



Ray McCann
Review into HMRC's Loan Charge figures

Via email contact@lcreview2025.org.uk

14th April 2025

Dear Ray,

Your inappropriate interview and prejudicial and biased comments in Computer Weekly

We are writing to you regarding your interview published in computer Weekly (1st April 2025). We note that you instigated this interview, rather than having been approached to give one.

We are both astonished and dismayed about your comments in this interview, which are very clearly prejudicial, showing preconceived views and bias, that are wholly incompatible with your role in leading what is supposed to be an independent review.

In this interview you have clearly stated and reiterated your own strongly held existing views, views that a genuinely independent review lead should not hold (and certainly should not have expressed publicly). This will inevitably undermine confidence in you and the already unacceptably Treasury restricted and biased review into Loan Charge settlements (which is what your review is, as opposed to a genuine review of the Loan Charge Scandal).

It would have been entirely appropriate for you to put out a comment to the media to encourage people to submit evidence and that is all you should have done in terms of media comment, whilst in the role of being the lead of a Government commissioned review.

Yet instead, you have engaged in a much wider discussion and the comments you have made show prejudice and bias (including as a direct result of you working in a senior role for HMRC, in this very area of Counter Avoidance activity). You make clear that you support the Loan Charge and that people affected should be facing it. That is a wholly unacceptable position for anyone leading any review of the Loan Charge, never mind one that is being presented as being independent.

Your comments also show that you continue to doubt the role played by a host of professional parties. Most extraordinarily of all, your comments in this interview show that you have already effectively come to a conclusion of what you will be recommending in the summer!

On the day your interview was published, the Loan Charge Action Group had just that morning emailed its members about your call for evidence, which was finally published just a few days before, on 28th March. We made clear to our members that we are encouraging them (and others with evidence) to supply it to your review, which we believe is important, despite the review unfairly being restricted to considering only changes to settlements.

Now people have read your deeply ill-considered and very troubling interview and comments, it will be harder to convince people to do so, which is presumably the opposite of what you hoped and intended. You presumably also hoped that the interview would convince people that you could be seen as independent, despite being a former Assistant Director of HMRC. Instead, your comments inevitably have done the complete opposite.

These are the particular comments of concern which we must raise with you, the Government and the All-Party Parliamentary Loan Charge and Taxpayer Fairness Group:

1. You are in the process of leading what is presented as an 'Independent Loan Charge Review' and yet you have now publicly stated that you support the Loan Charge

In this interview, you have stated clearly and explicitly that you support the Loan Charge policy and support the fact that your review should not repeal this deeply controversial legislation.

We already knew that regrettably, this was not to be a review of the Loan Charge legislation at all (despite the dishonest title it has been given by the Treasury), **but we now also know that this very limited review, which is about settlement terms only, is being led by someone who fully supported and still supports the deeply controversial Loan Charge in the first place.**

In the interview you state:

“It’s not open to me to recommend that the Loan Charge be repealed, and the government has made clear from the start that repeal was not an option, *and equally I don’t think it should be*”.

The thousands of people facing this deeply controversial legislation will be utterly dismayed at this and will be losing confidence in your ability to lead such a restricted and biased review. Even if you held this opinion (which of course should have ruled you out of any genuinely independent review) it is most surprising and unfortunate, that you have chosen to express it publicly, in the media during the time of the review.

2. You demonstrate clear bias in expressing broad support for the approach of HMRC and Government and in discussing individuals as having wilfully avoided “millions” in tax

You also show clear prejudice about the whole issue, assuming that the Loan Charge is justified (and that it was justified to rip up normal taxpayer protections and the normal processes for HMRC to pursue individuals). In doing so, you show your support of HMRC and the Treasury’s approach as well as a presumption of wilful and deliberate tax avoidance on the part of people caught up in the Loan Charge Scandal. Neither of these things is at all acceptable for someone leading a review into this issue.

In stating why that you don’t think the Loan Charge should be repealed, you reinforce HMRC’s propaganda that “many people” made “millions” from the use of these arrangements. This is a remarkably distorted, as well as biased view, when the reality (as you must surely know) is that those who made millions from the operation of these schemes (and HMRC’s failure to clamp down on them at the time) were the promoters of the schemes, not the contractors told by professionals that they should use them.

You state:

“It would be a bad move because – whether people realise it or not – there are many individuals who have got millions out of loan schemes and paid little or no tax on it. Government has a responsibility to the many millions who pay tax and national insurance contributions [NIC] on all of their earnings, and unless this is resolved in a way that is fair to both those affected by the loan charge and the millions of other taxpayers, many would no doubt ask why you and I should pay our tax and national insurance?”

This is a paragraph that is so clearly biased and prejudicial. **The vast majority of those affected by this nightmare were told by recruiters, accountants and scheme operators that all their tax and national insurance was being paid**, as well as being told that the arrangements were entirely compliant under tax law.

It is hugely disappointing that you have made such an inflammatory and prejudicial statement, at a time when you are trying to present yourself as being independent and when you are hoping people will have confidence in your review.

In reality (as opposed to HMRC's deliberate demonisation of people caught up in this scandal, the amount people earned from their work was often similar to those if they had operated through a limited company. In many cases, people were advised (including by Chartered Accountants) not to operate through a limited company due to the risk of being caught by IR35 legislation. To therefore make such a biased and inflammatory statement, that both infers guilt at deliberate tax avoidance and also suggest huge personal gain in doing so, is completely unfair and unacceptable (and unacceptably prejudicial).

3. You demonstrate further prejudice in expressing doubt that people were given clear, written assurances that the schemes were compliant and legitimate

You show clear prejudice in suggesting that people must really have known that the arrangements they were being advised to use were not compliant and legitimate. You state:

“Many people will have concerns, even if they get assurance from the promoter. And most of them did get assurances from promoters saying, ‘It’s all fine. It’s all tried and tested, and HMRC don’t mind. But I think there is only so far you can believe that to be the case without evidence, and some of that has already come into the review mailbox.”

In reality, people did take and follow professional advice from accountants, tax advisers, recruiter and umbrella companies, as well as promoters and were fully reassured that the arrangements were entirely legitimate, HMRC compliant and without risk.

You have thrown doubt on evidence that is already in the public domain which you must already be aware of. We were surprised to see you stating that you are not aware of the huge amount of evidence of marketing materials – brochures, adverts, videos etc – that was used by promoters and their agents.

You state:

“That’s the task before me – getting sufficient reliable evidence to show that the promoters are the bad guys that I can put in my review”.

Please ensure you read the damning report by [Tax Policy Associates](#) written last year, that laid bare much of this evidence. Also please read the [Loan Charge Inquiry Report](#) and [Follow-Up Report](#) by the APPG. You must have seen the many articles and some of the many social media posts detailing these marketing materials.

There is already a huge amount of evidence in the public domain, which we urge you to look at (and challenge your own preconception and prejudice) as well as seeking more such evidence from individuals affected.

4. Ministers themselves have acknowledged that people are victims of mis-selling but you are now publicly questioning this

Your statement above shows that you are inferring that people may not really be victims of mis-selling, which is a prejudicial thing to infer.

You state:

“But I think there is only so far you can believe that to be the case without evidence”.

That statement casts doubt as to whether people really were victims of mis-selling which all the evidence clearly demonstrates that they were.

Treasury Ministers and MPs alike are clear that people affected are “victims of mis-selling” so your comments in this interview are at odds with those of the responsible Ministers and the overwhelming feeling in Parliament.

The Chancellor stated on LBC Radio on the 29th January last year,

“...you are absolutely right, that **HMRC seem to be coming after the people who were mis-sold these products rather than the people who were mis-selling them, and that is a real scandal**”

On Twitter/X on the 18th January last year, the Chief Secretary to the Treasury said:

“In the loan charge debate today, I called on the government to review the behaviour of HMRC. It’s right that tax avoidance schemes are closed down. **But it can’t be right that HMRC are pursuing victims of mis-selling so aggressively but not those who misled victims.**”

If Treasury Ministers are clear that people affected are victims of mis-selling, it is troubling that you have decided to cast doubt on this, and in doing so, have given the strong impression of disbelieving victims and taking HMRC’s stance that continues to blame the victims themselves. This ignores the overwhelming facts of mis-selling, something that Ministers have explicitly criticised HMRC for.

5. You make a prejudicial point suggesting contractors would have been aware of criticism of EBTs (when most were not) and also criticise of them for “not doing Google searches” when they had taken and followed professional advice

You suggest in the interview that contractors must be at fault (inferring that they must have realised that they were getting involved with tax avoidance schemes and that they might face challenge from HMRC). This is clearly a prejudicial statement. You state:

“Even if you go back to 2010 and before, HMRC’s position on [the use of EBTs] was all over the internet. If you did a Google search at the time on EBTs, you might get millions of hits – and most of them were about HMRC’s view on them.”

This choice of words is in effect, defending HMRC (for whom you worked for up until 2006). It suggests that HMRC did do enough to warn people or to tackle the schemes themselves which clearly, they did not. It also suggests that somehow ordinary workers, who were taking professional advice from experts, would or should be internet searching for Employment Benefit Trusts. Perhaps tax professionals would be doing Google searches but ordinary workers would not have had anything like that level of awareness which you should be well aware of. Earlier in the interview you confirm precisely why you would have been so mindful of EBTs and HMRC’s position on them, where you state:

“When I was in the Revenue in the 1990s, I was one of the first inspectors to take on one of the big employee benefit trusts”

You were not only an expert; you were directly involved in looking into and challenging EBTs for HMRC. You would therefore be aware of this (and were well paid for being involved in looking into them!). To suggest that ordinary contractors – who were seeking a compliant way of working without the risk of being caught by IR35 – should have been aware is completely unrealistic, unreasonable and prejudicial.

What is important is not whether or not ordinary workers, with no knowledge of tax or accountancy, were doing improbable web searches for EBTs, but that they were told, pushed and in some cases instructed to use these arrangements by a host of professional parties, from recruiters, to accountants, to tax advisers, to umbrella companies, to promoters, to end clients. Why would someone who has done precisely what HMRC advises you to do – take professional advice and subsequently been given clear assurances of compliance, lack of risk and legitimacy, then start doing Google searches on EBTs, especially when the majority of contractors using these arrangements would never have even heard of this acronym and the rest would have naturally assumed they were permissible. As you know, the use of EBTs in themselves is not necessarily linked to tax avoidance.

6. You have also demonstrated bias as a former HMRC senior inspector/Assistant Director in mentioning HMRC’s “view”

In your above statement about EBTs, you refer to “HMRC’s view” and you also refer to HMRC’s “position”.

This is repeating a key phrase from HMRC’s propaganda, which also frequently states that “they were always clear” which in reality, many Freedom of Information (FOI) responses have shown that they were most certainly not. It also reinforces the line in HMRC’s narrative that their “view” is what matters, when the reality is that what should matter is the law. A large part of the controversy surrounding the Loan Charge, as you are well aware, is that it was devised to allow HMRC to issue life-changing tax bills without having to prove that they are actually, legally due. The disgrace of the Loan Charge and the way that it undermined the basic principles of the tax system is that it allowed HMRC to issue demands based on their “view”, not on the law or on any legal ruling despite many calls to be shown one.

Any genuine and truly independent review of the Loan Charge would be looking at the reality of the **law at the time**, not pushing the discredited line that HMRC’s view was that these schemes never worked. HMRC certainly didn’t effectively communicate this to workers/directors and unquestionably did not do enough to stop the schemes operating. Instead of calling for more powers to shut down schemes and pursue promoters, HMRC cynically invented the Loan Charge to instead go after the workers, the victims of mis-selling, knowing unlike promoters and banks, they could not defend themselves or challenge HMRC. The very restricted review was devised to avoid taking any of these important points into consideration.

7. You are assuming, wrongly, that ‘independent professionals’ weren’t involved in recommending/approving schemes, when they were

You state, when reiterating your call for evidence:

“It’s reasonable to conclude that the individuals involved, who often did not have independent professional help, were persuaded that this was okay.”

In reality, those who DID seek and follow professional advice, were told that the schemes were entirely legitimate, compliant and legally approved. We note that in the past you have expressed doubt that Chartered Accountants recommended schemes and the inference of your comments is that it was those without independent professional advice that were mis-sold. In fact, those who approached both high street Chartered Accountants and accredited tax advisers were told that the schemes were entirely legitimate.

We must urge you to look at the huge amount of evidence that shows the involvement of a series of professional parties – rather than suggesting it was only those who took the assurances of promoters at face value. Recruiters, tax advisers, accountants, umbrella companies and in some cases end clients all gave clear assurances of legitimacy/legality and also of a lack of risk (some backed with claims of insurance schemes).

The Chancellor herself has publicly acknowledged the mis-selling on the part of accountants, so we were surprised that you continue to seem to doubt this. She said on LBC radio on 28th January last year:

“We’re talking about ordinary people on ordinary wages but who were contractors and were encouraged by their accountants to participate in these schemes”.

If you continue, wrongly, to doubt the involvement of accountants, including Chartered Accountants, you presumably also doubted or didn’t know about the considerable involvement of recruitment agencies, including well known recruitment firms. Please watch the recent piece on [Sky News](#) about the involvement of recruitment agencies, which includes familiar high street names. This should be considered as part of your review, along with all of the considerable evidence that shows that those who took ‘independent professional advice’ were misled as well as those who did not.

8. You have stated that you will not be reading the majority of submissions

You have made the following statement, a matter of days after publishing your call for evidence, which makes clear you will not be reading the majority of submissions people send in:

“I don’t need everybody to send me details in, because if all 50,000 people in scope of the Loan Charge send me their evidence, this review would take 10 years to complete. But what I do need is enough to get involved that I can sensibly make a case that this is representative of what happened”.

This will no doubt discourage those who are so badly affected and who you know are already deeply distrustful as a result of the whole history of the Loan Charge Scandal, to submit evidence if they feel it will not even be read. These are agonising life stories that individuals are taking great pains to put down on paper which bring up old wounds. Finding information from sometimes more than a decade ago is a difficult and time-consuming exercise. If no one will read it, what is the point?

9. You reveal that you dealt with bank schemes whilst at HMRC, but conflate this with individuals when there is no comparison

You state:

“One of the last things I did before I left HMRC in 2006 was pre-empt the settlement with several banks in late 2005. One of the banks that I had challenged had put a billion pounds into an employee benefit trust”.

Aside from the issue of whether someone who worked for HMRC in this very area is an appropriate person to lead an independent review into a disastrous HMRC policy, what you are doing here is conflating the use of EBTs by banks with individual workers who have taken advice from professionals.

International banks, with vast wealth resources, would have used deliberately and knowingly, EBTs in a way to benefit themselves and their employees. In contrast, contract and freelance workers were advised, pushed into or instructed to use these schemes by professionals that they should have been able to rely on. There are no parallels here and shows a lack of understanding of the reasons that so many workers ended up in this nightmare, which was in very many cases to avoid the risk of being affected by IR35 legislation and in nearly all cases, because they were advised to do so. The overwhelming evidence, included [in the APPG survey](#) shows that workers did not enter into these arrangements predominantly to avoid tax, but because they were advised to do so, due to IR35 legislation and to avoid the risk of working through a limited company.

The comparison also misses the fundamental point that the settlements with banks and other large corporates (including the one you mention) were paid **by the banks NOT by bank employees**. These huge banks were given settlements involving considerable discounts, whereas individuals have been hit with max tax, penalties and interest. This is so clearly grossly unfair. We would now like you to publish the details of this deal, not to do so will lead to further distrust. You have yourself already acknowledged that huge banks have been treated far more leniently and offered far bigger discounts than individual workers who were advised to use these arrangements.

10. You have dismissed the idea that HMRC should pursue promoters

We are deeply disappointed that you actually dismiss the idea that HMRC should go after promoters, something that MPs from all parties are in agreement feel should be done. You state:

“We can argue that HMRC should have gone after this promoter or that promoter, and all manner of other things to do with the Loan Charge, but that doesn’t help someone who is sitting at home worried about the bailiffs coming round...If someone’s drowning in a river, they’re not going to be helped if people are just standing on the shore arguing about how they got in the river in the first place. They just want someone to rescue them.”

What you are saying here in your metaphor, is that it doesn’t matter who pushes someone in the river, leading them to drown. To the victims, it matters enormously who has caused them to be in this position. As a comparison to another shocking scandal that we are all familiar with, if a reviewer of the Post Office Scandal said “it doesn’t matter why sub-postmasters are in jail, it only matters that they are freed”?

This demonstrates that this review is merely an exercise in potentially reducing settlements a little and not at all about investigating the scandal, the industrial scale mis-selling and the failures and misconduct of HMRC themselves.

We also are concerned that you don’t appear to be interested in the Government/HMRC taking action against those who operated, mis-sold and made millions from these schemes. We must point out that this is entirely at odds with what current Treasury Ministers have said about promoters.

The Exchequer Secretary to the Treasury said in an interview with the Yorkshire Post 12th December 2021:

“We want to see the Government pursue the promoters behind these schemes and recognise that ordinary people are facing huge bills due to the loan charge and personal harm”.

The Chancellor stated on LBC Radio on the 29th January last year,

“...you are absolutely right, that HMRC seem to be coming after the people who were mis-sold these products rather than the people who were mis-selling them, and that is a real scandal...and I think you’re right to talk about who are the real culprits here. It’s the people who mis-sold products, and people like you are the innocent victims in this sort of war of attrition with HMRC now”.

On Twitter/X on the 18th January last year, the Chief Secretary to the Treasury said:

“In the loan charge debate today, I called on the government to review the behaviour of HMRC. It’s right that tax avoidance schemes are closed down. But it can’t be right that HMRC are pursuing victims of mis-selling so aggressively but not those who misled victims.”

It is deeply disappointing that they have backtracked on their desire to pursue promoters and their promise to a fresh, genuinely independent review of the Loan Charge. It is no wonder there is so little faith in the political system. It is a greatly disheartening attitude considering the harm promoters have done.

A genuine (and genuinely independent review) would of course look at the role of all of those who have caused people to be “drowning” in HMRC demands and then apportion blame and liability appropriately as opposed to starting from the position that victims of mis-selling are actually guilty of tax avoidance (and that no other party should be financially pursued). Ignoring the role of promoters (and of recruiters, umbrella companies, accountants, tax advisers etc) is a huge slap in the face for all those affected as well as an admission of defeat on the part of the review and the Government as you are confirming in this statement that promoters (and all these other professional parties) will get off scot-free.

11. You have stated you will be using a prejudicial and biased test of what is fair/unfair

We are disconcerted to see that rather than accepting the facts that people are victims of mis-selling (as Ministers have described them) and whether therefore the Loan Charge and the current treatment of them is unfair (which is what any genuine review would look at), the interview states that you will instead be using the subjective and biased view of fairness/unfair being what ‘other taxpayers’ might think is fair. This is inappropriate on many levels. The interview states:

He also needs contractors to engage in the review by supplying a “substantial and significant” amount of evidence that proves their claims that their treatment at the hands of HMRC has been “unreasonably and manifestly unfair” **in the eyes of the average person in the street who pays tax and national insurance.**

You go on to say:

“The argument you’ve got to make is that they’re being treated in a way that’s unreasonably unfair, and in a way you and I don’t support”.

You appear to be saying that your decision-making criteria will not be whether or not people are victims of mis-selling (as Treasury Ministers have stated) but will be an arbitrary test of whether or not other taxpayers who don’t understand the complexities of this issue would think is fair. If

you ask most people, do they think the amount of tax they pay is fair and if others should pay more, then they will say yes to both as they do not understand.

This is deeply worrying - and suggests the review is simply a way of saying "you are all slightly less guilty than HMRC has suggested" rather than looking at the whole issue for what it is, properly.

As you are aware, HMRC have waged a concerted propaganda war over recent years, deliberately ignoring the reality of how and why most people got into these arrangements and demonising everyone as rich, deliberate tax avoiders. As you are also aware, people who don't know anything about the issue or understand the reality of contracting and the reasons so many people received their wages in this way are also likely - unfairly - to see those affected in the same light. To make your main test as to whether an 'average taxpayer' would regard it as fair is deeply prejudicial, as well as being wholly inappropriate. In addition, describing others as an 'average taxpayer' is a way of deliberately tarnishing the victims of mis-selling caught up in this nightmare. You are effectively saying that victims are not average taxpayers and are tarnishing them, with the inference of their being deliberate and cynical tax avoiders. This is clearly prejudicial when you acknowledge that you haven't yet received or looked at the evidence of why these workers - many of whom are as 'average' as any other average person - got into this mess in the first place.

The APPG has always said that a genuinely independent review should be led by a retired tax judge (and not a former senior officer of HMRC).

12. You have announced the pre-determined conclusion of your review two days after your call for evidence was published

Perhaps most extraordinarily of all, you have already effectively announced the conclusion of your review in this interview, published just two working days after your call for evidence.

You state:

"I want to end up with a situation where people get a settlement figure from HMRC that they can look at and say, 'Well, okay, even if I'd rather not pay it, I can pay it, within a reasonable period if necessary'. Whereas, presently, people are saying, 'I'd rather not pay it, but even if I did want to pay it, I can't afford to'. I want to change that dynamic."

You have announced that your intention is to propose slightly lower "settlement figures" (in other words slightly reduced demands, for the disputed tax) and on slightly more manageable terms, whilst continuing to assert that people are *still* liable to pay it and that despite all the evidence, they are therefore effectively *still* guilty - and HMRC are correct.

It appears that there is actually no need for a review at all, if all the Government intended to do was to offer a slight reduction to (some) people affected (perhaps taking away some of the most draconian elements) and longer terms to pay. The Government could have done this without commissioning any review and that would have produced the 'resolution' that Ministers claim they want nine months earlier than will happen now.

People will rightly be asking why taxpayers' money is being spent on this very limited review, now we know that it will more than likely conclude that settlements should be a bit lower if there is any hope of people paying them. Rather than saving taxpayers' money by breaking their clear promise to actually review the Loan Charge, the Government is instead wasting taxpayers' money on this partial, biased and (now we know) largely pre-determined review when it could simply have announced a new discounted settlement opportunity.

This pre-determined outcome, bar the detail, makes a mockery of the Exchequer Secretary's claim that he does "not think it is right for people affected by the Loan Charge to have to wait years for any progress on bringing this matter to a close for them" in justifying the highly restricted review on settlement terms only. Now we all know that the recommendation will be in some way reduced settlement terms, this could have been done with no review and announced months ago.

You have also stated that your aim is to change the dynamic of whether people are prepared to pay. This is a deeply revealing statement that exposes that this so-called 'Independent Loan Charge Review' is nothing of the sort.

The aim of any meaningful review of the Loan Charge Scandal would be to review how the situation happened, which parties were responsible and what a just resolution would be involving all these parties. You are not doing this; you instead have admitted that your aim is to "change the dynamic" so those facing the Loan Charge can be made to pay.

Confidence in this restricted and biased review will be further undermined

It appears that your aim with this interview was to try to reassure people that the review would be independent. *In fact, it has achieved the complete opposite.*

You state:

"Some people have said that I'm under the control of the Treasury ... but there is no way I'm going to take instruction from HMRC or the Treasury on how to conduct the review – and to be fair to the Treasury and HMRC, they have done nothing that could be taken as trying to control the review or its direction,"

The reality is that the Treasury already determined the highly restrictive terms of reference, so that happened before the review began.

You go on to acknowledge this, and admit how limited your conclusions and recommendations must and will be:

"The minister made clear that my conclusions and recommendations must be made within the constraints of the current fiscal situation, but otherwise it's up to me."

We also note that you were thanked by the Exchequer Secretary for helping draft the Terms of Reference – and now you have publicly also defended the Loan Charge itself, as well as those very restrictive terms of reference, you have exposed just how restricted and dictated the whole review is, merely looking at making settlement terms better, to encourage people to pay. All that is "up to you" is how much evidence you actually look and what test you will use to make a recommendation as to changes to settlement terms. To present this as an 'Independent Loan Charge Review', as the Treasury has done, is both demonstrably false and profoundly dishonest (and that is even if you were not a former HMRC Assistant Director!). Whilst we do not blame you for this – and it is the fault of Treasury Ministers – your interview has not helped with the perception of the McCann Review into settlement terms (which is in reality what it is).

Please now look at evidence and do not express any further prejudicial views

We would urge you now to make no further public comment and not to speak to the media, other than to encourage people to submit evidence, which is all you should have done in the first place.

We will, however, continue to urge people to send you the huge amounts of evidence that clearly shows that the Chancellor and Exchequer Secretary were absolutely correct when they referred to people affected as "victims of mis-selling".

We do not want a response and believe that any further comment from you will only undermine confidence even further, which is the opposite of what you would want.

Yours sincerely,



Steve Packham
Spokesman & Executive Director



Andrew Earnshaw
Executive Director

On behalf of the Loan Charge Action Group

Cc Loan Charge and Taxpayer Fairness APPG
 James Murray MP, Exchequer Secretary to the Treasury
 Treasury Select Committee