

I see. So you became aware of the possibility that someone else knew about you meeting with Mr Wilson on the 12th of June by looking at this chronology yesterday?-- Yeah, I wasn't concerned about the fact because it was a private matter completely and had nothing to do with this case at all. 1

I see. Do you know when the 12th of June was in relation to the interviews, Mr Wilson was conducting?-- Well, if you look at the - he was in the middle of interviews, yes. 10

Yes?-- When you look at this, but at that stage I didn't know he was in the middle of interviews.

But you knew it before you gave your evidence, didn't you?-- Beg your pardon?

You knew it before you gave your evidence, didn't you?-- I don't consider I did, no. 20

I see. You hadn't read this chronology before you gave your evidence?-- The chronology here has come from you. I didn't read it before I gave my statement of evidence.

I see. You did read it, though, before you gave your evidence in answer to questions from Mr Derrington yesterday, though, didn't you?-- Yes. Only - yes, I did, yes.

All right. Let's - so do you accept then that you had a meeting with Mr Wilson on the 1st of April?-- Yes, I do. 30

Do you accept you had a meeting with him on the 12th of June?-- Yes, I do.

And do you accept you had a meeting with him on the 24th of June?-- Yes, I do.

And what was the subject matter of the meeting of the 24th of June?-- The 24th of June was really an exit interview as far as I was concerned. There was - Mr Wilson wanted to publish the names of the candidates fairly quickly and I didn't want that done at this stage because we had a board meeting coming up on the 26th, and also that we had a lot of problems with adverse publicity with the cushion track in Toowoomba and I had enough on my plate without handling the situation here. 40

I see. So - just bear with me for a moment. You say that was something you dealt with with Mr Wilson on the 24th of June now in a meeting which was face-to-face?-- Yeah, I believe that's correct. 50

You hadn't dealt with him about that earlier on, say, the 18th or the 19th of June?-- No, it was left unresolved.

What do you mean it was left unresolved? Had you dealt with him earlier on the 18th or 19th of June or not?-- On the 18th of June when I spoke to him from Melbourne about who was on the shortlist there was the issue of the fact that Bill

MR DERRINGTON: I can clarify that point that was raised before, your Honour. The document, the draft press release, was in fact discovered by my learned friend.

1

HER HONOUR: It was.

MR DERRINGTON: It was disclosed by-----

HER HONOUR: Can you give them the number in your list?

MR JACKSON: I call for it if it's disclosed.

10

MR DERRINGTON: Disclosed by you, your side.

MR JACKSON: We can't possibly have in our possession or power a document that was sent to Mr Bentley, really, with respect. I'll leave them to sort that out, your Honour. Can you look at paragraph 12 of your summary, which is Exhibit 4?-- Yes.

You see, in that document you set out the things that you say you told Mr Wilson was needed in your opinion?-- In my opinion that's what the board required, right, to make a functioning board.

20

When you communicated on the 18th of August to the members, you didn't tell them any of those things had been indicated by you or said by you as being your opinion?-- No, I certainly did not. There would be an explanation for it if you wanted to hear it.

Yes, I'd be happy to hear an explanation for it?-- Good corporate - in a normal operation the chairman, or the nominations committee, would sit down with a recruitment consultant and discuss who was going to be on the board, what skills were required. In this case it was an independent recruitment consultant. I spoke to Mark Wilson. I mean, how else would he possibly know or be able to make and form an assessment - and I looked at the number of people on the list of people that he had, the 26, and I think 21 would qualify under the mandatory criteria, and I see here - I think I'll leave it at that.

30

40

All right. Thank you for that. If I could take you back, then, to this document on page 2, the one dated 18 August that you sent to the members?-- Yes.

Where you say - I'm sorry, on page 3 where you say, "The press release attached from Northern Recruitment answers the next accusation", that was the press release that you'd vetted, wasn't it?-- No, I didn't vet any press release. That was a press release that came from Northern Recruitment. I've already said that. I asked for permission to put his press release on our website. It wasn't vetted, no.

50

What was the purpose in sending back your opinion of whether it was a good press release or not if it wasn't vetted?-- What was the purpose?