

Date:	31 July 2001
Event:	Nantygwyddon Landfill Inquiry
Venue:	Council Chambers, Pentre
Session:	Day 34,
Speakers:	David Purchon - Chairman of Inquiry Mr Brian Privett

Transcribed by

Talk Write Back Limited, Greencoat House, 183 Clarence Street

Kingston-upon-Thames KT1 1QT

Tel: 020 8408 6300

For legal reasons this transcript does not include some parts of the oral evidence given by Mr Privett.

CHAIRMAN: Right ladies and gentlemen, Mr Privett's going to continue his testimony, and in your own time Mr Privett. When you've filled your glass with that delicious water. We'll have a break about 11.15, should that be necessary.

(30 seconds silence)

BRIAN PRIVETT: Right Mr Purchon, good morning. We actually finished off with Dr Max Wallace. I think he asked a question on Question 5 that you put to me. I think the angle he was taking on that was, where did Halcrow's report fit into the planning permission at the time? Well, if I remember correctly, I give him a partial answer and then we adjourned. If he were here this morning, what I was going to say actually was that if he would hold on for possibly five or ten minutes, or longer, I'd come to the part of dealing with the planning permission, whatever sort it was. if I can use that terminology, and then the consultees that would be involved in that particular exercise.

I contend, and I've got a good reason for saying this, that the system, at that particular time, wouldn't hold much information anyway because, if you look at what the system doesn't hold, it is itself indicative that the planning application for the tip didn't go through the full and proper procedure.

I have got to tell you at the time that I attended, because of my involvement outside of the department, I attended virtually all committees at that time and I could only recall only the one time at committee - I referred particularly to Councillor Idwil Braes -what he said regarding the tip, that he was very much against it and, of course, he was supported then by Councillor Mal Jones. This is why, if you look at the system, I do recall, I don't think there was any public participation. Because the whole thinking of the way of Council at that time was, if it could get away without consulting the public, they would do it, because who were the public anyway? You know, they only voted them into office and once they were there, that was it.

I think you also noticed then, very early on, the officers distancing themselves from the decision and this is where the implications of this lack of action manifests itself then with the reserve matters not being dealt with.

Of course, when you look at what the chief officers should have been doing, they all had a particular role to play. Michael Bradley, the Treasurer, he had the Section 48,

49 - I can't quite remember what section it was, but he had the capacity as the Borough Treasurer to, shall we say, intervene at any time to correct what he thought wasn't in line with proper procedure.

Whilst Tony Roberts was the Borough Secretary at the time, I can never ever recall the Legal Department being outspoken against anything the Council did. As a matter of fact, I've already given you examples last time, that they would sit on their backsides and do absolutely nothing.

As I say, I did refer to the initial in-house, I believe, site appraisal and I get a feeling that, knowing the individuals who were in the engineering drawing office at that particular time, that they would have dabbled more than doing a proper job of things because, at officer level, there was general talk that things weren't being handled correctly. In other words, as officers, they were expected then to become involved without correct procedures being followed. In other words, they were being asked for support information, but when they say, "Well, right, fair enough, where's the planning consent, what about the reserve matters, what about any of the conditions that apply?" I think they realised, like many other people, like myself in particular, that this information was missing. So, I would say that they wouldn't have approached - if they were involved, they wouldn't have approached this exercise in a truly professional manner, which was quite common, shall we say, in the Rhondda Borough Council as it stood, by way of what was happening, what wasn't happening, what was it all about and so on, and so on.

Now I already believe, as a matter of fact, I know, that the wheels are already in motion within the Labour Party, shall we say, to put a - I could(?) say stop to your investigation, but to limit your findings as much as they can. Now that hallmark is already laid down because what do we have? We got great criticism of the former Labour establishment, how the courts(?) got through the system, any unions that may be involved in this are Labour-controlled, (inaudible) now(?) Unison, which I am still a member of, and of course they are Labour Party, and of course the First Minister holds the majority, say, in the Assembly and I believe that these people could possibly be influenced.

The reason why I say that is when Rhondda Cynon Taff came into being, there is one individual - no, I won't mention any names on this, but there is one individual who was known to be the unelected Ayatollah. All of the decision-making was taken in the smoky back room of the fire headquarters in (inaudible) in (inaudible) Green (?). Of course, this guy was laying down the law. If, in actual fact, we'd had a strong leader and deputy leader

ORCT, then they would have assertively have followed(?) him and there would be no problems.

But it was a known thing in the Labour Party, which I happened to be - as I have already said - I believe, a fully-paid card-carrying member of the Labour Party, in case somebody thinks I'm a Conservative or something else. And of course what'll happen now is this individual who was in the frame at that time, still remains in the Labour system between Rhondda and Assembly in Cardiff. Now I have got a feeling; I knew this, but of course he indicated to me as well, from within the Party, that whatever comes out of this investigation could well be mitigated in some way by the contacts within the system. Now having said that, as I say, I won't mention a name or names. I think we'll wait for the heads to pop up, because they will, no doubt, over the next couple of months.

You know (several inaudible words) as I said I am a member of the Labour Party and because the Labour Party preaching democracy, particularly at a local level and transparency. So I should hate to see anyone interfering in any way with your findings on the good work which you are undoubtedly doing within your brief. What I would like is an audience, if possible with the appropriate committee of the Assembly, whenever that may be. Now, a name has been mentioned in the past. First of all he was a professor, then I found out now he is a doctor. Before I spoke to Dr Max Wallace, he said, no, he's not a doctor. He is just 'Mr'. So I understand, is it 'Mr' Edwards?

CHAIRMAN: He is a doctor of (inaudible), I think.

BRIAN PRIVETT: Oh, he is a doctor?

CHAIRMAN: (several inaudible words)

BRIAN PRIVETT: Max - Well, that's fair enough. So then, Max was wrong. So if it's 'Dr' Richard Edwards, that's fine. Now, if it means that I've got to go through him to the appropriate committee, in other words it is obligatory that I see him first well, well, so be it. But that is what I would like to do. Now then, when it comes to maybe -

CHAIRMAN: It is perfectly possible for you to offer to give evidence of a confidential nature direct to the Committee and I would be perfectly prepared to pass that to them. I think it's - if you are concerned about any individual being influenced by party political considerations, probably it is best to offer to give evidence to the

Committee, because obviously that is representative of all the parties involved at the Assembly, whereas if you agree to see any individual, you will never quite know whether they might be tempted to take account of some party advantage or disadvantage.

BRIAN PRIVETT: Right. Well, that is what I feel, you know, because when you come back to local level, I was absolutely shocked when I got to know the first time of this year that the police are getting involved in the site there, and really they have no jurisdiction at all, you know?

When you look at things, as I say, I was able then to refer back, allow Michael Bradley, say being the type he was, well, I contacted (inaudible) and I contacted the police, the Fraud Squad, who were active in the (inaudible) situation then in Cynon Valley before the amalgamation of the authorities. I was told virtually, "Well, you know, there is no need for you to become involved because the matter has been reported to us by your internal audit". I said, "Yeah, I appreciate that", I said, "but if you know the background to how these people work, I'd give it all to you, but I say what you get is, it is always sort of a credible ploy. If something is wrong you will be the first to report it because then you are the good guy." This is why we had Michael Bradley allowing so much for his internal audit, allowing so much to go on within the Council, without taking any heed of it at all, but at the same time being seen outwardly to be a good auditor in as much as he draw attention to some many investigations, various people were sacked. And there he was saying to both the Fraud Squad and to External Audit, "Well, don't worry about this because, you know, I've got it all under control," etc etc. Initially they were somewhat reluctant to become involved, you know? And you can look at this and see why politics being politics, you've got local government, (several inaudible words) maybe representatives on the police authority there(?) involved with the local judiciary. It is all for me to suggest for one minute that there is anything unduly wrong in that, but only around again, it is a very cosy set-up that doesn't bode very well when you've got a dispute and you suddenly find that the police are involved for six months. They shouldn't be there. I happen to know the local police chief, shall we say. I remember him as a very small child. I knew his Dad before him and I think his name is Inspector Paul Canon. Now Paul Canon is a very, very competent policeman. He won the Police (inaudible) Cup, I think it was, for his community involvement and it absolutely amazes me, really, that such a good policeman should allow his officers with an interest in Rhondda, to participate in the tip for six months, unless

somebody at a higher level at - okayed it, condoned it - call it what you like. So I find that a big question mark and that fetches me back to the political involvement at all levels.

What I want to do and I will do this within the Party, I will take it to Labour Party Headquarters, anyway, at (inaudible). That is something I intend to do myself outside of this inquiry. When it comes to the integrity of the tip that has been mentioned, going back in 1960 I went to a seminar in Cardiff with the (inaudible) and Highways(?) and you were dealing then with geology and hydrogeology - maybe some of you might have mentioned this earlier(?) I don't know. But we were dealing there with landfill sites, would you believe it, but particularly with carwork(?) where it's taken through all manner of geology. And of course, I think Dr Max mentioned the old process year ago of puddling clay to make the waterproof liner. You know, it's a shame really that that old myth had disappeared in favour of the questionable quality of the liner up on the tip. The mere fact that the liner - the question mark had been put over it as regards its suitability, I believe. It was originally specified for domestic waste only, and of course all manner of things have gone in since then, which in other words means, to my mind, if the Council had done their job properly and if everything had been put in place technically, properly, at the start, the shutter would have gone up, the gates would have got up and said, "Well, I'm very sorry, the integrity of that site will not stand, shall we say, general use, general disposal," and here again I've got a feeling where I've questioned the files. I can't imagine a Council officer, right, unless it was Malcolm dark, giving the okay for general use of the tip whilst at the same time it is clear in my mind that what Dennis Thomas and Gwynn Evans told me, it was a political decision to put the tip there. They went along with it because they couldn't do any other. Gwynn Evans was the chief officer for the management team. He carried the whole management team with him. So he - they are responsible, and to my mind, in as much as the - taking that into account - taking it that the integrity of the tip is flawed, it amazes me how the Environmental Agency - I think I am right and stand corrected if I am wrong, but I overheard a week yesterday a conversation with the Agency people whose got it all (inaudible) where the senior of the two individuals concerned was saying, well, you know, how too often new licenses - licensing conditions in respect of this tip - well, I was just sitting there and what struck me and I had a think about this, I said, "Well, you are missing the boat completely. You know? The horse is gone." In other words, the integrity of the site is flawed. I think it was Dr Klink who said the site is leaking. That, to my mind, should be sufficient grounds

to say, "The tip closes now". All is - otherwise what if during(?) they are going to load another couple of hundred thousand tonnes or a million tonnes or whatever on top of that. That liner is going to be pressurised and it is only going to get worse. You know, I was amazed, as I say. I had come across the Environmental Agency before and they don't seem to have the ability to grasp the nettle of the situation. Circumstances are there. If Dr Klink had said, "There is no leak off that site", right then you could say, well, we've stumped you. They could now drop all manner of restrictions. But he actually said it, that it is leaking, and to - for it to remain(?) the state it is now. And here we go right back again, having made a mistake in the original design are being introduced to tip there in the first place without proper technical procedures and public participation at that particular time. One can argue that they didn't require public participation of the planning, but I still feel it probably would've been a good thing if the public had been involved.

But of course we get back again now, and I know I am just recapping here, on the way it was dealt with. The politicians wanted it there for their own gain. The Chief Officers at the time who could have objected and done something about it did not do so. And this is where it has all stemmed from. As a result of that, I believe, that if Council officers were involved, they didn't do a proper job because they knew, in other words they had been trying to put the proper buildings, shall we say, on top of a flawed set of foundations. And to my mind that is going to be there as long as the tip is there. And you know, this is something that's to my mind got to be dealt with and (inaudible) of course, that is very much my doings. As I say I - from the transcript you will be able to pick up on the relevant parts of this as we have gone back or as you go back. And I failed then to come out in support of my colleagues. I've got to be honest. I think actually I was so aggrieved that they had done so much for so long for so many years that - Nantygwyddon Tip is something different. All that they did in the past, one can argue, didn't so very much affect the (inaudible) Rhondda, but they put the Nantygwyddon Tip there.

I know for a fact that it is flawed, and badly flawed at that, by what I have already said, and what upsets me is that I've got family, a grandson in particular, that lives directly beneath this tip. The tip was given a 40-year life. It is still working at, I don't know, 20-25 years, but I feel really aggrieved that those councillors at that particular time for their own selfish ends committed the tip and in its present state if it is allowed to continue it is going to be with most people for a long, long time and that I do not like. So that is the main reason why I have actually come out and taken part in this investigation and that, I would say, is my

main concern. Now I would just like to go back and ask you -

CHAIRMAN: Excuse me a moment. Councillor Morgan wants to intervene. Yes. Microphone, Mr Chairman(?) as you've been promoted. Certainly unpaid, yeah.

COUNCILLOR MORGAN: Thank you, Mr Purchon. Okay. I missed Mr Privett's evidence on Monday 23 July, but I have noted two comments he made a few moments ago, when he made a similar comment about ten minutes ago about the role of councillors and the tip. He said just a few moments ago that Nantygwyddon was promoted for their selfish ends. There was one word there. I think the phrase he used about ten minutes ago was, I think, it was "own gain", I think was the word he used. The transcript will show the actual words he used. Did Mr Privett refer to that on 23 July, what he meant by that on 23 July? I'm just trying to find out from (overspeaking)

CHAIRMAN: Yes. From my recollection it was thought to be potentially attractive that the site was somewhat out of sight, possibly out of mind, and that there was a potential for the income from gate fees to not necessarily go through the system. So that was roughly the gist of the suspicion. I don't think any proof was brought forward. It just was in the context of a generally corrupt way of proceeding that that was thought to be potentially attractive if anyone was corrupt. That is as I recall it. Do you want to add anything to that, Mr Privett?

BRIAN PRIVETT: That is very much correct. I think what I actually said was Dennis Thomas was sympathetic because of my involvement with him or exactly what was involved. In other words, it was a political decision initially. I did mention the councillors who were involved and I will repeat that because I can recall them, that was Givey(?) Davis, (inaudible) Wales, Ivan (inaudible) who is now Ivan Davis, Councillor Sid Murphy - Dan Murphy, beg your pardon. He was the other one. And my memory is just a little dimmer(?) now on the fourth one. But there is another one as well, who ...

CHAIRMAN: Is it on the record?

BRIAN PRIVETT: Yes, it is on the record. It is on the record. Say the name? I can ...

CHAIRMAN: Roy Hicks?

BRIAN PRIVETT: Roy Hicks. That was the one, quite right. Roy Hicks was the - that's right. They were the - let's say they were the prime political movers. Gwynn Evans did qualify it, I think you will find from his script. Gwynn Evans did qualify it that the councillors wanted it, but you could check this back on the script. The councillors wanted it. He confirmed that these were the prime movers. But I think, as I said then, that all of these councillors had their loyal followers anyway. So in other words, if one councillor would vote, you could guarantee to have three or four or five or six followers that would go with him because basically, they recognised a good thing, you know? But I did say that Gwynn Evans - and I am glad that Councillor Morgan has (inaudible) - I did say that Gwynn Evans didn't implicate himself at that time, even though Dennis Thomas had said that he was implicated. But when you look at it sensibly, there was no way that any political faction, however strong, could take a decision to implement that tip site in any way without it having the officer backing, in other words backing by the management team. And of course, the management team in at that time can be checked because I am still not sure of when John Little took over from Larry Davis. That would be the only change. And of course Gwynn Evans was the chief executive, and of course he was chair of the corporate management team, the "it" as he used to call it. You know, and one can't absolve them at all. They were in frame(?) -

CHAIRMAN: We are recapping a bit now, Mr Privett (overspeaking) Could I just enquire? It is 12:45. How long do you think until you wind up, because there will be some observations and questions, I am sure. Would you like to wind up then, please? Thank you.

BRIAN PRIVETT: I did want(?) to ask you actually, is there any part that you are not happy with that I haven't answered, particularly relative to the five questions you asked me. I think I've covered them all. Councillor ah - Dr Max Wallace did raise the point about the site surveys. That would be to my mind (I'll just answer on that little one because I'd forgotten about it) - that would be to my mind relative to the consultees. In other words, you have got a flawed application to start with that was never fully and properly approved. If you've got an application that is properly approved you've got the consultees anyway, which in relation to the tip there, would have been the Highway Authority because of the access at that particular point, which would have been (inaudible) County Council. They possibly had the pole companies with the overhead lines or whatever and Welsh Water

and so on and so on, any environmental involvements. But of course what would have happened then is any site surveys, if they were carried out initially, they would have been taken account of. But of course I think the question from Dr Max Wallace was, you know, where did they stand? Well, in as much as the whole thing was flawed, that the - those deciding on the implementation step would have quite simply disregarded it, if it didn't suit their scheme. It As simple as that. So -

CHAIRMAN: I think the files show that the planning department did consult quite widely with those that nowadays would be the statutory consultees or their predecessors. But of course that was after the decision had been taken. It was on the reserved matters. And then as to the design, there was some involvement of Halcrows in the early days but that wasn't pursued. So I think that there is quite a lot of information on that and I am not sure that you would have any involvement, because by that time you had withdrawn from the corporate function, if I understand the timetable correctly, and probably were heading for retirement at the time some of the detailed work was being done or should have been done.

BRIAN PRIVETT: Yes. Well, I think I've -just to finalise this, it's - I thank you very much for allowing me to say so much. There was a need, really, to cast doubt on the decision-making or to tell you exactly how the decisions came about, to cast doubt on the whole workings of the Rhondda Borough Council at this time and particularly the accuracy of the files that you were working from, I will say again that I have got no doubt that they are flawed. They are incomplete, things having been put in and taken out.

CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much Mr Privett, for coming forward. I will confirm that I have found it very useful, especially as so few others from that era have been prepared to come forward and because so much of the detail is missing. So I appreciate the time and effort that you have put in on behalf of the investigation and hopefully that will prove to have been worthwhile in the public interest. Can I ask if there are any comments or questions at this stage? Gill Evans first please. Behind. Ladies first. Overuled.

GILL EVANS: Thank you very much. I haven't attended many of these sessions because of my work being away a lot of the time, and so this might have been raised already. But I would like to ask from your own

viewpoint from one working within the authority, what was the reaction of officers or what were instructions given to officers in dealing with the public opposition to the decision to site the tip in Gelli(?)? Because as I mentioned in my evidence, there was a Local Action Committee set up at the time which met in (inaudible) Rugby Club, which you would know well, which did have a letter-writing campaign to the Council in opposition to the tip. And it was something that was felt very strongly in (inaudible) The people in Clydach(?) of course were told at the time it wouldn't affect them at all. But there must have been awareness within the Council about the public opposition, which obviously had, you know, a political knock-on effect locally as well. And were sort of instructions taken or, you know, contingency plans to deal with that opposition?

BRIAN PRIVETT: I think in all fairness this comes down to the general attitude of the Council which I've covered very comprehensively, I believe. I do recall the action group, even as I still had residence in Tyntyla Ward at the time, and fairly generally I can equate that to my mind to everything else apart from the Improvement Grants. If the Council or councillors took a decision under the guidance of the management team, as they always did, if they didn't want to respond to public reaction, they wouldn't do so. Or if they did then what - it would be just be by way of minimum response along the lines of that we took your views as being considered, blah blah blah. You would get very much the typical Council weakness

CHAIRMAN: Mr Privett can I just intervene? I get the impression that you weren't involved inside the Council at the time the opposition was being articulated, so you are giving your view as a resident, essentially, are you?

BRIAN PRIVETT: Ah, yes, but also based upon the - like, I can say to you about your finals. You know, in other words, you know, I think Gill Evans has put a question to me that I can recognise. I can recognise from your system, you know? In other words what the Council are doing is getting back into giving to Evans' ultra vires, you know? The Council would take decisions. They would declare policy, you know. They made a big play of - on many, many things, Council policy. Council policy would be declared in those days in this room. It would get a purposeful, deliberate big play in the press, but that was only for public consumption. Right? Council policy which they, one can argue, they were bound(?) to a bye bye(?) Just went out of the window. They just did their own thing.

And if any observation from any action group, protest body, anything at all, dared to infringe upon anything that they'd decided upon, then it wouldn't be given, shall we say, the consideration it should've been given. In other words, as I said, they would respond from the courtesies (?) for the purposes of not being subject to any direction then to the ombudsman. In other words, you didn't reply etc, etc, to give that very much stereotyped reply, Council reply, they just press on and hoped that what had shown its head would just disappear, you know? And that is the way they worked. That is the way they worked.

CHAIRMAN: Mr Owen.

GARROD OWEN: I don't know which way to set about this but I take it as I did yesterday. I think I'm going to have to go backwards on it. Referring to what Mr Privett's last statement there, I will just remind the evidence and the investigation of what the District Auditor, the current District Auditor and the position held by Paul Griffiths, when he said to myself and a very small group of our people: Councils can do as they like and that there is nothing that he can do as a District Auditor to get involved in it.

To answer what Gill asks, Gill Evans asked Mr Privett on the attitude of the Council towards, and officers, rather, towards the public participation, I will remind the investigation again about a memo that is on file written by Malcolm dark in response to a point raised by John Cummane, the Planning Officer, when he was asking for public participation in the - and public meetings regarding the siting of Nantygwyddon and the other sites. And he was definitely told in this memo to, "Be off with you", that there was nothing that the public should be interested in getting involved in it.

The third point I want to make is, are you now -is it your intention now to go back to Dr Edwards, the Chairman of the Transport and Planning and Environment Committee to arrange a meeting between their committee and Mr Privett? Because quite frankly, the way that Mr Privett has given the evidence and the details that he has given, albeit some of it may be from personal memory of the matter, I feel that, you know, this is drawing me to the very firm conclusion that the only course of action that I see possible as a result of this investigation is for it to continue further in some other investigation. And I suggest that it is that of a full public inquiry, because as Mr Privett says, there are so many people that are and were involved in this. I mean, there are officers and we go back to Gareth Davis, the Environment Officer, yes the Environmental Health Officer for the time, the head of the department and to his deputy who became the deputy in

RCT, Howard Hodges, who quite frankly on file and on record in the letters held there - some of his statements in there are quite disturbing, particularly in his reaction to the manner in which he treated some of his subordinates in the department.

I'll go through the list that Mr Privett gave on the Engineering Department because when you say that no-one from that era has come forward to give evidence, I am part of that era. I worked in the Technical Services Department of RBC for quite a number of years, probably as long as, if not longer, than what Mr Privett did. But unfortunately, as far as I was concerned, well, sorry, fortunately, I was in the Architectural Section and not in the Engineering Section. But the people and the names that he referred to are very familiar to me and I will go through them.

Peter Smart who was one of the engineers, he would have had very little, if any involvement, in Nantygwyddon landfill site because he was a structural engineer and not a civil engineer. He might have been duly qualified, but his prime task or prime duty with RBC was that of structural engineer. Roger Cope, who is the second named engineer, actually filled in when Bernard Davis, who was the Borough Technical Officer for a period, who was a qualified architect and the first architect to get a borough technical officer's position. When he retired, albeit very quickly, Roger Cope, the person we just mentioned then, took over and acted on a temporary capacity of Acting Borough Technical Officer and that was during the time when one of the planning applications of the 1981 or the 1983 applications were being submitted. Brian James who was also an engineer in that department, he was one of the senior engineers there, did for a time become Acting Deputy to Roger Cope until the appointment of Malcolm dark. He and Evans had quite a bit of involvement on Nantygwyddon site in that his name is initialled onto a number of the drawings that you are holding in the Resource Centre there. And he - as I said, a number of the drawings are offered by him and obviously traced out by Sandra (inaudible) who was the tracer in the Engineering Department.

We come to Malcolm dark, who I can understand from what Mr Privett has said, was the prime controller of Nantygwyddon. And from what Mr Privett has said I think that he was the leader of everything that happened, whether it be good or bad - mostly bad, about Nantygwyddon.

What Mr Privett was not aware of, there were three other engineers in that department who were actively involved in both the design and the running of Nantygwyddon

Landfill and they were Cliff Parish, Phil Burgess and Mike Bloxsom. Now, those three officers, when the re-organisation of local government came - sorry, the Environment Agency was formed and all (inaudible) there (I can't remember the year,) but those three transferred to the Environment Agency and Mike Bloxsom became the Site Engineer up on site there. And he is a person that I really sincerely believe should be made, if it is possible to attend this investigation to give evidence, because there are some quite damning notes in site notes there that he has initialled as being the author of. I mean, his complaints against the management and the running of the site are well-endorsed in these reports. Now I know

that he finished. He finished. He retired early on ill health, but I am certain that there is a possibility or an opportunity that he comes forward and that we do not miss that opportunity, because I believe he has got tremendous information which may be able to do something more helpful towards this investigation.

There's Maunsell Mason was mentioned. I can't say very much about Maunsell Mason, but I did see the reply to written questions that you've got there and if you could understand the man you would understand the tone of his reply to you in just pointing out the mistakes that were in the invitation for him to answer the questions. And looking at it in that light, I feel it is impossible for you as an investigator to give written questions to the people that you have done and expect from their written replies to be able to formulate any opinion as to the people who they are, the jobs that they've run and the way in which they've run those jobs. And I think that it is going to be an absolute disgrace to all of us concerned in Nantygwyddon investigation if those people do not attend.

There are people then also mentioned from the Legal Department and I quote the names here: John Price, John Lewis and Gethin Williams. John Price and John Lewis dealt with contracts, basically, in the legal service because they handled many of the architectural contracts that I ran. Gethin Williams had a very, very serious and large involvement in Nantygwyddon because there are some letters still standing in the Resource Centre filing system of which Gethin Williams is the author, showing an involvement of people from the Welsh Assembly where they were forming the Welsh Office. And I can name one as the Director appointed to Rhondda Waste Disposal, that of Michael Evans. And I think that these people have been asked. They formally disagreed - or formally mentioned that they will not attend the hearing. And I think for that reason there cannot be a continuation of coming to a decision on this investigation without the full public inquiry. And I do understand your reasonings at the beginning when I spoke to you the first week that you came to the Welsh Assembly, that a public inquiry may

not enable you to cross-examine these people properly or correctly because they will still in that format, still have the right not to speak.

But Sue Essex in her words to me when she said - and it wasn't to me it was to my colleague as well, Bill Thomas, and I think Len Long was with me when we spoke to her - and she said, "Well, we will ask these people". And it was mainly at that time, because I hadn't gone into the full details of it then, there were namely the three former directors of Rhondda Waste Disposal: Vie Collier, Hugh Hoather and Michael Evans. And I said that those three people must be made to come to it and she said, "Well, we will ask them and you can draw your own conclusions if they don't come". Well, it would appear Mr Purchon, from the hearings and the details that Mr Privett has given now that there is a far more reaching, far more searching investigation needed into Nantygwyddon before we will come to the proper answer on it.

I go lastly onto one point. That other important people that Mr Privett mentioned, and he gave three. We weren't certain of the name of the middle one, but the first one was Kevin Reilly, the second one was Ann but we couldn't remember what her surname is, and the third one was Enid Butler. Now those three people were definitely part of the committee section who attended every meeting of every committee, whether it was one or maybe two. Sometimes there were two called if the meeting was important enough to warrant it, to have cross-reference to each other's notes on it. And I believe that Kevin Reilly and Enid Butler could well be asked to come forward and give their observations on some of the decisions that they saw taken and heard taken in some of these very important committee meetings for which there are no records of the details of them. Now I would assume that the details that are not evident are those that Mr Privett referred to - quite rightly - in his statements as saying the odd documents have been removed. I mean, I recall, as I said earlier this afternoon and in previous meetings, of what evidence I have given, where the leader of the Council, the present leader of the Council said that a number of these documents may well have been shredded. Now, you know, there were - I am not going to recourse to rumours, but we heard it on the day that Labour lost the elections and the local party where there were fires and bonfires running riot up at Clydach Vale. I mean, I can't at(?) sure say but people say that they saw them. I mean, there may be good reasons for it. Perhaps the central heating wasn't working.

But, you know, there are so many things that need an answer to. I think you have done a very searching and a very sort of in-depth study, but you have been severely

limited and restricted in the information that you have had.

I think we have been very fortunate that Mr Privett has come forward and given this detail. And I mean, he was on the list of people that we asked you to consider inviting to it. I hadn't spoken to him before about coming forward. I had spoken to him a number of times since, because, I mean, at the time we were colleagues together on Rhondda Borough Council and I mean, whereas he was in the Building Inspectors' Department that often turned down many of the drawings that I submitted to them, that was beside the point. I don't have any ill feelings about that at all. Perhaps my drawings weren't up to quality. But I am glad that he has come forward. He has certainly given us fairly light entertainment as well with it there, but I mean, that has always been his way of working. But I still, come back, but without a full public inquiry, I am sorry, but our action cannot cease with the closure of the investigation. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr Owen. A couple of things there, I think, for me to answer. As with all others who have offered to pursue issues with the Committee, I will let the Committee Secretariat know of Mr Privett's willingness, nay, eagerness, to appear before them. He can certainly request a preliminary meeting with the chair and the secretary if he wants to discuss the timetabling. I do think, as you will be aware, there are some limits to the time that a committee of the Assembly can spend receiving information and evidence from individuals, but that is the only practical constraint, I see.

So far as your other concerns about the benefit of a more far-reaching inquiry, I note what you say. All the limitations and reservations about this investigation that I have been conducting will be covered in my report to the National Assembly. It is in the nature of a preliminary investigation. The main investigation is by the Committee itself, and I think they may well wish to take some matters further. What of course they were hoping for was a report within six months. They are now expecting my report to be formally presented on 31 October. I am working to that sort of deadline for the report. It will not attempt to be a final report into all the issues. It is quite clear that there will be elements of speculation and opinion in the report, based on all the information that has been brought forward to me. But there is, as you say, a great absence of evidential documents and testimony and that was probably always the problem you foresaw with this sort of investigation. I think that you will acknowledge that it has been of some use but perhaps not quite as much as you were hoping for. Mr Thomas.

MR THOMAS: Thank you, Mr Purchon. It is a question which I think Mr Sid Morgan has touched upon and Mr Privett has mentioned in his evidence, regarding the way the Council operated and it's regarding the choice of the Nantgwyddon site as the landfill site. So my recollection at the time, Gelli Waters represented by Mr Dyffrig Hughes was an independent. Did this actually have any influence at all upon choosing of the site?

BRIAN PRIVETT: No, I wouldn't think so. Dyffrig Hughes was a colleague of mine. We worked together from 1961, late 1961 until he retired, which I believe was well into the 1980s, just before he became a Councillor. But let's say it

made it a lot easier for the Council then to take a decision. I think I have covered it as well. Am I right in saying that the Council alongside Dyffrig was (inaudible) at any particular time?

FEMALE SPEAKER: (several inaudible words)

CHAIRMAN: There would have been three representing the wards, yes.

BRIAN PRIVETT: The thing is that I was informed of this last time. I didn't know it, but Dyffrig Hughes, I beg your pardon, Edward Grace spoke out vehemently against the tip. I did tell Mr Purchon and the audience how impressive he was. I didn't realise until afterwards, until one of the listeners here said, well, come the next elections he was deselected. In other words, to my mind what he did at that particular committee meeting was so much out of step with the Labour faction's attitude, compared(?) (inaudible) what they do, they victimised (I think I've made this well and truly clear in the various chat (?) I've given) that they would - if anybody stepped out of line, they would be victimised, as simple as that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further questions or observations?

If not, can I remind you that the next public event will be on 13 August. This will be a presentation about the toxicological review of the information pertaining to the site by the Institute of Environment and Health, Leicester

University. I think that may be preceded or followed by a final statement from RANT from the distinguished Chairman, Mr Garrod Owen. We still have to timetable that session. That will conclude the public hearing scheduled for now, unless any other developments take place. Thank you very much for your attendance and have a pleasant afternoon.