully consistent with the strict requirements of the Regulations.

30. Given that bookings may be made up to 18 months ahead, the Committee may wish to set different dates for new bookings and for events taking place, with the date for the latter being such that no Member who acts reasonably promptly need incur a financial penalty in canceling a function in the House. If the Committee agrees with this approach, it may wish to decide that it will adopt the approach set out in the preceding paragraph in respect of complaints relating to (a) events booked from 18 June 2007 (i.e. following the likely date of publication of its report on this case), and (b) events already booked but taking place on or after 1 October 2007 (cancellation of which prior to the beginning of August will not incur a financial penalty).

4 June 2007

Sir Philip Mawer

Written evidence received by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards

1. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr John Mann and Mr Kevan Jones, 24 April 2007

In the light of your Third Report of Session 2006-07 (HC431) we wish to make a specific an individual complaint about the misuse of House of Commons dining facilities by Mr Julian Brazier MP.

This event, on Wednesday 18 April 2007, in dining room A, was a Patrons Club dinner. According to the last two sets of accounts registered with the Electoral Commission by the Canterbury Conservative Association, its Patrons Club is a net and significant contributor to its fundraising.

The Refreshment Department of the Commons gives precise advice that fundraising is not permissible in its dining rooms.

The net sum raised for Canterbury Conservatives should, we contend, be paid to charity forthwith and this breach requires a full investigation.

24 April 2007

2. Section 5 of the Banqueting Regulations

5. Use of Private Dining Rooms

- 5.1. Subject to the exclusions in 5.2, the private dining rooms are not to be used for direct financial or material gain by a Sponsor, political party, or any other person or outside organisation.
- 5.2. Use of the private dining rooms for direct financial or material gain by all-party Parliamentary groups or by registered charities is acceptable.
- 5.3. The private dining rooms may not be used as an inducement to recruit new members of outside organisations or non-parliamentary associations.
- 5.4. No commercial presentation, promotion or demonstration is permitted.
- 5.5. Subject to the rules on the declaration of interest and 5.1 above, it is appropriate for the private dining rooms to be used for political functions or for “lobbying purposes”.
- 5.6. All functions must be brought to a close by 10.30pm and guests should leave the Parliamentary Estate by 11.00pm. The Refreshment Department reserves the right to recover additional costs incurred in the event of a late vacation of the premises.
- 5.7. With the exception of Wedding/Special Event cakes, no food or drink, other than that supplied by the House of Commons Refreshment Department, may be consumed on the premises.
- 5.8. No betting or gaming may be carried out on the premises.
- 5.9. Concerts, loud music or other activities likely to cause a noise nuisance are NOT permitted. Background music may be permitted by prior agreement at times when neither House is sitting and adjacent rooms are not in use for other events. The Sponsor should apply in writing to the Chairman of the Administration Committee who will advise the Speaker.

3. Letter to Mr Julian Brazier from the Commissioner, 26 April 2007-06-07

I see that Mr Mann and Mr Jones copied to you the letter they sent me on 24 April complaining about a dinner held by your Conservative Association's Patrons' Club at the House of Commons on 18 April.

The essence of their complaint is that the Club is a fundraising organisation for the Conservative Party and that the dinner was a fundraising event.

Whilst paragraph 5.5 of the Banqueting Regulations (a copy of which I enclose) provides that "*it is appropriate for the private dining rooms to be used for political functions ...*", paragraph 5.1 says that "*the private dining rooms are not to be used for direct financial or material gain by a Sponsor, political party, or any other person or outside organisation*". Paragraph 5.3 adds that the rooms "*may not be used as an inducement to recruit new members of outside organisations or non-parliamentary associations.*"

Paragraph 14 of the Code of Conduct for Members provides that:

"Members shall at all times ensure that their use of expenses, allowances, facilities and services provided from the public purse is strictly in accordance with the rules laid down on these matters, and that they observe any limits placed by the House on the use of such expenses, allowances, facilities and services."

In their letter, Mr Mann and Mr Jones refer to the recent Third Report of the Committee on Standards and Privileges for the current session (HC 431). In that report, published on 29 March, the Committee said:

"We believe that political clubs that are engaged in fund-raising for a political party should in future not be allowed the use of House facilities." (paragraph 9)

The Committee went on to recommend to the Administration Committee and Mr Speaker the amendment of paragraph 5.1 of the Banqueting Regulations to add after the word "*direct*" the words "*or indirect*". (see paragraphs 12-13 of the report)

That proposal will be considered by the Administration Committee. Behind the proposal, however, lay the view of the Committee on Standards and Privileges that:

"... the current distinction inherent in the Banqueting Regulations between direct fund-raising by political parties, which is specifically prohibited, and indirect fund-raising, which by implication is acceptable, is unsustainable." (paragraph 11 of the report)

It is this view which now sets a key part of the context in which the complaint by Mr Mann and Mr Jones falls to be considered.

In order for me to reach a view on the complaint—and in line with the procedures for considering complaints set out in the enclosed note—I should be grateful if you will let me have your response to the complaint. It will be helpful if this covers, among any other points you wish to make:

1. The nature of your association's Patrons' Club—its aims, membership, and how members are recruited (including a copy of any relevant recruitment literature).
2. How it funds its activities—including details of any subscription charged and what this covers.
3. Its involvement in fundraising—including details of any amounts donated to the Conservative Party nationally or locally over the last 5 years.
4. The event on 18 April—who sponsored it (I assume you did), how many were present, how it was funded, whether any 'profit' or surplus was made on the event and how that was disposed of.

I look forward to hearing from you. If you would, at any point, like a word about this matter, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

26 April 2007

4. Letter to the Commissioner from Mr Julian Brazier (without enclosures), 8 May 2007

Thank you for your letter of 6th April with regard to the complaint by John Mann MP and Kevan Jones MP. Let me say immediately that my Patrons Club does raise funds for the party, although it is also a social organisation and provides me with contacts useful for my constituency work. It has no written aims and, although it has a bank account, publishes no separate formal accounts. Its members, of whom there are approximately twenty at any one time, are recruited at my personal invitation—there is no recruitment literature. I attach a copy of a typical letter inviting individuals to join.

Members pay an annual fee of £250 for which they receive invitations to two engagements a year, one a dinner in the House of Commons and the other a cocktail party, usually at my home, together with a personal and exclusive quarterly newsletter—I enclose the latest copy.

The surplus which the Patrons Club makes each year, typically £2-3,000 is simply transferred into the Association accounts each year.

I did, indeed, sponsor the event on 18th April. My understanding has been that the distinction between a direct and indirect fundraising event is that the former involves a specific charge for the event, whereas the latter does not. (Indeed it is hard to think what else the distinction could mean.) We have never charged any separate fee for the annual dinner, other than cost price for additional (i.e. second and subsequent) guests.

On the Monday before the event, I received advice via Party channels that the use of the House of Commons Dining Rooms would no longer be suitable for Patrons Clubs because a tightening in interpretation was occurring. It being too late to cancel or move the event, I notified members that evening that this was likely to be the last occasion that we could meet in the House of Commons, something we all felt was rather sad.

On a separate point, I would be most grateful for your ruling on a second body for which I book rooms twice a year, the Canterbury Industrial Consultative Council. This is a freestanding body which has existed for at least 30 years although the staff in my Association office until a few months ago provided its secretariat. I attach a copy of its articles, aims and objects, document and recent accounts.

Unlike the Patrons Club, members of the CICC do not have to be members of the Conservative party and none of the CICC officers hold office in my Conservative Association. The organisation has never been primarily a fund-raising one. Over the years its distance from the Association has increased. Originally, it simply transferred any surpluses to the Association in lieu of an administration fee.

Over the last few years, the CICC has instead paid a small administrative fee split between the Association Agent and his secretary for administering it. Following the departure of his secretary, Councillor Ann Taylor, from the Association office last year, it was decided that she would take charge of this and such payments in future will be made direct to her alone.

From time to time the CICC has continued to make donations, usually in the form of equipment to my Association. I see that in the past five years there have been two such donations, one for £2,720 in August 2004 and one for £917 in February of this year. I understand that the CICC has also taken an advertisement in our Association Ball programme during the last two years. I do not think any member would see it as a fund-raising body for the Conservatives.

I hope that this is helpful. As the CICC are here early next month, they would be grateful for an early indication from yourself on their use of Dining Room A.

8 May 2007

5. Sample letter of invitation to join Mr Brazier's Patrons' Club (without attachment)

I am writing to ask whether you might be interested in joining the Canterbury Conservatice Patrons Club.

The Club provides its members and their guests with an enjoyable focus for political interest. Membership is limited and by my personal invitation and the annual cost is £250 per annum—or a greater sum, at the discretion of the member.

The Club meets twice a year—once in the spring with a dinner for members and their spouses in Parliament and once in the summer or autumn for a cocktail party in the constituency, usually at my home. At previous dinners in the House we have been privileged to have senior figures from the Shadow Cabinet as well as more general speakers such as the late Alan Clark and the redoubtable Daphne Park (one of MI6's top agents). Our next meeting will be a dinner in the House of Commons on 9th March 2005.

I write personally to Club members four times a year and attach a copy of my most recent letter.

Appendix 2: Letter to the Clerk of the Committee from Mr Julian Brazier, 8 June 2007

Thank you for your letter dated June 7 and Sir Philip Mawer's report with regard to the complaint made against me by Mr Kevan Jones MP and Mr John Mann MP. I fully accept Sir Phillip's report as to fact and finding and apologise unreservedly for this breach of the rules.

It may be helpful to the Committee if I give some further explanation with regard to a separate matter which Sir Philip refers to (paragraph 14), as I raised it with him by telephone on receiving his original letter. This is the dinner for a second body, the Canterbury Industrial Consultative Council, which took place on Wednesday the 6th of June. This body, unlike the Patron's Club, is not primarily a fundraising body although it has from time to time made donations to my Association and used to be given administrative support by them.

Sir Philip and I discussed the scale of charges where an event is cancelled at 60 days or less notice and confirms in his memorandum to the Committee (paragraph 28), "I do not think it reasonable given the long history of such events, to require members to cancel events in circumstances which would leave them with a personal financial liability of this nature." On that basis I allowed this second event (which fell within the 60 day period of the Committee's ruling) to go ahead. To prevent any further possible clash with the rules, I have agreed with the officers of this body that they will make no further donations to the Conservative party, in order to be able to be allowed to continue holding some of their functions in the House of Commons. (No donation has ever arisen from an individual event)

I hope this will prove satisfactory and would like to re-iterate my apology to the Committee.

Formal minutes

Tuesday 12 June 2007

Members present:

Sir George Young, in the Chair

Mr Kevin Barron

Mr David Curry

Mr Andrew Dismore

Nick Harvey

Mr Elfyn Llwyd

Mr Chris Mullin

The Hon Nicholas Soames

Dr Alan Whitehead

* * *

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report [Conduct of Mr Julian Brazier], proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft report be divided, at the end of paragraph 5.—(*The Chairman.*)

Ordered, That paragraphs 1 to 5 of the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 5 read and agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fourth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Several Papers were ordered to be appended to the Report.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Report be reported to the House.—(*The Chairman.*)

* * *

[Adjourned till Tuesday 18 June at 10.30 am

Reports from the Committee on Standards and Privileges in the current Parliament

Session 2006–07

| | | |
|---------------|---|--------|
| First Report | Evidence to the SSRB Review of Parliamentary pay, pensions and allowances | HC 330 |
| Second Report | Conduct of Mr David Cameron | HC 429 |
| Third Report | Complaints about alleged misuse of Parliamentary dining facilities | HC 431 |
| Fourth Report | Conduct of Mr Julian Brazier | HC 682 |

Session 2005–06

| | | |
|----------------|--|---------|
| First Report | Conduct of Mr Jonathan Sayeed | HC 419 |
| Second Report | Conduct of Mr John Horam | HC 420 |
| Third Report | Conduct of Mr Tony Baldry | HC 421 |
| Fourth Report | Pay for Standing Committee Chairmen | HC 568 |
| Fifth Report | Electoral Administration Bill: Simplification of Reporting Requirements | HC 807 |
| Sixth Report | Mr Stephen Byers (Matter referred on 19 October 2005) | HC 854 |
| Seventh Report | Conduct of Mr George Galloway | HC 1067 |
| Eighth Report | Conduct of Mr Mark Lancaster | HC 1144 |
| Ninth Report | Lobbying and All Party Groups | HC 1145 |
| Tenth | Conduct of Mr Michael Foster (Worcester) | HC 1223 |
| Eleventh | Conduct of Ms Emily Thornberry | HC 1367 |
| Twelfth | Conduct of Nadine Dorries | HC 1368 |
| Thirteenth | Conduct of Mr John Prescott | HC 1553 |
| Fourteenth | Conduct of Dr Desmond Turner | HC 1578 |
| Fifteenth | Conduct of Mr Eric Illsley | HC 1579 |
| Sixteenth | Review of the Guide to the Rules Relating to the Conduct of Members: Consultation Document | HC 1580 |