

## **Submission from Kevin Pringle**

Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for your emailed letter of 1 March, in relation to Alex Salmond's evidence session last Friday.

The person I have maintained the most frequent contact with throughout the period in question is Geoff Aberdein, who is a close friend and former colleague. As one of the "three other people" referred to by Mr Salmond, I can confirm from my conversations with Mr Aberdein that he is in no doubt that a complainant's name was shared with him at the meeting referred to by Ms Baillie, and he made Duncan Hamilton and me aware of this in a call later the same day. (In the interests of transparency, I also confirmed this point, last November, to the ministerial code inquiry being conducted by James Hamilton.)

Second, again based on my contact with Mr Aberdein, I know he was clear that the purpose of the meeting on 29 March 2018 was to discuss the two complaints that had been made against Mr Salmond. I do not believe Mr Aberdein called me immediately after that meeting, presumably because I was not attending the meeting on 2 April.

Finally, I would appreciate the opportunity to set out a personal position on wider issues. In a Sunday Times column on 29 March 2020, after Mr Salmond's trial, I wrote that: "Let justice be done though the heavens fall, and no one other than the jury members could determine what that would be. However, my hope has always been that, at the end of it, Salmond would be found innocent and Sturgeon would continue in office unaffected, whatever else may fall"; and again on 21 February 2021: "I have no wish to second-guess the inquiries that are under way, but my hope is that Sturgeon continues in office without jeopardy to her position." That continues to be my position.

I trust that this is of assistance to your inquiry.

Yours faithfully

Kevin Pringle