


A close-up, high-contrast photograph of a black panther's face. The panther's eyes are a striking yellow, and its whiskers are visible against the dark background. The lighting is dramatic, highlighting the texture of the fur and the intensity of the gaze.

Panthers, Passion & Politics – The Roger Cowan Years

A serialised history of the Penrith Panthers' transformation and the leadership years of Roger Cowan.

The Panthers Merger Debate — The Campaign of Letters

The Panthers Merger Debate — The Campaign of Letters

An exchange between Roger Cowan and Ron Mulock
September 1999

Introduction

During September 1999 the debate over Panthers' proposed merger increasingly moved from boardrooms into the public arena.

These three contemporary documents illustrate the exchange of arguments between Roger Cowan and Ron Mulock during one of the final stages of the campaign.

They are reproduced in chronological order as historical source material.

- **6 September:** A Press Release from Ron Mulock
- **10 September:** Letter from Roger Cowan to sponsors of the Penrith Panthers
- **24 September:** Open letter from Ron Mulock published in the Western Weekender. (see Part 36 – The Myth of the Footy Five)

This material complements:

- **The Series:** Parts 36 - 37 — *A Strange Response to a Lifeline*
- **Beyond the Book:** *Following the Merger Debate*



Press Release

Ron Mulock

6 September 1999

PRESS RELEASE

Ron Mulock, Patron of the Penrith Panthers for the last 30 years, said today that "Penrith Panthers' members and supporters can expect yet another attempt for a so-called merger with Parramatta, to be launched almost immediately."

"Spearheading the merger proposal, once again will be the General Manager, Roger Cowan."

"Now the NRL has put "the 30 pieces of silver" back on the table I have no doubt Roger will revisit the merger proposal for the Board's consideration" Ron Mulock said.

"I am, however, confident that the Board of Directors, by the slimmest of margins will hold to a stand alone position."

"Last year, almost to the day, at the Information Night the members said "NO" to the merger proposal."

"The next night the Board rejected Roger Cowan's written recommendation of a merger with Parramatta."

"This recommendation has been on the Board table for a few weeks and Roger had been conducting meetings with small groups of sponsors at a time, pushing the merge barrow."

"Let me assure members and supporters of Penrith Panthers that this first rejection was initiated by a block of 5 Board members."

"The total Board membership is 9. On this first occasion one Board member was absent overseas."

"The announcement of this Stand Alone decision was all dressed up. It was presented as if no one on the Board or at senior management level ever had any other intention but to stand alone – no hide, no Christmas box."

"Since then the Board, on 20 July 1999 re-affirmed its decision to stand alone."

"On 31 July 1999 a Special Meeting of the Board was called. This was the last day stipulated by the NRL to notify merger proposals and receive a financial benefit."

"This meeting was called to expressly consider a report from the General Manager, Roger Cowan."

"Roger recommended the acceptance of an invitation by the NRL to make a non-binding submission for a joint venture with Parramatta."

"The 5 directors stood their ground and in doing so, exploded the myth, once and for all, that the whole Board and senior management favoured a "Stand Alone" role.

"Fallout from this meeting apart from Board tension of a high order, included 2 Board members having their names recorded against the decision rejecting the report. Also, during the Board meeting 2 of the 3 Board members, representing the Board in the Stand Alone Committee tendered their resignation from that committee" Ron Mulock said.

"I am prepared to name names if any one wishes to deny these facts" Ron Mulock claimed.

"I am confident the 5 Board members will stand firm and reject any further proposal or proposals for any merger put forward by Roger" Ron Mulock stated.

"All of this management push for a merger has sent very negative messages to the NRL decision makers."

"The last thing those NRL decision makers want is to be called upon to make a decision to eliminate any team from the "sacred 14" competition."

"Penrith Panthers survival strategy has emerged as a truly "tame cat" operation – one foot lightly on the accelerator, the other foot hard on the brake."

"This is in contrast to the way in which Souths have marshalled their claims and forces behind the "heritage" banner."

"The Penrith Panthers strategy has failed miserably to apply any public pressure under the "future" banner."

"There is still too much future in this Penrith region for the clock to be turned back by a sell-out to Parramatta" Ron Mulock concluded.

6 September 1999

Contact : Ron Mulock 472 [REDACTED] (tel) 472 [REDACTED] (fax)





R.R.D.S

ACN 003 908 503

10 September 1999

Letter to Sponsors

Pages 1 & 2

Roger Cowan

10 September 1999

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName»
«Company»
«Address1»
«Address2»
«City»

Hello «FirstName»,

Our Stand Alone campaign obviously has been successful. We are confident of being part of the 14 team National Rugby League competition and we appreciate your support during this battle.

In the spirit of keeping sponsors informed about controversial matters, especially in Rugby League, I want to send you some comments regarding a media release by Ron Mulock on 7 September.

I am enclosing that media release so that you can see exactly what was said.

Under normal circumstances personal attacks are better left ignored but this media release contains so many distortions of the facts that I think it is essential that sponsors are brought right into the picture. Your support of Panthers is important and there is a risk that this attack by Ron Mulock might leave you with negative thoughts about Panthers and its administration.

Here are some facts for you to compare with what Ron Mulock has submitted for public information.

1. There has not been one single occasion on which the Directors have been asked to vote in favour of a merger. There has never been any opportunity to have that vote because no negotiations have ever proceeded to the extent that we had a choice.
2. At the end of last year and before an information meeting was held in The EVAN Theatre, I submitted a recommendation to the Board of Directors that we should pursue negotiations with Paramatta for a joint venture. There was a lot of opposition to it and it was not supported by any Director.
3. There has never been a merger proposal to the members of this club. To do so would have required the calling of a general meeting and a formal proposal. A meeting was called of members and supporters to provide them with up to date information concerning our future prospects. They were told about the risks involved in Standing Alone. Ron Mulock was given as much time as he required to make any statements he desired to make to the meeting.
4. That meeting had no influence on the Board's decision because the Board had already made its decision.
5. The information night was not held for the purpose of voting.
 - There was no notice of meeting sent to members
 - There was no notice of any resolution
 - Many of the people who attended had no voting rights. They were non members.
 - Only 353 people attended and these included staff members and non members.

6. The Board meeting on 31 July 1999 was called because we received a fax from the NRL advising that clubs would be given further time to investigate their options provided they made a non-binding submission for a joint venture. In other words there was nothing to lose by taking extra time to consider the position. The proposal put to the Board was that we should employ a firm of consultants to thoroughly investigate the financial and other implications likely to affect Panthers as a result of the rationalisation of the NRL competition. Some Directors voted in favour of the recommendation because they felt it was part of their fiduciary duty to do so. They were not voting in favour of a joint venture. The majority of Directors felt that by accepting the NRL offer we might send a message of weakness and therefore voted against the recommendation.
7. As recently as two weeks ago I was asked by a representative of the NRL Board if there would be any possibility of discussions between Parramatta and Penrith starting up. My response to him was that there would not be one chance in a million because the Board of Panthers was totally committed to Standing Alone.
8. The agreed strategy of the Board and of the Stand Alone Committee has been to avoid being categorised as a struggling club with Wests, Souths, Norths and Balmain.

You can see from the above that Ron has grossly misrepresented the truth.

A reader of his media release could not help but be convinced that the decision about Standing Alone is on a knife-edge at Penrith. We are holding a Stand Alone position by the "slimmest of margins" according to Ron. If that were true, and it is far from it, why would he want to make it public knowledge? Who is sending negative messages to the NRL decision makers?

Before this media release the NRL decision makers had no doubt that Penrith was totally committed to Standing Alone.

It is disappointing to read in the media that Ron Mulock thinks he has a responsibility to issue warnings about something that I might do, when there is not one shred of evidence to support any such assumption.

He warns that I will spearhead a merger, yet he must know that there is no point in my making any further recommendations because the Board unanimously is committed to Standing Alone.

Ron Mulock has made sure that what should have been a confidential recommendation to the Board became public knowledge. It is no secret that I was in favour of a joint venture this time last year and nothing has happened since then to change my mind. However, that has not stopped me, or any member of our senior staff at Panthers, from doing everything possible to put us in a good position to be selected in the 14 team competition. There have been a number of things done behind the scenes to help our case and we have been confident for several weeks now that we have achieved what the Board wanted us to do.

The fact that I have a personal opinion that differs from the unanimous opinion held by the Board does not mean that I should change my opinion. It does mean however, that I should work as hard as I can to bring about the policy set by the Board regardless of my opinion. If I could not do that I would not be a fit person to hold the Chief Executive position.

Normally a difference of opinion between myself and the Board would not be public knowledge and I would not need to do anything other than to pursue the policy set by the Board. In this case however, I have to accept that it is public knowledge and it is important to me and to the club

that sponsors, in particular, understand that there can be good reasons for differences of opinion and that people do not have to be enemies just because they differ.

It is important to me that you understand that my recommendation to the Board was based on my analysis of the situation in Rugby League as it would affect Panthers in the years to come.

I made the recommendation because I believed at the time that Panthers would be at great risk over the next five years if we tried to stand alone. Some of that risk was eliminated when Adelaide was unexpectedly cut from the competition. Some more of the risk disappeared when North Sydney failed to make a successful move to the Central Coast. However, a lot of the risk remains and I still feel that standing alone is a risky proposition. Nevertheless we will be standing alone, I will be working as hard as I can to make it successful and I will be hoping along with you and every member of the Board that the risks do not become reality.

My main concern is that I believe that we have only seen the tip of the iceberg as far as rationalisation of the competition is concerned. I believe that a number of Sydney clubs will be cut from the competition within the next five to six years. There are a number of factors that have influenced me to come to that conclusion:

- a) Every club and every official that I know in Rugby League believes there should be another team in Brisbane. Because of contractual obligations that can't happen for another two years, but from that time the first Sydney club to falter will lose its position.
- b) When the 14 team competition has become a reality News Limited will have completed every promise it has ever made to Rugby League. During the Super League saga and since then News Limited has never failed to deliver on its promises and on many occasions has delivered more than it promised. But it now has a huge investment in Rugby League and that investment was made for the purpose of having a very high standard National Rugby League competition. From now on News will undoubtedly be seeking to have its objectives met, and for \$28m per year is entitled to do so. In my opinion the benchmarks will be set high and clubs failing to meet those benchmarks will be shown little mercy.
- c) The NRL must become more of a national competition if it is to compete with AFL. News wanted a national competition of 12 teams and compromised to accept 14 teams including 8 in Sydney. If this results in any weakness in the standard of competition I am sure the weakness will be addressed quickly.
- d) By the end of next year I believe there will be complaints from a number of clubs and players about too many games. Playing 26 games in a season imposes great pressure on clubs and players and makes it difficult to handle representative fixtures without being unfair to the best clubs who have the most representative players.
- e) There is a risk that some time in the future, it might be five years or it might be ten years, but some time in the future there will only be four teams in Sydney.
- f) If there are any further cuts in the number of Sydney clubs the joint ventures will be preferred to Stand Alone clubs, provided they are competitive and financially viable. Joint ventures will enjoy some distinct advantages over Stand Alone clubs in the most important area of financial viability.

- g) It will therefore be risky for Panthers as a Stand Alone club if we are thinking longer term. That risk will increase if 4 joint ventures are formed in Sydney – and that seems likely.
- h) Had Penrith and Parramatta formed a joint venture it would have been called "Panthers" and it would have been a very strong team - assured of its place for the next 100 years.

The above explanation is to show you that my recommendation to the Board was based upon what I saw as a logical analysis of the future of Panthers in rugby league and my desire to protect Panthers position for the long term – and not for any other reason.

Most people in Penrith disagree with my analysis or think I am painting the picture too darkly. I hope they are right. A number of people in the upper echelons of Rugby League agree with my analysis. I hope they are wrong.

In any event, at this stage it doesn't really matter. We are committed to Standing Alone and we must do our best to make it work. The entire City of Penrith needs to be aware of the risks and of the things it can do to help avoid them.

The most objectional point about Ron's media release is that it infers two things

- a) That I am secretly working against the policies of the Board.
- b) That there are four members of the Board in favour of mergers.

Both of these inferences are totally incorrect. They are unfair. They must have been made to achieve some objective for Ron that is not easily seen at this time.

It is impossible for me to imagine what lies behind this attack but it cannot possibly be anything to do with our Stand Alone campaign. Indeed, it could have weakened our position rather than strengthened it. I will be taking steps this week to make up any lost ground and to make sure that the NRL understand there are no weaknesses in the resolve at Panthers to stand alone.

Thank you for your support in 1999 and I look forward to a continued association as we take our place in the elite competition in 2000.

Best wishes



ROGER COWAN
GENERAL MANAGER

j:\special projects\rc\let\letter to sponsors september 8, 1999.doc/jh

Letter to Sponsors

Pages 3 & 4

Roger Cowan

10 September 1999



Open Letter

Western Weekender p6

(paid advertisement)

24 September 1999

AN OPEN LETTER FROM RON MULOCK TO MEMBERS, SPONSORS, SUPPORTERS AND PLAYERS OF PENRITH PANTHERS

ADVERTISEMENT

Last week Roger Cowan, sent a letter about me to Penrith Panthers' Sponsors. The letter - 4 pages of it - consists, in my opinion, of any number of issues of grave concern. A detailed response from me will be forwarded to the Penrith Panthers' Sponsors. Meanwhile, let me report to you about another "letter". This one fell off the back of a truck - just a single page. Before I tell you more about this fascinating piece of paper, I need to refresh your collective memories about how I came to be involved in the Paramatta Merger issue.

On the 22nd August last year I was approached by a group of long-standing Sponsors. They were concerned at a proposal to merge with Paramatta being pushed by Roger Cowan, General Manager of the Licensed Club (Panthers World of Entertainment). Roger was conducting group meetings with Sponsors, a group at a time, preaching the merger message.

As the Club Patron for some 30 years they asked me to become involved.

Although, for personal reasons, the timing of this request was far from ideal, I agreed to help. I then spent that Saturday afternoon making "phone" contact with 8 of the 9 - man Board. My telephone conversations sharpened my concern.

On the 24th August 1998 I wrote to each of the 8 Board members. A 9th Director was overseas. All I wanted was for a Members "safety net" to be put in place before any further discussion or deliberation took place on the Paramatta proposal.

All I asked was if any decision was taken by the Board to enter into an agreement with Paramatta, which would eliminate the Panthers' "Stand Alone" option, it should be ratified by the Club's Membership.

It seemed a pretty reasonable request to me.

In retrospect, every Club merger that has taken place since then has obtained Members' endorsement. At the Board meeting of 25 August 1998 no resolution, to give the Members involvement in the decision making process, was forthcoming. As an alternative the Board decided to hold "an information forum for Members".

After more than a year there is still no "safety net" to protect the members' rights. The concerning issue was the intervention of Roger Cowan. There was a written report from Roger Cowan recommending a merger with Paramatta. Simply stated, if Roger Cowan had not pushed the merger button, then there would have been no problem - but he did.

At the Information Forum held on 7th September last year when asked for their view, the people present sent a clear message. **NO MERGER - STAND ALONE.**

The following night the Board rejected Roger Cowan's merger recommendation.

Roger has tried twice since then, 20th July and 31st July, to push the merger option. Within hours of the stipulated deadline for mergers, midnight 31st July, Roger made a pre-emptive strike at a Special Board meeting.

Back to the piece of paper that fell off the back of a truck - a single page.

If approved, it was to be signed by Roger Cowan on behalf of the Penrith Panthers and forwarded to the Chairman of the NRL, Mr Malcolm Noad.

It had already been pre-signed by Denis Fitzgerald for and on behalf of Paramatta District Rugby League Club Limited.

Amidst much tension the Board resolved that the Penrith Panthers "is not prepared to sign a non-binding application to the NRL for a joint venture with Paramatta or any other club."

In the wake of this decision, 2 directors had their names recorded as having voted against this resolution. Also 2 directors, during the meeting, tendered their resignations from the Stand Alone Committee.

First paragraph of the proposed application to NRL states: "This is a submission by Penrith District Rugby League Football Club Limited (ACN 008 820 511) and Paramatta District Rugby League Club Limited (ACN 000 254 980) requesting the NRL's approval for a Joint Venture for participation in the NRL competition from 2000."

It goes on to seek funding for the Joint Venture equal to the funding provided by the NRL, to the Wests/Balmain Joint Venture.

It provides that NRL approval of the Joint Venture would entitle the Joint Venture entity to a 5 year Club Agreement for participation in the NRL for the years 2000 - 2005.

It provides "The Joint Venture is subject to contract and if necessary, member approval." Why the "qualification" in the interest of members' rights it should have read, "subject to contract and member approval."

This provision gravely concerns me and it should concern all other members.

Every merger that has taken place and the pending merger Manly/Northern have all been subject to members' approval.

The proposal states: "This submission creates no obligation on our clubs to conclude the Joint Venture."

"Please ensure that this submission is treated as strictly confidential."

How very interesting!

We are into the third week since I made the call for Roger Cowan to make a public statement that he will not pursue his self proclaimed personal agenda for a merger with Paramatta prior to the 15th October next when the NRL will announce the "sacred 14".

I now make a call for a joint public statement to be made by Roger Cowan and the Chairman of the Board.

The public statement should be unequivocal. It should assure the membership that any merger proposal, before or after the 15th October 1999 related to NRL Competition 2000 - 2005 which obtains the Board support will require member approval.

The public statement should also indicate that it is the Board's intention to take the necessary action to entrench in the Club's Rules a provision that requires mergers to have the members' approval.

Meanwhile, just in case the Board is not prepared to act as requested in relation to the amendment of the Club Rules, I will be seeking legal advice aimed at initiating a Notice of Motion calling for an Extraordinary General Meeting to entrench the members' right to approve or otherwise any Board decision to merge with Paramatta or any other club.

Thanks to the concerned Sponsors who have made this space available to me.

Authorised and written by Ron Mulock

Panthers, Passion & Politics - The Roger Cowan Years

A untold history of the Penrith Panthers' transformation and the leadership years of Roger Cowan.

27 September 1999

PENRITH 2750

Ph:
Fax:

RON MULOCK'S RESPONSE TO ROGER COWAN'S LETTER TO PENRITH PANTHERS SPONSORS (10.9.99)

Dear Penrith Panthers Sponsor

I am responding to Roger Cowan's letter because my credibility has been attacked.

My personal credibility in the Penrith area, and beyond, has been forged in the professional, commercial, sporting, social, cultural and public life of this area over the past 44 years.

If Roger Cowan wishes to make credibility an issue, I am more than happy to accommodate him.

Might I suggest, that as a background, you might just stop for a moment and read the attached copy of an Open Letter published in the *Western Weekender* (Friday 24.9.99).

Having read the "Open Letter" it must be quite obvious that protection of "Members' rights" is where I started and where I am going to finish.

Now let us look at Roger Cowan's letter and test his claim to be presenting "some facts" to you.

CLAIM #1 "There has not been one single occasion on which the Directors have been asked to vote in favour of a merger."

MY COMMENT: The only reason they have not "been asked to vote in favour of a merger" is because 3 times Roger Cowan's recommendations aimed at pursuing a merger have been "rolled" by the Board (8.9.98, 20.7.99, 31.7.99).

CLAIM #2 "At the end of last year and before an information meeting was held in the Evan Theatre, I submitted a recommendation to the Board of Directors that we should pursue negotiations with Parramatta for a joint venture. There was a lot of opposition to it and it was not supported by any Director."

MY COMMENT: First part is true but, of course, no one beyond the Board and Roger knew what was happening until I "blew the whistle" about Roger Cowan's report recommending a merger with Parramatta. As for the claim "it was not supported by any Director" - this claim I contest. As I stated in my Press Release of 6 September 1999, which Roger was good enough to circulate to you with his letter, "Let me assure members and supporters of Penrith Panthers that this first rejection was initiated by a block of 5 Board Members. There were only 8 Members present. One Board member was overseas. In a block these 5 Board Members rejected Roger's recommendation and adopted a Stand Alone position. The other 3 can count and they doubled in behind the 5 to present a united front."

Fortunately, on the other two occasions when Roger pushed the merger button (20.7.99 and 31.7.99) these 5 stood firm as a block. I have already told of the fallout from the 31.7.99 Special Board Meeting in my Press Release 6.9.99 and in my "Open Letter" attached.

CLAIM #3 "There has never been a merger proposal to the members of this Club."

MY COMMENT: True, but only true because the Board spearheaded by 5 of the 9 Board members has maintained a Stand Alone position 3 times resisting Roger Cowan's attempts to pursue his self proclaimed merger agenda. More importantly, there is no "safety net" which would guarantee that the Members' approval would be sought.

CLAIM #4 "Ron Mulock was given as much time as he required to make any statements he desired to make to the meeting (Information Night for Members)."

MY COMMENT: Seeks to convey how fair Roger Cowan was in giving me equal time.

The truth is that I arranged for a motion to be moved from the floor for me to be given equal time. There was a table on the stage - all places taken.

When the proposal was made the Chairman for the night, Glenn Daniel (2WS) looked to Roger Cowan for assistance. Caught between a rock and a hard place, Roger Cowan acceded and a seat was found and I took my place on the stage and made a statement to the meeting and participated in the ongoing discussion between the Members present and those on stage.

CLAIM #5 "The information night was not held for the purpose of voting.

- There was no notice of meeting sent to members.
- There was no notice of any resolution.
- Many of the people who attended had no voting rights. They were non-members.
- Only 353 people attended and these included staff members and non-members."

MY COMMENT: Many of you attended that night and you will know from your own personal experience that this claim not only lacks credibility, it contains some incredible claims.

Indeed, the information meeting was not held for the purpose of voting, but a vote was initiated from the floor and it sent to the 8 Board Members present an unambiguous "NO" merger message. I believe there was not a dissentient voice to be heard.

Certainly true that there was no notice of meeting sent to Members. In fact, the meeting was sparingly advertised. There were two different dates and two different locations advised in a period of a few weeks leading up to the Information Night.

Letter to Sponsors

Pages 1 & 2

Ron Mulock

24 September 1999



Letter to Sponsors

Pages 1 & 2

Ron Mulock

24 September 1999

As to the suggestion that many of the people present were non-members - **absolute rubbish**. It was an "Information Night for Members" - Members were required to produce their membership card and sign. **Supporters who were not Members, were turned away.**

To my knowledge, the only non-members present were Neil Whittaker, Chief Executive, NRL and his Public Affairs Officer, John Brady, who were there at the express invitation of Roger Cowan.

The estimate of most people I have spoken to, who were at the meeting, is that it was twice Roger Cowan's estimate.

CLAIM #6 Roger Cowan's version of the Special Board Meeting of 31.7.99.

MY COMMENT: I stand by my version of what took place at this meeting of the Board as detailed in my "Open Letter" attached.

CLAIM #7 "As recently as two weeks ago I was asked by a representative of the NRL Board if there would be any possibility of discussions between Penrith and Parramatta starting up. My response to him was that there would not be one chance in a million because the Board of Panthers was totally committed to Standing Alone."

MY COMMENT: If this is so, why won't Roger Cowan make the public statement that I called for 3 weeks ago "that he will not pursue his self proclaimed personal agenda for a merger with Parramatta prior to the 15th October when the NRL want to announce the "Sacred 14".

CLAIM #8 The agreed strategy of the Board and of the Stand Alone Committee has been to avoid being categorised as a struggling club with Wests, Souths, Norths and Balmain.

MY COMMENT: This may have been Roger's recommended strategy as conveyed to the Board and the Stand Alone Committee, but it becomes irrelevant if at the same time he keeps pushing the merger button.

The remainder of Roger Cowan's letter suggests some wrong doing on my part because I have made public just what's been going on.

I reject any suggestion of wrong doing, it has been an information sharing operation. Information that Members, Sponsor Supporters and Players are entitled to know.

He says, referring to me, "He warns that I will spearhead a merger, yet he must know that there is no point in my making any further recommendations because the Board unanimously is committed to Standing Alone."

Roger must make the public statement I've called for and stop using the word **unanimous** when it's quite obviously not the case.

merger is the only way forward for Penrith Panthers to continue to participate in the elite NRL Competition of the future.

Finally, the licensed Club, now referred to for marketing purposes as "Panthers World of Entertainment", was founded with its primary object "the propagation of Rugby League in the Penrith District".

PENRITH has been the focal point for the Penrith Panthers Rugby League team.

When the Penrith Panthers Supporters chant to support their players on the field they chant, 'PEN-RITH -- PEN-RITH'. They don't chant "PAN-THERS".

On page of 4 of his letter to you, the Sponsors; Roger Cowan makes the point:-

"(h) Had Penrith and Parramatta formed a joint venture it would have been called "Panthers" and it would have been a very strong team assured of its place for the next 100 years."

My response: Parramatta Panthers might seem OK to Roger Cowan but what do the Penrith area based Sponsors, Members, Supporters and Players think.

The retention of the word "Panthers" might provide the Panthers World of Entertainment with marketing linkage into the coverage of the elite NRL Competition through the Foxtel, Optus and Channel 9 Coverage. But what about "PENRITH".

Yours sincerely



RON MULOCK

Att

