

Copy

Alan Smith  
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp  
RMB 4408  
Portland 3305  
Victoria, Australia.

Phone: 055 267 267

Fax: 055 267 230

14 April, 1997

Gina Sanna  
Legal Support Officer  
Human Rights Commission  
GPO Box 5218  
Sydney 2001

Dear Ms Sanna,

**Re: The Casualties of Telstra (COT) Australia**  
(Small businesses versus a Telecommunications Corporation)

The following items are included for your information:

1. Video tape, addressed to
2. Copies of two letters (and their attachments) addressed to Mr John Pinnock, Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman (TIO), Australia.
3. Copy of a draft of part of my forthcoming book titled "*Phoney Business*". Please note that this has not yet been proof-read.

A submission regarding this national disgrace has also been forwarded to Senator Richard Alston, Minister for Communications and the Arts. A contact met with Senator Alston, in his office at Parliament House in Canberra, before he received my submission. At this meeting Senator Alston told this person that he had read numerous documents which I had previously forwarded to him and had concluded that I had proof of a massive cover-up regarding my Arbitration.

It was after hearing of this comment that I forwarded to Senator Alston the submission referred to above. This submission was first assessed by a legal person who has also stated, in writing, that my Arbitration did not produce Natural Justice. Senator Alston has not yet acted on the information included in this submission.

Mr Pinnock (TIO), for reasons unknown, has actually slandered me when writing to Mr Laurie James, past president of the Institute of Arbitrators, Australia. In this letter Mr Pinnock gave the impression that I was not a person of good character, stating that I was 'troublesome' and turned an innocent event (an after-hours phone call to the Arbitrator's home) into a major incident.

This 'incident' occurred as follows:

I phoned the Arbitrator on 28 November 1995 after receiving a parcel of documents under Freedom of Information (FOI). These documents further supported my belief that Telstra technicians had deliberately introduced beer into a touch-phone telephone which had been removed from by business for testing by Telstra. It is quite clear that beer had not been spilt into the phone in question before it left my premises but Telstra used a 29 page report on this matter to support their defence of my claims under Arbitration. In this report Telstra state that the 'beer' had been the cause of my ongoing phone problems.

During my Arbitration, Dr Hughes (Arbitrator) refused to give my Forensic Document Researcher (Mr Westcott of Canberra) access to the working notes on which Telstra based this 29 page report although, only a matter of a few weeks previously, Telstra's Forensic Document Researcher was allowed access to my private diaries, creating a 72 day extension on the time Telstra took to assess my claim.

I am sure you can therefore understand how agitated I was when, six months after my 'Award' had been finally handed down, I received this parcel of FOI documents which proved what I had believed all along, and which resulted in my after-hours call to Dr Hughes's residence.

On this occasion I phoned at 8.02 pm, 28 November 1995 and spoke to Dr Hughes's wife who answered the phone and informed me that Dr Hughes was in Malaysia at the time. I was concerned not to alarm Mrs Hughes, being fully aware that Dr Hughes may have told her about my Arbitration and my anger at the results, and so, on the spur of the moment, I decided it was better not to leave my own name. I gave the first name that came to mind, John Rundell, a member of one of the resource units attached to my Arbitration, and told Mrs Hughes that I would contact Dr Hughes when he returned.

As I have already explained, when writing to Mr James of the Institute of Arbitrators, Mr Pinnock turned this harmless episode around, stating (incorrectly) that I rang at 2 am and gave a false name, as if I had plotted to frighten Dr Hughes family when I was actually attempting to do the exact opposite. Because Mr James and I had corresponded before Mr Pinnock wrote this letter, Mr James was already concerned at what had taken place during my Arbitration and so he notified me of Mr Pinnock's comments.