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THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Stoljar.
MR J STOLJAR: May it please the Commission, I appear with my learned friend, Ms Roughley, as counsel assisting. It may be appropriate to take appearances.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR M IRVING: If the Commission pleases, my name is
Mark Irving. I appear with my junior, Ms Knowles, for the Health Services Union.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.
MR I TEMBY: If it please the Commission, Temby for Health Services Union, NSW, and Mr Michael Seck appears with me.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr Temby. Any other appearances to be announced? Very well, Mr Stoljar.

MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, the hearings commencing today relate to the Health Services Union. The Health Services Union is an old and well established union. It has existed in various iterations since 1911.

The members of the HSU are health and community service workers. The HSU is a trade union registered under the Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act 2009 (Commonwealth). It was one of the five employee associations specifically named in the Commission's Terms of Reference.

The supreme governing authority of the HSU is the National Council. More broadly, the HSU is a federation of various autonomous State branches. These branches collect membership fees and operate as financially independent units. Each branch has elected officers. A Branch Committee of Management, or BCOM, is responsible for the management of the affairs of the branch. The BCOM is comprised of the branch officers and rank and file members.

In addition to the federally registered HSU, there have existed for many years independent but associated state-registered unions in New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia. These state-registered unions are "employee associations" within the definition of that term
in the Commission's Terms of Reference.
The hearings commencing today also relate to the Health Services Union of NSW, which is a legal entity distinct from the HSU. I will refer to this as the "NSW Union".

The HSU and the NSW Union have undergone various well-publicised upheavals in recent years.

Among other things, the HSU and the NSW Union implemented major structural changes:

- in early 2010, the Victoria No 1 Branch, the Victoria No 3 Branch and the New South Wales Branch of the HSU merged, forming the HSU East Branch. Fair Work Australia certified the rule changes necessary to implement this merger on 24 May 2010. In July of that year, the NSW Union amended its rules to permit members of the former Victoria No 1 Branch and No 3 Branch to become members of the NSW Union. Officers of HSU East Branch automatically held the same position in the NSW Union. I will refer to the HSU East Branch and the enlarged NSW Union collectively as "HSU East".
- on 21 June 2012 the merger was reversed by order of the Federal Court of Australia. HSU East Branch and the NSW Union were put into administration. The various branches were "de-amalgamated". The HSU East Branch ceased to exist and was broken into the Victoria No 1 Branch, the Victoria No 3 Branch and the New South Wales Branch. The Victorian members ceased to be members of the NSW Union.

These structural changes took place in the context of other significant events.

First, Mr Michael Williamson was for some years General Secretary of the NSW Branch. After the merger in 2010 he was Genera1 Secretary of HSU East Branch and the NSW Union.

As is well known, on 4 October 2012 Mr Williamson was charged with various offences relating to corrupt conduct.

On 15 October 2012 Mr Williamson pleaded guilty to some of those charges. He's presently serving a custodial sentence. Mr Williamson is also party to civil proceedings
in the New South Wales Supreme Court brought by the NSW Union.

Secondly, Mr Craig Thomson was formerly National Secretary of the HSU. He later became a member of Federal Parliament, after the 2007 elections. Mr Thomson was charged on 30 January 2013 with a large number of offences relating to the misuse of his union-issued credit card. On 18 February 2014 Mr Thomson was convicted by the Magistrate's Court of Victoria of some 71 counts of obtaining financial advantage by deception and some 16 counts of theft. Mr Thomson has lodged an appeal against these convictions.

Mr Thomson is also presently a party to pending proceedings in the Federal Court of Australia brought by the General Manager of Fair Work Australia in respect of alleged contraventions by Mr Thomson of the Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Act 2009. Some of those contraventions overlap with the criminal proceedings.

The hearings starting today will not investigate the specific circumstances of the conduct leading to the convictions of Mr Williamson and Mr Thomson - those circumstances have been or are being canvassed in the various proceedings referred to above.

Rather, these hearings will examine questions relating to or arising from those circumstances. Questions such as: How did this corruption flourish? Why was it not detected earlier? Why wasn't something done about it? What happened when it was detected? What could have been done better?

Before describing the evidence to be given by the various witnesses it will be helpful to list some of the significant dates, to put that evidence into context.

Prior to the merger which resulted in HSU East, Ms Kathy Jackson was the Secretary of the Victoria No 3 Branch. In due course she became Executive President of the newly created HSU East and held that position until HSU East was put into administration into June 2012. Ms Jackson did not contest the fresh elections held in 2012 for the No 3 Branch.

In addition to her roles at branch level,
since December 2007, Ms Jackson has been the National Secretary of the HSU.

In early 2008, when Ms Jackson took over as National Secretary from Craig Thomson, after his election to Federal Parliament, she happened upon bank statements for the credit cards which ultimately became the subject of the criminal proceedings against Mr Thomson.

On or about 24 August 2011, the National Executive resolved to refer the allegations against Mr Thomson to the NSW Police. That evening Ms Jackson appeared on the ABC TV program Lateline, during which she publicly confirmed her belief in the veracity of the allegations against Mr Thomson.

Within 48 hours, someone left a shove1 on Ms Jackson's home porch in an apparent attempt at intimidation. That same day, Ms Jackson's union phone was cut off. At that time she continued to hold the offices described earlier.

Partially overlapping with the events surrounding the referral of Mr Thomson's conduct to the police, in or by early 2011 Ms Jackson had become concerned that Mr Williamson had also engaged in corrupt conduct. Among other things, it was clear to Ms Jackson that Mr Williamson's income, large though it was, was insufficient to pay for his obvious expenses.

Ms Jackson carried out, or caused to be carried out, various investigations. As time and these investigations continued, Ms Jackson's concerns began to crystallise.

By this time, Ms Jackson had alerted others in the HSU of her concerns. Some were opposed to her actions. By the end of August 2011, Ms Jackson began to suffer extreme stress-related conditions. She was hospitalised on 2 September 2011.

On 12 September 2011 Ms Jackson made a forma1 complaint of corruption against Michael Williamson to the NSW Police.

On the same day, the NSW Police announced the formation of Strike Force Carnarvon.

Over the next days and weeks, the NSW Police commenced
their investigation. At the same time, opposition to Ms Jackson intensified among other officials and delegates of the HSU, particularly those from NSW. Mr Williamson and his supporters remained very much in control of HSU East.

A few people were prepared to come forward and raise their own concerns.

Mr Marco Bolano was one. Mr Bolano was Secretary of the No 1 Branch and then, following the merger, Deputy General Secretary of HSU East.

Another was Ms Katrina Hart, who was elected President of the Randwick Campus General Sub-branch of HSU East in August 2011.

Ms Katherine Wilkinson, Vice-President of the HSU East Branch Committee of Management, and a member of the HSU East Audit and Compliance Committee, was another.

Mr Bolano, Ms Hart and Ms Wilkinson are giving evidence over the next few days. They will describe the the way they were treated when they attempted to obtain information on the financial affairs of HSU East and to bring Mr Williamson's conduct to light.

To give one example, after raising certain concerns, Ms Hart was immediately threatened with defamation proceedings.

On 16 September 2011, a meeting of the Council of the HSU East Branch took place by teleconference. Ms Jackson sought the passage of a resolution, calling for an independent investigation into the activities of Mr Williamson. This resolution was overwhelmingly defeated, 46 votes to two. In addition, the council voted against a resolution that would have prohibited union funds being spent on Mr Williamson's legal fees in responding to the police investigation.

The Council's decision was received unfavourably in the media and by some members. The Council was reconvened less than a week later. At this further meeting of the Council, on 22 September 2011, again by teleconference, Mr Williamson rejected the allegations against him but announced his intention to take leave on full pay.

The Commission will hear evidence that during these Council meetings, or shortly after, the New South Wales component of HSU East began calling for a demerger. The amalgamated Branch had been in existence for less than a year and a half.

The HSU's Annual Convention took place over a number of days beginning on 14 November 2011.

It is worth focusing briefly on the conduct of the Convention. In some ways the events of those few days are inconsequential. But they do provide a snapshot of hostility confronting Ms Jackson, Mr Bolano and others who did not support Mr Williamson. And they reveal much about the challenges facing those who tried to blow the whistle on powerful persons in the HSU.

To put these events in context, by mid-November some two months had passed since Ms Jackson had reported Mr Williamson to the NSW Police. Mr Williamson had not been cleared of the allegations against him. He was a man under suspicion of serious misconduct.

Mr Bolano and Ms Jackson will describe in their evidence the first morning of the Convention. They were both in the audience. The Convention got underway at about 9 am. After about an hour and a half, Mr Bolano noticed that the spotlights illuminating the stage had suddenly swung around, so the lights were pointing to a side door.

All at once, Mr Williamson strode in through the side door and entered the Convention. As he marched in the theme from the film "Rocky" began playing over the public address system. The 600 or so NSW delegates got to their feet and gave Mr Williamson a standing ovation.

Ms Jackson and Mr Bolano watched all this from the audience. In due course, when they did get an opportunity to speak at the Convention, they were disparaged and shouted down, with loud booing and jeering from the NSW contingent. Ms Jackson describes being abused, being called "Judas", and being spat at.

When Mr Williamson got up to speak, he told the crowd that the allegations against him had been trumped up and that Mr Bolano and Ms Jackson should be sacked.

Ultimately the Convention passed a resolution expressing no confidence in Ms Jackson and voting in favour of a demerger of HSU East.

It is telling that the people who had raised serious and well-founded concerns were treated in this way. Those events raised questions about how unions such as the HSU treat whistleblowers and about the duties and accountability of union officials.

In addition to the evidence of Ms Jackson, Mr Bolano, Ms Hart and Ms Wilkinson on these topics, the Commission will receive evidence from Mr Mark Hardacre. When Ms Jackson was still trying to examine the activities of Mr Williamson, she was warned about what had happened to Mr and Mrs Hardacre ten years before, when Mr Hardacre and his wife had tried to challenge Mr Williamson. Among other things, Mr Hardacre and his wife were sued for defamation. Mr Hardacre will tell his story this morning.

The evidence of this set of witnesses has common features. The modus operandi used by the then senior officials of the HSU with respect to whistleblowers or perceived rivals was largely the same, and involved many of the following features:

- failure of senior union officials to investigate or act on complaints.
- discouraging rivals from contesting elections, including by amassing large re-election funds out of contributions made by officials, and refusing to refund contributions made by the persons who withdrew their support for an incumbent's team.
- intimidation, isolation and harassment of whistleblowers or perceived rivals. The tactics ranged from the petty - such as making the whistleblower or rival sit at a desk facing a wall outside the office of the very person against whom allegations had been raised - to unrelenting hostility at meetings and in the workplace and marginalisation from the members and any support base.

These tactics succeeded because, in addition to the ringleader's own conduct, he or she also enlisted the support of many other officials and members.

- placing pressure on whistleblowers or perceived rivals to leave the union on generous redundancy terms, a condition of which was confidentiality.
- accusations of misconduct against whistleblowers and rivals, in part to deflect attention from the more serious allegation raised against the incumbents.
- threats and the institution of legal proceedings including for defamation - against rivals and any of their supporters. Such proceedings placed financial and psychological pressure on opponents and further deprived them of resources and time to progress their positions within the union. In the case of Mr Hardacre and his wife, Janice, legal proceedings instituted by Mr Williamson against them pushed them to financial hardship. A term of the settlement was a non-disclosure term.
- use of union resources to campaign against opponents standing in contested elections. This ranged from the unauthorised use of members contact details to the use of union employees - such as union organisers - to campaign for the incumbent's re-election in circumstances in which those employees were persons paid for by members' subscriptions.
- use of external consultants to support restructures that marginalised opponents and cloaked the restructure with the veneer of impartial advice.
- claims of confidentiality in order to defeat genuine requests for information that would provide members and their elected officials with the proper understanding of the governance and affairs of the union and its officials.

Two other topics will also be the subject of the evidence.

The first relates to the funding of union elections and, specifically, that of Mr Bolano's election campaign in 2009.

HSU East was in due course de-amalgamated on 21 June 2012. All officers of the HSU and HSU NSW were dismissed. Later in 2012, fresh elections were called for the demerged branches.

In the elections for the No 1 Branch, Mr Bolano was defeated by Ms Diana Asmar for the position of Branch Secretary. Previously, in 2009, Mr Bolano had defeated Ms Asmar for the same position. Mr Bolano will give evidence about the conduct and funding of these elections.

The second concerns certain allegation against Ms Jackson regarding financial expenditures of the No 3 Branch during the period in which she was the secretary of that Branch.

In recent weeks, a number of allegations have surfaced in relation to Ms Jackson.

In summary, these allegations are to the effect that:

- HSU's No 3 Branch made a number of payments to an account controlled by Ms Jackson named the "National Health Development Account". It is alleged these payments were not authorised by the BCOM and were not properly disclosed in the financial accounts provided to Fair Work Australia:
- Ms Jackson used $\$ 1$ miliion in members' funds to pay off two personal credit cards between 2000 and 2011:
- Ms Jackson withdrew approximately $\$ 220,000$ in cash using HSU bank cheques between 2007 to 2010; and
- Ms Jackson had some involvement in a slush fund account allegedly operating out of or through a company called Neranto No. 10.

Ms Jackson will give evidence responding to these allegations.

The Commission will also hear evidence from the following people concerning the current allegations against Ms Jackson:

- Ms Katherine Wilkinson. Ms Wilkinson was a BCOM member of No 3 Branch during the relevant period. She will give evidence concerning the financial documents provided to the BCOM, the sitting fees of the BCOM and their authorised use, and her knowledge of payments made to the NHDA. The source of the payments made to the NHDA was a settlement the No 3 Branch received following legal
proceedings against the Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre in Victoria. The Commission will also receive a signed statement from Mr Reuben Dixon, another member of the No 3 Branch BCOM in the relevant period.
- Ms Jane Holt. Ms Holt was the bookkeeper of the No 3 Branch from 1988 to 2010. Ms Holt will give evidence as to the financial material that she prepared for BCOM meetings, the nature of the financial records she maintained on behalf of the No 3 Branch, her knowledge of the payments made to the NHDA and how she recorded those transactions in the financial records. Ms Holt will also give evidence concerning credit card expenditure by the Branch. Finally, Ms Holt will give evidence as to her recording of cash withdrawals made by Ms Jackson and her understanding of the purpose of those withdrawals.
- Mr John Agostinelli. Mr Agostinelli was the auditor of the No 3 Branch for the audits conducted for the financial year ending 30 June 2009 and an exit audit performed in respect to the No 3 Branch as at 24 May 2010. Mr Agostinelli will provide evidence from his firm's audit file as to the nature of the audit undertaken and the investigations made concerning payments to the NHDA, credit card expenditure and cash withdrawals.

He will also address the reporting of payments to the NHDA in the audited accounts provided by the No 3 Branch to the Fair Work Commission. The Commission will also receive a signed statement from Mr Iaan Dick, the former auditor of the No 3 Branch for the financial years ending 2004 to 2008.

- Mr Craig McGregor. Mr McGregor has been the Secretary of the HSU No 3 Branch since the elections held in November 2012 following the demerger. He will give evidence as to the current state of the financial records held by the No 3 Branch in respect to the period for which Ms Jackson was the Branch Secretary.

As appears from the above, the evidence which will be heard over the coming week covers a range of different facts and issues. However, a number of themes can be discerned.

First, the treatment by officials in the HSU of whistleblowers who spoke out against corrupt conduct or who
were otherwise perceived as threats to those officials. Some examples of the tactics used against, and treatment of, whistleblowers, have already been mentioned.

The next theme is closely related to the first. It concerns the scope and content of the duties owed by union officials to the members. The real question is whether senior union officials in the HSU or their supporters deployed some or all of the tactics set out above in order to entrench their own positions and to shield themselves from any or adequate scrutiny, rather than acting in the best interests of the members.

The third theme relates to the funding of union elections and to the solicitation and expenditure of funds to or from relevant entities established by the HSU and the NSW Union or officers of those employee associations.

The Commission has on Friday, 13 June 2014, released three issues papers, which address the three themes just identified.

The three issues papers are available on the Commission's website.

The Commission invites submissions from any interested persons on the issues set out in the issues papers.

It is likely that further issues papers will be released in conjunction with further hearings.

The first witness, Commissioner, is Mr Mark Hardacre.
<MARK MUSGRAVE HARDACRE, affirmed:
[10.21am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR STOLJAR:
MR STOLJAR: Q. Your full name is Mark Musgrave Hardacre?
A. That's correct.
Q. You live at Picton?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. You're a registered nurse by profession?
A. Correct.
Q. You've prepared a statement for the Commission. I understand you have some corrections to that statement which I'11 just take you through.

The first relates to the matters that you describe in paragraph 31. Is that strategy that you refer to in paragraph 31, and we'11 come back to it, I just want to make the correction first, that is something that related to the first election or the second election against Mr Williamson?
A. Actually, it relates to the second election. The content is fine. It's just that it's in the wrong sequence.
Q. It is under the wrong heading at the top of page 3 ?
A. Yes. I mean, it could be the very end of the first election because it was issued prior to the second election but it is related to the second election.
Q. And then if you come to paragraph 37 , in the final sentence you say:

We sought redress in the court.
Did the matter actually get to court?
A. I'm not too sure about that. It did go to litigation.

We had to engage our solicitors to get that matter resolved. There were a number of other issues that were running through into the courts, so I'm just not 100 per cent sure of that. It needs to be addressed.
Q. And then paragraph 80, you refer to a letter which is at tab 16 of the bundle, and you say it is from an anonymous member. Did you want to make a correction to that?
A. It was from myself. It was a report addressed to Mr Williamson and it wasn't anonymous, as stated in the transcript.
Q. Save for those matters, is the statement that you've given dated 5 June 2014 to this Commission true and correct?
A. Yes, it is, yes.
Q. Could I just ask you a few questions about the matters in or arising from your statement. You've set out --

THE COMMISSIONER: Could you just pause there, Mr Stoljar. Do you want that to be treated as evidence?

MR STOLJAR: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: The document which is behind tab 20, paragraph 5, confidentiality agreement, your position is that the Royal Commission's Act would override that agreement.

MR STOLJAR: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: Secondly, does Mr Williamson have solicitors?

MR STOLJAR: He does. They have been notified of this hearing, but, as I understand it, they're not present today and I'm not certain whether they would have received this particular document. They would not have.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's probably safe enough to proceed without doing anything special about paragraph 5 behind tab 20.

MR STOLJAR: Yes.
THE COMMISSIONER: I will receive that statement of Mark Musgrave Hardacre into evidence. The annexures too can be referred to by the letters and numbers given in the statement itself.
\#STATEMENT OF MARK MUSGRAVE HARDACRE DATED 5/6/2014
MR STOLJAR: I'11 provide for the Commission's record the original of the statement, together with the folder of materials to which the statement makes reference.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Can I just go to that document?
MR STOLJAR: Q. Which document?
A. Tab 20 to the deed.
Q. Yes.
A. I sought some limited legal advice on this and I was advised that the parties, you know, are to be advised that
this has been presented. I have contacted all those and they're quite happy for this to be presented at the Commission. The only person I haven't contacted, of course, is Mr Williamson.
Q. I see. So you've contacted Ms McNamee, Mr O'Connor, Mr Ford and Mr Ivers?
A. Mr O'Connor is deceased.
Q. I see, but you've contacted Mr Ford and Mr Ivers?
A. Correct.
Q. And they, together with Ms McNamee, have indicated that they have no objection to this document being put into evidence in this Commission?
A. That's correct. There's just one other issue I would like to address.
Q. Please.
A. I do understand that there is some form of censorship that occurs. Some of the statements here have got the phone number of Geraldine Betran, it's in her evidence, and I certainly would like to have that deleted before it gets it out to the press.
Q. We had, yes, contemplated publishing on the website only a redacted version of your statement and the bundle of exhibits, MFI1, and had contemplated redacting any personal details.
A. Yes.
Q. But we can discuss that with you during the course of the day, Mr Hardacre.
A. Yes, thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. When you answer counsel's questions could you speak up a bit, it's a little hard to hear you?
A. Okay.

MR STOLJAR: Q. Mr Hardacre, could I begin by just asking you for a bit more information about your background and training. You trained as a registered nurse, did you?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. When did you do your training?
A. I started in 1995 at the North Ryde Psychiatric

Centre. It's now referred to as the Macquarie Hospital. I finished my training there about 1978. From 1982 I moved across to Marsden Hospital and completed my mental retardation qualifications there as well, and finally resigned in 1987 to take up the position as an organiser within the Health and Research Employees Association.
Q. I thought for a minute you said in 1995. You started your training in 1975?
A. 1975, that's right, yes.
Q. You became a registered nurse in 1978 ?
A. That's right.
Q. You say you did further training in the area of mental retardation. You obtained your mental retardation registration in 1984, was it?
A. Yes, it would have been 1984. It was like a sort of bridging 18 months course. I started Marsden in 1982 and would have finished it in 1984.
Q. Did you say in 1987 you became an organiser?
A. That's correct.
Q. At that stage it was the HREA. What does that stand for?
A. That's the Health and Research Employees Association.
Q. You made reference to that election in paragraph 8 of your statement. After having been an organiser, you were elected in due course as assistant state secretary?
A. No. Actually, I came in under the Harry White team as 1987 and it wasn't - I think it was just a filling a vacancy. It wasn't contested. There were elections that were uncontested after that time.
Q. Why don't we come to paragraph 14. This makes reference to an issues paper you prepared in 1998 in relation to Mr Williamson. Why did you prepare this? A. By that stage I'd been there for about three years. All the issues relating to Michael Williamson were ongoing almost daily. By this stage $I$ just needed to get it all sorted out in my own head, and that's why this document went together. It was also for our solicitors with the defamation. By this stage he was moving towards defamation and of course with that defamation we cross filed against Mr Williamson.
Q. Let's take that in steps. Why don't we begin by going to the document itself. It is in tab 2 of the folder of materials beginning on page 4 . It's quite a lengthy document. Who did you give it to?
A. It was mainly for my use. With the defamation, the four persons that were being defamed would have probably seen this document as well. The only other persons that I would be aware that would have it would be our solicitors and, of course, the Fraud Squad also took these documents, probably about two years ago, in the Michael Williamson case.
Q. If I take you to the first page, which is page 4 in the top right-hand corner, this is a document you prepared back in - it must have been after 24 September 1999, we know that much. Do you remember the exact day?
A. No, I couldn't tell you.
Q. It was around about that time anyway?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. In the first paragraph you talk about something described as a "ghost on the association's payroll". Can you just tell the Commissioner what that is about?
A. As a - in the very early stages of my time as the assistant state secretary, Peter Clapham, who was the assistant state secretary prior to my success in the election, was speaking about the fact that Michael Williamson's wife was on the payroll. He stated that he'd seen a group certificate for her as well. As this document states here, Michael Williamson confronted Peter Clapham about that and stated that he was actually paying it out of his wages and it was some form of tax avoidance or something. There was a number of people that tried to access the financial records. That was part of what was sought, and the documents that were released by the association had all the names blacked out so we couldn't track that down. As I say again, under confidentiality, that they can't release the names against the list of employees that were there, so we could never prove that that was the case.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Mr Hardacre, was Mrs Williamson actually working within the union?
A. No, she wasn't, no.
Q. Was there any description of the job she had?
A. No. No.
Q. When you say that Mr Clapham said he had seen the name of Williamson's wife on the union's payroll, did you see a document answering that description?
A. No, I didn't, no. This is only from what's come back to me from Mr Clapham.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: Q. You then deal over the next few pages with matters relating to various female employees who had raised concerns about Mr Williamson. I won't go into detail about those matters, Mr Hardacre, in part for the reason that you mentioned at the outset. If I take you to page 9 --
A. I've got that.
Q. -- you're describing there the position of another assistant state secretary, Ms Vernon. In the paragraph under that heading in the third line you refer to "Williamson and his team." Do you see that?
A. Can you bring me back to that again? Where's --
Q. The heading is "Katrina Vernon" and the first paragraph after that heading refers to, in the third line --
A. Yes I see it.
Q. -- Williamson and his Team, with a capital T. Who was Williamson's Team?
A. Basically it was everyone. We only contested the top three positions. Alan Ivers contested Michael Williamson as the state secretary. Myself and Katrina Vernon contested the assistant state secretaries and defeated Peter Clapham and Bill Massey. The rest of the team was elected unopposed because we only had the three positions. So we were in an environment where basically the two of us were facing, you know, the full force of the other team that was there. That included the council as well.
Q. I think you then deal with some of that on page 10. You describe on page 10 , under the heading "Number 3 ", ways in which that you were isolated or kept away from important policy decisions. Can you just tell us a bit more about that?
A. Well, when we arrived after the election, the previous assistant state secretaries, Peter Clapham and Bill Massey, were still there. They were re-employed in some form of consultancy. I think Peter Clapham was being paid as, you know, the national branch assistant secretary which was unpaid at that stage but of course I couldn't determine whether they were paid or what they were being paid. But they had the full conditions of the assistant state secretaries which is a vehicle, mobile phone, an office and so on. Katrina and I were basically isolated from that. We had to then go through to get legal assistance to push this through.
Q. When you say you were isolated, you said that they had an office and a vehicle and so forth. Did you and Ms Vernon have an office?
A. No, we didn't, no.
Q. What was the arrangement you had?
A. We were placed in with the other organisers, you know into a large room with probably three or four desks in that room. So, effectively, nothing had changed post the election.
Q. In the third paragraph you say that there was a campaign strategy circulated to team members. That was a campaign strategy circulated by Mr Williamson?
A. Mmm-hmm. That's right, yes.
Q. I'11 come back to that, if I may. I'11 just go through this document and come back to that issue. You say at the bottom of that page that at some point, or I gather that at some point Ms Vernon ceased to be assistant state secretary; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. What happened there?
A. When we first arrived, Michael Williamson wanted to when we arrived we were met by Craig Thomson who was the senior industrial officer at the front desk and he stated that Michael Williamson wanted to interview us separately. Katrina had never been actually involved in full-time union work, she was a branch, you know, delegate.
Q. When you say you arrived, you mean on the morning after the election?
A. Yes, after the declaration, probably a couple of weeks
later, and I said that's not going to happen, you know, because she was still very vulnerable and it's her first day there. Michael Williamson then stated - well, he did see us together, just stated that we have disobeyed a lawful instruction from him and you know what the consequences of that will be. Then what happened was --
Q. Did he spell out what the consequences would be? A. Basically it would mean you would be going up to council for disobeying the instruction which could then see
removal from office, you know, so. They seemed to because I had the experience there as an organiser previously and had a lot of knowledge, they seemed to target Katrina, she was a lot more vulnerable, and then there was resolutions coming up from - one was from Albury sub-branch saying they were concerned about her stand on privatisation which was just total folly, you know, she denied it all, but it meant her fronting up to council to answer these sort of charges. We were then brought up under rule 19 which is removal from office, that was brought against us, and we had to then go back and get legal assistance to deal with that. The charges were frivolous and, of course, it didn't go anywhere after we had to engage legal representation, but as assistant secretaries we had to pay that out of our own pockets of course.

The issue with Katrina, they kept on targeting her. The issue of not having an office, being placed with other organisers so they could keep an eye on her. Eventually she became very stressed and went out on stress leave. She filed a workers' compensation claim and that claim was successful and I think she picked up about $\$ 14,000$ off that. All this went back to the state council with this sort of intimidation and what's happened, but then she finally - it got a bit more complicated. There was a restructure through BDO Ne1son Parkhill, consultant, to look at restructuring the union and she accepted a redundancy which came out of that report. It was quite a substantial redundancy payment as well. Associated with that was a confidentiality clause that no-one - she can't discuss it and he can't discuss it. So again it was basically another way of stopping information getting out, yes.
Q. Could I take you through to page 12 of the document. You quote there a campaign strategy theme that

Mr Williamson used. It is a quote from Machiavelli, "The Prince". He says:

It has to be noted that men must either be pampered or crushed because they can get revenge for small injuries but not for grievous ones, so any injury a man does to an enemy must be of such a kind that there can be no fear of revenge.

Was that something that Mr Williamson propounded in his campaign materials?
A. No, that was part of - well, of his campaign material which was internal to all the organisers and officials of the union. I managed to get a copy of that and that's on --
Q. Tab 4.
A. That's it, page 25.
Q. Yes. So page 25 behind tab 4, there's a heading "Campaign Strategy"?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. This was a document which Mr Williamson circulated, did he?
A. Yes. Yes, to his team members for how to deal with us, you know, how to deal with any opponents really.
Q. How did you get a copy of it?
A. It was handed to me. There were some organisers there that were concerned about what was going on and they did leak information across to me, but they would never come out and openty support me because of what was going on. So you'll find that's a recurring theme. A lot of the information through here had been handed to me by other organisers, other officials.
Q. Page 27 was where he deals with things that could be said or run against yourself and others?
A. Where's that?
Q. Page 27, top right-hand corner. You are still behind tab 4. It is in the same document you've just been looking at.
A. What was the question again?
Q. These were, to your understanding, suggestions that he was making to his supporters or organisers about how to, or lines they could run against you?
A. Yes, that's correct. Yes.
Q. The second-last dot point on that page says:

They are the puppets of others hard Left who want to get hold of your union.

Was Mr Williamson associated with a particular faction?
A. Yes. He was certainly associated with the New South Wales Right. We weren't and even when we, both Janice and I, resigned from the union, we wrote to the Law Society asking for solicitors to help us recoup our funds but on the basis that we needed a law firm that was actually not involved in any factions or any sort of, you know, dealings and we did get a response back from the Law Society and gave us three solicitors and we chose out of that. So it shows that, you know, we weren't aligned with the hard Left, but this was a theme that he pushed all the way through, that we're there to take over the union and, you know, sort of basically very hard Left policies and views which is just, you know, the fear tactics towards the actual membership.
Q. Could I come back to your statement. We've been discussing the issues paper that you make reference to in paragraph 14.

In paragraph 16 you describe paying a certain amount of salary into a fighting fund. Was that something that you and your wife, Janice, did while you were elected officials?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And what was the purpose of doing that?
A. The purpose of that fund is that it's a percentage of your salary which goes into this fund and it's supposed to be refunded if there's uncontested elections, but it's basically a fund that's, you know, to fight any sort of opposition.
Q. Who puts the money in? Is it any elected official?
A. Yes, that's right, yes. One of the problems we had was we couldn't get access to this fund and I was only just recently talking to one of the - he's now an ex-organiser,
this is many years later, and he stated there that they still haven't been able to access what happens to this money; where it goes.
Q. When you say it is a fund do you mean it's a bank account or is it --
A. Yes, I believe it was originally under Harry White in the early days here in the Commonwealth Bank, but I don't know, you know, in recent times.
Q. While you were there, let's focus on the time while you were there, who controlled it while you were there, that bank account?
A. It was normally the state secretary.
Q. Is that Mr Williamson?
A. It was --
Q. After Mr White.
A. Yes, Harry White firstly and then Michael Williamson.
Q. To your knowledge, that person had sole control of the fund or were there other signatories?
A. I'm not too sure. I mean, the organisers who were paying into this never got statements or any sort of, you know, feedback on what was going on with this fund.
Q. You describe in your statement that Janice or indeed yourself left in due course. What happened to the money that you'd put into the fund?
A. Well, the issue was that Janice resigned because of direct harassment from Michael Williamson. Harry White was the state secretary at that time. She went to Harry White and asked him to do something about it and he didn't. You know, he couldn't. He was very upset about her leaving but --
Q. What do you mean he couldn't?
A. Well, he just said he can't do anything. You know, for some reason, I don't know why, but he didn't seem to have the ability to control Michael Williamson even at that stage.
Q. This is when, 1995?
A. It would be 1994, I think, yes. Prior to the 1995 election, you know, and then what happened is that Janice asked for her contributions because naturally she was very
angry with what's happened and she wasn't going to donate her money to see Michael Williamson, you know, be
re-elected again so she asked for her money back and what then happened was that at an officers' meeting they put a resolution up that they will spend the funds out of that to fight Janice to stop her getting her money back. And then --
Q. To pay legal fees do you mean?
A. Yes, basically to get legal advice and they said because you're part of the team, you're bound by caucus on this and that you had to go along with it. I made it quite clear that, you know, when it comes down to Janice or Michael Williamson and his team, I'm sorry, but, you know, I can't accept that and that was part of my resignation. It was clearly made out in my resignation which I think is one of the documents here.
Q. Yes.
A. We were both then in the same situation. I was trying to get our money back. As I mentioned before, that's when we then wrote to the Law Society trying to find some independent legal firm and they gave us the name of three lawyers and we eventually engaged Taylor \& Scott to assist us and we did get the money back.
Q. Could we then come to the first election against Mr Williamson. I think you have already touched on this to some extent. This was the election where you and Ms Vernon were elected to assistant state secretary positions and Mr Williamson had a narrow win over Mr Ivers; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did Mr Williamson at that point ascend to the position of state secretary?
A. That's right, yes. Well, I'11 go back a bit.
Q. Sure.
A. Prior to that election, Harry White was rolled. There was a coup. They met down at the Strawberry Hills Hotel to put a vote of no confidence. This is the organisers in Harry White, Peter Clapham and one other organiser, I can't remember the name of that organiser, went up and told Harry that "You don't have the confidence and support of your team." He then stood down on the basis that he would still be able to attend Labour Council on Thursday nights and
that did occur. Michael Williamson then moved up to the position as state secretary and then the election came up in 1995.
Q. To your knowledge, who organised the coup?
A. Michael Williamson.
Q. You were then successful and you became an assistant state secretary, although you had the difficulties that you describe. In fact, if you come to page 4, this is where you deal with the events of that first day that I think you have mentioned already.
A. That's right, yes.
Q. In paragraph 37 of your statement you describe being at a desk facing the wall outside Mr Williamson's office. I think you said before you were in a room with other organisers?
A. Yes. You know, you see it's written I was to have a desk, that was planned, and I immediately said, "That's not going to happen, so you'd better sort that out." And he did back down off that one and I ended up being in an office with the other organisers basically just to be observed.
Q. I see. What he told you that initially, did he? He said that to you that you were going to be --
A. Yes, that's so.
Q. Did he offer you a reason as to why you would be placed against the wall outside his office?
A. Well, one of the problems with that building is that it was very cramped, there was very little space in $5 / 11$ Elizabeth Street in Surry Hills, and he kept the assistant secretaries there. There was no room for us really, that's what it came down to, so --
Q. It was because, to your perception, the previous assistant state secretaries were still on the premises that there was no room for you and Ms Vernon?
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
Q. You had to seek solicitors to try and remedy that situation, did you?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. And what happened?
A. It took a couple of months but we finally - I put a document to Michael Williamson listing all the things. Basically, it was just what the previous assistant secretaries had had, and that included the car, the mobile phone, being fully briefed on all important matters in the union, being involved at conferences, any important meetings with departmental or government officials; so he basically conceded to all that, although, you know, the meetings with, you know, government officials or any sort of positions like that, he never did that and it was an ongoing battle all the way through those four years.
Q. Did you go to Labour Council meetings?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, he stated through the council that he had the authority to determine and he put that back to council who should be delegates to that, to the Labour Council and that was one of the issues, very much a sore point, is that it is the peak body for the unions and the assistant state secretary is a very important position, but he denied us access to the whole four years that we were there because he had control of the delegation. Yet, some of those delegates were the office manager, employees of the union, yet, the assistant secretaries were denied that sort of access, yes.
Q. Prior to 1995, when you became an assistant state secretary, do you know whether the previous assistant state secretaries had gone to Labour Council?
A. Yes, they were and I did as well as an organiser. Yes. I mean it was - I wouldn't say it was compulsory but it was pretty much very important that the organisers, assistant secretaries and state secretaries attend those meetings.
Q. You make reference in paragraph 39 to delegations to the ALP Annual Conference. Did you attend the ALP Annual Conference as an assistant state secretary?
A. No, I didn't, no. We weren't part of that delegation either.
Q. Why was that?
A. For the same reasons. Well, if you want my view of it, he didn't want us to be associated with other unionists, other peers. It basically was just a lockout.
Q. You describe that to some extent in paragraph 40. You say, "This action was intended." That of course is just your understanding or belief, but, in any event, putting it no higher than that, what was your understanding or belief as to why you were told that you couldn't go to the ALP Annual Conference?
A. Two things. I think one was he didn't want to be seen to have someone opposing him present at that forum.
Q. Yes.
A. But it's also to do with the bloc voting that occurs at those conferences.
Q. Can you just explain that a bit more?
A. Well, it goes back to old factional lines. The Right Wing union would vote for the Right Wing faction of the ALP and their voting would be in a line - every single vote for the members would be represented by the Michael Williamson delegation, and that delegation was all his, so it would all be on that basis. So you couldn't vote really openly. What usually happened - well, the time before when I was an organiser I was there, you're paired up, so that there's someone watching how you voted so you wouldn't be able to vote against the ticket.
Q. What do you mean paired up?
A. Normally they'd put an organiser with you, another organiser with you, and you had to show each other the voting to ensure that the vote was secured. It was a bloc vote.
Q. So you would observe that when you were able to go to the ALP as an organiser?
A. As an organiser, yes.
Q. Prior to 1995?
A. Yes.
Q. But after 1995, you couldn't get to the conference?
A. I couldn't get on to the delegation to go to annual conference because Michael Williamson wouldn't include me in that and it wasn't supported by the council, which is his council.
Q. What do you mean it was his council?
A. Everyone on council was on his ticket.
Q. Who was on council at that time?
A. Oh, probably 15 councillors. There was the president, two vice presidents, and a number of councillors, you know, so --
Q. In paragraph 42, you make reference to something you adverted to briefly a few moments ago, namely, a report commissioned by Mr Williamson by an external consultant, BDO. You say:

Early in my four-year term, Mr Williamson brought in a consultant.

You say:
I knew exactly where it was going to go.
Again, that's just your understanding and belief, but on that level, what did you understand or believe as to what would be the outcome?
A. Well, to get rid of the assistant state secretaries, to restructure the association so that it would exclude us.
Q. You thought that would be the outcome of the report before it was commissioned?
A. I was confident, very confident, that's exactly where he was going to go with this and of course the - I did speak to the consultant as the assistant secretary. He was quite taken aback by the fact that we were on a different ticket, he wasn't briefed on that. I put forward my views and I've made mention I think in some of those documents there that those views didn't come out in the final report from BDO and, of course, the final report was that they found that the assistant state secretaries really didn't do much work in the place, they weren't really needed, and that was because we were locked out of everything. We couldn't go to members' meetings. We couldn't go to any sort of - anything really. We were just basically kept to our offices. The other part of the BDO report was that there would be a motivational pay rise for Craig Thomson who was the senior industrial officer at that stage.

Now, the reasons for that is that there was a superannuation fund operated by the union and that was closed down under Harry White and those that were paying into that converted that across to a 10 per cent pay rise.

One of the other contentious points is that Michael Williamson moved his contributions from 3 per cent to to 10 per cent after the thing closed and ended up with a 10 per cent pay rise. That created an anomaly in the structure. So you had some people that were being paid you know inflated by 10 per cent over the others and of course the BDO report then came in and said that Craig Thomson, who was Michael Williamson's campaign manager, should get a pay rise. So basically the BDO report, you know, sort of met the needs of Michael Williamson by getting rid of us, the two assistant state secretaries, and giving his campaign manager a pay rise.
Q. You say "his campaign manager".
A. Yes.
Q. Do you mean Mr Thomson?
A. That's right.
Q. So Mr Thomson actually ran the campaigns for Mr Williamson, did he?
A. They had various, but most of them were employees which is another issue. You know, as an employee you should be independent from the political machinations of the union and of course he wasn't, you know. He certainly wasn't, yes.
Q. Mr Thomson or Mr Williamson?
A. Mr Thomson.
Q. Mr Thomson. In any event, the report came down and then Mr Williams (sic) approached you and Ms Vernon, and what did he say?
A. Mr Williamson, yes.
Q. Mr Williamson.
A. He basically says "Which one of you want to go?"

I told him neither of us, we've been elected here for a four year term and no matter what happens we're going to, you know, sit it out. Of course at this stage the pressure was then really put on Katrina. She was already, I think, taking some sort of stress leave with it and then she buckled and accepted the redundancy that was offered to her.
Q. How long had she been working in her position at that
stage?
A. Not long. Not long. Less than a year. I can't remember the exact time. Probably 6 months, 7 months.
Q. What was the size of redundancy?
A. Well, again, that was bound by confidentiality. Michael Williamson wouldn't even let the council know. He basically said it was going to be under normal public service redundancy arrangements which should only be a couple of thousand dollars. I did manage to get hold of the actual stat dec with her termination and there was a problem there because both the witnesses had different signatures. I don't know why that is, and it's an issue that I tried to pursue. The only reason that I was aware of how much money she actually received was that somebody mistakenly left a document on the photocopier that
I managed to pick up and it showed a payout figure of $\$ 88,000$.
Q. Did that surprise you?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. What was her actual salary at that stage?
A. I couldn't - it's going back 15, 20 years.

I couldn't - I could find that out.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Would you go to tab 8, page 51 , in the top right-hand corner. Is that the document which you picked up off the photocopier?
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.
Q. The figure in the top of $\$ 1,264.90$ per week, would that reflect salary?
A. Yes. Actually it would, yes. That's right, your Honour, that would be the figure.
Q. Coming back to your statement, did Mr Williamson make an approach to you about taking redundancy?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. What did he say?
A. He said, "Now that Katrina has gone, what about you?" And I just repeated the same line, that I was elected here by the members to represent them for a four year period and I'm not going to walk away from that.
Q. So then what happened? Did you stay?
A. Oh, yes. Yes.
Q. And what were the working conditions like?
A. Pretty - one of the things I managed to carve out a bit of a niche was in training and education which is a fairly - I mean it's important but it's certainly not at the level of assistant state secretary. So I managed to keep myself busy by becoming part of the Health Industry Group Training Company Board and the ITAB as well, the Industry Training Advisory Board, so I was sort of able to get something but, again, it kept me away from the membership, it kept me away from the main policy decisions that were made in the union and basically just isolated me.
Q. You didn't have contact with members; is that what you're saying?
A. No. No.
Q. Did he say something to you about that?
A. Well, he just reaffirmed that he's the one that determines the roles and responsibilities of those under him and we were under him, and if we breached that, back up to council again, you know, to face council so --
Q. Did you make any protest to anyone?
A. Oh, yes, yes. I mean, I was raising this all the time with council. Some of the - I look back on it now and, you know, there were sort of real screaming matches at the council meetings over these very issues, about trying to get access and so on.
Q. Screaming matches involving you?
A. Well, basically the - I'd be there by myself because Katrina had already gone so I was a lone voice, but I'd get jeered and, you know, sort of comments being made. I can distinctly remember, it's in my notes as well, with Craig Thomson basically trying to shout me down, I'm asking the President to get him to keep his mouth shut, you know, which he couldn't control it, and it was a pretty heavy night that night, you know, so --
Q. About when was that approximately? Some time between 1995 and 1999?
A. Oh, certainly, yes. It was sort of - I think it was nearly towards the end, around about 1997-98, so yeah, but I mean the issue with - the real stress point was at every
council meeting you'd be going there as a lone voice, so you never knew what was going to come up, you know. And the other big issue we had is that we couldn't get access to the agendas, to the minutes, and that was ongoing all the way through. We took that to the Industrial Relations Commission and they made it quite clear that the assistant secretaries need to be - they are part of council. He tried to get the rules changed as well and he always maintained that we were only there as observers, not as participants in the running of the council, but that was overturned in the Industrial Relations Commission supporting us that we were, but we couldn't still get information, you know, so --
Q. Were copies of the agenda of the council meeting circulated in advance?
A. Well, yes, they were, and also the minutes.
Q. To you?
A. No. No. I would occasionally, you know, when

I really, really pushed and pushed and pushed and pushed,
I would then get the minutes of the last six month but it's all too late. When things are moving, you know, you need to be abreast of these things when they're occurring.
You're basically reading history, you know. You're not really part of what's happening with the union.
Q. Yes. Could we come through to the second election. You deal with that in paragraph 62 and following.

In the second election in 1999, you say you were part of a ticket. You didn't have a full ticket "but we had key positions", you're saying this in 62. Who was standing for what? What position did you run for?
A. I ran again as assistant state secretary for my position.
Q. Who was running for state secretary?
A. Janice. Janice Hardacre.
Q. Who was the other --
A. Sorry. Her maiden name was being used. It was Janice McNamee.
Q. In any event that's your wife, Janice?
A. My wife, that's right.
Q. Who was the other assistant state secretary or at least who was running for that position?
A. Actually, I can't quite remember, actually. Yes, it might have been - it might have been Paul Ford. Sorry, I take that back. By that stage they'd implemented the restructure of the union with the BDO report. So when they got rid of Katrina, they abolished that other state secretary position, so that's why there was only the one, myself as the assistant state secretary, running for that position.
Q. You say in 63:

> Mr Williamson had changed the rules to make it difficult for anyone to challenge them.
> He did this by moving that union rules have above-the-line voting and below-the-line voting.

Can you just explain what you perceived to be the problem there?
A. There was a whole raft of rule changes that went through. Again, I was advised by one of the organisers that Michael Williamson was down at the Industrial Relations Commission with a whole bunch of rule changes, you know. I confronted him about this. He's saying, "Don't worry about it, nothing's happening, it's not really that important." The night when they actually rammed it through was the night that I was sent to Western Australia to do something with education with the Western Australian branch. When I came back I asked what was going on. I'd heard that there had been some rule changes and these rule changes weren't documented, they were verballed and voted on as a verbal rule change, but they were quite significant. It changed the process of the elections and also brought in the purging rule against members. It involved the PSA and the Nurses Association when they exchanged members and of course that was, you know, a big part of our voting base was in those areas. Yes, that's what happened there.
Q. You say in 63 that he did this by moving that union rules have above-the-line voting and below-the-line voting. A. Yes.
Q. I understand what the difference is or what that encompasses, but what was the significance of that from
your point of view? How does that --
A. The original --
Q. I suppose the specific question is why do you say that makes it difficult for someone to challenge him?
A. Well, originally, what was put up was that to be above the line you've got to have a full ticket and that's almost impossible if you're not the incumbent because you've got to have all positions covered, you know. There was a lot of documentation that went through to the State Electoral Office and was actually contested in the Industrial Relations Commission. Again, we had to engage solicitors to deal with this. That was struck out as being unfair and eventually the Industrial Relations Commission accepted that you can have a ticket of, you know, sort of three or four to be still above the line. Michael Williamson was not happy about that being struck out.

But there's also the issue of - it's fairly complex, but, you know, there's the whole issue in relation to the State Electoral Office and the roll and what would happen is that if you had that above-the-line voting, that only one would be a full ticket. All it takes is one person to fall over and then your ticket is invalid for
above-the-line voting. As you see further on in my statement there, he used tactics to get candidates to withdraw.
Q. Paragraph 66 you make reference to some documents that you prepared and they're in tab 14 of your statement. When did you prepare these documents?
A. This would be after I finally got a copy of the rule changes. It's probably two months after they went to council. He only gave them to me after they were pushed through the Industrial Relations Commission. So what I did, because this had to go back to our solicitors, I did a lot of the ground work to save costs and I just went through line by line against the rules and where the changes were and that's basically what that document on page 72 is, and I think page 77 is just a further update on that, you know.
Q. Can I then take you to page 9 of your statement. You say:

In the middle of the campaign $I$ was served with documents for legal proceedings by the
union's solicitors.
Who actually brought the proceedings?
A. Well, defamation is personal and it was Michael

Williamson, and one of the problems we had is that it was our union solicitors that were, you know, sort of leading the charge with this, you know.
Q. Who were the union solicitors?
A. McClellands, in particular, Greg Keating.
Q. Do you know who paid Mr Williamson's legal costs?
A. No, I don't.
Q. In paragraph 72 you identify some other defendants to those proceedings. Janice is your wife, and then there's Mr William or Bill O'Connor?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You say in 74 he wasn't standing for an elected position?
A. No. Bill O'Connor was a very well respected official of the union. He was the assistant state secretary and retired as such, and he was also awarded a life membership. Of course, one of the things that really upset a lot of people was the fact that he was involved in the defamation. Now, he was not part of the ticket, he was the campaign manager for us then, you know.

And I might just add, too, one of the problems with defamation is that by its very nature it defames the respondents. So Williamson would use that then to show "Look, you know, I'm not lying, they're liars" and, you know, "I'm right, they're wrong." In a campaign it is very difficult then to overcome that. That's another form of a barrier and particularly with Bill 0 'Connor, he used that as part of that strategy.
Q. These proceedings were commenced in the middle of the campaign?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Who is Mr Paul Form (sic)?
A. There is a typo there. That's Paul Ford - F-O-R-D.
Q. Who is Mr Ford?
A. He was one of our candidates standing for an
organiser.
Q. I see. And Mr Ivers?
A. Mr Ivers was a former organiser and he originally ran against Michael Williamson and was defeated by 151 votes in the 1995 election and he, along with Bill O'Connor, had tried to get access to the documents as members and had great difficulty trying to do that and discovered quite a number of inappropriate purchases and was basically a thorn in the side for Michael Williamson.
Q. Did the institution of those proceedings hamper your ability to conduct your election campaign?
A. Oh, yes. Yes. I mean, I think the figure was $\$ 750,000$. That does sort of weigh on your mind and, you know, we didn't have the resources. Really we had to fight this. At the same time, we're trying to think about running a campaign at the same time, and it does sort of make you question every document you put out, of course, and, you know, these proceedings and these costs are sucking up more of your resources, whether it is time or money.
Q. Who was paying for your legal costs?
A. Basically we did. We ended up paying - at the end of - it didn't finish. Normally, we were advised by our legal team, was that if you put a cross-claim in after the election it goes away, you know, they decide to walk away from it, it is just a tool of campaigning. It didn't with Michael Williamson. We were still, after the 1999 election, we were still in 2003 fighting this issue. I was unemployed at the time. So, you know, the final call, we had to pay about $\$ 20,000$ each to meet the legal costs of this and we had to borrow against our house to do so. I don't know about the others, I don't know where they got their money from, but I think they were pretty much in the same position, they're only just individuals.
Q. The proceedings, they didn't go to trial? They ended in some sort of agreed settlement, did they?
A. What was happening was it would go into court, into the District Court and then he'd withdraw and make amendments. There was no - you know, it said for unspecified damages, all this sort of stuff. I mean we couldn't nail it, we couldn't get it down, it went on and on and on.

Finally our solicitors said, "Look, you can't keep going on like this". I was pretty sure that the money, all these issues in our defence lay with Michael Williamson's wife, the money was in her bank account, and I instructed our solicitors, "You've got to do what we want. We need to subpoena her accounts." When that happened, Michael Williamson wanted to settle. Again, I'm talking personally here, some of the others wanted to fight on and some didn't, but my position was that $I$ wanted to fight on with this and the reality was that we couldn't. We couldn't keep going.
Q. You mean because of the expense?
A. The expense, yes. The expense of it all, and we'd lose our house, you know. What then occurred was the document at tab 20 which again bound us to confidentiality and I had great reluctance to sign that because of that clause, you know, but if we needed to stop it, we had to do it.
Q. You describe some other difficulties you had during those 1999 elections in paragraph 77 and following of your statement. Can you just tell the Commissioner a bit more about that. Organisers came to hospitals when you went there to campaign, did they?
A. Yes. We'd always have - I suppose it's the benefits of incumbency is that the organisers had all their hospitals in their areas and they'd go out there and ensure that we were basically not welcomed; made it very difficult for us to get around to the various members. Normally what happened the security would be the ones that would front up first and he would had right of entry under the Act to campaign. We'd spend, you know, an hour or two just trying to talk our way through to get to the members, you know even to put notices up and stuff. So it was very difficult and of course, you know, anyone that's a supporter of Michael Williamson would ring through to head office and they'd send organisers up there to meet and greet and also to deal with any of the information that we put up about our team in the election; so it was very difficult.

We eventually moved towards only going out in the weekends because the organisers only work Monday to Friday and it sort of gave us a bit of protection.
Q. Mr Williamson won that election by a large margin? A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Do you know whether anyone challenged Mr Williamson again over the next few years or do you not know?
A. We were going to have another - well, half-hearted. We didn't actually make a decision on it, whether we would challenge him again in four years time. The time for the election came and there was no indication of an election.

We rang the State Electoral Office and they said, "Oh, that's a special case". Now, I think it had something to do with changing of the name of the union or merging with the Victorian branch, but whatever happened, basically the election didn't occur because of this new structure that was going in; but no, no, we were gone, we were gone by the 1999 election, yes.
Q. You just said by the 1999 election. You meant the one after? You mean you'd finished --
A. By 1999 we were expended. Financially we couldn't keep going and I think emotionally as well. With this we couldn't keep going.
Q. Excuse me just one minute, Mr Hardacre. You said something in your evidence about it being made difficult for other people to stand in elections. Was that - are you really dealing with that issue in paragraphs 69, 70 and following?
A. 69, 70. Yes. Part of the strategy during that election was that if someone puts a nomination in for a position from, say, our team - there were three teams running but from our team, for example, you've got to have someone to second and move the nomination, so you've got to have a couple of names. Normally you put two, three on there just to make sure in case someone's not financial. It then goes to the State Electoral Commission who then send it back to, well, refer to Shaun McMillan as the independent person, the office manager, which she wasn't, she was part of the Michael Williamson team, for verification that they are eligible to stand. Firstly, that they are a member, a financial member, and secondly that nomination, the seconders, and so on, are also members.

What would happen is that they would send the organisers out to that workplace. If they can't get the actual candidate, they'd normally say, "Look, this is going to cost this union, you know, sort of $\$ 60,000$ ", or whatever
the figure is, you know, this is what it's going to cost your members. If they don't willingly withdraw, they then go to the people they've nominated, nominated them in and withdraw, and quite often we'd suddenly get a notification from the State Electoral Office to say that they're invalid because they've decided to withdraw. There is one instance where - and we have got documentation to that - where McClellands actually rang the people at night to get them to withdraw and they went in with stat decs back to the State Electoral Office. We wrote to the State Electoral Office about all this saying, you know, it is impossible to maintain the ticket when you've got that sort of, you know, undercurrent running, where you've got the other team going in and wilfully destroying your nominations.

MR STOLJAR: Thank you, Mr Hardacre.
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Mr Hardacre, in paragraph 91 of your statement, in particular subparagraph (c), you speak of you and your wife being put back approximately $\$ 100,000$. In your oral evidence you said that between you you'd spent $\$ 40,000$ on the District Court defamation case. Do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. The other $\$ 60,000$, what was that spent on?
A. It was basically the expenditure for running the campaign. You know, the legal costs were $\$ 40,000$ but it's just an estimate for the cost of printing and we just estimated around about $\$ 100,000$. We had to borrow that money to meet those sort of debts.
Q. The other thing is this: in tab 12, which is numbered page 61 at the top, that's an affidavit of Mr Cahill explaining why he resigned as president and that it was sworn in proceedings in the Industrial Court of New South Wales. Did those proceedings ever go to judgment? A. No, they didn't, no.
Q. They were settled or something?
A. I'm not too sure. You'll have to ask Mr Cahill what happened with that. He was the initial president with Michael Williamson and he suddenly resigned and that's one of the problems we did have, is that rather than coming and supporting us and bringing the issues to us, we would lose support from those who were sort of with - or partly with us on the committee. It's very daunting and a lot of
pressure. They'd rather resign rather than get caught up in this, and I think that's the motivation with Ken Cahill, he's raised those issues in there about the funds and particularly about the computers and the deals that were done, he wasn't happy with that and resigned.
Q. Has anyone put on an affidavit answering Mr Cahill's affidavit?
A. I don't know. I don't know.

THE COMMISSIONER: What will happen now is that anyone who wants to cross-examine Mr Hardacre may do so at a time to be arranged.

MR STOLJAR: Yes. Commissioner, Practice Note 1 will apply, so the provisions in respect of cross-examination will apply.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Mr Hardacre can go for now?
MR STOLJAR: Yes, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Hardacre, you can go for now but it may be necessary for you to come back if anyone wants to ask you any questions about your statement. Thanks for giving your evidence today.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Might I just make a point here? I know we're dealing with a lot of corruption in the unions, but in my time as a union official and in sub-branches, there are a lot of good union members out there very dedicated, including those office in the offices and I think there are a lot of good unions as well. What we're seeing here is probably, you know, the belly end of it all and I still strongly believe in unions and I still believe there's a lot of good people out there.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: The next witness is Mr Bolano. It may be convenient to take the break now.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. We will adjourn until 10 to 12.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Stoljar.
MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, the next witness is Mr Marco Bolano.
<MARCO BOLANO, sworn:
[11.50am]
<EXAMINATION BY MR STOLJAR:
MR STOLJAR: Q. Your name is Marco Bolano?
A. Yes.
Q. You're a resident of Victoria?
A. Yes.
Q. And you are a disability support worker by profession?
A. Yes.
Q. But you've worked as a union organiser for quite a number of years as well?
A. Yes, organiser-official for about 10 years.
Q. You've prepared a witness statement in these proceedings. I'11 give you a copy.
A. Thank you.
Q. You have two corrections to that statement. First of all, if I take you to paragraph 90 - just to put you in context, you're dealing there with a situation in which various persons at the annual convention were being, what's described as "acting up", that is, moving up into more senior positions because one was vacated?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you wish to say something further about paragraph 90 ?
A. Yes, that's what $I$ actually said in the meeting but I wanted to clarify that the rules only provided for someone to be appointed as acting secretary in the secretary's stead should they be unable to perform their role. There was no requirement in the rules for people to act up in other positions.
Q. In paragraph 151 - or is it --
A. Yes - no, I don't think --
Q. I think it might be 157, actually, I misread it. Did you wish to make any additional point?
A. Yes, there was a fifth applicant.
Q. Did that person respond to the advertisement?
A. No, he didn't respond to the advertisement in

The Australian. He'd asked - he'd approached - he was a member of ours who I'd actually represented a few month earlier in a unfair dismissal and he approached Ballarat Trades Hall asking if there was any jobs in unions and Ballarat Trades Hall passed that information on to Stuart Miller, who was an official in the union at the time, and Stuart Miller contacted him and arranged for him to be interviewed.
Q. Save for those two corrections is the content of your statement, dated 12 June 2014, true and correct?
A. Absolutely.

MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, I'd ask that that statement be received into evidence, together with the folder of materials.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That statement will be received into evidence and the folder will be marked Bolano MFI1 containing the documents referred to in that statement.

BOLANO MFI\#1 STATEMENT OF MARCO BOLANO DATED 12/6/2014 TOGETHER WITH FOLDER OF MATERIALS

MR STOLJAR: Q. Mr Bolano, it is quite a lengthy statement and I'm just going to take you through some parts of it. First of all, your training and experience - you say in paragraph 3 that you joined the union in mid 2000 as a disability support worker?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Did you have some training in that capacity?
A. As a disability support worker?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I had a Certificate 4 in community services, disability.
Q. You worked for a couple of years as a disability
support worker or longer?
A. Yes, and then ultimately before I went to the union as a house supervisor.
Q. And then in about 2002 you became an organiser?
A. That's right.
Q. With the Victoria No 1 Branch?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did that until 2009?
A. Yes.
Q. In 2009 you ran as a candidate for election and you became secretary of the No 1 Branch?
A. That's right.
Q. After the merger what was your position?
A. Deputy general secretary, one of. There was two of them.
Q. Who was the other one?
A. Peter Mylan.
Q. Who are the members of the No 1 Branch?
A. Effectively, pretty much all non-clinical workers in a hospital, either public or private, aged care workers, with the exception of registered nurses, residential disability and youth workers and pathology collectors, and that's pretty much most of them, anyway, that I can recall.
Q. You say in paragraph 10 of your statement you contested the 2012 No 1 Branch elections but you were unsuccessful?
A. That's right.
Q. Do you presently hold any elected office?
A. No.
Q. On page 2 of your statement you deal with the 2009 elections that you were involved in. This is when you - if I can put it this way - made the transition from organiser to secretary?
A. After winning the election, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. I'11 come back to this. Could we just go through 16 and following. You say:

Based on my knowledge, approximately \$150,000 was spent on my campaign ...

That's your campaign for secretary?
A. Yes.
Q. And then:

Aside from the funds raised by my ticket ...

Do you mean by that the persons who were joined with you in the campaign?
A. Yes. People that were on my ticket and staff that supported me contributed some money, yes.
Q. And then you say --
A. And I did myself as well.
Q. You say.
... the fundraising also was done ... by
Senator David Feeney ...
And then at the top of the next page you say:
My campaign manager was [Mr Donnelly] ...
A. Correct.
Q. Let's take Mr Donnelly first. Did you know Mr Donnelly before this?
A. I'd met him once or twice at Labor functions but just being in the group, having a conversation with him. I didn't really know him until he managed my campaign.
Q. How did he come to be, as you say in 18, managing and administering your election campaign finances?
A. I believed Mr Feeney asked him to.
Q. Did you know Mr Feeney before then?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. How did Mr Feeney come to be assisting you with your campaign?
A. I believe that came about through his relationship with Ms Kathy Jackson.
Q. You say, just going back a bit, paragraph 14:

At the time, the Victorian ALP seemed to be
in a state of civil war and the warring
factions were throwing money at candidates
in the HSU elections.
Can you just expand on that? What do you mean they were in a state of civil war?
A. My knowledge of it was that the Victorian Right of Labor Party had split had split and there were two camps. There were what they called the ShortCons, which was the the Bill Shorten-Stephen Conroy camp, and I don't know what they called the others, but to the best of my knowledge the other camp was made up of the NUW, the SDA, I believe the CFMEU and David Feeney was in that camp.
Q. You called them ShortCons. Were they representing the Right faction?
A. I think both sides were from the Right faction.

I believe it was the Right faction that split. The
Right faction that had been called Labor Unity - this is my knowledge of it - that they'd split.
Q. Why were they throwing money at the candidates in the HSU elections?
A. My assumption - well, my considered assumption is it was all about votes on the floor of the ALP. The unions had so many - the HSU, including other affiliated unions, had so many votes per member, I believe it was so many votes per thousand members, I believe, on the floor of the ALP. I believe the HSU No 1 Branch was worth 14 or 15 votes on the floor of the Victorian ALP.
Q. How many members, roughly speaking, did the Victoria No 1 Branch have at that time?
A. At the time of the 2009 election it was approximately 14,500 towards 15,000 , somewhere in between those two numbers.
Q. The New South Wales component of the union, if I can call it that very loosely, it had much larger membership?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. How large was it?
A. Michael Williamson claimed over 40,000 . When we merged, as least when we merged with them, the reality seemed to be closer to 35,000 .
Q. Was the No 1 Branch the largest branch in Victoria?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Is this the position, if you take the Victorian ALP, the votes you're talking about are on the floor of the Victorian ALP Conference?
A. Yes.
Q. An annual event?
A. Yes.
Q. It's like the American Electoral College, is it? If you win a State by a small margin, the whole of the votes for the President from that State are cast one way. In other words, if, for example, the Feeney faction had won the election, the Feeney faction would control the totality of the votes, the 14 or 15 votes on the floor of the Victorian ALP conference?
A. Well, technically the secretary of the union would control them or No 1 Branch would control them, but
I suppose it was an assumption that if you were aligned to Mr Feeney, that you would send those votes in his direction, but at the end of the day I believe it was the choice of the secretary. It never came to fruition. I can't recall us ever actually voting before the merger, so it never actually happened.

MR STOLJAR: Q. Did anyone talk to you about the way, if you became secretary, you'd cast your vote?
A. No. I would have taken a dim view of that.
Q. In any event, Mr Feeney organised some fundraising for your campaign, did he?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr Donnelly was a staffer to Mr Feeney?
A. I believe he was the chief of staff.
Q. How did it actually work, Mr Bolano? Just talk us through it. Did you oversee what was going on, or did you
leave it to them, or how did it work?
A. The administration of the campaign I left to them. I was campaigning. It was - we campaigned - myself and the other candidates campaigned with an attitude. We were very disciplined in 2009. Our attitude was, "Imagine if at the end we lose this election by 10 or 20 votes." Our attitude was be out there, you know, talking to as many members as possible. All day we were in workplaces either walking around talking to members or having members' meetings and then in the evening we'd come back to the telephone room and be on the phones to members for several hours, and then you'd go home, go to bed, wake up and the cycle would start again.

We were effectively doing that seven days a week during the election campaign. I really didn't have time to focus on that aspect of the campaign. I had a say in the messaging obviousty. My main interest - and I had a - and the majority of the say $I$ had was in the messaging for the campaign, but in regards to the finances, how much money was coming in, it was just constantly coming in during the campaign, it was not that it all came in before the campaign and we had a budget based on what we had, the money just kept coming in. It appeared to me as needed. It would be if we needed to do another mail-out or print more posters, the money seemed to be coming in as needed.
Q. How did you form that understanding? Did you have a conversation with Mr Donnelly?
A. I had conversations with Mr Donnelly and all I got is, "Yeah, we're getting - people, you know, friends of ours are donating money." I'd ask more specifics. He did tell me about the SDA, although initially at the time he didn't give me an amount and obviously I knew the NUW were providing their phone rooms because I was in there doing telephone calls and I heard some names that I've mentioned in my statement.
Q. You deal with that in paragraph 20. Why don't we work through some of those names. First of all, Mr Williamson made some donations. Why was Mr Williamson donating to your campaign?
A. My understanding is that Mr Williamson or the New South Wales Branch was an ally of the Victorian No 1 Branch and the Victorian No 3 Branch. Beyond that, I didn't know what his interest was. I only found out - I found out about his donations when the first few mail-outs that we
sent out were going from a Sydney mail house and I was a bit perplexed, so I asked, I think I asked Mr Donnelly, "Why are they being mailed from Sydney?" And he said, "Because Michael Williamson have donated these four mail-outs."
Q. In 18 you say it was Mr Donnelly's responsibility to manage and administer the election campaign finances.
A. Yes .
Q. His responsibilities went further, did they? He actually organised mail-outs?
A. Yes, he organised mail-outs, he got them to the printer, made sure they were printed properly. He arranged for them to be printed and then obviously arranged for them to be actually mailed out to members. He arranged people for the telephone room; he sort of kept a roster.
Q. At 20.2 you say you asked Mr Donnelly not to use the Sydney mail house for further mail-outs.
A. Yes .
Q. Was that because it hadn't gone so well?
A. It was just disastrous. I remember one particular mail-out, there was one mail-out supposed to hit mailboxes and then a second one three or four days later. There was a strategic reason for that. I can't remember the strategic reason. But they both - both of the mail-outs hit on the latter day and some of them had material from the separate mail-outs mixed up in different - so it was just an absolute - members - one would arrive a lot later than we wanted it to arrive and then when it did arrive late, effectively, what should have been two separate mail-outs in some cases mixed up in the one envelope.
Q. You say in 20.2, although you asked Mr Donnelly not to use the Sydney mail house for further mail-outs, "I don't know if this subsequently occurred." Who is giving the directions? Is it you or is it Senator Feeney?
A. With the benefit of hindsight, I don't know. My concern about the mail-outs coming from Sydney was that it hadn't been effective, there had been muck-ups basically. I said, "We just can't use this mail house any more. It's just proven to be unreliable." I don't recall then. I have no recollection of any further mail-outs coming from that Sydney mail house, but I don't know - I don't know how that worked. I don't know if - I wouldn't know and I'd
only be speculating. I don't know if Mr Williamson just handed over the money out for the mail-out and we did it from Melbourne. I don't know for 100 per cent - I'm not 100 per cent sure if indeed they'd stopped going out from Sydney. From then on the mail-outs arrived on time and properly, so I wasn't worried about it.
Q. In 20.2 you also made reference to Mr Williamson I'm sorry, it's only a suggestion, but you say there was a suggestion that Mr Williamson donated money from his re-election slush fund. What's that?
A. In Victoria in the No 1 Branch we had a

Returnees' Fund where staff voluntarily donated putting a weekly amount, I used to put in $\$ 20$ a week, I think, into a fund which was called in the No 1 Branch the Returnees' Fund and the intention of that fund was to fund, you know, any elections or any other staffing matters, or you know factional matters. I assumed that Mr Williamson - when Mr Williamson, when we had coffee once and he spoke about it, I assumed that was the same - he was talking about a similar sort of fund.
Q. You described that coffee meeting in some of the subparagraphs following 20.2.
A. Yes.
Q. At the top of the page, page 4, 20.6, you say: Mr Williamson set up an election fund ...
A. Mmm.
Q. In 20.6 you say:

Mr Williamson set up an election fund which was, by that time, well-resourced due to the fact that he had not had a contested election in over a decade.

Did he say that to you?
A. The words he used were, obviously, yes, he hadn't had a contested election for a long time, it was over a decade, and that his staff contributed $\$ 30$ a week to it, so I extrapolated that there would have to be a fair bit of money in there.
Q. Further down the page you're talking about the

Australian Workers Union. You say that the AWU donated money to your campaign. In 20.14 you say you were surprised to learn that.
A. Mmm.
Q. Why were you surprised?
A. I hadn't been told they donated money. At the time I was aware and I'd been told that they were supporting Ms Asmar and they were in the ShortCon faction, obviously, the AWU, so I had the assumption that they were funding Ms Asmar's campaign, but then in late 2012, during my 2012 election campaign, I was contacted by Royce Millar, a journalist at Fairfax, who put to me that - I think that Fairfax had uncovered the Industry 22 slush fund and he put to me claims by Mr Cesar Melhem that he contributed money to both sides in the 2000 election and he contributed 30,000 to my campaign.
Q. Why would they contribute money to both?
A. The only logical thing I can think of personally is they were just having a bet both ways. They would have some sort of - they could have some sort of relationship if I won the election; but that's only sheer guesswork.
Q. In 20.15 of your statement you're talking about the National Union of Workers. That's the NUW that you made reference to earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. You say that they provided 10 telephone lines?
A. That's right.
Q. How did that actually work? You mean they provided -A. We went to the office. We'd go - we would assemble at their office after hours. Myself and the two other candidates for assistant secretary and president would be out campaigning in hospitals or workplaces all day and then we would go back to the NUW's office, as would supporters of mine, whether they be HSU staff or friends. I think it would be about four or five o'clock in the afternoon most of their people, all their staff had gone, there was just a couple of people around, and we'd start. We'd be allocated 10 lines and we'd, you know - sorry, with desktop computers with spreadsheets on them, our spreadsheets on them for people to call and we'd start calling and I think we'd do that through to 8.30 or 9 pm .
Q. That was on a daily basis for those --
A. Seven days a week. Sorry, on the weekends, on the Saturdays and Sundays we'd go in during the day, not in the evening.
Q. Then you mentioned the Shop Distributive Association, the SDA?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. To your understanding, they made a contribution to your campaign?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did they do that?
A. I could only assume because of the factional ALP politics as a favour to Mr Feeney. I think they had a friendship with Ms Jackson too. I assume that's why they helped out.
Q. Then you say that Mr Shorten made a donation to your campaign?
A. Yes. I considered it extraordinary.
Q. How much did he contribute to your campaign?
A. I was told $\$ 5,000$.
Q. Who told you that?
A. Stephen Donnelly.
Q. When did he tell that you?
A. During the campaign, in the phone room one night, as
it says in my statement, I walked in. There was a bit of a
buzz around the place. I heard people saying, "Shorten's given us money." As soon as I heard that I went to find Mr Donnelly and found him and when I found him he was actually relaying that story to somebody and I asked him straight out, "Do you mean to tell me Shorten has donated money to us?" He said, "Yes," sort of half-laughing. I said, "How much?" He goes, "5,000." I said, "Why on earth would he do that? You know, he's our enemy." And he said, his words were, "He's having a bet both ways."
Q. Those were Mr Donnelly's word?
A. They were Mr Donnelly's words.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. When you say Mr Shorten gave you the money, it must have come out of some fund, presumably,
it wasn't Mr Shorten's personal money?
A. I couldn't say that, your Honour. I wouldn't know, your Honour.

MR STOLJAR: Q. In paragraph 20.21 you make reference to a tobacco company making a donation to your campaign.
A. Mmm.
Q. When did you find out about this?
A. Probably some time last year, around the middle of
last year. I was just having a social conversation with Robert Elliott who is a friend of mine and was the national secretary prior to Craig Thomson and we were talking. We were sort of debriefing or just having a chat about what had gone on in the 2012 election and he just made an off-the-cuff remark. He said, "Didn't Feeney" - we were talking about how I was outgunned financially in 2012. He said, "Didn't Feeney get your tobacco money again?" I said, "What?" He said, "Well, he got it for you in 2009." I was surprised to hear that. Shortly after I spoke to Kathy Jackson and I told her about the conversation with Rob Elliott and she said, "Yes, didn't you know?" And then we had subsequent conversations about it and she said, "I recall you being at this lunch." And when she told me the name of the restaurant, who was there, I do recall being at a lunch, but that's further on in my statement, but not even knowing it was from Philip Morris.
Q. Is this fair to say, that you, as you sit here now, don't know precisely whether or not Philip Morris made that donation?
A. I can't say it precisely, no.
Q. You wouldn't know how much or anything like that?
A. No.
Q. It is just something you've discovered or that was suggested to you later?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: $Q$. You said you were surprised by this revelation?
A. Well, your Honour, I couldn't see what interest Philip Morris would have in supporting a candidate in the Health Services Union. It's not that I could convince employers to allow smoking in their workplace. I just couldn't think what I could offer, what would be in it for

Philip Morris, what would motivate them. Yeah, I could not think of any logical reason.

MR STOLJAR: $Q$. Then you identify some other persons on page 7. I'11 perhaps take you through each of those. I'11 just ask you perhaps about the person identified in paragraph 20.37. Do you know why Nazih Elasmar made a donation to your campaign?
A. No. All I got told was, because I remember, I got told this Nazih Elasmar had made contributions and I got told he was Diana Asmar's uncle, or related to Diana Asmar, and so I asked, "Well, why would he be giving me money?", given she's - and I got told there was a family feud; he didn't like his relative. I don't know. I can't recall specifically what sort of a relative she was, so I'm assuming - and I think - and I assume, again, I'm assuming, he was involved in the factional ALP politics.
Q. In your statement you then move to dealing with Mr Williamson and his supporters and you make the point that in August 2011 there was prominent media coverage concerning allegations against Mr Thomson and a bit later allegations against Mr Williamson. You describe the National Council Meeting in April 2010.
A. Yes.
Q. That's in paragraph 24. In fact, that was your first National Council Meeting.
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not sure whether the timing is quite right here, Mr Bolano, because it says in April 2010. You're dealing with a meeting, but that was a meeting attended by someone from Slater \& Gordon --
A. Yes .
Q. -- who talked about Mr Thomson, so that must have been a later meeting, was it?
A. Apri1 2010 - sorry, that was Apri1 2011.
Q. Oh, I see. I'm sorry, I may have --
A. Is that a typo or is that - no, it was April 2011.

I'm sorry about that, I didn't pick that up.
Q. No. It may be that that meeting --
A. No, no, it was 2010.
Q. I'm sorry, although that appears after paragraph 21, you're dealing with an earlier time when the allegations hadn't become public; is that right?
A. Oh, they were out in the - they were out in public, the allegations against Thomson. I think they had been since 2009 or 2008.
Q. In any event, this is a meeting that took place in April 2010. Representatives of Slater \& Gordon were there. Who had asked them to be there, do you know?
A. I don't know who asked for them to be there.
Q. Who were they acting for? Which branch --
A. I think for the union. I believe they were acting for the national union and Mr Fowlie had come along to give a briefing on the Thomson matter.
Q. You say what Mr Fowlie said in paragraph 28 and then in paragraph 29 you say you thought something to yourself. Did you say that to anyone?
A. No, I didn't say that to anybody, no.
Q. In 32 you're coming to the period January 2011, but did you have any conversation with anyone from the credit union about Mr Williamson that caused you concerns at about this time?
A. Yes. There had been things arousing the suspicion of Ms Jackson and I, you know, unusually high expenditure, et cetera, but somewhere between the middle of 2010 and maybe spring 2010, a lady from the SGE Credit Union, I just remember her Christian name being Fiona, Fiona Dunn I think her name is, rang me up and I had a relationship with her and she rang up and said, "Oh, our deputy CEO," and his name was either Paul Wills or Paul Willis, "is in Melbourne in the next few days. He wants to catch up and have a coffee." So I said, "Yes, fine" and we made a date. I met him at --
Q. You were the secretary at this stage?
A. I was the deputy general secretary. The merger had just been ratified by Fair Work Australia.
Q. Yes. Did you go to coffee?
A. Yes, went to coffee.
Q. Who was there?
A. Myself, Fiona and this Paul Willis or Wills.
Q. Do you remember where it was?
A. It was at a cafe in Clarendon Street in

South Melbourne. I can't - I remember we were sitting at a table outside on the pavement. I can't remember the name of the cafe but it was near the corner of Clarendon Street and Park Street in South Melbourne.
Q. Did Mr Wills or Willis say something to you?
A. Yes. He initially said the reason he wanted - you know, he congratulated me and the reason he wanted to talk is that SGE had this idea. Every year the union would send out new membership cards to its members and they'd be plastic cards similar in dimension to a credit card and obviously this cost the union money in postage and the making of the actual cards and he offered a proposal from SGE where they were offering - they'd purchased the machine that printed these cards and he was offering to print the cards for us and cover the cost and mail them out to our members if SGE could put their logo on the cards and effectively advertise their brand. I said to him, "That's sounds like a good idea but I'm no longer the secretary. The merger's gone through. Michael is now the secretary. You need to talk to him." And he said to words to the effect - he lamented it. He goes, "Oh, so you're telling I have to talk to Michael about this?" And I said, "Yes." And he goes, "Every time" - well, he swore and then he said, "Every time I go to Michael with something like this he always says, 'What's my cut?'" He actually gesticulated with his hand like this.
Q. You're cupping your hand and pulling your fingers together?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm just noting it for the transcript.
A. Yes. And I was stunned and I --
Q. Someone might want to put something into the hand?
A. Yes. And I just sort of made him believe it went over my head, I didn't react to it, and then I immediately went back and had a meeting or advised Ms Jackson of what I've heard, what I'd heard.
Q. In paragraph 32 you say that:

In about January 2011, after ear1ier doubts
and suspicions, Ms Jackson and I became almost certain that there was systemic corruption ...

Et cetera. And in part your doubts and suspicions were founded upon the conversation that you had had in the cafe? A. Yes .
Q. In 33 you say you were aware that Mr Williamson "had in the past fabricated 'financial irregularities' to get rid of an official or employee who did not submit to his will." You say that Mr Williamson and Mr Gerard Hayes had said something to you about that. Can you just tell me about that conversation? Where were you?
A. We were at a restaurant in the Crown Casino. It was an Italian restaurant. I don't remember the name of it.
Q. Who was present?
A. There were a few officials from the HSU. I don't recall Ms Jackson being there. It was all the New South Wales officials and there was myself from Victoria and then there was a group of people from the SG - I think it was the SGE Credit Union. He'd had some sort of I suppose you'd call it a team-building day in Victoria that day and then invited some of us out for dinner, including myself, and we were at the bar having a drink, having a conversation, waiting for a table, and Mr Williamson was telling a number of anecdotes and then he talked about - a name of a person came up, I can't remember the name, I don't know if it was a staff member or an official, and they started talking about how problematic he was and it was apparent to me that he was problematic because he didn't toe the line. And Mr Williamson - and he told this as a humorous anecdote - told me this fellow was being sent by the union to the United States. I can't remember if it was to do work with another union or for a conference or something, it may have been to do work with another, to sort of be a guest of one of the US unions, and Mr Williamson had a meeting with this fellow, this is what Mr Williamson said, that he had a meeting with this fellow to advise him he was going over and that he could use his union credit card for personal expenses while he was over in the United States. And he, you know, emphasised how clever he was because this was a verbal assurance; it was never put in writing. The fellow subsequently went off to the United States, came back, Williamson hauled him in and said, "Please explain all this expenditure." This fellow
said, "Well, you said I could use my union credit card." Williamson said, "I never said anything of the sort." He was removed from the union. I don't know if he was sacked or there was a - if there was a settlement but he was basically - he departed shortly after and Hayes was standing next to Williamson laughing along and giving the impression and filling in the gaps, so to speak. I got the impression that Mr Hayes knew the story.
Q. What was Mr Hayes' position at the time?
A. He was a divisional secretary.
Q. And then skipping over a few pages, as you know, on

12 September 2011 - you mention this on page 11 of your statement - Ms Jackson made a formal complaint to the New South Wales Police and then about a week later, in fact, four days later, there was a meeting at the councils of HSU East and HSU East Branch and you set out who was in attendance on page 12?
A. I want to clarify. That's who was on the council at the time. I can't say with precision whether they were actually at the meeting.
Q. Were you there in person or --
A. I was - Ms Jackson and I were in the Melbourne office on teleconference.
Q. Had Ms Jackson distributed a set of resolutions prior to that?
A. Yes, she had.
Q. What were the general terms of them?
A. The general terms were that he should be stood down and that we shouldn't pay his legal fees and there were others too.
Q. Did those resolutions get up?
A. No.
Q. Was there a vote?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you speak in favour of the resolution?
A. I spoke against - in favour of Ms Jackson's
resolution?
Q. Yes.
A. I believe I did.
Q. You address this in paragraph 56 and elsewhere, but what happened if you or Ms Jackson contributed to the meeting?
A. It was just screaming on the other end. We obviously - there was a conference phone on the table where we were and it was on loudspeaker. Any time we opened our mouths there'd be screaming and jeering and there was no way we could be heard at the other end, I don't believe.
Q. Were people saying things?
A. Oh, the tenor of - the main gist of what they were saying was, "You should have come to us first. You've got ulterior motives. You want to take over." Any time I spoke there were inferences or word to the effect that I was Kathy's puppet. I think there was a reference made to a string coming out of my back which Kathy was pulling, but I can't remember what was precisely said, aside from, you know, "Dogs", you know, "You pricks," "You bastards." There was swearing and basically that we'd betrayed Mr Williamson and we had ulterior motives.
Q. A resolution was passed. I suppose, firstly, council declined to pass a resolution standing Mr Williamson down? A. That's right.
Q. You deal with this in paragraph 59, but there was talk of an internal investigation, was there?
A. Yes, to be conducted by John Murphy who had been used as a barrister by Mr Williamson who I was informed often enjoyed a drink with Mr Williamson, but they were friendly, yes.
Q. When you say that he was friendly with Mr Williamson, you don't know that for yourself; you only know that you heard that from someone else?
A. Kathy Jackson told me, yes.
Q. You deal with the convention on page 16 of your statement. I think you touch on this in 88. Tell us about how many delegates went to the convention?
A. I estimated 800 to 900 .
Q. There was a dinner the night before.
A. That's right.
Q. On the 13th. In fact, we're now at the point - this is one of the corrections you made at the outset - when certain people who were "acting up" to the positions or a position --
A. The council meeting - did you say the dinner? The council meeting was before the dinner, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Can I just query whether a correction should be made to paragraph 85. In paragraph 89 you talk about Sunday, 13 November 2011. In paragraph 85 you talk about late October 2010. Should that be 2011? A. Yes, your Honour.

MR STOLJAR: Q. In paragraph 97 you're dealing with things that were said to you at the dinner the evening before by New South Wales delegates?
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. I just wanted you to tell us a bit about the proceedings the following morning. You were actually in the audience at the convention?
A. Yes, they didn't put us on the stage; the Victorian contingent that is. Me and Ms Jackson were in the audience.
Q. You deal with this in 99 and 100 of your statement.

What did you notice at about 10.30?
A. The spotiight which was on the stage swung to a side door and it opened. You know, it was obviously - whoever was on the spotlight knew he was coming. I actually believe his son was on the spotlight but I could be wrong about that. And the door opened and Mr Williamson walked in. He was leaning on his wife and immediately organisers - I remember Mr Williamson's brother, Daryl Williamson standing up and cajoling the members in the front. A11 the New South Wales contingent had been put in the front of the theatre or the conference room and they all stood up and cheered enthusiastically and then the 'Rocky' theme came on and Williamson just waved, my observation was it looked like the Queen when she's passing, sort of that, and looking ahead with a smile on his face and waving to his adoring supporters.
Q. And then there was some debate the following day.

That was about a resolution and the particular resolution was called "Item 68".
A. Mmm-hmm.
Q. I'11 just try and track down a copy of that. Yes. If you go to tab 2, page 8, in the bottom right-hand corner.
A. Page, sorry?
Q. Page 8 in the bottom right-hand corner of your bundle, in your folder of materials.
A. Oh, right. Yes.
Q. That's item 68 and then at the top of page 9 , it was a resolution condemning the actions of the executive president?
A. You say in tab 8?
Q. Sorry, tab 2 --

THE COMMISSIONER: Tab 2, page 8.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Page 8. There's page numbering in the bottom right-hand corner.
A. Yes.
Q. If you come over to page 9, the short point is that the resolution was to the effect of that set out in the penultimate paragraph before item 69:

We endorse a vote of no confidence in Kathy Jackson ... as Executive President.

And in addition, a demand that the union council demerge and create an ACT/New South Wales Branch, et cetera, so unwind the merger that had been put into place a year or so before.
A. Yes, basically, yes.
Q. Coming back to your statement, there's a debate about item 68 on 15 November 2011. How long did the debate go?
A. Three and a half to four hours.
Q. Did people speak for and against?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you speak?
A. I spoke against.
Q. Against? What happened when you spoke? What was the reaction of the New South Wales delegates?
A. Well, I got up - as soon as I stood up and walked towards the microphone there was booing and jeering and actually when I got up to the microphone I was even heckled by Michael Williamson. He stood up and he called me "Sunshine" for some reason, I don't understand why, and I proceeded to speak and they just kept saying, "Bullshit", "Bullshit", you know, and someone would ask a question or make an assertion from the crowd, I'd go to answer it and my microphone would be turned down. I later found out I thought it may have been technical problems because I think the sound engineers were independent, but I later found out that Mr Pollard, the President and the Chair of the meeting, had a volume control within his reach and he was --
Q. That's just something someone's told me?
A. Yes, someone's told me.
Q. Just concentrating on what you actually heard and saw, paragraph 126 and following of your statement, these are things that you actually heard people calling out or saying when you were --
A. There was one fellow - people were calling me

Carl Williams because one of the members from New South Wales who was speaking in favour of the motion kept - in his - when speaking for the motion he kept referring to me as Carl Williams and then it caught on. It seemed to have caught on. And Carl Williams - I assumed he was speaking about Carl Williams the gangster from Victoria who had been murdered in prison a week or two earlier and there was speculation in the media that he'd been murdered because he was a police informant. Carl Williams was a common theme. You know, "You've thrashed the union." "You've brought your Victorian shit to this union." When I said, you know, that substantial evidence had been given to the police, I was just laughed at and accused of being a liar.
Q. In paragraph 138 and following of your statement, you describe some difficulties you began to experience in accessing information. Can you give - I know you've set this out in a bit of detail over the next few pages - some examples of the sorts of things you're talking about there? A. The major thing is to write to a number of members, whether you need to send a newsletter to members at a
certain workplace about EBA negotiations, whether it is something you need to tell all the membership, you would access the membership system or the clerical staff would do it. My understanding how it worked is the data of the members you wanted to send the mail to would be shifted or put - by the membership system - put on an Exce1 spreadsheet by the membership system and then automatically I think, and then there would be a mail merge and that mail merge would print out address labels and then it's a matter of just sticking them on and sending them. They cut that off. We could not look at data - we could only look at data for one member at a time. We could put a member's name in and see their data but we could not get group data, names of members in the workplace, names of members overall, their addresses, and we obviously couldn't - we didn't have, they took away any authorisation in Victoria to trigger the sort of mail merges you need to do to a mass mail-out or a mail-out to a number of members that. That, of course, effectively meant that you could not communicate with members.

If you went out to a member - for instance, if you had a members' meeting in a public hospital where we had a lot of members, a good turnout, a really good turnout for a members' meeting would be 10 per cent of the total membership there; usually it was 2 to 5 per cent. Even a well-attended mass members meeting you would only be talking 10 per cent of the people in the workplace. You had to communicate by mail. Email wasn't effective, even though we couldn't do that either, but to get a message through to the wider membership it had to be done by mail or some sort of written communication and we were just absolutely unable to do that after - yes, after this period.
Q. Why couldn't you do that? What stopped you?
A. We couldn't actually - one, we couldn't actually generate address labels, generate a mail-out to all those people.
Q. Because you couldn't access --
A. We didn't have access, we didn't have the passwords.

They changed the access codes and then --
Q. Who is they?
A. Peter Mylan in New South Wales and then there was a directive that all mail, that any mail we sent out had to
go through, had to be sent, a draft had to be sent to Sydney and they would okay it and they would sign it and they would send it out. So they obviously weren't going to send out anything that was adverse to them and $I$ actually wonder, given feedback I was getting from members, if they actually even ever sent out straightforward industrial emails about industrial matters, because more and more members said, "No, I didn't get that newsletter, no."
Q. Can you come to page 26. You're dealing there with events of December 2011, the National Council Meeting of the HSU. Had you been yourself engaged in any negotiations with respect to an EBA at that time?
A. Yes. Kathy Jackson and $I$ attended initial meetings with the Department of Health and the VHIA and then after the initial meetings, our senior industrial officer took carriage of the negotiations.
Q. Can you remember roughly when they started?
A. Informal talks probably started in the middle of probably the middle of 2011, the initial talks, discussions, started.
Q. Had those discussions reached fruition in a general sense by December 2011?
A. By November 2011, yes.
Q. By November 2011?
A. Yes, I think by late November 2011.
Q. An EBA had been agreed in substance?
A. It was an in-principle agreement.
Q. Who was covered by the NBA (sic)?
A. The EBA?
Q. The EBA, I'm sorry.
A. It covered public hospitals. It was a multi-employee agreement, so it covered pretty much all non-clinical workers in public hospitals, managers, administrative officers and health professionals.
Q. It covered the members of what?
A. What were formerly the No 1 and No 3 branches.
Q. Yes. The agreement had been reached. Did you regard it as a beneficial EBA?
A. Yes. We actually got around the government wages policy and got a better outcome for our members than what the government wages policy was at the time, I don't know if it still is, without giving up any conditions which initially the government said, "If you want to go beyond the wages policy, you've got to give something up." So we felt we were quite successful, we hadn't given anything up, particularly for our lower-paid workers covered by the agreement, we got a resulting pay rise that went well beyond the government wages policy.
Q. Did the EBA have the support of the members?
A. Certainly.
Q. How do you know that?
A. Well, in the first week in December we convened a meeting of members, two meetings in fact, one for the health professionals, the former No 3 Branch members and one for the rest which were the former No 1 Branch members at Trades Hall. The VHIA on behalf of the Department of Health agreed to release staff affected by the agreement for a couple of hours to come to the meeting and Peter Mylan in fact agreed in providing what - we ran buses, either coaches or minibuses from the major hospitals for anyone that wanted to come along and Mr Mylan actually agreed to cover the costs of those, because Kathy and I couldn't authorise it at that stage, and so I think the health professionals meeting - and I estimate this, I know the capacity of the room is about 600 , so I estimate that about 500 came to the health professionals meeting and the room was almost full for the No 1 Branch meeting, so I could safely estimate about 600 for that.
Q. Are these the meetings you refer to in paragraph 173 and following of your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in 176 that the members across the two meetings overwhelmingly endorsed the EBA?
A. Yes. Only three members voted against it. I know it was three members because they approached me after the meeting and apologised for voting against it. They understood our pragmatic position, but the only reason they voted against it was a protest against the government's wages policy. Go figure. I don't know what the effect of that was, but yes, it was overwhelmingly endorsed.
Q. Would you come back to the meeting I was asking you about at 159. You say there was a National Council Meeting. At 162 you say that the secretary of the Victoria No. 2 Branch, which was not part of the HSU East Branch, said that health professionals working in mental health should be included in membership of No. 2 Branch?
A. That's correct.
Q. Just explain that. What was your understanding let's take it in steps. Health professionals working in mental health, you had treated them as part of No 1 Branch, had you?
A. No, number 3 .
Q. Number 3. The suggestion was, in effect, that they should come across to number 2 ; is that right?
A. Yes, he was claiming them - he claimed - under his interpretation of the rules of the union, he claimed they were his.
Q. Don't speculate, but do you know any reason why that proposal was made?
A. I'd just be speculating, yes.
Q. At 165 you say that the acting general secretary of the HSU East Branch agreed with the proposal?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say, "I thought this was extraordinary." Why did you think that was extraordinary?
A. A union secretary or any official just doesn't give up its members willy-nilly. I mean, there are always demarcation disputes. There have been within the HSU and in other unions. In fact, Mr Williamson years earlier had claimed that the disability workers in No 1 Branch, and I was one of them, were his and made claims on them and they weren't just handed over to him. He was vigorously resisted and it never happened. Whether it's a few hundred members, my estimate was 1,000. I've never heard of a union secretary in a demarc, or a demarcation dispute, just handing them over without debate, without argument, without a fight: "Yes, all right, I agree with you, you can have them." That's effectively what happened.
Q. Was there a vote?
A. There was a vote of the National Council.
Q. Which way did you vote - against?
A. Against the proposal.
Q. Which way did New South Wales vote?
A. For the proposal.
Q. There's a lot more New South Wales --
A. Yes.
Q. -- representatives on the council, so it went through?
A. Yes.
Q. What effect did that have on the EBA that had been negotiated?
A. Well, at that time, on the day this resolution went through, we didn't think it would have an impact on the EBA. They ordered Kathy - part of that resolution was ordering Kathy to read out some statement at the end of those members' meetings the following day, basically saying, "The members don't belong to you - to us." And she was clearly told that if she didn't do that it would be considered misconduct and she could be removed from office.

She ultimately did read the statement but at the end of the meeting when everybody was walking out, but the effect - we went and had those meetings the next day. The EBA was overwhelmingly endorsed and obviously the VHIA Department of Health were told, "Our members accept the deal." Al1 that needed to be done from there on was for the agreement to be properly drafted and then circulated amongst affected employees for a period of time, I believe it was either two weeks or 21 days, and then there would be a ballot and we would recommend members vote in favour of the agreement.
Q. But that didn't happen?
A. No. Not long after that meeting Mr Mylan wrote - in his capacity as the acting general secretary, wrote to Mr Djoneff, who was the CEO of the VHIA who were representing the Department of Health.
Q. Is that letter behind tab 15 and on page 378 of the bundle? Just have a look at tab 15.
A. I think that's the second letter. He did send one on 1 December which I couldn't locate, but the gist of the letter was that Ms Jackson didn't have authority or he's taken away her authority to agree to the agreement.
Q. Because members had moved out of, in effect, No 1 Branch and --
A. Yes, because we weren't seeking to cover those mental health health professionals in the agreement. My recollections are that initially the employers, or the employer group and employers said, "We11, on your bike" and intended to proceed.
Q. I just want to understand something a bit more about the letter, if you've still got it.
A. I've got the second one, the 16 th.
Q. The second one?
A. Yes.
Q. In the penultimate paragraph beginning "As the Acting General Secretary"?
A. The penultimate one, yes.
Q. The paragraph beginning "As the Acting General

Secretary"?
A. Yes.
Q.
... and the authorised Officer to conclude an agreement on behalf of HSU East ...

Just pausing there, the practical consequence of the resolution passed at the National Council Meeting in December 2011 was that the mental health workers had moved across from HSU East to No. 2 Branch?
A. Yes, but they weren't actually transferred across. The way it was done in the end was that Mylan just wrote to them all and said, "You need to be members," words to the effect of, "You need to be members of the No. 2 Branch, so I've resigned you off our system. Here a membership form to the No. 2 Branch. You need to join them." It wasn't a clean transfer. They were sort of dumped and told, "You need to join No. 2 Branch."
Q. What was being put was that there would need to be an amendment to the EBA expressed so as to "expressly and unambiguously exclude employees engaged in or in connection with mental health services"?
A. Yes.
Q. Would that have required a renegotiation of the EBA?
A. From the employer's perspective, they would have had to go back to the table in regards to this group of people, which I don't think - which I imagine wasn't desirable for them.
Q. Would you come back to your statement. You say in 181:

The Department of Health decided to proceed in accordance with the terms which had been agreed with Ms Jackson.

When you say "agreed", you mean agreed in principle? A. Yes .
Q. And then No. 2 Branch took the matter to Fair Work Australia?
A. That's right.
Q. And then the short point is they lost at first instance but then were successful on appeal?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the effect was that you say, in 184, "... the agreement was delayed for a period of nine months after Ms Jackson and I had already informed members ...", et cetera, "... that they would have their pay rises, and back pay ..." What effect did that have on the attitude of members, that delay?
A. Because we a - we were confident. We said to them at this meeting, "You may have your pay rises and back pay before," because they were getting two separate pay rises and the first of those two separate pay rises would be back pay for a substantial period of time, and we told them at the meeting, "You'll have your pay rises and back pay maybe before Christmas, but just after Christmas at the latest." I remember my words were, you know, "In time to pay off your credit cards for your Christmas expenditure." They were quite excited about that obviously. As time went on they grew increasingly agitated, more and more agitated, to the point where it was just outright hostility, that we lied to them, that we didn't have a deal, and I can understand why they thought that, and our telephone centre were getting calls and members were becoming abusive, aggressive, loud, and the tenor of it was that they'd been duped by the union, been lied to, that there was no deal,
they didn't have their pay rises and other, you know whereas, in their view, they were seeing the nurses in negotiations and other unions' negotiations in advancement. Even though ours was concluded, they weren't getting the results of it. They didn't have their new agreement. Yes, it increasingly grew hostile to the point of venom.
Q. Were a large number of workers affected?
A. About 7,000 or 8,000 of our members were affected, but it would have affected 50,000 workers overall.
Q. How long was the delay?
A. Nine months. An agreement they should have had in January 2012 they didn't get until October 2012, I think.
Q. In 188 you set out your view as to what the intentions were of certain persons in achieving that, but that's just your belief and understanding. Those persons may well have a different account, of course?
A. Yes. I don't think they could argue they were acting in the interests of the members and I think - that's a major objective of the secretary of the union, to act in what's in the best interests of members. I don't believe you could argue --
Q. Why do you say that?
A. Well, it's in the rules.
Q. Quite, they couldn't argue that, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Could I then ask you about Ms G1en who you have some evidence about on page 31. What were Ms G1en's - what was her position?
A. Prior to the merger she was the president of the No 1 Branch and then after the merger she was made - she became one of the divisional secretaries.
Q. She was in Victoria?
A. Yes.
Q. Was she, as it were, seen as an ally of yourself and Ms Jackson?
A. Oh, yes, my word. She ran - she ran on my ticket in 2009 and she socialised with Ms Jackson and I; I mean visited our respective homes. We considered her a friend.
Q. You say in 194 you received an email saying that Ms Glen had resigned. Was she, to your knowledge, made redundant or resigned?
A. She resigned. She sent Ms Jackson and I a text message saying she was resigning. I don't see how she could have been made redundant. I mean, her position was an elected position, divisional secretary. She wasn't made redundant, she was replaced. She'd only had about two years service, she wouldn't have been eligible for much of a redundancy, but the position was not made redundant.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a convenient time?
MR STOLJAR: Yes, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn until 2 pm .
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

## UPON RESUMPTION

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Stoljar.
MR STOLJAR: Just one housekeeping matter, Commissioner. I think I neglected to provide the original of Mr Bolano's statement and Bolano MFI1 and I do that now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Mr Bolano, I was asking you some questions about Ms Glen that you deal with at page 31 of your statement. You told me just before the break that Ms G1en resigned her position.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know from your own knowledge whether Ms G1en received any payment from the HSU upon her resignation?
A. I suspected at the time, but I found out for certain some time later that she continued to receive $\$ 15,400$ a month for a year after her resignation, so from December 2011 to December 2012.
Q. How did you find that out?
A. A staff member at the union last - sorry, at the end of 2012 provided me with the cashflow projections.
Q. Is that the document that you have at tab 18, page 387 ?
A. Yes, and if you go down to page - I think it's on the first page, yes, "Payments under agreement Carol G1en", I think the date indicates it's payable until the 31 December 2012, and they seem to have budgeted for further payments until that date.
Q. Where do you get the budgeting figure? You mean just in the columns to the right of the --
A. I think this document was produced in about August 2012 and if you see the Carol Glen line, I don't know why one payment in August is 10,444 , but then there's subsequent payments due of 15,418 in September, October, November and December 2012, which were prospective at the time this document was prepared.
Q. It was prepared during the course of all this, was it?
A. It was prepared when the union was in administration subsequent to all this.
Q. But you are extrapolating, are you, that if those payments were made in September, October, or budgeted for for September, October, November, et cetera, that they would have commenced about the time of the resignation? A. Yes.
Q. And that's your evidence for the proposition that she received about - I think you say in your statement around about 180,000?
A. Yeah, the total, being the sum total of those monthly payments which was her - basically, her annual salary. Her annual salary was around $\$ 180,000$-odd.
Q. I see. You're drawing the conclusion or inference that in rough terms the salary just continued?
A. For 12 months.
Q. For 12 months. And you express the conclusions in paragraph 210?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any more information about the circumstances in which Ms Glen had resigned?
A. Aside from thinking her sudden resignation was unusual and that there was - subsequent to her resignation there were meetings between herself, Mr Mylan and Mr Hayes, there was - one of our staff has contacted her, she was
a Facebook friend of Ms G1en's, and there was a conversation on Facebook within a few days of her resignation between her and her partner, I believe, talking about picking up a cheque.
Q. What I'm getting at I suppose is what was your position at this time?
A. My position within the union?
Q. Yes.
A. I was the deputy general secretary.
Q. And Ms Glen's position?
A. Divisional secretary.
Q. And did the divisional secretary report to you?
A. Yes.
Q. And who had entered into these negotiations, to your
knowledge?
A. Well, I think it was Peter Mylan and Gerard Hayes because they acknowledged at a subsequent council meeting they had met with her, although they wouldn't tell us why they'd met with her. Post - a few days after her resignation they met with her. They came down to Melbourne and met with her. Ms Glen had told that to her friend, which was a staffer of ours, and she'd relayed that to us. In the council meeting, I think of 14 December 2011, we put that assertion to Mr Hayes and Mr Mylan. They conceded that they had met with her but they refused to explain why.
Q. Can I come to the 2012 election and you deal with this on page 34 of your statement. I think you say in 228 that you had - that there were three tickets in the 2012 election - your ticket, Ms Asmar's ticket and Mr Lovell's ticket?
A. That's correct.
Q. But Mr Lovell didn't have a great deal of campaign money, so it was really a struggle --
A. Well, I deduced that he didn't have a great deal of campaign money because he never sent a mail-out. There was I think one newsletter and a how-to-vote that was circulated in hospitals, in a couple of hospitals, so there was no mail-out that I know of, so I assumed he had little money.
Q. Who was funding your campaign?
A. Initially, we started off - we were going to self-fund it but we ran out of money pretty quickly, so David Feeney assisted in getting a donation from the SDA.
Q. You deal with this $I$ think in paragraph 249. In subparagraphs (a) through to (g) you identify some relatively small payments?
A. Yes. What I refer to as relatively small payments were contributions of staff that supported me which was most, if not all, of the staff in Victoria, when we knew there was going to be an election, started putting money into a bank account on a weekly basis or in lump sums as they had it, and that money ranged from $\$ 50$ per deposit to on the odd occasion $\$ 1,000$.
Q. On the next page you identify in subparagraphs (h) and (j) respectively two cheque deposits?
A. Yes.
Q. From a Westpac account named Friends of Democracy?
A. I didn't know that was the name of the account at the time. I've discovered that more recently.
Q. But do you understand that that is, in effect, a donation from the SDA?
A. I knew the first $\$ 20,000$ to be - I'd been told that the SDA had contributed $\$ 20,000$, so recently when I was going through the bank account we had for that election, I identified that $\$ 20,000$ payment being a cheque payment, so I knew that was - must have been the one from the SDA but I ultimately checked with the Commonwealth Bank recently and they confirmed it was from Friends of Democracy and who the signatories were.
Q. And that was the same for the --
A. The $\$ 10,000$ one that came later.
Q. Why did the SDA contribute to your campaign?
A. Well, the reason I was told was that they were friends of Mr Feeney and they were going to be friends of mine.
Q. How did you come to have Mr Feeney helping you in this campaign?
A. It was a conversation - there was a conversation between me and Feeney where it was acknowledged that we were running out of money and Mr Feeney said he would try and talk to the SDA, to Michael Donovan specifically.
Q. In subparagraph (k), you refer to another transfer of \$20,000-odd?
A. Yes .
Q. Do you know how that money came to be paid in?
A. I didn't at the time and obviously when I saw it on the bank account, I had no idea where it came from.
Melissa Butler, who was depositing the money and taking it out, couldn't remember, so I rang the Commonwealth Bank on 23 May this year and they advised me it was transferred from another Commonwealth Bank account. For some reason the fellow from the bank on the phone to me couldn't identify which bank account it came from, but said it was recorded as a donation from Liberty Sanger.
Q. Do you understand that to be coming from Maurice Blackburn?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. Well, in --
A. I've known Ms Sanger for a few years.
Q. I see.
A. Yes. It might have been - I took it from being from her personally.
Q. That's how you funded your campaign. Perhaps just before we leave that, you say in 251:

My campaign in 2012 was not as well organised ...

There is a Mr Maxfield who helped you out?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you come across Mr Maxfield?
A. Through Mr Feeney. I'd known Mr Maxfield from around the traps. He'd come to HSU functions and I'd met him here and there, but he assisted - look, he was recommended by Mr Feeney.
Q. And so he helped you organise your campaign?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you come back to paragraph 228. I've asked you about the three tickets.
A. Yes.
Q. You then go on to describe some mail-outs. You say that Ms Asmar sent out official mail-outs which identified her campaign. For example, one mail-out comprised a black and white envelope, et cetera. That is behind tab 24 , page 454.
A. Yes.
Q. It says:

Got your ballot paper?
And then you have some more pages from the mail-out. Then you have the envelope in which the mail-out was sent on page 458?
A. That's right.
Q. On that envelope is a set of numbers 001805024 ?
A. Correct.
Q. Is that mail merge information?
A. I'm assuming that. The mail we sent out - what you got from the Electoral Commission was an Excel - or the Australian Electoral Commission, an Excel spreadsheet with a list of names and members in alphabetical order. There was no numbering on it, just in alphabetical order, their surnames first, Christian names and then their postal addresses, that's it. We obviously fashioned, our team, a spreadsheet from that and we had no numbers on our spreadsheet and obviously I imagine, you know, it would be given to a mail house who would do a mail merge and generate or print envelopes.

Ms Asmar's mail I noticed had this number for different members in the top right-hand corner here. On this one it's 1805. Obviously, we wanted to get her mail-outs, you know, as soon as we could and I wasn't - even though I was a member, I wasn't receiving Ms Asmar's mail-outs and so members - and some of them staff, and particularly this member, Ms Hovey, who lived near one of my staffers, would hand over the mail as she got it and someone would scan it or photograph it and send it to me, so we had a lot of Ms Hovey's mail. So
I noticed - but I'd notice these numbers on other - you know, the recipients of our mail-outs from Ms Asmar and I came to the assumption that they must have been using the spreadsheet with the members numbered 1 through to 12,000 , or whatever the specific number was, but this number was always consistent for Ms Hovey.
Q. In 232 you deal with an anonymous mail-out?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say:
... one mail-out comprised.
a. a blue and white envelope with the words "Voting is Compulsory."
A. Yes.
Q. And a letter at 232(b):
"If you do not follow these steps when voting, your ballot will not be valid..." 233 says:

The letter does not identify who the sender is. There is also a reply paid envelope to the Electoral Commission.

Now, was voting compulsory in the union elections?
A. Certainly not.
Q. And what is the problem with sending out, apart from the fact that that proposition is false, that is, voting is compulsory, what is the problem with sending out a letter like this, what happens?
A. Well, firstly, it's dishonest, as you've mentioned, but what happens, Ms Asmar - when the ballot papers are drawn up by the AEC, they virtually draw lots to decide who is first, second, third and apparently the science suggests that if people feel compelled to vote, a lot of them donkey-vote and they'11 just tick the first box, and that's what happened in practice. That's what my scrutineers when the ballot was eventually counted reported. One scrutineer reported seeing 200 or approximately 200 ballot papers where people had just ticked the first box in each candidate and then later on when they had to pick the branch committee and ordinary members of the branch committee and management, there was 30 -odd candidates, they - for the vote to be formal, they had to pick eight of those and a lot of, you know, my scrutineers reported hundreds where they just ticked the first eight boxes, so the first box "secretary", first box "assistant secretary".

My candidate for assistant secretary was successful, and she was on the top, and every candidate from either me and Ms Asmar's ticket that were in the first eight on the ordinary membership of the branch committee and management all were successful. So there were two from my ticket and about five from Ms Asmar's and I think the people assisting Ms Asmar and indeed assisting me are well versed in elections and I imagine well versed in human behaviour around what they do when they don't, when they have no interest in voting but they think they're compelled to.
Q. It certainly wasn't sent out as part of your campaign mail-out; that's your evidence?
A. Sorry, I missed that.
Q. There were three tickets?
A. Yes.
Q. So there's yours?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't send out this mail-out?
A. Certainly not, no.
Q. And the third person, as far as you know, only sent one or two mail-outs or perhaps no --
A. None by mail, just a few documents handed out in workplaces and put on notice boards.
Q. And so that left Ms Asmar?
A. Yes.
Q. In 232 you mention the identifying number 1805.
A. Yes.
Q. If I take you to tab 25 , page 459 is the first page of the materials that were sent out by somebody, "Voting is Compulsory"?
A. Yes.
Q. It quotes the Commonwealth Electoral Act. It suggests that a penalty may be imposed if the person doesn't vote?
A. $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{mmm}$.
Q. And then propounds the proposition that the HSU election is an election conducted by the AEC?
A. $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{mmm}$.
Q. And gives instructions. And then if one looks at the envelope - well, if you go to page 460 , is that a copy of the envelope?
A. Yes.
Q. So it had that, "Voting is Compulsory" in large letters on the envelope, did it?
A. Yes .
Q. And the number 1805?
A. Yes, the one that was Ms Hovey.
Q. Ms Hovey again and she handed this over to you?
A. Or one of my team, not to me personally.
Q. And you've drawn the inference that --
A. I've drawn the conclusion --
Q. -- that the database that was being used by --
A. It came from the same database. The odds of that happening coincidentally without doing the mathematics I think would be extremely remote.
Q. Did you put to anyone, including Ms Asmar, that she'd sent out this anonymous mail-out?
A. I didn't put it to Ms Asmar personally, we didn't have any communications, but $I$ did put it to the press. I don't know - I can't remember if the story actually ran and then I got feedback from members that had been called by Ms Asmar's team campaigning that when they put to her their displeasure at receiving this, she just suggested that I did it.
Q. At 235 of your statement, page 36 , you say Ms Asmar publicly denied the second anonymous mail-out was sent by her campaign office. On what occasion, to your information --
A. By "publicly" I meant when she was in phone calls but also when she was out talking to members in the workplace, I was getting feedback around that time coming back through staff from members that Ms Asmar was going around saying, in public I meant - I don't know if she ever said it in the press, I can't recall, but in public, when meeting with members, she made the allegation that it was me.
Q. You didn't hear any of that, that's just something that was reported to you?
A. I can't recall hearing it other than it being reported to me.
Q. In paragraph 252 you have an estimate of what Ms Asmar would have, you say, received. I think you really mean funds that might have been deployed by her in campaign funding. Now, how have you come up with that figure? A. Based on the mail-outs that I've had in my possession which I've given to the Commission and based on the estimate at the time we had - the elections in 2012, we had a shade under 12,000 members and mail-outs in an envelope, from my experience, would cost approximately around 10 to
$\$ 12,000$, in the vicinity of $\$ 1$ per member, and then there are also DL cards, which are like postcards, that weren't sent in an envelope and they were cheaper obviously because there was no envelope and they cost in the vicinity of 8 to $\$ 10,000$. So knowing for sure that she had at least 23 or 24 mail-outs, because I was in possession of them, you know, I could extrapolate that on mail alone she spent about \$200,000 and then there were huge posters, or posters of various sizes, many very big, just plastered over throughout every public metropolitan hospital, stickers just on walls everywhere and outside the public hospitals and expensive stickers. I say expensive because they were the type that they were extremely hard to remove and when hospitals - obviously, when they went up, hospitals would send their cleaning staff around and take them off and when they were putting parking meters outside the hospitals, the council would send people to clean them off and almost instantaneously they were back up, so she seemed to have a never-ending supply.

Now, I know there was a DVD mailed out and I know that is a bit more expensive than just sending regular mail; you know, it could be $20,000,30,000$. So I was able to - you know, it's beyond the guesstimate. I was able to, you know, reasonably estimate, you know, in my view, at least 300K. I just want to - in regards to the "Voting is Compulsory" letter in 2012.
Q. Yes.
A. I am also pretty confident it was Ms Asmar because she did the same thing in 2009 and admissions were made. That matter ended up in the Federal Court and her husband admitted that he'd caused ballot papers to be redirected to a post office box in his name.
Q. But that's just something - you're really drawing an inference there from matters that you're familiar with about Federal Court proceedings?
A. Yes.

MR STOLJAR: There's nothing further, thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well.
Q. It may be that you'll be called back here because some people may want to ask you questions about your statement,
but subject to that you're free to go for today.
A. Thank you, your Honour. Can I say a few words before I go.
Q. Yes.
A. I welcome this Royal Commission. I think, for the sake of working people across Australia, we have an economy in transition and they need unions like they've never needed them before, but they need unions that they control, that aren't beholden to the Labor Party or indeed any other political party, without the members choosing that, and I hope this Royal Commission addresses the issue of election funding because the reality is as a rank and file member $I$ could not have won the election in 2009 without the funding I received. I understand there's groups of members in Victoria and New South Wales wanting to challenge the incumbents in forthcoming elections. I wish them wel1 but I don't think they've got a chance because of their lack of financial resources.

I'd also finally like to add that $I$ believe it's no wonder whistleblowers don't come forward, whether it be in the union movement or elsewhere, after the treatment I've been subjected to and particularly Kathy Jackson, what I've seen happen to Kathy Jackson. I want to note that Kathy Jackson has been placed under far greater scrutiny that Michael Williamson or Craig Thomson were for blowing the whistle. I knew Kathy Jackson to run an effective union and there was no negative press about her before she went to the police and I hope after this Commission that there is something done to protect whistleblowers and stop them being marginalised and attacked and I thank you for your time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: Who is next, Mr Stoljar?
MR STOLJAR: The next witness is Ms Katrina Hart.
Commissioner, it may be that Ms Hart has just popped
downstairs. It might be worth adjourning for a few minutes
THE COMMISSIONER: If you wish to.
MR STOLJAR: I am in your hands, Commissioner. Oh, she's
here.
<KATRINA-ANNE PATRICIA HART, sworn:
[2.30pm]
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Have a seat. Is it Ms Hart?
A. Yes, Ms.

## <EXAMINATION BY MR STOLJAR:

MR STOLJAR: Q. Your full name is Katrina-Anne Patricia Hart - H-A-R-T?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And you are a resident of New South Wales?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And you are a clinical support officer?
A. Yes.
Q. You are also president of the Randwick Campus General Sub-branch of the Health Services Union New South Wales?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. You have prepared a statement in these proceedings?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Being your statement of 3 June 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that statement true and correct?
A. It is.

MR STOLJAR: I'd ask Commissioner that Ms Hart's statement be received into evidence together with a bundle of documents which has been marked "Katrina Hart MFI1"

THE COMMISSIONER: The statement will be received into evidence and the accompanying documents will be collectively called Hart MFI1.

HART MFI\#1 STATEMENT OF KATRINA HART DATED 3/6/2014 AND ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

MR STOLJAR: Q. Ms Hart, can you just tell me a little about your training and experience. Do you have any qualifications?
A. I do as a clinical support officer and I have a lot of
experience as a president. I represent a lot of members.
Q. Just tell me about your qualifications as a clinical support officer. Where did you do your training?
A. I did the training through the hospital, an administration certificate, which was part - it was compulsory for me to hold that position.
Q. When did you do that training?
A. Through the hospital. So I mean we went to training courses and there was actually a contracted - what do you call it - contracted education firm that actually trained us .
Q. When did you obtain that qualification?
A. 2010 .
Q. You've been a member though of the union since 2004 ?
A. Yes, around that time, yes.
Q. And when did you become the president of the Randwick Campus Sub-branch?
A. Actually 2011. I was on the committee but I actually became president when my predecessor died.
Q. You became president in 2011 and it was in that year, as you say in your statement, that Mr Williamson stood down and then Mr Mylan, Mr Hayes acted up, to use that expression, as did Ms Seymour and Mr Hull?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you've got a copy of your statement in front of you in the witness box?
A. I do.
Q. In fact, you say in paragraph 12 it was August 2011 you became president and it was the next month that allegations concerning Mr Williamson became public know1 edge?
A. That's correct. It was only a couple of weeks from me becoming president to the actual allegations.
Q. Were members coming to you and asking?
A. Oh, they were furious.
Q. And what were they saying to you?
A. They wanted to know if it was true. They wanted to
know if their money had been wasted. I had - like, we've got domestic services, so the cleaners, porters, they don't earn much money and they're paying $\$ 22.20$ a fortnight to a union and there's allegations out there that Williamson had actually misused their money; they were furious.
Q. Did you try and find out some more information about what had happened?
A. Constantly.
Q. Let's go to tab 1, first of all. This is an email. This is page 1 of your statement, it's behind tab 1, and when I say page 1, I am looking in the numbering in the top right-hand corner. Is this an email that you sent to Mr Mylan on about 5 October 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. Why were you asking for the minutes of union council meetings?
A. There were allegations of misuse of money,

Communigraphix, I think it was Access Focus, all those companies. It had all come out in the Sydney Morning Herald through Kate McClymont. So all those financials would have been in those council meetings and I also wanted to know who were responsible for voting it through. That would have been the documents that would have approved everything and I mean they refused to give them to me.
Q. Did you ever get them?
A. I got some from 2010 to 2009 from an ex-councillor, his name was Mark Hanran, and in the 2010 elections when it all merged, because he started asking questions, Williamson bumped him off the ticket, but he was the one that gave me all the minutes.
Q. This email on page 1 is addressed to Mr Mylan and Mr Hayes?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they respond to this email?
A. Never.
Q. Did they give you the minutes you'd asked for?
A. No.
Q. Could you come please to tab 4 of your statement and it's a bundle of documents beginning on page 7. I'11 take
you first of all to an email or to page 10 of that bundle. On page 10, that is the beginning of the email chain, if you look down the bottom, Wednesday, 5 October 2011, that's the email I just took you to?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you got no reply to that email?
A. Never.
Q. Then come through to page 9. You sent another email
on 16 December 2011?
A. That's correct.
Q. It is addressed to Mr Mylan and you've copied in Ms Jackson, Mr Hayes and Mr Bolano?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the subject matter is "Grave Concerns of the Direction of HSUeast", and you raise in summary in the first paragraph the fact that there are important issues relating to members that in your view weren't being addressed?
A. It wasn't being addressed. What was being addressed is slandering Kathy and Marco and the Victorians instead of actually representing the members, and the members have some really, you know, important issues, but none of that was addressed.
Q. You make that point in your emai1. You say that the New South Wales HSU East officials and councillors are consumed with eliminating Victoria and then you talk about item 68.
A. Yes.
Q. Was that the resolution debated at the annual convention that had taken place a few weeks before?
A. That's correct.
Q. Were you at that convention?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. I'11 come back to that. Coming down a couple of paragraphs, you say:

In late September, 2011 I wrote to you regarding accessing the Union Council minutes. To date $I$ have not received

> a reply ... It is my understanding this request has not been to Union Council.

And you asked Mr Mylan to attend to this matter immediately. Did you get any reply to your email?
A. Never. There was one he did reply on and I can't remember, and he wanted to know - because I was signing it off as president of the Randwick Campus General Sub-branch, he wanted to know - he was saying that I wasn't allowed to sign it off because it'd never gone to a sub-branch meeting which was untrue, I was allowed to do that, but he never actually answered any of the questions. I was told I wasn't allowed to have them. I was told that council had to - union council had to vote whether they were going to give them to me or not. I was told by Peter Mylan once that it was going to the next council meeting but, of course, it never did. Everything virtually I was told was a lie.
Q. When you say you were told, did you make verbal requests as well as the written requests?
A. Verbal, yes.
Q. Were they by telephone or in person?
A. Both.
Q. If you have a look at page 66 of the bundle, it's behind tab 13, is that the email to which you were just referring from Mr Mylan of 20 March 2012?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. His response is to say that you've signed off as the sub-branch president and wants to know when the branch committee and sub-branch met to endorse your actions?
A. Mmm.
Q. But save for that response, there was no email addressing the substance of your requests?
A. No. I think that was actually hypocritical of that email when prior we had actually sent resolutions through at sub-branch meetings to not pay for Michael Williamson's legal fees, to access the union council records, and to have guarantee that not one of our, like, members' money would be wasted, and for them to cooperate with the independent investigation. Now, they were all endorsed at sub-branch meetings and they were never acted on.
Q. Just come back to page 9 for me. This is your email of 16 December 2011. At the bottom of the page, the second-1ast paragraph, you say:

It is my belief the Union Council voted and carried motions [relating to merging members]. Twelve months later [they] are voting and carrying a motion to de-merge
... This could be construed, as effectively admitting their initial decision to merge was wrong ...

Then you talk about the use of members' fees. Is that also information you were after when you were trying to get the minutes?
A. Yes. I'd also said it could have been perceived, too, that it was retaliation for the whistleblowers for actually exposing corruption.
Q. What was retaliation?
A. The merging of New South Wales and Victoria.
Q. When you say "the whistleblowers", who are you referring to?
A. Marco and Kathy.
Q. On page 10, in the fourth last paragraph in that email you say:

When are the NSW HSUeast officials going to concentrate on the real issues ...rather then dividing and destroying this great union for what one could perceive as their own ... agenda or an attempt to conceal the alleged ...corruption. There are grave concerns within the rank and file...

Et cetera. Did you receive any response to that? A. Never.
Q. Did you receive any response at all from Mr Mylan and Mr Hayes to this email?
A. Never. I even asked Gerard Hayes why he wouldn't respond. He said it wasn't his place. I disagreed. He was meant to be the divisional secretary of New South Wales which meant he was meant to be looking after New South Wales, but he refused to even respond. I only got "read"
receipts.
Q. And then on page 7, this is your next email, so the one I was taking you to on page 9 was 16 December. The following month, 22 January 2012, this is on page 7, about the middle of the page, you say:

Dear Mr Peter Mylan ...
And so on and then you make reference in the paragraph beginning:

It has been reported the General
Secretary's salary is approximately \$380,000 per annum.

Did that come as a surprise to you?
A. Absolutely. I was shocked.
Q. You were shocked by the size of it?
A. Yes.
Q. Had that information not come out, as far as you were concerned, only as far as you were concerned, prior to that?
A. Never.
Q. Did the members of the sub-branch express any --
A. They were furious.
Q. About the size of the salary?
A. Yes, definitely, absolutely furious.
Q. The Randwick Campus Sub-branch, that is a large sub-branch in New South Wales, is it?
A. I should explain this. On the Randwick campus there's actually three sub-branches because of the size of the membership there. I'm in charge of the general sub-branch which is one of - probably the largest, second-largest sub-branches in the HSU and it was in HSU East when we were there.
Q. It was in?
A. It was either the largest or second largest. It could also be the largest now because I know a lot of members dropped out with the corruption that went on. I managed to save a lot of my members, to stay. Then we've got the

PAICT sub-branch, which is the professionals, and then we've got the HSMs which is the managers; so there's actually three sub-branches.
Q. And this is all in Randwick?
A. Yeah. I'm probably the only president that has to deal with - I've got four hospitals on one. I've got a mental health. I have health share. I've got pathology. No other sub-branch has what I have.
Q. In any event, the short point is this is a large sub-branch and expressing concerns about information?
A. Mmm, and I have to say so did the HSMs and the professionals, so they were very concerned as well.
Q. How successful were they in getting information?
A. No, neither, none of us got any information. I even had emails from other members, not even on our sub-branch, that still never got any information.
Q. Just continuing to look at the email chain that's behind tab 4, beginning on page 7 , I was asking you about the email beginning about the middle of the page on page 7 , 22 January 2012. Over the next page, page 8, you say:

Since October, 2011 I have written to you,
Mr Peter Mylan numerous times to access the
Council Minutes ...
You actually set out a series of resolutions that have been passed?
A. Yes.
Q. You received no reply to that either?
A. Never, and those resolutions never went to union council and they should have.
Q. At the top of page 7, yet another email, 14 February 2012:

Dear Peter
I note I still have not received an acknowledgement or reply to my emails below.

You make reference there to a union council meeting
when rank and file members refused to leave and your failure to answer questions and you said that your perception was that there'd been an attempt, as you put it, to cover up decisions made. Did you ever receive a letter denying that proposition?
A. Never.
Q. Then you say:

Considering rank and file members have been requesting an open and transparent Union, it is my perception your decision not to even acknowledge my emails or answer questions ... you are deliberately displaying an attitude of contempt towards members. This behaviour is deplorable.

May I remind you it is the RANK AND FILE MEMBERS who are this Union ... I therefore insist on an acknowledgement to my emails ...

What was Mr Mylan's position at that time?
A. Acting secretary.
Q. And Mr Hayes?
A. Acting deputy secretary.
Q. Going back to your statement, paragraph 17, you dea1 just to put you in context, you are dealing here with your attempts to get information when all of this is coming out and you say:

The executives of HSUeast office, including Mr Mylan ... informed me that it simply wasn't my place to ask questions.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have a conversation with Mr Mylan where he said that to you?
A. Via telephone.
Q. And where were you?
A. I was at work.
Q. Approximately when was this?
A. Oh, it was just before the convention, so --
Q. The convention was about mid-November 2011?
A. Yes, it was just a couple of weeks before then.
Q. Just tell me what happened in that conversation? What did you say to Mr Mylan, what did he say to you?
A. He was actually quite short with me. I rang him on his mobile and I used a blocked number because then he wouldn't know it's my number obviously. I told him it was Katrina Hart. I asked him if when he's going to answer my emails, when I'm going to get copies of the documents that I had actually asked for. I also said to him that under the union rules that my request had to go to union council. I have asked when the next council meeting was so that could actually go to union council, so I could get access to it, and basically he just listened for a while and then he said it wasn't my place, that $I$ was stirring up trouble, and I said, "No, I'm trying to get information for my members. They're asking questions."

They just - he just basically accused me of stirring up trouble, really, and the conversation didn't go for that long and he said, "Oh, I've got to go to a meeting now", and hung up. But if I had used my normal phone, he wouldn't have answered the call.
Q. In paragraph 24 you describe ringing Mr Brown. When did that conversation take place?
A. Shortly - I think it was shortly after I rang Peter Mylan. It was the first time I'd actually contacted Chris Brown. I'd never spoken to him before. I asked him why I couldn't get access to the documents. He was supposed to be, what was it, the acting president of the national council, the national branch. He basically said it was deplorable that I couldn't get access and I wasn't getting any - like, even an acknowledgement to my emails, but then he started rambling on and, you know, slandering Kathy and saying that she shouldn't have gone to the media and that she was, you know, bringing the union in disrepute and all that, and I got angry and I said, "Look, I'm not here about Kathy Jackson. I'm here about getting the information I've requested", and I asked him to speak to them. I don't think he ever did.
Q. Then you say in your statement that you sent an email
to Ms Jackson and that's behind tab 2. It is at page 3 of your bundle. The gist of your email is that, you say:
... I have some questions I need answering
as soon as possible. Members of our
sub-branch are asking multiple questions
daily ... [and we can't answer them.]
Had you written to anyone else, I mean someone local, before writing to Ms Jackson?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Who did you write to?
A. I wrote to Peter Mylan, Gerard Hayes, Kerrie Seymour and Michael Williamson. That letter there was just copied and pasted to Kathy about a week later. They saw it.
Q. Are you able to find that email that you sent?
A. I've been trying to go through most of them at work because it was sent from my work email address, so I am trying to find it.
Q. In any event, to your recollection, you sent an email about a week before to Mr Mylan and company?
A. That's correct.
Q. Asking, in essence, in very similar terms to the email to Ms Jackson?
A. That's correct, and I only discovered Kathy's email address via an article in the paper.
Q. Did you get any response to your email to Mr Mylan?
A. Never.
Q. So you wrote to Ms Jackson and you said, "Look, I'm trying to" - well, you tell me. You were trying to deal with your members' questions at this point, were you?
A. Definitely. They were angry. Some were quite abusive, actually. They wanted to know what was going on. I'd looked at the rules of the union and that's when I found - like you can see in that email where I found it was top heavy in New South Wales. I was trying to get confirmation about how everything was supposed to run and the structure and also like, eventually, I was trying to get the union minutes and all that. Kathy rang me probably a week after I sent the email.
Q. Yes. Just before we come to that, I just want to ask you about the top of page 4 and you said:

> I understand there is a police investigation underway ...

How did you know about that?
A. It was in the paper.
Q.
... [that] members need to be told something from HSUeast, we cannot leave them hanging like this. Just like myself, our members pay their fees and really should not be left in the dark.
A. That's correct.
Q. And you had put that to the New South Wales senior officials and got no response and so then you went to Ms Jackson?
A. That's right.
Q. I think you were saying that she rang you about a week later?
A. About a week later.
Q. And what did she say to you?
A. I was surprised that - I answered the phone, "Hello." She said, "Hello. This is Kathy Jackson" and I went, "What?" I was surprised she actually rang. We had a discussion.

I went through the email and I said am I correct in what I'm seeing or am I wrong in the union council minutes - sorry, the union rules and how New South Wales was top heavy and that's how they were pushing resolutions through, and I questioned where the 20 representatives were and she said, "You get it. Finally someone that gets it. You get it", and I said, "Yes, I do get it." Then I said to her, "A lot of our members are quite angry, they're confused. They're asking a lot of questions. I can't answer the questions." I said, "Would you like to come and address my members on the sub-branch?" She was quite happy to do that, and I arranged for her to come and actually speak to our members and allow our members to ask her questions, and I believe I was the only
sub-branch that managed to do that.
Q. When did that meeting take place?
A. About mid-October.
Q. So Ms Jackson came. Where was the meeting, by the way?
A. At the Randwick campus. It was in the old Edmund

Blacket building.
Q. How many members came along?
A. Oh, stacks. It was standing room only.
Q. Did Mr Mylan or others come along?
A. Yes, and they weren't invited.
Q. Well, who came? Mr Mylan came?
A. Kerrie Seymour came and Graham Conroy.
Q. So Ms Jackson spoke, I take it?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Did members ask questions?
A. They did, they really did, and she answered every single question.
Q. Did Mr Mylan say anything?
A. He spoke. When members asked him questions, he just went around in circles. He wouldn't directly answer the question. I had members that were actually heckling him. I was chairing the meeting and I was telling members just to, you know, "Sit down. Behave. Just listen to everybody." I was giving everybody a fair chance of speaking and after that meeting, my members just said - you know, they actually believed Kathy.
Q. Did Mr Mylan say anything to the members or Ms Jackson about the way she'd conducted herself?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And what did he say?
A. He was slandering Kathy and saying that these allegations should not have gone to the media, "We want to deal with this internally. There's an investigation. None of this should be spoken about now. Let the investigation go through", that kind of thing, and just bagging Kathy because the media was always interested.
Q. You say in your statement that there was some discussion about legal fees at that meeting, Mr Williamson's legal fees. What was that discussion? A. There were two meetings with the legal fees, by the way. This was an informal meeting, so nobody actually signed to come. It was just so the members could actually meet Kathy and Marco and just see what they had to say.

One of the members - actually, it was me. I asked Peter Mylan, "Why are we paying for Williamson's legal fees?", and he said, "Oh, he's a member of the union. He's entitled for us to pay for his legal fees and he should" and I said, "Well, hang on a minute, this is a criminal matter, it's not industrial. So, yes, a member is entitled to industrial legal representation, but this is a criminal matter and they're investigating him as to stealing money from us, so why are we paying for the legal fees?"
Q. What did Mr Mylan say?
A. They stuck to the story and it just went on and on, "He's a member. He's entitled to have his legal fees paid by us", and that's all they kept saying.
Q. You describe council meetings on 16 September 2011 and again on 22 September 2011.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you go along to those council meetings?
A. I wasn't allowed.
Q. Who told you you weren't allowed?
A. Kerrie Seymour and Sam Shao. He was the councillor, New South Wales councillor on our sub-branch.
Q. What did they say to you?
A. I wasn't allowed. Members don't go.
Q. But were you proposing to go and - well, you obviously can't go and vote, but what were you proposing to do at the meetings?
A. To observe; to see how it was run.
Q. And did you ask them whether you could go?
A. Yes. They actually didn't even tell me where it was.
Q. The outcome of that was you weren't in attendance on

16 or 22 September 2011?
A. No.
Q. But in February 2012, early the next year, you decided that you would go to a council meeting?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you ask Ms Seymour about going?
A. I told nobody.
Q. We11, in 63 you say that you did have a discussion with Ms Seymour, it looks like?
A. Where is it? That was the next council meeting.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. When you say, "I flew to Victoria." Did others from New South Wales come?
A. No. I was the only one.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Stoljar --
THE WITNESS: When it says:
"I said words to the effect of: "I can go. It's in the rules"...

That was actually in Melbourne. What they did was they opened the meeting and they saw that there were members there, so they passed - first of all, they passed this resolution to have us removed and then we refused to leave and we just sat there. So they adjourned the meeting for about half an hour to an hour so everyone went outside because it was adjourned and that's when, you know, I was told I wasn't allowed to be there, I can't go, and I'm saying, "It's in the rules."

MR STOLJAR: Q. So when you said you didn't tell anyone, you meant in the period leading up to them?
A. No. I found --

MR STOLJAR: Commissioner?
THE COMMISSIONER: Do we have a copy of the Rules that Ms Hart has been referring to?

MR STOLJAR: Excuse me just one moment.
A. They were the old HSU East rules. I think some have been changed since the demerge.

MR STOLJAR: We don't have them in Ms Hart's statement but I can certainly get them.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think it would be a good idea to have them in evidence as background to what she has been saying in her statement

MR STOLJAR: Q. So the conversation you describe between yourself and Ms Seymour at the meeting occurred actually at the meeting, not in advance?
A. In the adjournment.
Q. And you'd gone with - I'm sorry, you flew to Victoria, you were the only intended observer from New South Wales, but there were five Victorian members who were also going to be observers; is that right?
A. Well, I didn't know that until I got there but, yes.
Q. I see.
A. When I arrived, the hotel was just opposite the airport. So I went over to the airport and I had to wait because I couldn't see anybody that I knew there. So I sort of waited down a bit and then I saw Kathy and Marco and I was a bit nervous about going because I knew I'd be treated with hostility. So Marco introduced me to a gentleman by the name of Rob Morrey, who was a Victorian member, so I sat with Rob and I just felt a little bit more comfortable that way.
Q. Mr Stephen Pollard was the president chairing the meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. At paragraph 72 he said something to Ms Jackson. Tel1 us about that?
A. When he opened the meeting up, basically he said, "Oh, isn't it lovely Kathy's got all the Victorian members here", and I just put my hand up and said, "New South Wales", and he just went, "Oh, shit", and then he was accusing Kathy of staging this sort of - staging having the members there which I know - I was sitting sort of behind and on a diagonal, and I know that she didn't because one of the members actually had come up and she didn't even
know who they were, and introduced himself and actually congratulated her and it was the first time she had actually met him. How can she stage something if she doesn't know the members?
Q. But you were proposing just to observe, were you? A. Yes.
Q. What happened then? Did Mr Pollard invite you to stay or did he say something else?
A. They went quiet for about 10 minutes. They rustled up some resolution. They put the resolution through to council. I call them "sheep". All the little sheep were sitting there and they were just going "Yeah" and agreeing to whatever Peter Mylan put through, and that was to get us to be removed. When we refused to be removed, we just said, "We're not going. We have every right to be here. We're sitting at the back, we're only observing, we're not saying anything, we're not interfering with the way you're running your meeting", and that's when he adjourned. Steve Pollard adjourned it. He asked about five or six times for us to go, and we refused.
Q. Did the meeting continue or was it just simply adjourned?
A. It was adjourned. We went back. He said, "Are you going to leave?" We said, "No", so he closed the meeting and it never took place.
Q. This was at a time when you were trying to get information?
A. Yes.
Q. What was your purpose in going to the meeting?
A. To see how a union council was run. I mean you can see how - like, I'd spoken to councillors like Clarrie Smith, Ted Hinge from New South Wales. Even Sam had mentioned certain things about the way a council meeting was run. But $I$ don't rely on what people tell me. I like to see it for myself. So that was one of the reasons I went there, to actually see how they were conducted, and it was true, they were sheep.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Ms Hart, if you could go to tab 2 which Mr Stoljar has taken you to before, page 3 of Hart MFI1, that is your email of 21 September. Down the bottom you've got a recording of the fact that the rule provides
the council consists of 76 members, and then they're all set out.

When you talk about it being top heavy in New South Wales, you are talking about 21 councillors from New South Wales and 20 general representatives of New South Wales? A. That's correct.
Q. So that bloc was really the sheep?
A. Yes.
Q. So if they were all there or enough of them --
A. Yes.
Q. -- everything would pass? Thank you.
A. And all those 20 general representatives were actually organisers. So they were actually union organisers.
Q. The significance of that is what? That they're --
A. The significance is they're paid employees.
Q. Of the union?
A. Of the union.
Q. Whereas you, for example, weren't?
A. No.
Q. Right.
A. Oh, and by the way, they were only from New South Wales, not from Victoria.
Q. So you are saying in Victoria there were no equivalent of these organisers who were employees of the union? A. That's correct, and I needed to know who the 20 general representatives were at first. I sat there one day, it was funny, doing stick figures trying to work it out in my head which is how then I came to this conclusion, and then I realised that any resolution that was put forward, if it was a problem like what was actually starting to happen, Victoria had no chance of winning any vote because of these 20 representatives who happened to be paid employees of the union. So, in my interpretation, if you're a paid employee of the union under New South Wales, your vote is actually compromised because your managers, your bosses, are the people that you are actually voting with. So can you imagine if they tried to vote against them? It's compromised.
Q. Just above that group, we've got one general secretary, et cetera, et cetera. Were they all employees too?
A. They're elected officials.
Q. But once elected, they're paid by the union?
A. Yes. So you've got the two general secretaries, deputy general secretaries. One is from Victoria, one is from New South Wales. The same with the divisional and the same with the acting divisional, that's why there's two.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Can I just clarify. You said "they're all organisers". Did you mean --
A. New South Wales organisers.
Q. Yes, but the general representatives?
A. Yes.
Q. And the councillors?
A. No, the general representatives.
Q. And who are the councillors?
A. They're elected so they're throughout. They could be presidents of sub-branches, secretaries, anything like that.
Q. I see.
A. And they're asked to go on a ticket.
Q. To come back to your statement, in paragraph 86, you say:
... at a general sub-branch meeting in
front of all the members $I$ represented
Ms Seymour communicated that she was
commencing legal action against me for defamation?
A. That's correct.
Q. First of all, when was that meeting, roughly? I mean the end of - well, you tell me?
A. Well, it's actually in there because if we go to the email that was sent to Peter Mylan.
Q. Is that at tab 8?
A. It could be tab 8. Yes.
Q. It is page 22 .
A. Because that was - that email was sent virtually two days, three days afterwards. It would have been about March, I think. Yes.
Q. So you are talking about an email that you sent to Mr Mylan and others, it's about the middle of page 22 ? A. If you go to page 30 , it was 13 March.
Q. This is --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. That seems to be part of an email sent by you to Mr Mylan and others on 15 March.
A. That's right.
Q. We see that on page 28. This is a long email?
A. It is a very long email, yes.
Q. And that summarises the meeting of the 13th.

MR STOLJAR: Q. So your email was sent two days after the meeting but you weren't present on 13 March, were you?
A. No, I had to actually have a facts day, it was unfortunate, so my vice president chaired the meeting.
Q. And she said - well, someone told you about what had occurred?
A. Yes. I had the emails. I was told by two committee members what she - that she claimed that I'd defamed her and that she was seeking legal advice to sue me.
Q. The emails to which she was referring, are they in evidence, 8 March?
A. I don't know.
Q. In any event --
A. What had actually happened was the week prior, we'd had a sub-branch meeting where I tried to pass resolutions not to pay Michael Williamson's legal fees. Whenever I had sub-branch meetings, they brought the big guns out. So there was Kerrie Seymour and Andrew Lillicrap there. So they were arguing for us to pay legal fees; I was arguing against.

After that meeting I was furious because I had four members who desperately needed legal help with industrial issues on the campus, and they weren't getting anywhere, but yet here we are paying Williamson's legal fees. So I had written a letter complaining about that, and Marco Bolano was the only one that answered that letter. So it was actually - in the letter, in the email, I was sort of saying, you know, why are we paying for his legal fees and why aren't my members getting legal representation and, "Kerr, you should know that, you're the organiser here", so I was virtually asking questions. About a week later she comes out with I'm defaming her, and she mentioned Marco Bolano too in that, that she was going to sue him.
Q. Just so I'm clear. Ms Seymour is an organiser based where?
A. In the Randwick campus.
Q. I see. So she would have known, you thought, that legal fees weren't being paid for four members who had some industrial issues?
A. They weren't even getting appointments with a solicitor, and she knew about it because I was requesting it.
Q. Why weren't they getting appointments? Because the solicitor wanted to be paid?
A. I don't know.
Q. So you sent that email and then Ms Seymour, as you say on page 30, said that you defamed her and she was referring emails to her solicitor?
A. That's right.
Q. So your email is responsive to that?
A. That's correct.
Q. This is the email, as the Commissioner said, which begins on page 28.
A. It is quite a long email.
Q. You respond to that. Did you ever get a response from Mr Mylan or Mr Hayes rebutting what you were saying?
A. Never.
Q. Did Ms Seymour commence any proceedings for
defamation?
A. Never. I also sent that email and complaint to the HSU Ombudsman. I didn't even get an acknowledgement from him

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. The HSU Ombudsman, what, is an official within the union whose job it is to try and resolve complaints about maladministration, is it?
A. Yes

MR STOLJAR: Q. Excuse me just one minute.
A. No, that's fine.
Q. You've included "read receipts". These are at page 34, tab 9. You started asking for "Read" receipts on the emails?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. So page 34 indicates that your email was read by Mr Hayes?
A. That's correct.
Q. And likewise for the next few pages.
A. Peter Mylan. They all read the email. I think I just became a thorn in their side.
Q. Can I take you to --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Just before you leave that. Mr Sam Shaw - S-H-A-W - he was an organiser?
A. No, he is a New South Wales councillor and it's S-H-A-O.
Q. Yes. And what relationship did he have to your responsibilities on the Randwick campus?
A. He was part of the committee and he did run against me for president and vice president and lost both.
Q. So he's not an employee of the union?
A. No. But I must say at that stage councillors were given a nice allowance to be councillors. I even asked how much that was and I was never told, and when I actually asked did he get paid to be a councillor, he denied it.
Q. Do you know now what it was?
A. No. I still don't. They loved it. They got flown everywhere. Everything was paid for, hotel rooms, the lot.

MR STOLJAR: Q. On page 8 of your statement, you describe an incidence when you went to Mr Mylan and had a discussion about Ms Seymour. Just tell us what Mr Mylan's reaction was?
A. I came out of the lifts and there was meant to be a union council meeting.
Q. When was this, by the way?
A. April.
Q. April?
A. April 2012, and that council meeting was canned because we'd written and said we were going. There were two Victorian members that had flown up and stayed - like, just met me at my house and I took them in to head office and into their hotel room. Their names were Loretta Hanson and Sherida Jacks. It was the first time I'd met Sherida Jacks and I'd taken them into the HSU head office because they wanted to get information because there was AGMs coming up in sub-branches. So I walked in and Peter Mylan was actually out in reception. His face just sort of went, "Oh my God", like that. So they had gone straight to the reception to get their AGMs things and I; bee-lined Peter Mylan and I said, "Peter, when are you going to actually answer any of my emails? I want Kerrie Seymour taken off my side. If she's claiming she's suing me, then you're putting me in an awkward situation and we can't work together." And he said, "I've made a decision, she stays", and I said, "No, she's got to go". We were sort of raising our voices at this stage, and I stood my ground and I said, "She has to go. She cannot turn around and say to my sub-branch that she's going to look at legal action against me and be an organiser there, it can't be done", and he just clenched his fists like this (indicating) puffed his chest out and came inches to my face and said, "I've made my decision, she stays", and I just laughed at him. I said, "You're not scaring me. I have three brothers, you're not scaring me." He was just frustrated because I was not going to back down.

THE COMMISSIONER: I am just having a bit of trouble picking this up in the statement, Mr Stoljar. A. It is at 93 to $94,95$.

MR STOLJAR: It is 93 to 96 inclusive.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, good. Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: Q. I want to come to the events of the annual convention of 2011. You say it was on 14 November, but just before it you had a barbecue at your home and Ms Jackson came. It was a social occasion, was it?
A. It was.
Q. You say at 100:

On Thursday, 10 November 2011, a meeting of the Randwick Campus General Sub Branch Committee was held.
A. I'11 just - they're committee meetings. So every two weeks, because my sub-branch is so big, we have committee meetings and discuss union matters like how are we going to represent a member, et cetera.
Q. And does Ms Seymour come to those, or came to those?
A. She did, yes.
Q. So she was in attendance. Well, you tell me about the conversation you had with her on that occasion?
A. I was completely taken back and shocked. That meeting was supposed to - we were supposed to go through the resolutions. I think there was about 200 resolutions.
Q. Did that include item 68?
A. Yes. But Sam Shao and Kerrie Seymour only wanted to talk about item 68 which was annoying me. I was the voting delegate and on the floor, I had a lot of votes. I think it was something like 56 votes which was a lot in HSU. They started carrying on about, "We have to get rid of the Victorians. Kathy Jackson has, you know, brought our union in disrepute", and I was arguing against it and I'm saying, "Look, let the investigation go through", all that kind of thing, and then all of a sudden Kerrie Seymour said, "When are you going to tell me about your secret meeting?" and I said, "What?" I was really thrown back. I'm saying, "What are you talking about?", and she goes, "On Saturday you had a secret meeting and you had it with Kathy Jackson there." I said, "I didn't have a meeting at all, it was a barbecue, it was just a barbecue", and she just kept carrying on about it being a secret meeting and that's when I got angry and I said, "Look, what I do in my own time, in
my own residence, is my own business. It's nothing to do with you. I did not have a secret meeting, nor did we discuss any resolutions or anything about the conference or anything."
Q. Then you describe some further events in your statement. I won't take you through them in detail, but you then come to the annual convention itself. It began, as you say in paragraph 129, on 14 November 2011. You were there on the morning, were you, the first morning?
A. We were there the night before. It was a Sunday night, I think it was. I had just sent - I'd gone to work and sent the email on the Sunday because I was still stewing about what Kerrie had done to me. So I sent an email to her.

That night there was a dinner for all the delegates. I was there. I decided there was no way in the world I was going to have a drink. I had Andrew - not Andrew, Randa11 Millington, he was an organiser at the time - no, industrial officer/organiser. He obviously was quite intoxicated. So when I walked in to the meeting - like, walked into the actual dining room area, I was looking for Ted Hinge and I was standing there and I found Ted and he said, "Are you going to have a drink?" and I said, "No, I'm not going to have a drink", and he said, "Oh, okay." Next thing Randall Millington, who was quite intoxicated, was coming up and slurring his words and going, "You've got to vote to get rid of the Victorians, we've got to get rid of them", and I was just like "Go away", and he just kept going and going and going, and Peter Mylan had actually seen it and seen me asking him to go away and eventually Peter Mylan moved him away.
Q. The following day was the first morning of the convention?
A. That's right.
Q. Were you in the audience that day?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Where were you sitting?
A. Right down the front. The arena was like on a slope and I was right down the front, probably two or three rows up from the stage.
Q. Tell me about what happened when Mr Williamson
arrived. What did you see?
A. It was disgusting. All of a sudden music was playing.
Q. What was the music?
A. "Rocky". The theme to "Rocky", and everybody was standing up. So I actually stood up and I didn't know why they were standing up, and I couldn't see at first because obviously people were in front of me, and I said - turned around and I said to Kerrie Seymour, "What's going on?", and she said, "Oh, Michael Williamson has just arrived" and I said, "What the hell is he doing here?", and she said, He's got every right to be here", and I said, "No, he doesn't, he doesn't have any right, it's disgraceful that he's here", and I argued with Kerrie about it, and then all these New South Wales people were standing up clapping and cheering him, and I'm just thinking, "Oh, my God, there's an investigation going on and that they're cheering that he's there". I just thought it was really inappropriate.
Q. And the debate for item 68 took place the next day?
A. Yes, and again that was deplorable.
Q. Why was it deplorable?
A. First of all there were 200 resolutions to go through.

A lot of them were issues relating to members, issues relating to their workplaces, all that kind of thing. Nothing of those were really discussed.

The convention started. This gentleman got up, right from the back, put this resolution to the floor that we deal with item 68 first. That was passed, and then all of a sudden for four or five hours it was all about item 68.
Q. Which was the no confidence in Ms Jackson?
A. That's right, and yet we had no increases of membership fees. We had workplace issues, all that; resolutions, and it just wasn't addressed.

To me, I'm sorry, I just think that this is union, members pay their fees, we are meant to support members and look after their best interests. At that convention, they looked after their own interests.
Q. Who is "they"?
A. Peter Mylan, Steve Pollard, all the New South Wales people.
Q. And did the New South Wales people vote as a bloc to your observation?
A. Yes.
Q. Except for you?
A. A couple didn't. A couple didn't

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Could I just ask you this, Ms Hart. Early in your oral evidence, you mentioned that members had to pay $\$ 22.40$ per fortnight deducted out of their pay, presumably?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the basis on which fees were levied? I mean some of your members would have quite a high income and many of them would have very low incomes, presumably?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is it a percentage, a flat percentage?
A. It's a flat rate, \$22.20.
Q. I see. It's just a dollar figure? It's not a percentage of anything? All right. Thank you.
A. You can understand why members pulled out.

MR STOLJAR: Q. I asked you - I think all I said --
THE COMMISSIONER: Q. I'm sorry to interrupt one more time. Some would be full-time employees?
A. And some would be part-time.
Q. And the part-timers had to pay $\$ 22.40$ as well?
A. I started as a member working three days a week and I still had to pay the full-time rates.

MR STOLJAR: Q. I think I said to you did New South Wales vote as a bloc. Do you know what the actual votes - how the votes played out in the end; what the voting was, roughly?
A. No. All I know, it was just - like, the hands that went up basically in favour of the resolution was - there was just a sea of them and then against, there wasn't that many. I really couldn't tell you the votes, I really couldn't.
Q. But you voted against?
A. I voted against.
Q. And you were exercising a number of votes?
A. Yes, 56. I'd like to actually point out that I voted against not because of my own principles. We had five delegates there. We had decided that everybody was to listen and then afterwards they would be sitting with me and saying - if four against one said vote for it, I would have to vote for it but it was unanimous. Like, all of us said, "No, you've got to vote against it." So that vote I put forward was in consultation with the other four delegates that were there.
Q. Delegates from the sub-branch?
A. Yes.
Q. You said you decided you would listen to the debate?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you listen to Ms Jackson and Mr Bolano speak?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. How easy was it to hear what they were saying?
A. At times you couldn't hear what they were saying,
there was that much heckling going on, or yelling or screaming. I heard bits and pieces of it. I've got to say I was actually ashamed. I was ashamed to be a member of HSU that day. It was awful. The behaviour was childish, it was deplorable. Yeah, I was ashamed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. What was the precise method of voting? Was it a show of hands?
A. Yes, it was but - no, sorry, it was and it wasn't. Everybody had a paddle. On my paddle it had 56 ; some had 1, and so it went, and then you just raised your paddle.
Q. So whoever was in charge would try and make a quick guess as to where the majority lay?
A. No. In that particular instance they had people going through and counting.
Q. Right. So it was a sort of non-secret ballot, but it was mathematically precise?
A. That's right. It was interesting because normally when you put a resolution through - normally - two people speak for it and two people speak against. This went for four hours because I think they had something like 60
people, 30 for, 30 against. I can't remember the precise amount of speakers. They were supposed to only have two minutes. Some of the New South Wales people went on for 40 minutes just - and none of what they were actually saying made sense to me anyway, and I just - as I said I felt ashamed, the name calling, the heckling, the childish behaviour, even when they were actually speaking against or for the actual resolution.

There was one lady, though, I have to give her credit - and I wish I could have shaked her hand - got up there, I'11 never forget it. I think she was from Victoria and she turned around and pointed to Williamson and said - well, first of all she said to Steve Pollard, "Can I ask Mr Williamson a question?", and Mr Pollard said, "I don't know about that", and Williamson said, "Yes, yes, you can ask me a question." So she said, "Did you use those credit cards?", and that was it, everybody was in an uproar because that question was asked, and he never actually answered the question.
Q. Was Mr Pollard the person who was chairing the meeting?
A. Yes. He's the president

MR STOLJAR: Q. He's New South Wales?
A. Yes.
Q. Did Mr Williamson speak at any stage?
A. Yes.
Q. What did he say?
A. He spoke in retaliation against Kathy and Marco and he got up and started yelling and screaming and then, to my recollection, he basically said, "Once this is all over, you guys are going to be fired, we're going to get rid of you." It was something along those effects, and he was yelling and he was quite aggressive. I felt - he had his wife sitting next to him and Gerard Hayes' de facto sitting next to him. The spotlight, of course, was on him when he said it.

I have to point out that convention was one of the first conventions I'd been to, and I felt they followed me everywhere. I couldn't even go to the toilet without an organiser or a union councillor being there. Even to go up the road to get a cappuccino, because I'm a cappuccino
junkie, I'd turn around and there would be some official there.
Q. Official from where?
A. New South Wales. They were following me everywhere. I couldn't go to the toilet. I couldn't go out to have a cigarette. I couldn't go up to the shops. It was like they were frightened that I was going to speak to the media. I don't know why. I had - you know, I was surrounded, absolutely surrounded, in the actual convention, like, sitting there, with union councillors, union organisers. It was like I was being kept. I was trapped.
Q. Can I ask you some questions about the defined benefit scheme that you deal with in paragraph 146 of your
statement. At 146 and following, you describe some emails. You really come to it at 155 . What is the defined benefit scheme and who does it apply to? This is a super scheme, I take it?
A. It is a super scheme that I knew nothing about until basically the Temby Report, just prior to the Temby Report. From my knowledge - and I've asked for information about it and still haven't received it, but from my knowledge, this scheme includes probably about maybe 10 to 14 employees. It's a very generous scheme.

I'm under the understanding - like, obviously Mr Williamson, Mr Mylan, Gerard Hayes, they're all part of this scheme. I've actually sent emails requesting information about the scheme, who is part of this scheme, only to be told it's confidential and I'm not allowed to know that kind of stuff. But $I$ just don't think that - if we're paying for a superannuation scheme, $I$ think $I$ have a right, I'm a member, to have a right to know where my money's going and who it's going to.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Ms Hart, you said it was very generous?
A. It was extremely generous.
Q. In what respect is that so or what was the --
A. Well, Ian Temby had actually recommended that that scheme be stopped, and it's still going. In the financial records that I've actually just seen of HSU - and I think they're in here somewhere in the evidence - but it's a huge liability for the actual union.
Q. But it involved the members after they retired, that class you mentioned getting, what, a certain percentage of the final average salary or a percentage of --
A. Again, they will not give me any information.
Q. But can we find it in Mr Temby's report?
A. No, it wasn't in Mr Temby's report. He just - he quickly glazed over it. I think it was about --

MR STOLJAR: Q. It's page 315, Commissioner.
A. There you go. What tab?
Q. Tab 45. The report begins on page 250.
A. That's the financial - yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's page 315 in the top right-hand corner. It's about 20 pages from the end of Hart MFI1.

MR STOLJAR: Mr Temby summarises at paragraph 8.10:
A small number of executives and employees, approximately 14, are members of two older type defined benefit schemes.

THE COMMISSIONER: So is the witness correct in saying it doesn't actually disclose, for example, whether it was going to be 60 per cent of the salary of the general secretary from time to time, or whether it was going to be 75 per cent of Mr Williamson's retirement salary?

MR STOLJAR: That's correct. I don't think there's an explanation. Mr Temby is here, but I don't think there is an explanation of precisely how the defined benefit is calculated with respect to each of the 14 employees to which it refers, or to whom it refers, but we do know that it's underfunded or at least it was as at 30 September 2011 by just over 3 million.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Of course if BHP Billiton had such a scheme and it was under-funded by 3 million or 1.7 million, it wouldn't matter much. You need to know more things.

MR STOLJAR: Yes
THE COMMISSIONER: At all costs we must keep Mr Temby out
of the witness box. Maybe you could ask him afterwards where we might find some documents.

MR STOLJAR: Yes.
THE WITNESS: I think in the financial --

MR TEMBY: We'11 certain1y provide more information, but can I say, Commissioner, what you have just said outiines the essence of a defined benefit scheme as you would know. It did relate to a small number of the senior officers of the union, and I'11 have to obtain more information before I can provide it to the Commission as to the present situation.

THE WITNESS: It's actually in the financial report.
MR TEMBY: I have a strong impression that the position has been changed during the course of the administration, but we' 11 have to advise that.

THE COMMISSIONER: It would be useful to know what the old position was and what the new position is.

MR TEMBY: Precisely. We'11 provide that information.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
Q. You wanted to say something, Ms Hart, when I interrupted you?
A. In the current financials that were actually put on the website about March 2014, this year, there is mention of a defined benefit scheme and the funding, et cetera, in there. I just can't find those documents at the moment. So that's outlined in the financials.

MR STOLJAR: Q. Is the short point that $I$ draw from paragraphs 146 and following, and please stop me if this isn't correct, but is the short point that you have made attempts to get more information about the defined benefit scheme and the fact that it's underfunded by \$3.3 miliion --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- or so and you haven't been able to obtain that information?
A. And $I$ haven't even been able to obtain actually who is
in that defined benefit scheme.
Q. So you have no information about who are the 14 employees?
A. No.
Q. To whom reference is made in paragraph - I think it was 8.10 that we just had a look at?
A. That's right. I believe that scheme is a huge
liability for the union.
Q. We11, you say at 156:

I understand there are twelve people covered by the Scheme, including Mr Williamson, Mr Mylan and Mr Hayes.
A. That's right.
Q. How did you come by the thought that it was

Mr Williamson, Mr Mylan and Mr Hayes, among others?
A. Kathy Jackson told me.
Q. You've described your election campaign on page 14 of your statement. This is a campaign in 2012. Was that for the position of president of the sub-branch again or were you running for some other position?
A. No, it was secretary of the union.
Q. Oh, secretary of the union.
A. New South Wales.
Q. And then you are, I suppose in substance, comparing your campaign to that of Mr Hayes which begins at 173? A. Yes.
Q. Did Mr Hayes have access to a call centre?
A. Yes, I believe he did.
Q. Where was the call centre located?
A. I've been told by Bob Hull's team or people campaigning for Bob Hull that it was the CFMEU call centre he used. I had members complaining constantly about phone calls. I think the administrator had complaints as well, and I also complained to the administrator about how organisers were taking all this time off to campaign when they should have been looking after members' interests, and
we're in a situation where we've got a New South Wales government that's Liberal and I was trying to say to the administrator, "Members' issues need to come first", and all these organisers were getting time off and just campaigning, and some were actually campaigning while they were working.
Q. You have set out some further matters in your statement. I perhaps don't need to take you through them, they speak for themselves, I think. Yes.

MR STOLJAR: I have nothing further, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Very well.
Q. Thank you for coming today, Ms Hart. You are free to go back to Victoria but --
A. I'm from New South Wales.
Q. I'm sorry, I do apologise, I remember. You are free to leave, but it may be that people will want to ask you questions about your statement at a later date and you'l1 be informed of when that is when it's known.
A. Can I actually say something?
Q. Certainly.
A. I'm very happy a Royal Commission has actually now been called. I'm concerned about - we're due to have an election soon in HSU East - sorry, HSU New South Wales.

Now, what I'm concerned about is that in that election, people will be potentially voting for persons of interest in this Royal Commission and I don't know how to have that election delayed until this is finished.
Q. Well, there's not much that can be done about it, but when is the election due?
A. It was due to be called a couple of weeks ago and Gerard Hayes hasn't called it yet, or I think the AEC has to call it.
Q. When it is called, when is it likely to be?
A. It should be now so I don't know, I really don't.
Q. Do you know what the normal period of time is between it being called and actually happening?
A. It should have been concluded probably mid-August.
Q. And that date isn't fixed under the rules, is it?
A. No.
Q. What does its selection depend on?
A. Beg your pardon?
Q. What does the selection of the date for an election depend on?
A. I'm not quite sure. I think it's the AEC.

MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, Mr Irving may have some more information about that election.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR IRVING: Commissioner, the timing of the rules - the timing of the election is set in accordance with the Rules. Pursuant to Rule 29 there is a nomination period that usually starts - I think it's about the first week in June that nomination is called. Ultimately the timing of that election is in the hands of the AEC. The AEC acts, after it has received a request from the Fair Work Commission as to the holding of the election.

Due to recent changes of the union rules, the request for the Fair Work Commission has not been communicated as yet to the AEC, but we understand that will occur some time this week.

The AEC will then set the timetable for the election. We anticipate that nominations will be called by about late this month, early next month, and then there's a period of approximately three weeks for nominations to be closed. If more than one candidate nominates for a position, then an election is held.

That timetable is set in accordance with the rules and we will organise the rules as they currently are and as they previously were to be provided to the Commission, and we'll make further inquiries with the Fair Work Commission and the AEC to nail down that period if that will be of assistance.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you very much for that information.
Q. Thank you for raising it, Ms Hart?
A. I'm just a bit concerned about it.
Q. Yes.
A. I will say $I$ am running again.
Q. I see the difficulty.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is there anything more to do this afternoon?

MR STOLJAR: No, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: We will resume at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.
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