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THE COMMISSIONER: Yesterday's transcript, at pages 806 to 811, records evidence and argument about the admissibility of a tape-recording made on 13 February 2012. In the light of the evidence, there is no legislative obstacle to the playing of the relevant tape-recording or its reception into evidence. See section 6 of the Telecommunications (Interception and Access Act) 1979 (Commonwealth), section 7(3)(a) and (b)(i) of the Surveillance Devices Act 2007 (New South Wales), and section 11(2)(a), (b) (ii) of the Surveillance Devices Act 1999 (Victoria).

If there is no further objection to the proposed evidence, it may be admitted. Is there any further objection to its reception?

MR STOLJAR: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. Yes, Mr Stoljar.
MR STOLJAR: I would ask, first of all, that Ms Jackson return to the witness box.
<KATHERINE JACKSON, on former oath:

## <EXAMINATION BY MR STOLJAR CONTINUING:

Q. Ms Jackson, you are under your oath that you gave yesterday. Yesterday, during your evidence, we heard from you evidence about a meeting of the council that took place on 13 February 2012, at which there was debate about what had happened to financial records of the No 3 Branch. Do you remember that evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. Your evidence in substance yesterday was to the effect that after the merger, persons from the Sydney office had come down to Melbourne in about September 2010 while you were on leave and had gone through the records of the branch, what used to be the No 3 Branch?
A. Yes.
Q. You were told, you said in your evidence yesterday, that staff from the No 3 Branch who were there during that visit described what had happened as a "chuckfest"?
A. Yes.
Q. You had some debate during the course of the meeting
on 13 February 2012 that you recorded with persons in attendance in the meeting about what had actually happened during the course of that visit in September 2010 ?
A. Yes.
Q. What I propose to do, although the minutes of that meeting are in evidence, is to play a recording of a part of that meeting which records some of that discussion and then I'll ask you some questions about it to see whether it sheds any further light as to what may have happened to the records of No 3 Branch.

I would ask that an extract from the proceedings of meeting be played?
A. Can I just say I think it is meeting of 28 March 2012.
Q. That may have been a meeting at which there was separate discussion, but, in any event, we'11 1isten for the time being to parts of the meeting of 13 February 2012. A. Yes.
Q. I'd ask that the recording from the point 11 minutes and 51 seconds be played.
(Audio played)
THE COMMISSIONER: Shal1 we mark that Jackson MFI3, tape-recording of part of a meeting of HSU East executive committee held on 13 February 2012?

MR STOLJAR: May it please the Commission.

## JACKSON MFI\#3 TAPE-RECORDING OF PART OF A MEETING OF HSU EAST EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DATED 13/02/2012

MR STOLJAR: Q. Ms Jackson, there were a number of voices on that recording. Who is Stuart?
A. Stuart Miller was an administrative officer, admin clerk, at the Victorian branch. On amalgamation, he remained that. Once Ms Glen resigned, Mr Williamson appointed Stuart Miller into Ms Glen's position as a divisional secretary to pay off his loyalty to him because he would do the right thing by Mr Williamson, which meant that he would do as he was told by his factional leaders in Victoria.
Q. I just want to clarify - he was someone who had worked
at the Victorian branch?
A. Yes.
Q. Was Mr Miller's voice the male voice saying that he had gone through the boxes and sorted them into three categories or was that someone else?
A. No, I think that was Mr Bob Hull.
Q. Mr Bob Hull?
A. Yes.
Q. Then Mr Hull said if it was him on MFI3, that he identified documents in three categories: industrial, secondly, personal and, thirdly, financial and then he said he'd given them to Barry. Who is Barry?
A. Barry Gibson was the financial controller of the HSU East Branch and previous to that he was the financial controller for the New South Wales Branch.
Q. Prior to the merger, documents had been kept in the way that you outlined yesterday, that is, Ms Holt had kept all the primary records in lever-arch folders and so forth? A. Yes.
Q. And also in MYOB. In this visit, documents were bundled up by Mr Hull or others, as you understand it, you weren't there, and given to Barry, and then what happened? A. That's the whole point, I don't know what happened then. We requested the documents. Once the allegations once they started to make allegations after I went to the police, we kept on requesting those documents, I requested those documents, and they kept on saying they didn't have any documents to give me.
Q. The resolution requested that you, as executive president, carry out some searches for documents and send them to Sydney?
A. As the president of the branch, yes.
Q. As we stand here today, we still are not able to find quite a number of minutes of $B C O M$ meetings and the like, so we don't know where they went but, in any event, you certainly have not been able to find them in your searches since that February meeting of the executive committee?
A. That's correct. We11, I understood from that February meeting that whatever they took away when they did their clean up, so to speak, went to Sydney, and then I heard
nothing else about it until the allegations started to be made and then I sought those documents back from Sydney and they said that they didn't have any documents and then I asked the administrator the same questions and got the same response.
Q. Do you know who precisely came - and if you don't know, don't speculate - but do you know who actually came from Sydney for the visit in September 2010 when there was the clean up or reorganisation or whatever it was?
A. I think it was earlier than September. I believe it was in August of 2010, but I'm not sure about that. No, I don't know, but I've been told that Bob Hull was there, Stuart Miller was there, Darren Williamson was there, Michael Williamson was there, and did I say Barry Gibson? I did say Barry Gibson.
Q. No, you haven't mentioned him.
A. And Barry Gibson.
Q. So he was there?
A. He was there. There may have been others from New South Wales, but they're the ones that I was told were there.
Q. When the male voice that may be Mr Hull says "I gave them to Barry", Barry was likely, as far as you know, to have been there on the same occasion?
A. Yes .
Q. Could I come to a different topic. Paragraph 416 of your statement. You're dealing here with the National Health Development Account.

I want to start off by asking you some questions about the origin of the funds that went into that account. In 416 you say that in late 2003, No 3 Branch received an amount of about $\$ 250,000$ from the Peter MacCallum Cancer Institute - Peter Mac. I know this is a long time ago, it's 11 years ago, and I gather - do you have, as you sit here now, any records of the actual court proceedings, written records?
A. I have an advice.
Q. Yes. You mention that in 417, but I meant the underlying court records, you don't have those?
A. No.
Q. Doing as best you can with your memory, were proceedings brought by the No 3 Branch against the Peter MacCallum Cancer Institute in respect of some breaches of awards or the like?
A. Yes. Just from memory, Peter Mac, we were enterprise bargaining and we had been for a couple of years, and in those previous two agreements a new - not a new, but a structure had been reached for the research scientists at Peter MacCallum. Peter MacCallum did not apply those wage increases to those people because they thought they were outside that agreement but obviously they weren't. So eventually the union took action to resolve this dispute with Peter Mac and we took court action, but in that dispute there was a dispute that was launched against Peter Mac, and I say it was excellent industrial work that was done by the branch on behalf of its members. A large number of members received a settlement in respect of their outstanding entitlements, but they also received a new structure and a new enterprise agreement that came out of that and security of employment.
Q. I'11 take you through it step by step just in bite sized pieces. The first point is did the proceedings actually go to a final hearing in court and was judgment given?
A. No.
Q. Was there a compromise of those proceedings, a settlement?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you were just enumerating various matters that were components of that settlement, so I'll endeavour to take them one by one. As a component of that settlement, did members of the union who were working at the Peter MacCallum Cancer Institute get some payment?
A. Yes. They got a - they got their own settlement in respect of their outstanding entitlements. There was millions of dollars at the time, so union reached agreement about that and, in return, the members got an enhanced career structure and security of employment, and that's how we settled with the Peter MacCallum Cancer Institute on behalf of the membership.
Q. So the members got some payment and in addition, on your memory, they got some guarantee about security of
tenure or the like going forward?
A. And a new structure.
Q. And a new structure. The proceedings had been brought alleging breaches of the award; is that right?
A. Yes. Of the enterprise agreement.
Q. And the enterprise agreement. And separate from what the members received, was some component of the settlement referable to the union?
A. That's right.
Q. What was that?
A. In addition, the union was a separate litigant in its own right pursuing fines against the employer, as it was our right and as many unions do, and then we settled for a sum of money that was properly payable to the union, and it had nothing to do with the members' entitlements and the whole arrangement was approved by a members' meeting at Peter MacCallum because it affected them, and the advice we received from counsel is somewhere in my affidavit or in the tabs. As I've said - as I just said, the whole arrangement was approved by the membership. They got their entitlements as they were - you know, that's why you run these cases, but in the same breath the union was a litigant in its own right to seek penalties under the Act for the employer being in breach. But what we've seen in the media in the last couple of days is that I - you know, I couldn't find the members and somehow the union took this money secretly and we, you know, put it away and all this sort of stuff. That did not happen. The union had its own case that it ran for penalties under the Act, and we were successful in getting those penalties.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Ms Jackson, you would understand industrial law generally. This action was in the Victorian tribunal, was it?
A. No, it was - Peter MacCallum is covered by a Federal award.
Q. So it was in Federal industrial tribunals?
A. Yes.
Q. It is a feature of that type of litigation that if a person other than the state or a government brings proceedings for penalties, they can keep the whole of the penalty or a fraction of the penalty?
A. Yes. The organisation. The penalties - the penalty or the settlement that was reached with Peter MacCallum because it didn't end up going to court, it was a settlement that we reached with Peter MacCallum, the penalty was paid directly to the union and, separate to that, Peter MacCallum reached an agreement through the union with their employees.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I understand.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Just to clarify, when you say "the penalty was paid", it was an amount paid pursuant to the compromise agreement that was reached?
A. Yes.
Q. The net result to the No 3 Branch was that an amount of about $\$ 250,000$ was paid to it by Peter Mac?
A. Yes.
Q. You say at 421 there was a long discussion at a BCOM meeting about what to do. Just pausing there, do you recollect who were the members of the BCOM at about that time?
A. No, I don't, only because I don't have access to the minutes, but if you --
Q. I can take you to one minute. It is not late 2003, but there are a few minutes still in existence, and one of them is in Mr Dixon, MFI1. I'11 just see if we can bring that up. If you go to page 1 behind tab 1, it's a committee - I'll keep calling it a BCOM meeting at 9 April 2003. I know that's not late 2003 but perhaps the committee was similarly constituted in early 2003. It says at the top third of the page "Present", and then there are a number of people identified. Were they members of the committee as best as you can recall or most of them in 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there are some apologies in item 1. Were they other persons who were members of the committee?
A. Yes.
Q. Who were the members of the committee? Where are they drawn from?
A. The rank and file membership. For example, Mark Hindson is a physiotherapist. Kathryn Whitfield was a
health information manager, a clinical coder. Kate Wilkinson was a radiation therapist. Jenny Dunlop was a deputy chief radiographer. Lisa was an occupational therapist. Reuben Dixon was a radiographer. 01ga Gountras was a social worker.
Q. The persons who weren't able to attend that meeting? A. Sorry, Bryan Yeates was a prosthetist and orthotist. Kristine Olaris was or is a physiotherapist. Adriana Vespecci is a speech pathologist and Robbie Matejin is a radiographer or medical imaging technologist.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Did you say what Lisa Magnusson's occupation was?
A. Occupational therapist.
Q. Right. Thank you. For some of these occupations one needs significant training, presumably?
A. Yes. They're all Bachelor of Science, four year qualified.
Q. Rough1y what age span were they? Were they everything from sort of 20s to 60s?
A. Maybe not 60s, but late 20s to - this is 2003 - to 50s, mid-50s.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: Q. They were persons with significant training and experience?
A. Yes, definitely, and some of the people - I don't know at the time, but Jenny Dunlop was quite a senior person in her organisation. As I said, she was a deputy chief radiographer at Monash Medical Centre and I still think she holds that role today. Kate Wilkinson was the clinical educator in quite a senior position in her organisation. Mark Hindson is quite a senior - I think he's a spinal physiotherapist at Austin Health. Lisa Magnusson works in occupational therapy and community health and Mr Bryan Yeates has been one of our longest serving members. He's recently retired, but I think he was a member of the union for 40 years. He was one of the first prosthetists and orthotists, which are limb-makers, that were employed in Victoria.
Q. Coming back to your statement, you said in 421 there was a long discussion at a BCOM meeting about what to do
with the Peter Mac settlement moneys.
A. Yes.
Q. You suggested - and I am now going to 422 - that this was an opportunity to establish the discretionary fund. Did you make that suggestion at a meeting of the BCOM? A. Yes .
Q. What did you actually say?
A. I would have said words to the effect that - we would have spoken about the settlement. Obviously members knew about the settlement and talked about how there was, you know, $\$ 250,000$ coming the union's way. The union at that time, and at most times under my leadership, was in a very healthy financial state for a small industrial organisation, and I suggested to them, after speaking to some of the members as well, that we should set up a discretionary fund that we would be able to use to fund campaigns and the political interests and industrial interests of the branch.

As I said yesterday, because it was such a smal1 branch, just having a fund where members put money in per week would not be sufficient for these activities and, more importantly, when, for example, campaigns were being run, be it your rights at work or campaigns where staff had to be released to assist the ALP or other unions at times, we weren't large enough to be able to do that because you couldn't afford to have any employees off the job, so to speak, going off to run campaigns elsewhere. So, therefore, we decided to set up this discretionary fund that instead of giving manpower or people power, booking for staff off, that we would be able to contribute in a financial manner.
Q. You say in 422 that the suggestion was supported by several members of the BCOM?
A. Yes.
Q. We've just seen - I didn't count them - but there must have been about 10 members at that time at least. Were some members opposed?
A. From memory, no, I don't think they were opposed. It was all about having - making the best use of the money and we had situations in the past, particularly in the mid-90s, when the union had almost - not gone under, so to speak, but where there was a big case we'd run in the - I think it
was in the Supreme Court about entitlements and if we hadn't won that case and had penalties awarded against us, then that would have wiped out the union. But by 2003-2004, the union was in a very healthy financial situation and that was never going to - we were never going - that was never going to happen to us again because payroll deductions had come - would fix the problems that we had with payroll deductions or rather losing payroll deductions. So no, there wasn't - from memory, there wasn't any opposition. There were discussions certainly about how we should do it and which was the right way which was the right path to take to establish this fund.
Q. You make reference in 422 to political donations. Was there discussion about that topic at the BCOM?
A. Yes. The union was an affiliated - was affiliated to the Labor Party and members understood - members of the committee understood what that meant, and that's not to say that every member of that committee of management was keep in mind this is a group of health professionals and it wasn't a situation where, you know, this would just be used for ALP purposes because there was a variety of views held on that committee.
Q. In 423 you say:

Eventually the BCOM reached agreement and a resolution was passed ...

Was that a formal resolution passed at a BCOM meeting? A. Yes.
Q. Was it recorded in writing?
A. Yes.
Q. If we had the minutes, would we be able to --
A. You would easily be able to identify that the state secretary would have said something like the state secretary is authorised to put aside this money into the NHDA and that we would not put the whole money in there immediately but, as needed, the money would go into that account and - sorry - and that we would use this money in conjunction with the Victorian No 1 Branch.
Q. Did the resolution stipulate whether the whole of the Peter Mac settlement moneys, if I can call them that, would go into that or be covered by that arrangement or some
part?
A. The whole of the money.
Q. Was there any provision in the resolution concerning whether or not you would have access to some component of those moneys for your personal use?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. What was said about that?
A. The resolution, from memory, went on to say that

I could - I was authorised to spend up to $\$ 4,000$ of that money per annum in lieu of sitting fees and the work overtime, et cetera.

Understand that - most union officials will tell you this - when you work in a union, it is not a nine to five job. You're there, it's a lifestyle, so to speak, so that was to compensate me for that sort of out of hours work and the sitting fees and meetings that I did very regularly out of hours.
Q. You say that you recorded that in - it's in the minutes and you make reference, you've given evidence about the minutes, but you also maintained a minute book.
I think you gave some evidence about that yesterday. The minute book is among the records that can no longer be found?
A. Yes.
Q. But you, to the best of your recollection, included within the minute book that you maintained a copy of the minute that was passed in late 2003?
A. Oh, definitely. Yes. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: I think there is a mistake in paragraph 424 of the statement. It says.
... the minute book has disappeared in the circumstances addressed at paragraph 384 above.

384 doesn't deal with that subject. It is probably intended to say 388 to 390 , or something like that. Those paragraphs deal with the taking of the document.

MR STOLJAR: Q. Yes. Is that a correction that should be made to your statement, Ms Jackson? Should the
reference to --
A. Yes.
Q. So in 424 the reference should be not to " 384 " but rather to "388 to 390 inclusive above"?
A. Yes.
Q. You say that when there was discussion about it, it was referred to as the Peter Mac money?
A. That's correct.
Q. When you talked about that at meetings and the like, you tended to designate it as the "Peter Mac" money --
A. The Peter Mac money.
Q. -- rather than the NHDA?
A. That's correct.
Q. But as you say in 426, after the BCOM approval, you opened a bank account at the Commonwealth Bank. Can I provide you with a folder of documents which have been produced in answer to a notice to produce by the Commonwealth Bank.

THE COMMISSIONER: That should be marked Jackson MFI4, Mr Stoljar?

MR STOLJAR: May it please the Commission.

## JACKSON MFI\#4 FOLDER OF DOCUMENTS PRODUCED IN ANSWER TO A

 NOTICE TO PRODUCE BY THE COMMONWEALTH BANKQ. Would you come to page 3 of MFI4. You are there looking at a CBA authority for a non-personal account which was completed on or about 4 December 2003. Have you seen this document before?
A. No.
Q. When you said in your paragraph 426:

In December 2003 ... I opened a bank account ...

That was just going on your memory at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. So you've got a reasonable memory of these events?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the handwriting on that document your handwriting?
A. No. The signature is mine but the handwriting is not.
Q. The name of the account is National Health Development Account. Who came up with that name?
A. I think we just talked about it at that meeting and I would have had discussions with the No 1 Branch as to what we should call it, and that was the amount - sorry, not the amount, that was the account name we came up with.
Q. On page 5 of the document, there is a signature in section 8 . Is that your signature?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. It says:

Complete this section for Unincorporated Association Accounts.

Were you contemplating operating the account through an unincorporated association?
A. At that point, just from memory, I just went down to open the account. I had an intention that we would formalise it at some point and have an incorporated association with rules and constitution, what have you, but never got around to doing that. But, yes, at that point, it was set up as an unincorporated association.
Q. Is what you're saying that at that time, 4 December, 2003, you contemplated doing that but the fact is you never ultimately did set up an unincorporated association?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you remember why you were looking at using an unincorporated association?
A. No.
Q. Is that something just from your time in the union movement you'd come across before, unincorporated associations running accounts of this kind?
A. Yes. Just from memory there was - I remember asking various people - not just then but throughout the whole time. For example, if you were running a campaign and I don't know, say you were running a campaign for a particular electorate or a federal electoral committee, or
whatever, the advice that I'd been given by various people within the Labor Party was just to set up an unincorporated association.
Q. Were you given the --
A. When I say - sorry?
Q. Let's take that again in steps. First of all, you were there referring more to the Labor Party. I was more interested really in what unions did. Is that something that other unions were doing that you know of, setting up unincorporated associations?
A. That was my understanding, yes.
Q. Where did you derive that understanding?
A. Just from talking to other officials at that time and through that time.
Q. Did those discussions you were having give you any insight into the benefits that those officials apprehended accompanied the establishment of an unincorporated association?
A. No.
Q. It was just something that was done?
A. It was just something that was done, yes.
Q. Could I just ask you to put MFI4 to one side for a moment. Keep it there. Just come back to your statement. In fact, you say in 427 that you had planned to establish an unincorporated association "in which my then husband, Mr Jackson, would play a part", but in the end you didn't get around to it?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you say:

I was the sole operator of the NHDA since its inception.
A. Yes.
Q. And then 429:

I certainly discussed the opening of the NHDA with the BCOM ...

When did you do that?
A. After that had occurred, once the bank had sent me details and, you know, I had an account number and what have you, I informed the branch committee of management that the account had been opened and it was called the NHDA, and also that there would be a separate ledger in the accounts that recorded this.
Q. In the books of account maintained by the No 3 Branch?
A. Yes.
Q. In the MYOB records and the like?
A. In the MYOB records, yes.
Q. In 431 you say that the Peter Mac money was expended by you over a period of years between 2004 and 2010. Just tell us about the process pursuant to which you were able to effect those expenditures?
A. So, depending on what was happening between those years then there would be money withdrawn, money would be kept. People would ask for money, or requests would come in either from Mr Jackson at the No 1 Branch, or others, about what they needed money for and then I would give them the money for those purposes. For example, it may have been for printing, as I said yesterday, it may have been for campaigns, it may have been for staff events, but usually it would be spent on campaigns and reimbursing of members and the like.
Q. Yesterday you were giving evidence about a separate sum of money which was the money remaining after members of the BCOM had received the $\$ 100$ cash payment per meeting each?
A. Yes.
Q. You said that you kept that in a kitty, in a steel tin or the like, in your office?
A. Yes.
Q. And used it for purposes of the kind you were just describing?
A. Yes.
Q. That process, as I understand it, continued through this period?
A. Yes.
Q. So there was that fund and then separately from late 2003 or early 2004, there was this other NHDA fund?
A. But the money was used for the same purposes.
Q. The same purposes?
A. Yes.
Q. So a range of different purposes?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you go back to the BCOM and seek approval each time you deployed some of the money that was in the NHDA?
A. Not every time, but at every committee meeting, if money had been taken out, it will appear in the statement not in the statement, in the financial reports.
Occasionally a member would ask "What did we spend that on?", and they would get a reply where the money was spent when the financial report was given.
Q. When you say taken our, you mean --
A. A withdrawal.
Q. A withdrawal from the funds maintained by the union which had been received by it in the settlement with Peter Mac?
A. Yes.
Q. When you say "withdrawal", you mean funds were transferred from some union account into the NHDA?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say that if people queried what was happening with that, you would provide an explanation?
A. Yes.
Q. What about once funds had reached the NHDA, the account that you were maintaining, and you were deploying them in one way or another, did you go back to the BCOM and seek approval for that?
A. No. No, I didn't, but - when I say I didn't, for example, say the Australian Institute of Radiographers had a ball on or a function on, then people would say "Well, how are we paying for that?", and I would say, "Well, we have the NHDA money to pay for that." So it was done in that sort of fashion.
Q. You say in 432:

> Over the years, I often discussed with the BCOM a proposal to transfer monies from the Peter Mac Fund.

When you say "the Peter Mac Fund", what do you mean?
A. The NHDA.
Q. So you're saying - well, when you say the NHDA, you mean the account with CBA that you opened in December 2003? A. Yes.
Q. You say here:

I often discussed with BCOM a proposal to transfer monies from [that account].

But you say:
I did not seek the approval of the BCOM ...
because the transfers were all covered by the original approval in late 2003.
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by that?
A. What I meant by that was if I needed to withdraw, say, I don't know, $\$ 4,000$ or $\$ 5,000$, or whatever the amount, I would just withdraw that amount. That amount would then appear on the financial statements. So I didn't go to the Branch Committee of Management and before I withdrew the money and say this is what was going to happen before I withdrew the money.
Q. What was your practice? You say something about it in 432, was to go back to the BCOM afterwards; is that the position?
A. That's correct. Particularly when the statements, when the financial reports were being presented, on occasion people would ask about the NHDA money.
Q. But did the financial reports presented to the BCOM descend into the detail of - I'll take that step by step. Did the financial reports presented to the BCOM identify money that had come across from a union account to the NHDA; that's right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they descend into the detail of how the money had been spent once it had reached the NHDA?
A. No.
Q. How would members of the BCOM find out, if they did, about what had happened once it reached the NHDA?
A. Because I kept an exercise book that had - it was just handwriting, when the withdrawal was made, how much it was for and where it went.
Q. Is that the exercise book to which you refer in 439 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You kept a record of the money spent out of the NHDA. Did you go back to the BCOM and discuss with them how the money was being applied from time to time?
A. From time to time, yes.
Q. You say that was - tell me if this is correct or not. Do you say that was an informal process?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you come, please, back to MFI4. That's the folder of CBA accounts. On page 8 - I should mention, Ms Jackson, the records the bank maintained only went back a certain period of time. As I understand it, this was about as early as we were able to obtain. Picking up the story on page 8, 14 August 2007, there is an ATM --
A. Sorry, which page are you on?
Q. Page 8 in the top right-hand corner.
A. Yes.
Q. It says an opening balance of $\$ 6,259.45$ and then on 1 November there's a withdrawal in the amount of $\$ 500$. Would that have been a withdrawal that you would have effected?
A. Yes, probably.
Q. You were the only person operating the account?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any recollection, as you sit here today and I'm sure that you may well not - as to what that money was spent on?
A. No.
Q. Is that money that you would have used for union purposes or personal purposes?
A. Union purposes.
Q. Coming over to the next page, page 9, there are some withdrawals on 26 November and 4 December respectively?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you have any recollection as to what matters those withdrawals related?
A. Which dates are we talking about?
Q. 26 November and it says "YG'S" - it seems to be Young Generation?
A. Oh, yes, yes, yes. Sorry, yes, I can. Sorry.
Q. And then on 4 December Kip McGrath Education?
A. Yes. So what I did was that - because I had been I had the - I thought it was prudent of me, so people didn't make any allegations that $I$ was misspending the cash component, I decided in relation to that $\$ 4,000$ that whatever withdrawal I made for my purposes that it would be shown exactly where that money was spent, so if anybody asked me about that money, then it was easily identifiable as my expense, and that's why I used it in that fashion. So 26 November, for example, is mine; 4 December is mine.
Q. Just pausing there.
A. Sorry.
Q. When you say "mine", what do you mean?
A. As part of my $\$ 4,000$.
Q. So those withdrawals, 26 November and 4 December respectively, were effected by you?
A. Yes.
Q. And the money was applied for personal purposes, not union purposes?
A. Yes.
Q. But is this the position - and please correct me if I've got it wrong - you say that that was within the $\$ 4,000$ allowance that had been afforded you by the BCOM in late 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. On 6 December and then again on 21 December there were transfers, it looks like, in amounts of $\$ 8,000$ each?
A. Yes.
Q. And one can see that that had come across from the No 3 Branch account?
A. Yes.
Q. Would they have been transfers that you caused to be effected?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recollect what those two sums of $\$ 8,000$ each were spent on?
A. Just looking at those dates, I imagine they would have been spent on - around that time a lot of Christmas parties and delegates things are being held. A lot of the time we spent a lot of that money buying vouchers for different delegates across the state.
Q. Vouchers for what purpose?
A. To thank members for work they had done.
Q. Gifts you mean?
A. Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Have you finished your answer? A. Yes.
Q. Ms Jackson, those two $\$ 8,000$ figures are credits in. There are no debits out in December, or January, or February there recorded; debits out again in March on page 10.
A. $0 h, I$ see.
Q. Do you see?
A. Yes.
Q. You couldn't have been funding vouchers and Christmas parties merely by money going into the account. The question is what happened when the money came out of the account?
A. When the money came out of the account it sat in that grey box, but I'm just saying that there would have been there may have been money in the box that we would have used at that time, which was normal practice, to pay for
that, and that may have come out of the sitting fee component and that would have been to top that up.

MR STOLJAR: $Q$. When you say "that box", you mean the kitty, as you described it yesterday?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't top up the box in the balance of 2007 going into 2008. The first significant withdrawal was on 6 March 2008 for the sum of $\$ 6,000$. Do you know what that was for?
A. No, not from memory.
Q. What were the kinds of things that you were withdrawing sums of that magnitude from the NHDA?
A. It would have been - just from memory, it would have been withdrawn to pay for, I don't know, different campaigns that people may have asked us money for at the time, but just from looking at that date, I just can't remember.
Q. Union campaigns or political campaigns?
A. Union and/or political campaigns.
Q. How would the withdrawal have been effected - by cash?
A. Yes.
Q. And then handed over to somebody?
A. Yes. And when I say handed over to somebody, they may not have got the whole amount.
Q. Are there any records, or were there any records identifying with any more precision how that cash was applied?
A. No, other than what existed in my exercise book, no, there isn't.
Q. I see. Just keeping that folder, MFI4, with you and going back to 439, you say that the record that you kept included the date, payee, amount and purpose?
A. Yes.
Q. There are some more comparatively small expenditures during 2008 and I can see various cash sums. For example, 18 Apri1, it says 50, and then the numeral 4, 349 , and then there's a payment --

THE COMMISSIONER: That's not a cash sum, that would be a
cheque, wouldn't it? I mean 6 March withdrawal, that seems to be cash, but when there's a payee nominated, one would expect it to be a cheque or possibly a direct transfer.

MR STOLJAR: Q. Ms Jackson, are you able to --
A. Which page are you on, sorry?
Q. Page 10 in the top right-hand corner.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is a cheque number it seems likely, 930018.

MR STOLJAR: Ms Jackson may comment, but unless, Commissioner, it is use of a card to which some receipt number was allocated.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Ms Jackson, do you have a recollection of how that --
A. No, I don't know what that is.
Q. Did you have a card that you used to operate this account?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it also a cheque account?
A. No, not from memory. It says "cheque account" up here but I don't ever recollect writing a cheque.
Q. For example, the payment on 6 May 2008, which looks like to a doctor --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that would have been effected by use of the card?
A. Yes.
Q. That was presumably for a personal purpose?
A. Yes.
Q. Likewise, 18 April?
A. Yes.
Q. The smaller amounts that were coming out from time to time were generally for personal purposes, is that right, and the larger withdrawals may have been for some other purpose?
A. Yes.
Q. Coming over to page 12, there are two withdrawals in May of $\$ 4,000$ each. Were they cash withdrawals, do you remember?
A. Yes .
Q. Do you remember what they were used for?
A. No.
Q. Would they have been used for personal purposes or union purposes?
A. Definitely not. They were used for either political or industrial purposes.
Q. If you come to page 14 , there's an amount of $\$ 8,000$ transferred across and then there's another withdrawal of $\$ 3,000$. Do you know what that was about?
A. No.
Q. What about the withdrawals on page 15, 26 November 2008, there's a withdrawal of $\$ 7,000$ and then on 24 December another withdrawal of $\$ 5,000$. Do you have any recollection of what those withdrawals may have been used for?
A. No. When I say "no", as I have said previously - what year was that? Political or industrial purposes.
Q. Did you wish to add to your answer?
A. No. Sorry.
Q. Page 16, there's an amount of $\$ 50,000$ comes across on 23 March 2009 from HSU No 3 Branch and the following day a withdrawal for the same amount, $\$ 50,000$. What was that about?
A. That was in relation, I think, just from memory, with the No 1 Branch, but I can't be certain of that, about debts that they had, and I believe that that was given to them.
Q. Do you remember how that withdrawal was effected?
A. No.
Q. It is unlikely that you went to the bank and withdrew a cash sum in that amount, is it not?
A. I'm not - I'm not - I couldn't say either way, sorry.
Q. When you say it was paid across to the No 1 Branch, was that done electronically or some other way?
A. Oh, look, this is the first time I've seen this, so I'm not positive. It may have been paid across directly to the No 1 Branch but I'm not - I'm just not positive of that. I can't --
Q. When you say it is the first time you saw it, the Commission provided you with these account statements? A. Yes, but I did not go through every single page. I've had Federal Court proceedings to deal with as well as this Royal Commission.
Q. Can you come to page 18. There is a transfer across on 5 October of $\$ 8,000$ and then two withdrawals on 16 and 22 October respectively in the amounts of $\$ 5,000$ and $\$ 3,500$ respectively. Do you remember what those transactions were about?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Take a moment to read through the further pages of the statement in MFI4, so pages 19 through to - in fact, if you just go to page 25 because after that, just glancing at it, there seems to be little activity on the account. Do you have any memory, as you sit here today, of what the various transactions, or the larger ones on that account, were for?
A. Depending on the time frame, it would have been used for election purposes, be it at the various industrial elections around that time, but I'm not positive.
Q. Can you be a bit more precise? Were there elections in 2009?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. When did those elections take place in 2009, do you remember?
A. No. No. It's in my affidavit somewhere though.
Q. You mean elections in the union?
A. Yes.
Q. HSU elections?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I take you to page 18, for example. On

16 October and 22 October 2009 there are two separate withdrawals. Do you know whether either of those related
to those elections? If you don't know, just say. A. I don't. I don't know.
Q. You don't know. In paragraph 444 of your statement you say:

I had no other record of the application ... apart from the ... exercise book.

And you say that with your unaided memory, you can't recall and that's in effect what you've said today. Then on the top of page 50 of 63 you say.

```
... most of the transactions I cannot now
```

recall without some other documents ...

What other documents would assist you apart from the exercise book?
A. Other documents that would assist me, I suppose, would be when various elections were held, when various
State-Federal campaigns were held, when various fundraisers were held, when various state- not state, local government elections were held, and also when the various union disputes/rallies and - what are they called - protests, et cetera, that the union from time to time were involved in.
Q. In 448 you say.

> ... I did not claim or collect the honorarium that had been approved by the BCOM in respect of the additional duties associated with performing the role of Secretary of the No 3 Branch, notwithstanding my full-time role as National Secretary, I did not ...

You're really just making two propositions in 448. The first one relates to an honorarium that had been been approved by the BCOM in respect of additional duties associated with performing the role of secretary of the No 3 Branch. You mean after the merger?
A. Yes. No, after - not after the merger. After I became the national secretary.
Q. There was some evidence given about an honorarium that accrued and ultimately reached the amount of about $\$ 48,000$,
from memory. Is that that honorarium you're talking about there?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's quite separate from the sitting fees of the BCOM that produced the funds or the money that was put in the kitty?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Then you say.
... I did not utilise the full amount that I had been authorised to utilise for private purposes by the BCOM.

What did you mean by that?
A. The $\$ 4,000$ that $I$ was authorised to use, I did not use the full amount per annum.
Q. You then deal with a $\$ 5,000$ payment to something called $A B$ Hinc. That relates to a dinner that was held at a Lebanese restaurant on 22 Apri1 2010. That's behind tab 52. It is page 1032 of the third volume of MFI1. There was a dinner at which Mr Pakula was speaking?
A. Yes.
Q. If you go over to 1033, that was recorded in the branch accounts as a donation to a political party?
A. Yes.
Q. You say in 457 that the payment of $\$ 5,000$ to $A B$ Hinc was a lawful common garden political donation in the form of the purchase of a table. In 458:

I have no knowledge of any connection between this transaction and the charity known as "Australian Bringing Hope Inc".

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Mr Pakula was a member of the Labor Party who was the Minister for Public Transport; is that correct?
A. In Victoria, yes.

MR STOLJAR: Q. He was also the Minister for Industrial Relations, was he not, at some point, or do you not remember?
A. As much as you can be that in Victoria, yes,

I suppose.
Q. Could I show you John Agostinelli's statement. It is the folder which has been marked MFI1 or Agostinelli MFI1. Would you have a look at page 20. This is a bundle of financial statements - I'm sorry, these are financial statements for the period ending 24 May 2010, that's behind tab 2.
A. Sorry, what tab are you on?

MR STOLJAR: Tab 2. Commissioner, in case of any confusion, Mr Agostinelli's statement was contained within a small folder that was marked on the cover MFI1 and there were three volumes from the audit. I'm coming to the small folder containing the statement itself.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I've got that.
MR STOLJAR: I've handed the witness a copy. Behind tab 2 --

THE COMMISSIONER: You mentioned page 20. Is that numbering at the bottom?

MR STOLJAR: In the top right-hand corner.
THE COMMISSIONER: I haven't got that. What's the first line on the page?

MR STOLJAR: Health Services Union Victoria No 3 Branch for the period ending 24 May 2010.

THE COMMISSIONER: And then table of contents?
MR STOLJAR: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: What's the first important line on the page?

MR STOLJAR: I'm sorry, yes, it is a table of contents financial statements, yes, and there is a received date.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR STOLJAR: $Q$. So that's the accounts audited by Mr Agostinelli?
A . Yes .
Q. And if you come to page 38 --

THE COMMISSIONER: Does it have a number on the bottom of the front page?

MR STOLJAR: Top right.
THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, I haven't got it at the top right but I've got it --

MR STOLJAR: In the middle, at the bottom, it says 18.
Q. Mr Agostinelli, in item 13, has referred to Australia Bringing Hope Incorporated in an amount of $\$ 5,000$. Do you know where that's come from? Do you have any - is that just something that's happened subsequently?
A. I've never been asked about this. I saw this the first time when it was put up in here a couple of days ago, and I have had press inquiries about this obviously when they published a smear article about this. As far as I knew, when you look at that flyer that you showed me earlier or we went to earlier --
Q. Did you want to go back to that?
A. Yes.
Q. That's in volume 3 of your materials, tab 52.
A. 52. That was the flyer that we had received. I would have or - I or Frances Lindsay would have given this - we did attend this function. This would have been given to Frances and Frances would have passed it on to Jane for payment. The cheque was made out to $A B$ Hinc and when I started to get calls from the media, particularly Fairfax, saying to me that $I$ had sent $\$ 5,000$ to some organisation called Australia Bringing Hope Incorporated and they had been contacted and they had never received any money from the Health Services Union - and I explained to the journalist who obviously didn't listen to what I was saying that I had been to some charitable function but it wasn't this organisation, it was some organisation I believed at the time from Shepparton in Victoria and the union had donated money to them but this Martin Pakula fundraiser - when I say "Martin Pakula", he was the guest speaker, but the Marlene Kairouz fundraiser, the cheque was made out to that organisation by the union and whether it was just - I just can't remember. I think it was an
electronic funds transfer. Now, why it appears, this donation number 13 appears as a donation rather than a political donation, I don't know. I wasn't asked about this. But, more importantly, as I understand it, is that Fair Work Australia had some sort of query in relation to this. At no point did Fair Work Australia, nor whoever dealt with this, which I believe was Barry Gibson from the New South Wales office, came to me to ask me about this because - but when I Googled "AB Hinc", I came up with this Australia Bringing Hope Incorporated.

Let me make it clear, the union has never, ever, sent money to this charitable organisation. That just never happened.

Now, what may have happened - and I am totally speculating here - Ms Kairouz may have an account, obviously has an account, because the payment was made electronically by cheque to that BSB number that we see after tab 52. The union sent the $\$ 5,000$ to that branch account, BSB 013-375, account number 9017-200-64 and that's where the money was sent.

Now, how it appears as this here, I don't know, because in the MYOB statement it appears as a political donation and that's exactly what it was.
Q. When you say the MYOB statement, you're talking about the document at 1033 behind tab 53?
A. We just looked at it earlier. What one --
Q. Yes. In volume 3 of your materials, tab 53, page 1033 in the top right-hand corner?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. Is this the position, Ms Jackson, that in the internal records of the branch, this was recorded as a donation to a political party in the sum of $\$ 5,000$ ?
A. Yes .
Q. As appears from the document at 1033?
A. Yes.
Q. Those materials, or the underlying financial records were provided to the auditor?
A. Yes.
Q. And at some point the audited accounts included the information that we've just looked at at page 38, top right-hand corner, or 18 middle at the bottom in Mr Agostinelli's MFI1?
A. Yes .
Q. And you, as you sit here today, can't explain why the auditor recorded it in that way on that page?
A. That's correct. And, more importantly, no-one asked me. The first I ever knew there was any query by Fair Work Australia was during these proceedings - no, when the press spoke to me and then during these proceedings. No-one I believe, no-one has come to me to ask me what it was and quite disturbingly, you know, the allegation is made that somehow I had made some sort of donation - I had tried to cover up some sort of donation to the Labor Party by saying that we gave some sort of donation to some group called Australia Bringing Hope Inc. Let me make it quite clear, we never made any donation to anybody called Australia Bringing Hope Inc, but we did make a donation, a political donation, to Marlene Kairouz. We did attend this dinner and as you can see in 1032, tab 52, the cheque was made out to AB Hinc and as I said, when I Googled that, I came up with Australia Bringing Hope Incorporated. Now, I can't say why the auditor or why Mr Gibson, or why Fair Work Australia, whoever, has placed - has put it down as a donation like that to that organisation when it never occurred.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. You just said in that answer the cheque was made out to AB Hinc. Did you mean if you were to pay by cheque, it should be made out to $A B$ Hinc?
A. Yes.
Q. Because the actual payment was by electronic funds transfer?
A. That's what I believed happened, yes. But why I use that $A B$ Hinc reference is when I Googled $A B$ Hinc, I came the Google search gave me Australia Bringing Hope Incorporated. At that point I looked at this organisation and we had - from my memory, we had never been to any such event or given them any sort of money, but when I spoke to the media in that time, I did say to them that $I$ had been to a charitable function. I don't know whether it was this one or another one, but it definitely was not this one once I went to the website.

MR STOLJAR: Q. In 461 of your statement there is a heading "NHDA Hudson". You say:

Mr Williamson was aware that I had a "fighting fund".

When you say "fighting fund", are you referring to the funds emanating from the Peter Mac settlement?
A. Yes, the NHDA.
Q. You say that you had a conversation with Mr Williamson about a Mr Hudson. What's the context there? What was happening at that time?
A. Mr Hudson had - the union had been put into
administration some time in, I think, 2009, this is the No 1 Branch, and Mr Hudson was still owed a substantial amount of money in outstanding entitlements, that the No 1 Branch weren't able to meet those obligations at that time. We had a discussion about how much money was involved and how he needed the money to pay his solicitor, and Williamson explained to me that they also had a cash flow problem and whether I would be prepared to pay some of the cash out from our fighting fund to Mr Hudson to shut him up and that they would pay us back when it was resolved. So I agreed to that proposition, that the money - some of the money would come out of the fighting fund and the rest would come out of the No 3 Branch account.
Q. If you go to tab 54 of volume 3 of your materials, page 1034 --
A. 1034 .
Q. -- whose handwriting is that:

As requested verbally by $K J$.
A. I believe that's Jane Holt's.
Q. This is the Commonwealth Bank transfer record relating to the payment made to or for the benefit of Mr Hudson?
A. Yes.
Q. I just want to pick this up from the document, but did this come from the NHDA account or from the Vic No 3 account?
A. Both.
Q. I see. So when you say "both", at the bottom it says: Account Name. National Health Development [Account].

In an amount of $\$ 6,000$ and then Vic No 3 has an amount of \$7,000?
A. Yes .
Q. Giving rise to a total of $\$ 13,000$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. When payments came out of the NHDA account, at least if they were some sort of transfers, were they effected by you or by Ms Holt?
A. Like, for example, this one?
Q. Yes.
A. Ms Holt. I didn't have access to the MYOB file.

MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, I note the time.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. We will adjourn until 10 to 12.

## SHORT ADJOURNMENT

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Stoljar.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Ms Jackson, I was asking you about a payment made to or in respect of a Mr Hudson. Could you go to 464 of your statement. You say.

> ... I gave Ms Holt instructions for the making of that payment, the cash component as a transfer ... and the balance from a No 3 Branch account ...

How much did Mr Hudson need or desire?
A. I can't remember but I think around $\$ 13,000$, just from memory.
Q. We looked at some bank records a moment ago. Was it the position that you say here - that $\$ 6,000$ came from a No 3 account and $\$ 7,000$ came in cash; is that correct?
A. The other way around.
Q. The other way around, I'm sorry. Do you know whether the cash came out of the NHDA or the kitty that you were maintaining, or are you not sure?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Can I take you back to MFI4, that's the bundle of documents produced by the Commonwealth Bank in answer to the notice to produce.
A. Yes.
Q. If you come to page 22 in the top right-hand corner, there's a transfer on 13 October 2010 of $\$ 6,000$ from the HSU No 3 account. Did that relate to Mr Hudson?
A. A credit, yes.
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Yes.
Q. In order to pay Mr Hudson - well, does that mean that $\$ 13,000$ came out of either this account or the kitty? I'11 call the other one the kitty.
A. Yes. When I say "yes", just from looking at exhibit 1034, \$6,000 cash would have gone to Mr Hudson and the rest would have been an EFT transaction of $\$ 7,000$.
Q. I see. So $\$ 7,000$ was an EFT, $\$ 6,000$ was paid to him in cash, but that money was refunded, or that money came from NHDA?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you able to identify whether there's a withdrawal in cash from the NHDA account, the CBA account, which corresponds to that payment?
A. No, because there would have been cash sitting in the kitty, we would have given him the cash out of that, and just credited or deposited into the account the $\$ 6,000$ that sat there.
Q. So when Mr Williamson talked about the fighting fund, he might have been talking about one or the other?
A. One or the other, yes. But the conversation I had with him on that particular day was in relation to the NHDA.
Q. Could you come back to paragraph 446. You say there:

Every transfer of money to the NHDA and

> every expenditure of moneys by me out of the NHDA was with BCOM approval.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you stil1 have MFI4 there, the CBA bundle of documents?
A. Yes.
Q. I asked you some questions about the transaction which appears on page 16 being a transaction which occurred over the two day period 23 to 24 March 2009, pursuant to which there is a deposit of $\$ 50,000$ and a withdrawal of $\$ 50,000$ the following day.
A. Yes.
Q. Let's take it in steps. Firstly, $\$ 50,000$ came out of the HSU Vic No 3 account, that's the first half. Did you discuss that aspect of the transaction with anyone at the BCOM?
A. I don't remember but I may - I don't remember. It was around the time of - 2009. No.
Q. I'm going to show you some financial records. They are contained within MFI1 for Jane Holt. Behind tab 3, beginning on page 3 , numbering in the top right-hand corner, are some profit and loss statements in respect of the No 3 Branch. These were prepared by Ms Holt?
A. Yes.
Q. You submitted regular profit and loss statements to the BCOM as part of your financial report?
A. Yes.
Q. You used, for that purpose, profit and loss statements created by Ms Holt?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you come through to page 9. You'11 just have to turn the folder around. There's a P\&L for July through January for the 2009 year?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see in the right hand "Expenses column, just above the line in bold "Total Expenses" the letters "NHDA" and an amount of $\$ 25,000$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. So as at January 2009 - or this document in fact appears to be dated 15 February 2009 - I'm looking at the date in the top left-hand corner - an amount of $\$ 25,000$ had been paid across from the branch No 3 account to the NHDA? A. Yes.
Q. That was something that was submitted to the BCOM, was it?
A. Yes, definitely. These are the sort of reports that were submitted - presented to the BCOM when they met.
Q. If I take you through to page 11, there's a date in the top right-hand corner, if you flip the page around on its side, 17 May 2010, and that reflects that there's an increased amount, $\$ 75,000$ ?
A. Yes .
Q. The difference between the 25 and the 75 is clearly the $\$ 50,000$ ?
A. The 50 .
Q. Do you know whether there was any discussion about that expenditure of $\$ 50,000$ at BCOM leve1?
A. These reports, as I said previously, are the sort of reports that are presented to the Branch Committee of Management whenever they met, and if any member had asked a question - and I just can't - like, this is in 2009, they may have asked a question about that and they would have got the answer to that. Like, it wasn't hidden from them. Here it is in the accounts and every - and if you go through all the accounts, it appears as "NHDA" and the money was there. It was never hidden anywhere. So yes, this document was presented at a Branch Committee of Management. These financial reports were accepted and endorsed by the Branch Committee of Management.
Q. The day after the money was paid into the NHDA account, it was withdrawn again. That appears from page 16 of MFI4. You said before, when I asked you about it, that you thought that money was paid to the No 1 Branch? A. No 1 Branch, yes, but I'm not positive about that.
Q. Are you sure or are you just guessing?
A. I'm guessing.
Q. If you had your exercise book, do you know whether you
recorded the payee and the purpose of the account in your exercise book?
A. If I had my exercise book every transaction would have been recorded faithfully and I - my position is, this is exactly why they have taken this exercise book because I imagine it would embarrass a lot of people about what's in there and where the money went to, and what I say about that is that NHDA was opened - the account was opened with the endorsement and the approval of the Branch Committee of Management. Some people may find that unpalatable but that's how business was conducted. Not just in my union, I imagine, but in other unions as well. Unless we have different regulation and procedures, then this is how people operate in this environment.
Q. Let me again break that into different steps. You say that practices of this kind were occurring in other unions? A. As I understand it, yes.
Q. Can you identify any other union which operated an account like the NHDA?
A. I'm not sure whether they operated exactly like the NHDA but I know from having conversations with officials previously that other unions, such as the AWU, the NUW, the SDA, et cetera, also had accounts that were run by the organisation, but not audited as such by the branch auditors, they were off-line sort of accounts. And let me make that clear, as far as I understood, and still understand to this day, as long as you had approval of your Branch Committee of Management of how this money is being spent and you make a recording - like you account for it, that there's nothing illegal about doing business that way for a better term. But I understand, as I said before, that people may find that unpalatable, but unless there is different regulation and procedures in place, this is what people do. This is how - this is how the movement operates and that's why at some point in my - I'm not sure which volume it's in, I did present a paper to my National Executive about seeking regulatory change about how union elections were conducted and, for example, funded and how there should be full disclosure about these matters, because I understand that the majority of the public and members and the community would find this sort of stuff unpalatable. But let me say again, this was how business was conducted, not just in my organisation but across the movement.
Q. Was the NHDA account itself audited?
A. No.
Q. You described it as "off-line". What did you mean by that?
A. What I meant by that was that there was - the Branch Committee of Management, as I said previously, approved the setting up of this account. The money that went into it we saw as a windfall, it wasn't members' money, it wasn't going to come out of members' dues, and that money was set aside in a discrete account that I was authorised to use for the purposes that I outlined earlier.

We didn't go to - like other organisations would have had - larger organisations than ours would have had grand fundraisers, big balls, big events where big corporate sponsors would come along and contribute, you know, $\$ 10,000$, $\$ 20,000$, or you would have events where a certain minister would turn up and, you know, access to that minister meant you had to, I don't know, pay $\$ 5,000$, $\$ 10,000$ for a table. We didn't have the luxury of that in a small branch, and for us to have any sort of political influence, or be at the table, then you had to have money to be able to do this. You had to have money to be able to contribute to campaigns, be they political or industrial, but mainly political, and that's how it was done.
Q. You said unless there are changes to regulations and procedures, this will be the way people conduct business, in effect. Do you regard the way this NHDA account was conducted by you as falling short of proper practice? A. I would say it would fall short of proper practice in relation to what the public expect, but I don't say that it's an illegal account. I say that it's an account that was set up to meet the needs of the organisation at the time, and that's how it was transacted.
Q. You said that you presented a paper to the Executive I think you may have said --
A. To the National Executive.
Q. To the National Executive calling for changes to regulation. Is that in your evidence?
A. Yes, it is. I'11 just have a look. Just give me a second. I think it's at - is it in volume 2, tab 27 ?
Q. That's a report that you make reference to at
paragraph 299 of your statement?
A. Yes.
Q. I won't go through the document at tab 27 which begins on page 413 in detail, but were there aspects of this document that you would point to as relevant to the conduct of accounts such as the one that we've seen this morning?
A. Hang on a minute. I'll just read - I'll just start at page 414 , and what I say to the National Executive at this time, in November of 2011, was that - and this was in the context that I was seeking to introduce preferential voting into union elections and I say:

And continuing on the issue of undemocratic practices, in recent years the union has abolished the previous practice of
permitting a candidate to submit a photograph and short election statement to be included in a booklet posted out by the Returning Officer with ballot papers. This move was deliberately and shockingly undemocratic. I am surprised that FWA (previously the Industrial Registrar allowed this rule to be certified. At any rate this earlier action is a stain on the union.

For this reason $I$ am proposing that candidates' photographs and election statements be restored.

This attempt to gag candidates was even more gratuitous since incumbents already have an enormous advantage in elections.
Q. If I can just cut in there, I was really focusing more on the question of --
A. I'm coming to it.
Q. -- the account. Perhaps you're coming to it in about the third paragraph?
A. The next sentence:

Throughout their period of office they can use union journals to promote themselves. They commonly build up "war chests" with which to fight elections, sometimes

> involving very large sums. In light of recent events, particularly, I hope we can expect greater external scrutiny of the source of those funds.
> As is the case in political 7 ife general7y, the incentive to raise electoral funds can be a pathway to corruption. It is common7y argued, right7y in my view, that big money politics subverts democracy by making politicians beholden to campaign donors.
> So as to both give reformist and independent candidates a fair chance of electoral success, as a bulwark against prospective corruption, I now propose that we limit campaign spending per candidate to $\$ 1000 . ~ I ~ n o t e ~ t h a t ~ e v e n ~ t h i s ~ a m o u n t ~ w o u l d ~$ mean that a ticket of 50 to 60 candidates would still be able to spend \$50-\$60,000, a very significant sum.

I go on to talk about how we should change our rules to limit electoral funding, have electoral funding disclosed, et cetera, et cetera and I also recommended that the union instruct or request Mr Temby SC, in conjunction with the union's solicitors, to set up such a rule change to reflect these recommendations, and I go on to talk about gender equity and, you know, the role of the National Executive.

My proposals were soundly defeated at the National Executive. Believe it or not, the Health Services Union, according to the National Executive at that time, did not need any such changes to the way elections were funded, and my concern all along has been - and I say this to you, and to the members of the Health Services Union and to the public - there is a problem. There is a problem where, to be able to effective, to be an effective union leader in this country, that you do have to have money to fight those elections because there are people out there, factional warlords out there, that are always on the hunt to take over a union, to make sure that union's alliances or allegiances changes whether they're Left or Right, to whoever is funding that election. To do business - and I hate putting it that way, but to be able to survive in that political environment, you have to have a war chest. You have to have money in an account such as the NHDA to be
able to be an effective union leader. Otherwise, look what happened at the Health Services Union. The Health Services Union up until - I mean, I can put a date on it. I mean, I'm not sure whether you're interested but I'm happy to talk about it --

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Ms Jackson, you've drifted a long way from Mr Stoljar's question.
A. Okay. Sorry.

MR STOLJAR: Q. Ms Jackson, could I just ask you to deal with one other matter. I note that you've prepared a detailed written statement. I'm not going to take you through the whole thing, but you've been able to set out quite a deal of the matters that $I$ think you were just raising in the balance of your statement. Can I just deal with the matters at paragraph 467.
A. Yes.
Q. You're dealing there with another article in the press but it's talking about the funding of candidates by tobacco companies. In 468 you say:

I did support the candidacy of Mr Bolano.
Did you support that financially, in a financial sense?
A. Yes.
Q. Where did those funds come from?
A. The funds came out of the NHDA and/or the honorariums.
Q. When you say the honorariums, you mean what I have been calling the kitty?
A. The kitty, yes.
Q. Do you recollect how much you actually drew from one or other of those funds?
A. Not exactly, but at least - I would say at least 10 if not more. A lot of the money was also spent on, as I said yesterday, buying overnight bags because it is really important to have lots of overnight bags to be able to send members things as they happen. When I say that, postage overnight bags.
Q. Oh, I see.
A. Not - sorry.
Q. You don't mean carry-on bags?
A. No, not carry-on bags. Australia Post overnight bags, and it was very important to have lots of those in stock, particularly at election time, and money was also spent on, for example, paying for people that had come out to help, giving people some cash to buy dinner or what have you, and those sort of things.
Q. You say that you attended a lunch. Actually, before I come to that, setting aside things like contributing by buying overnight bags or the like, did you actually pay funds over to any person?
A. Yes, I gave some money, cash, to Marco Bolano.
Q. When you say to him, how physically does it work? You physically handed him cash?
A. Yes, in an envelope.
Q. And that was money drawn from one or other of the kitty or the NHDA?
A. Yes. And I should add, I also, I don't know if it's come out anywhere else, but I also contributed - well, when I say "I", the organisation contributed money to the Fleur Behrens campaign in that election as well.
Q. She was also a candidate for office in the HSU elections?
A. In the No 3 Branch election.
Q. Was that in 2009 or 2012?
A. 2012 .
Q. You are talking here about the 2009 election?
A. Sorry.
Q. You also supported Ms Behrens's candidature in the 2012 election?
A. Yes.
Q. You attended a lunch with some representatives of Philip Morris, that was in 2009. You deal with that in 470 and following.
A. Yes.
Q. Is the short point that there was discussion about donation, but you reach a conclusion in 480 ?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't know for certain one way or the other?
A. I'm not certain how much money was contributed to Mr Bolano's campaign, or any other campaign for that matter. What I do know is that I have a recollection of this meeting only because the gentleman that was there from Philip Morris, his name was Bede Fennelly and I just thought it was a very unusual name, only because I'd been reading that week a book about Bede Griffith, a Benedictine monk who went on to live in an ashram, I think, and made a comment to him about, you know, his unusual name and, you know, was he named after Bede Griffith, and that's why I remember his name. At that meeting I thought it was quite strange that here they were a tobacco company, and I think Mad Men had just started on the TV and I said, "My God, you people should watch this", you know, "It's all about you people", and I did ask at the time, you know, "What are you doing contributing money to Health Services Union elections?", and basically the response was, you know, "We can't give it away. It's very hard to give our money away to political parties these days", and that's how it was left.

MR STOLJAR: I have nothing further, thank you.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Ms Jackson, at a later time there may be legal representatives who want to ask you some more questions, and what that time is will be arranged with you later. So you can leave the witness box now.
A. Can I just say - I won't take much of your time because I've been here a while.
Q. Yes.
A. I just wanted to say that I welcome this Royal Commission and I believe that I speak for many unionists when I say that. I remain fully committed to cooperating with the Commission. I remain totally committed to the idea of unionism, and I believe it's essential that working people organise and unionise.

I very much hope that any recommendations for reform that might eventually arise from this Commission will increase the governance and effectiveness of unions for the good of all union members in this country. So, I thank you for that.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

## <THE WITNESS WITHDREW

THE COMMISSIONER: Who is the next witness, Mr Stoljar? MR STOLJAR: It is Mr Dick.
<IAAN GRAEME FORBES DICK, affirmed:
<EXAMINATION BY MR STOLJAR:
MR STOLJAR: Q. Your name is Iaan Graeme Forbes Dick?
A. That's correct.
Q. You're an auditor by profession?
A. Auditor or accountant.
Q. You are a resident of Victoria?
A. Sorry?
Q. You're a resident of Victoria?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you prepared a witness statement in these proceedings?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's dated 3 June 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the content of that statement true and correct?
A. Yes.

MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, I'd ask that that statement be received into evidence, together with the bundle of documents which has been marked provisionally MFI1.

THE COMMISSIONER: The statement will be received into evidence, and the documents just referred to will be known as Dick MFI1.

DICK MFI\#1 WITNESS STATEMENT OF IAAN GRAEME FORBES DICK DATED 3/6/2014 TOGETHER WITH BUNDLE OF DOCUMENTS

MR STOLJAR: Q. Mr Dick, I'm going to show you some MYOB screen-shots, and they appear in Holt MFI1. If you go through to tab 14, that's page 329 in the top right-hand
corner.
A. I'm hard of hearing, I'm having trouble.
Q. I'm sorry. If you go to page 329 of that folder.
A. 329?
Q. Yes. Are you looking at a document with the date 23 June 2005 at the top, some MYOB screen-shots?
A. Yes, NHDA.
Q. Yes. You were the auditor for the Victorian

No 3 Branch for the years 2002 through to 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. And before that you had been an auditor for the Federal Health Services Union?
A. Yes.
Q. You would receive, for the purposes of conducting your audit, documents from Ms Jane Holt, the bookkeeper for the No 3 Branch?
A. Yes.
Q. Did those documents include MYOB statements or MYOB information?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen screen-shots of this kind before?
A. Yes.
Q. The only point I was really going to draw your attention to in these screen-shots is that the NHDA was allocated its own account number in the MYOB files for the No 3 account?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. It was account number 6-4000; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. The MYOB screen-shots, first of all on page 329 , reflect funds which had been paid from the No 3 Branch accounts over to the National Health Development Account from time to time?
A. Yes.
Q. And those were transactions that you were familiar with from your audits that you carried out; is that right?
A. I would have seen them, yes.
Q. You describe the way you did the audit in your
statement. If you have a look at paragraph 24, you say:
I would normally obtain a copy of the MYOB database from Ms Holt and I would take it off-site and review it for about three to four hours.

Was that your practice throughout the whole period?
A. Yes.
Q. If you come through to 44 , you say you'd also look through the minutes of the Branch Committee of Management?
A. Yes.
Q. Come through to 68. You're talking there about categories. There are 150 categories. What do you mean by "categories"?
A. Well, accounts.
Q. Accounts?
A. Yes.
Q. So just different accounts in the MYOB?
A. Yes.
Q. In the example we're talking about, NHDA would be one such category or account?
A. Yes.
Q. From time to time for the purposes of your audit, is this right - but please tell me if it isn't - you would, as you say, combine four or five categories into one category? A. Yes .
Q. Some matters are required to be included in the accounts by law?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there's a letter which appears behind tab 2, page 27 in your folder, that's been marked MFI1. That's a letter that was copied to you but you say - and just to remind you, in paragraph 4 you say:

I do not recall being given a copy.

But in any event, on page 29 there's a list of items that need to be disclosed on accounts?
A. Yes.
Q. And that doesn't come as any surprise to you, I take it, you were familiar with those matters?
A. I can't have thought that those things were loans not loans. I can't think of - at the time I couldn't have thought that those NHDA things were donations, or one of the special items that needed to be classified.
Q. Yes, I hadn't quite come to that yet. I'm just saying that you were familiar with what needed to be disclosed or didn't?
A. Yes, I think so.
Q. Why don't we start with tab 1. So page 1 in the top right-hand corner, that's the financial report for the financial year ended 30 June 2004?
A. Yes .
Q. You've signed off on that account - page 17 in the top right-hand corner?
A. Yes .
Q. If you come back to paragraph 61 of your statement, you're giving evidence there about an "original \$80,000 payment through the BCOM meeting minutes". That's a payment to the NHDA?
A. Yes.
Q. When you prepared your audited reports, did you include or did you take account of, or make reference to that payment of $\$ 80,000$ ?
A. No.
Q. It must have been --
A. Oh, no.
Q. You mean not individually? Did you include it in one of the other items?
A. Well, in the statements to the committee of management, it was a separate item, NHDA. But in the actual statutory accounts that went to the registrar, it wasn't included as a donation. It wasn't highlighted out as a donation.
Q. Is it included in other expenses from ordinary activity?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that on page 3, if you look in the top right-hand corner?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the 2004-2005 year.

THE COMMISSIONER: Actually page 3 is surely the year 2003 to 2004.

MR STOLJAR: Yes. I'm sorry.
Q. Could I come to the next year which is behind tab 5. Again, you've signed off on those accounts at page 45 ?
A. Yes .
Q. If you come to page 47, there's an income and expenditure statement.
A. Yes.
Q. The third last entry you've got under the heading "2005. NHDA 20,000", and for the comparative 2004 year you've got 80,000 ?
A. Yes.
Q. That's in the 2005 year. In the 2006 year, which is at page 59, you've done a different treatment. Just before I come to that, can I take you to paragraph 57 of your statement. You say there that you've reviewed your records and you've identified the number of items of expenditure to the NHDA for the years 2004 through to 2007?
A. Yes.
Q. And these are payments that you identified from your recent review of the records, are they? When you came to make your statement, you didn't recall particular details of your audit?
A. I just went back into the financial records and dug them out.
Q. In paragraph 58, you say.
... I would have queried the Payments ...

$$
\text { as } I \text { was not aware of what [it] was. }
$$

And then you say:

> From what I remember, I just checked out what it was and that it was approved by BCOM.
A. Yes.
Q. You have a memory of doing that, do you?
A. No. But that's what - that was my procedure. I don't remember specifically to these payments, no. It's a while ago.
Q. Yes. The 2006 year begins on page 59. You've signed off on that at page 71. On page 73, you have the income and expenditure statement for the financial year ended 30 June 2006. Under the heading "2006", you haven't included as an expense item NHDA, although you say in 57 of your statement that an amount of $\$ 18,000$ was paid. In effect, you say that from (c) and (d) - 10 and 8 - was paid out --

THE COMMISSIONER: Isn't it $\$ 8,000$ ?
MR STOLJAR: It's two payments, Commissioner, 6 January and 30 June.

THE COMMISSIONER: I see, yes, 18. That's correct.
MR STOLJAR: Q. I perhaps elided the two.
A. They were netted off into sundry income, weren't they, or other income?
Q. You netted it off - can you just explain your process there?
A. I can't really remember, you know, why I did it but --
Q. No, I'm not asking you why. I'm just saying what have you actually done? When you say "netted it off", what do you mean?
A. Well, in sundry income I think it's explained. Say the sundry income category was $\$ 40,000$ in 2006, I netted off the payment to NHDA against that sundry income to my knowledge.
Q. Is sundry income the same as other income in the third entry under --
A. Yes, "Other Income", sorry, yes.
Q. -- "Other Income." The heading "2005", that's the comparative year?
A. Yes.
Q. We just looked at the 2005 income and expenditure statement. It is on page 47 . In the statement on page 47, you've included an expense of NHDA in the amount of $\$ 20,000$, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. If I come to page 73, under the heading "2005" for the comparative year --
A. It's not there.
Q. -- it's not there?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was that?
A. I suspect at the time I was just trying to reduce the number of categories to make it more meaningful, but specifically $I$ can't remember, but that's what's happened.
Q. But it is something you've done in the course of your audit, is it?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the same explanation in respect of - I'11 take that in steps. Go back to page 47. "Other Income", this is on page 47, you have an amount of $\$ 58,000$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. If I take you through to page 73, that comparable figure has come down to $\$ 38,058$, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. The $\$ 20,000$-odd has come out of expenditures in respect of the NHDA?
A. Yes.
Q. The numbers, I don't think, then quite add up, do they?
A. No. There's been other documents I have provided that would show the make-up of what's actually gone on there.

There's been another accountant working with it, I think, that shows how that's all been --
Q. I see. But it is a product of your netting off, because you net off one against the other, you net off some expenses --
A. I was just trying to reduce the number of categories; that's what $I$ was trying to do, rightly or wrongly.
Q. And you explain that in your statement in paragraphs 68, 69 and following?
A. Yes. I've tried to explain it.
Q. Good, bad or indifferent, that's what you did in the course of your audit?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you retain copies of the BCOM minutes that you looked at in the course of your audit?
A. No.
Q. In fact, you say in 82:

I would have disposed ...
I'm sorry, you're talking about the hard copy of the ledger you printed out in 82, are you?
A. Yes.
Q. And 79 records the on1y documents that you retained from your audit?
A. Yes.
Q. You describe the practice that you undertook when preparing your audit in paragraph 38 of your statement. You say there:

My normal practice was to speak to either
Ms Holt or Ms Jackson about my concerns.
Were they any concerns you might have had after your initial review of the documentation?
A. They might just be things that I thought were in one spot that should be somewhere else and then, if they both agreed, it would be --
Q. And then in 41 you say:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text {.. with other clients, I would expect to } \\
& \text { make a greater number of corrections ... } \\
& \text { [but] there were very few corrections } \\
& \text { required in the accounting records for } \\
& \text { No } 3 \text { Branch. }
\end{aligned}
$$

A. Yes.
Q. Did Ms Holt keep pretty good records?
A. Yes. She was really good.
Q. She was really good?
A. Yes.

MR STOLJAR: Nothing further. Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: You have no more questions of Mr Dick?

MR STOLJAR: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. It's possible, Mr Dick, that the legal representatives of various parties may wish you to come back here to be examined further. I just don't know how 1 ikely it is, but if that happens, you will be given notification and some date will be worked out. Thank you for your attendance.
A. Thank you.

MR STOLJAR: There is one more witness, Mr Donne11y, there's no statement, and he has been issued with a summons. I'11 perhaps try and have some discussion with Mr Donnelly over the 1 unch break and see if we can progress that position, but otherwise Mr Donne11y would be at 2 pm .

THE COMMISSIONER: We will resume sitting at 2 o'clock.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

UPON RESUMPTION:
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Stoljar.
MR STOLJAR: Commissioner, the next witness is
Mr Stephen Donnelly. Just before Mr Donnelly is sworn in, his legal representative is in the court, Dr Marich.

DR M MARICH: Commissioner, Martine Marich from Marich Legal and I seek leave to appear for Mr Stephen Donnelly.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, you have authorisation.
<STEPHEN PAUL DONNELLY, sworn:
[2.00pm]
<EXAMINATION BY MR STOLJAR
MR STOLJAR: Q. Could you tell the Commission your full name?
A. Stephen Paul Donnelly.
Q. And you're a resident of Victoria?
A. I am.
Q. What's your current occupation, Mr Donnelly?
A. I'm the assistant secretary of the Victorian branch of the Australian Labor Party.
Q. In 2009, for whom were you working?
A. I was working for Senator David Feeney.
Q. And he was a senator for the ALP?
A. For the state of Victoria, yes.

MR STOLJAR: Could I provide you with a bundle of documents.

THE COMMISSIONER: Do we have one for Dr Marich?
MR STOLJAR: Yes, I will provide a copy to Dr Marich.
Q. Mr Donnelly, you were involved in the campaign by Mr Bolano for office in the HSU in 2009?
A. That is correct.
Q. At that time you were working, as you said, for

Senator Feeney. Can you describe the nature of your role in that election?
A. I performed a voluntary role in assisting the Marco Bolano team with the HSU election and provided logistical advice and support for the Marco Bolano team in two particular areas of interest. The first being the communications aspect to the campaign, the way in which we communicated to the union members during the election period about why they should vote for the Marco Bolano team, and the development of the messaging and the output of direct mail and various other forms of communication to those voting eligible members.

The second area was in, I guess, what you would call the voter contact area of the campaign which is going out there into the workplaces where eligible members were and having structured conversations with them about why they should vote for the Marco Bolano team but using essentially a grassroots organising model that would empower both delegates and lead activists and lead volunteers to get involved in Marco Bolano's team, to encourage the people that they worked with to vote for the Marco Bolano team during the election period.
Q. How did you come to have that position or do that work?
A. I was introduced to Marco Bolano, Carol Carmichael, as she was then, now Carol Glen, and Jamie Mantirana, through David Feeney and Kathy Jackson.
Q. Had you known them before?
A. I'd never met those three candidates that were running on the team before. I'd known Kathy from my younger, Young Labor days and I'd obviously known then Senator Feeney since I was about 18 years of age.
Q. So Senator Feeney and or Ms Jackson asked you to work on the campaign, is that what happened?
A. Yes, they'd asked me if I would be interested in helping the campaign with some of the areas that $I$ was experienced in.
Q. You said you were still working for Senator Feeney?
A. I was. So I was doing it on a voluntary role.
Q. Was that the first campaign or union campaign you had been involved in?
A. It was. Sorry, that's not entirely true. As a Young Labor person I was recruited to make calls for a previous union election campaign when I would have been 18 or 19, but that was simply, you know, two or three hours work.
Q. Would it be fair to describe you as Mr Bolano's campaign manager?
A. No, I don't think so. That title wasn't formally attributed to myself. I do recall having a conversation early in the piece in the year 2009, after that campaign, in which another person who was involved in the HSU and the campaign had indicated that they were the campaign manager which - I mean that's fine. So I don't agree with the notion that I actually technically was the campaign manager.
Q. Were you administering the finances for the campaign? A. No, I was not.
Q. Who was doing that?
A. There wasn't really a single person that was responsible for taking charge of the finances for the campaign. It kind of fell down to a number of people who had various interests in running the campaign.
Q. Were accounts kept?
A. No. No, they were not.
Q. Were things just done on an ad hoc basis?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Was there a budget for the campaign?
A. I'm not aware of any formal budget that was presented to me. It had been indicated to me that with the production of a certain amount of direct mails, that
I could work towards, which I did, but in terms of a formal budget at the beginning of the campaign, like you would do for a traditional political campaign, there wasn't any formal budget that was structured.
Q. You said it had been indicated to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Someone said something to you, did they?
A. Yes.
Q. Who?
A. Kathy Jackson had indicated that to me.
Q. What did she say?
A. She said that we probably have budget to do four, maybe five, direct mails to the membership.
Q. What was the membership at that time?
A. That's a good question. I should know the answer to that. I think it was around about 12,000, from memory.
Q. So three or four mail-outs. How did the mail-outs work? Who was the mail-out company?
A. The mail-out company - there was a mail house company that printed, bundled and then sent to Australia Post, which was based in New South Wales. I don't know the name of that company, or I don't recall at this point in time.
Q. You knew it at the time?
A. I probably did, yes.

MR STOLJAR: I gave you a bundle of documents at the beginning of your evidence and indeed, Commissioner, I would ask that that bundle be marked for identification.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That will be Donnelly MFI1.
DONNELLY MFI\#1 BUNDLE OF DOCUMENTS
MR STOLJAR: $Q$. That contains only a very small bundle of documents. You were issued with a notice to produce by the Commission, 17 pages, seeking all documents including emails and the like relevant to the campaign and you've produced only this very few documents, the 17 pages or so. Did you send emails and the like in the course of the campaign?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Have you been able to locate the email account in respect of which you sent those emails?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. Who was the server?
A. I don't even recall which server I was using. It was a Gmail or a Hotmail type.
Q. Did you set up an account specifically for the
purposes of the campaign?
A. I did.
Q. Did you cease to operate that account subsequent to the completion of the campaign?
A. I did.
Q. Is this fair, Mr Donnelly, there would be a great deal, many more documents in existence electronically, at least, relative to the campaign but you no longer have access to them?
A. That is correct.
Q. And it may be that those documents include materials identifying with more precision the way the finances operated?
A. Not necessarily. The majority of the emails on that server would be related to designing of materials, communicating with campaign team members about activities in workplaces and hospitals and organising - campaign organising in a general sense.
Q. The total cost of the campaign, would it be in the order of $\$ 150,000$ ?
A. I don't feel comfortable in picking a figure. If I did some crude maths off the top of my head, I don't feel it would be as high as $\$ 150,000$. I know that figures like to get thrown around in the media a lot and every time someone writes a story it seems to get higher. I don't think it would be as high as 150,000 .
Q. Between 100 and 150,000 , is that a fair range?
A. Yes. That would be a safe bet, yes.
Q. You indicated that there were four mail-outs. Who paid for the mail-outs?
A. Who specifically paid for those mail-outs, I do not know.
Q. They were organised in Sydney, were they?
A. They were.
Q. To your understanding, was the payment procured by or on behalf of Mr Williamson?
A. That was the inference that I'd received, yes.
Q. Was the mail house his preferred mail house?
A. My understanding was that was correct, yes.
Q. That was a large component of the 100 to 150,000 , was it, the cost of the mail-out?
A. It was.
Q. That was contributed by - well, to your inference, Mr Williamson?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. Did other persons or entities contribute to

Mr Bolano's campaign?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. Did the AWU contribute?
A. There was speculation early in the campaign that the AWU were going to make a contribution to the campaign. I never saw the evidence of that contribution, but it is my understanding that the AWU did make a contribution to the Marco Bolano campaign.
Q. Was that in the order of $\$ 30,000$ ?
A. My understanding was that it wasn't.
Q. What do you say it was?
A. Once again I'm only speculating, but my understanding was it was in the order of around $\$ 10,000$.
Q. There's no books or records of this campaign. Let's take it in steps. On your understanding, how was the \$10,000 contribution actually paid?
A. I'm not clear on how that was done. It wasn't a - I was not a part of that process.
Q. Was it in cash or cheque, or do you not know?
A. No. Once again I don't know.
Q. To whom on your understanding - I mean you were working in the campaign every day. Was there discussion about it?
A. Not so much with myself, actually. As I said, I'd heard inferences that the AWU were considering making that donation, but I didn't inquire as to how or when or --
Q. What was the background to all this? Was there some power struggle, for want of a better word, going on in the Labor Party in Victoria?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. Tell us about that? Who was on what side?
A. The Victorian Right wing grouping within the ALP had broken apart in early 2009, I think, and it created schisms where various I guess players, members of parliament who also had allegiances with various unions, they may have worked for that union or come from that union, lined up with those players as politicians, lined up with those respective unions.

When the Health Services Union election came about in late 2009, various elements of the Right wing of the Labor Party got involved in that union election by running their own proxy candidates, essentially.
Q. Who were those elements of the Right wing?
A. It was - I mean, it's speculated that

Senator Stephen Conroy was backing the Doug Byron ticket, that Bill Shorten was backing the Asmar ticket and that and this has all attributed to in the media -and that David Feeney was backing the HSU - sorry, the Marco Bolano ticket.
Q. Was Mr Shorten still at the AWU at that time or had he moved on?
A. No. He was the member for Maribyrnong.
Q. Was there any discussion about the AWU having a bet each way?
A. I don't know if there was a discussion. I certainly thought to myself that that might be the case. I don't know if I shared that with anyone.
Q. Ordinarily, they would vote in accordance with the candidate being backed by Mr Shorten; is that right?
A. Yes, that would be right.
Q. In any event, did the National Union of Workers contribute any funds or make any other contribution to the campaign?
A. I'm not aware of them contributing any funds to the campaign. However, they did make their call centre available to volunteers from the Marco Bolano team in the evenings to make calls to members of the union.
Q. What about the Shop Distributive Association - did
they provide any contribution?
A. Yes. The Shop Distributive and Allied Employees

Association also, for roughly about a two-week period, made their call centre available to employees of their own union who could volunteer to make calls on behalf of the Marco Bolano team to union HSU members.
Q. I asked you about whether the AWU had provided any contribution or funding and you thought it might be in the order of $\$ 10,000$. Do unions to your knowledge, from your experience, generally maintain fighting funds that they can use for election purposes?
A. Generally speaking, yes, that's my understanding, that a lot of the unions do do that.
Q. Can those funds also be called a war chest?
A. Yes, they could be called that.
Q. You were present when you heard Ms Jackson giving evidence this morning?
A. I was.
Q. Are those the sorts of funds, that she was describing - two different kinds of funds - that unions maintain for the purposes of funding elections? A. In a general sense, yes.
Q. Was it your understanding at the time that the AWU had such a fund?
A. I think it's an assumption from people who are involved in the labour movement or in the Labor Party itself that most unions do have those funds. I guess we always speculate and there have been occasions in the past where other unions had been - where the media had reported that this particular union had this fund and I think it's just fair to assume that most unions do have these funds, so people would speculate that the AWU would also have a similar fund.
Q. Is a fund like that generally kept off-line or kept separately from the union?
A. I would not be able to answer that question. I've never been in a leadership position of a union to understand how they do that.
Q. In any event, the evidence that Ms Jackson was giving didn't come to any great surprise to you?
A. No, not necessarily.
Q. Did Mr Shorten himself to your knowledge contribute any funds to Mr Bolano's campaign?
A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. But the AWU did?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it possible that you said something to Mr Bolano or others in the HSU at some point to the effect that, "Mr Shorten's contributed some money" or "Bill Shorten's contributed some money", meaning that as a shorthand for the AWU.
A. I'd like to think that I would be more careful with my words, but sometimes there are occasions where we refer to a politician which by proxy means that union, so I could understand where people could think that if you were to say that Bill Shorten is donating to the campaign, that they literally mean that Bill Shorten is donating to the campaign, whereas the inference actually is that his union that he once was the secretary for was supporting that particular campaign.
Q. Or the fighting fund associated with that union?
A. Absolutely, indeed, yes.
Q. By the way, did the HSU as a union at the time control votes at the ALP Conference?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. How many votes?
A. From memory, at the time the HSU No 1 Branch, as an affiliated union to the Victorian Branch of the Labor Party, had around 15 votes or delegates on the conference floor.
Q. That's the No 1 Branch?
A. That's the No 1 Branch.
Q. What about the No 3 Branch?
A. I think the No 3 Branch may have had five.

THE COMMISSIONER: Q. Is this the Victorian Conference, is it, not the National?
A. Yes, this is the Victorian Conference.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you.
MR STOLJAR: Q. Was the expectation in Senator Feeney's office that if Mr Bolano was successful in the election, he would exercise his votes at the Victorian Conference in a particular way?
A. No.
Q. You are saying no, but you'd be surprised if he exercised them contrary to the wishes of Mr Feeney, wouldn't you?
A. You'd have to ask David Feeney. We wouldn't take the support from Marco Bolano as the Secretary of that No 1 Branch for granted. However, we would expect that if we were to speak to Marco and his union about a particular issue that was going to be debated on the floor of the State Conference, that we could get a fair hearing and the strong relationship that we have or had built up over that time would enable us to get that fair hearing.
Q. If I'm understanding your evidence correctly, you're saying that there's not some binding agreement that you'11 exercise your vote in a particular way; is that fair? A. Yes, that's all.
Q. But there may be an expectation or understanding that the HSU would vote in a particular way if the leadership had assumed that position with the assistance of Mr Feeney? A. Yes, that's true but, you know, union secretaries are their own - they're strong-minded individuals and they'11 do as they see fit.
Q. To your knowledge did Philip Morris make any donation to Mr Bolano's campaign?
A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. Did you attend a lunch at a restaurant called "Becco" at any stage during the campaign?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Who was in attendance at that lunch?
A. From memory, the people that attended that lunch were Marco Bolano, Kathy - sorry, Marco Bolano, Carol Glen, David Feeney, myself, Stanley Chang, and that was for the lunch that I had and that was it.
Q. Were there any representatives of the Philip Morris
company there?
A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. When you say not to your knowledge, what do you mean? You were there.
A. I mean, I'm just trying to think if there was anyone else at that lunch. It was quite a small table, so I feel confident in saying that they were the people around that table at that point in time.
Q. You say, do you, that, so far as you are aware, Philip Morris didn't make any donation to the Bolano campaign, but it's possible, is it, that a donation was made and you're just simply not aware of it?
A. Yes. I mean, it certainly is possible, but to my knowledge no-one had inferred to me that Philip Morris would be donating.
Q. There was no discussion about that. Was there a lunch, whether this one or a separate one, attended by Ms Jackson at Becco and yourself?
A. Yes, there was a dinner in the evening that was attended by Ms Jackson, David Feeney, myself, Carol G1en, Marco Bolano, but that happened after the election campaign and that was a celebratory election victory dinner.
Q. Was anyone at Philip Morris at the dinner?
A. No, there wasn't.
Q. You said that you had worked on a union campaign back in, I think you said, your student days or Young Labor days. Have you worked on any campaigns subsequent to the 2009 HSU campaign?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Can you give me an example?
A. Yes, I volunteered on the TWU Queensland Branch campaign in 2010 I think.
Q. Tell me about that campaign. Who was the incumbent secretary and who was challenging who; who were you campaigning for?
A. The incumbent secretary was Hughie Williams who had been secretary at that branch for the better part of 20 or 30 years.
Q. He's Left Wing ALP, isn't he?
A. Notionally, yes.
Q. What do you mean by that?
A. I don't know if Hughie ever tied himself to the Left in Queensland's Labor politics but he certainly had Left leanings.
Q. What was happening? Was he under challenge, was he?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. Who was the challenger?
A. The candidate that was running for secretary of that branch was a union member by the name of Peter Biagini.
Q. Whose campaign were you working on?
A. I was supporting the Biagini campaign.
Q. That campaign was successful, wasn't it?
A. Yes. The Biagini ticket won by I think 70 per cent of the membership.
Q. Did that campaign also receive funding from any fund?
A. Once again, my role wasn't associated with the fundraising or the allocation of resources.
My understanding is that there perhaps may have been a fund that would be supporting that campaign.
Q. When you say "perhaps may have been", what was that fund?
A. I don't know the name of that fund.
Q. Are you sure?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. The McLean Forum?
A. I've heard that name before and during that campaign I never heard the word McLean Forum mentioned.
Q. I'm probably putting this crudely, Mr Donnelly, but is it correct to say that the Biagini ticket was associated with the right-wing faction and the Williams ticket was associated with the left-wing faction, or is that putting it too crudely?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Tell me, what role precisely did you have in that campaign?
A. A similar role to the HSU election campaign. I provided support and logistics and organising. A lot of the lessons I'd learnt from the HSU campaign I sort of adopted to change for the TWU campaign. It was very much a very grass-roots organised campaign of working with the delegates to go out there and converse with members.
Q. That was up in Queensland, wasn't it?
A. It was.
Q. Who were you working for at that time?
A. Senator Feeney.
Q. Did you have to go up to Queensland to do that work?
A. I did.
Q. How long were you in Queensland for?
A. I think probably a month and a half to two months.
Q. Who told you or asked you to work on that campaign?
A. Senator Feeney.
Q. Why did Senator Feeney to your knowledge ask you to work on the HSU campaign?
A. To my knowledge, David had a longstanding relationship, both professionally and in a friendship sense, with Kathy Jackson and other people within the HSU over a longstanding time.
Q. Why did he to your knowledge ask you to work on the TWU campaign?
A. David and myself both regard ourselves as part of the TWU family. I was an organiser with the South Australian and Northern Territory Branch of the Transport Workers Union for three and a half years. David worked for the National Office, prior to becoming a politician, with the Transport Workers Union and we both were keen to see a good rank-and-file ticket get elected to represent the members in Queens 1 and.
Q. Can you recollect from your work what the budget approximately was for the TWU campaign?
A. Once again, that was another figure that got thrown around a lot. I don't feel confident in actually putting a price or a figure on what the size of the budget was.
Q. Can you give me a range?
A. It was certainly more than - it would be around the \$100,000 mark.
Q. It was a bigger campaign than the Bolano campaign, wasn't it?
A. It was a bigger campaign from an organising perspective. The amount of phone calls and yard meetings that we had talking to members was much larger. I don't think we put out as much mail as we may have done in the HSU campaign.
Q. Who else was involved in running that campaign, the Biagini campaign?
A. Well, I worked closely with Peter himself as the number one candidate on the ticket and members, rank and file members who were previously on the Branch Committee of Management or are delegates or had been delegates that sort of played the - that were also on the ticket, the new Transport Workers team ticket.
Q. Did you have any official title on that? Were you the campaign manager?
A. No, not really.
Q. Was there a gentleman by the name of Daniel Mookhey working on the campaign?
A. Certainly not in Queensland, no.
Q. How many votes at the Queensland ALP State Conference did the Queensland TWU have?
A. I actually don't know the answer to that. I don't know how many votes they have on the conference floor.
Q. Have you worked on any other union campaigns since 2010?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Were you on leave for the month and a half or so that you were in Queensland?
A. It followed the time that I worked on the Federal election campaign in which I'd accrued enough time in lieu that I was working on my own time under an arrangement with Senator Feeney.
Q. Did you deploy a similar arrangement in respect of the hours you worked on the HSU campaign in $2009 ?$
A. As in did I work a similar amount of hours?
Q. Did you work a similar amount of hours?
A. I probably worked more in the Queensland campaign.
Q. In the Queensland campaign?
A. Yes.
Q. But in the HSU were you also working in some time-in-lieu arrangement?
A. Most of my work that I did on the HSU campaign was after hours.

MR STOLJAR: I have nothing further, thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
Q. Thanks for coming, Mr Donnelly. It's possible that some legal representative of some of the parties may want to ask you questions on a future occasion. If so, an attempt will be made to accommodate your convenience, but thank you for your attendance today.
A. Thank you.
<THE WITNESS WITHDREW
THE COMMISSIONER: Is there anything more, Mr Stoljar?
MR STOLJAR: No, nothing further, Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: We will adjourn until 10 o'clock on Monday in Perth.

AT 2.32PM THE COMMISSION WAS ADJOURNED TO MONDAY, 23 JUNE 2013 AT 10AM
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