

GREERPUB01398
16/06/2016

GREER
pp 01398-01442

PUBLIC
HEARING

COPYRIGHT

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

THE HONOURABLE MEGAN LATHAM

PUBLIC HEARING

OPERATION GREER

Reference: Operation E14/0362

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

AT SYDNEY

ON THURSDAY 16 JUNE 2016

AT 10.15AM

Any person who publishes any part of this transcript in any way and to any person contrary to a Commission direction against publication commits an offence against section 1122) of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 1988.

This transcript has been prepared in accordance with conventions used in the Supreme Court.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, good morning. I think we're resuming with Mr Johnson's evidence and, perhaps, given the delay, I should just remind Mr Johnson that you're still subject to the section 38 order that I made on the previous occasion, and at an appropriate time I will ask that you be resworn. Yes, Mr Henry?

MR HENRY: I'm ready to continue.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You're ready to go? All right. Mr Johnson, sorry, do you wish to be sworn or affirmed?

MR JOHNSON: Affirmed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, can we have him reaffirmed, please

<MARK JULIUS JOHNSON, affirmed

[10.13am]

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Henry.

MR HENRY: Thank you, Commissioner. Could Mr Johnson please be shown Exhibit G18, and that part of it which is the exhibit to his affidavit at page 428? You should have, to give you context, perhaps, Mr Johnson, if I could just ask you to turn back, excuse me, to page 421. Page 421 is a letter to Mr Lombe from you, dated 18 February, 2014.---Yes.

30 And I'm just showing you that page to remind you where the table to which I'm taking you, at page 428, comes from. It's an attachment to the letter. Do you recall?---Yes.

So if you go now, then, please, to page 428, do you recall on the last occasion I asked you some questions about entries in the table on page 428 that were described in the far right-hand column by you as "Isuzu truck and trailer"?---Yes.

40 Now, I suggested to you on the last occasion that the total value of those entries was \$37,103.29, and I said that I'd check that. I've done that and that number is overstated. The total of the Isuzu truck and trailer entries recorded on page 428 is \$21,508.59. Do you appreciate that? You understand that, Mr Johnson?---Yes.

All right. You recall there's also entries on page 430, which are described in the far right-hand column as "truck and/or trailer". Do you see those? ---Yes.

And I asked you some questions about those entries as well. Do you recall?---Yes.

And I suggested to you that the total value of those entries was \$12,596.30, and I've checked that and that remains the case. Do you understand that?
---Yes.

So the total value of the entries on pages 428 and 430 described "Isuzu truck and trailer" on page 428 and "truck and/or trailer" on page 430, you can take from me the total value of those entries is \$34,104.89. Do you understand that?---Yeah.

10

So approximately \$34,000. Now, of that amount you say, don't you, that all but two of the entries to which I've referred reflect expenses incurred in connection with a plan to provide mobile health and dental services to Aboriginal people, correct?---To the best of my memory.

All right. Now, if you go back to page 428, I asked you some questions on the last occasion about an entry for \$9,800 for an invoice dated 21 July, 2011. Do you recall that?---Yes.

20 There's an entry beneath that for \$2,400. Do you see that entry?---Yes.

Now, you said on the last occasion that those two entries, the \$9,800 entry and the \$2,400 entry, were different from the other entries to which I've referred in that you said they weren't entries relating to expenses incurred for the proposed provision of the mobile health and dental clinic. Do you recall?---They weren't, yes.

What do you say the \$2,400 entry was an expense for?---GPS.

30 I'm sorry?---GPS satellite.

Right. And why do you suggest that that expense was a business-related expense?---Find my way around.

To find your way around where?---Sydney environment.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is this a GPS installation in your car or a mobile GPS?---No, it was an installation.

40 MR HENRY: And was it in a car or was it in the horse trailer?---It was in the truck.

It was in a truck? And you say you needed that for the purposes of conducting your work as CEO of GLALC?---Yes.

What work do you do as CEO of GLALC that required you to have a GPS system?---Drive around Sydney.

Why would you be driving around Sydney for the purposes of conducting your role as CEO of the GLALC area for GLALC?---I spend as much time coming into the city, going to other areas, to meetings, the list goes on. We can spend all day, Mr Henry.

All right. Now, you say that apart from those two entries, the \$9,800 and the \$2,400 entries - sorry, I'll withdraw that. If you combine those two entries, they total \$12,200. Do you understand that?---Yeah.

10 Now, you can take it from me with the arithmetic, excluding those two entries, you or Waawidji was reimbursed \$21,904.89, as reflected in the entries styled "Isuzu truck and trailer" on page 428 and "truck and/or trailer" on page 430. Do you understand that?---Yes.

Now, and you say those entries, totalling almost \$22,000, related to this driving around that you've given evidence about to schools, correct?---Yes.

If you go to page 430, please, you'll see the second-last entry, described as "truck and/or trailer" from the bottom of the page, is an entry for an invoice
20 dated 5 December, 2011, for \$1,560. Can you see that?---No. Where are we?

If we're at page 430 and you look to the far right-hand column.---Yes.

Go to the second entry from the bottom, described as "truck and/or trailer". Can you see that?---Oh, yes. Yeah.

And if you come across the page to the left, you'll see that it's an entry for \$1,560. Can you see that?---Yes.
30

And it says "reverse camera, DVD player, navigator power lead". Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, the navigator referred to there, is that the GPS system to which you were just making reference?---That is one, yeah.

Well, is it the same one as you were referring to a moment ago?---No, would be different dates, wouldn't it?

40 Is it two different vehicles, perhaps?---Possibly.

You'll see, in any event, that entry on page 430, to which I've drawn your attention, includes a DVD player. Do you see that?---Yes.

Why did you need a DVD player?---I didn't.

Right. Well, why was that a business expense?---What?

The DVD player?---It's just part of the unit in-built.

Right. Did you need a reverse camera?---Yes.

You needed that to do your role as CEO of GLALC?---Yeah.

So you say, do you, you needed the reverse camera. You didn't need the DVD player. You presumably say you needed a second navigator, did you?---It's probably, it would be the same thing again, Mr Henry.

10

Is it the case, you claimed reimbursement of this expense knowing that it wasn't a business-related expense, Mr Johnson?---No.

Indeed, if you look further up the page, look at the first two items on page 430, described "truck and/or trailer". The first one is for \$446.96. Do you see that item?---Yes.

It says "insurance for Isuzu horse float". Do you see that?---Yes.

20

Well, why was that a business-related expense?---As I mentioned to you last time, these were set-off costs.

THE COMMISSIONER: I'm not sure I understand that. Set-off against what?---Using the vehicle rather than claiming mileage.

MR HENRY: Mr Johnson, this was a vehicle, what, registered in your name or Waawidji's?---I can't remember.

30

But one or the other? One or the other?---More than likely.

It wasn't registered in GLALC's name?---No.

This insurance expense was for the owner's benefit, that is, the owner of the vehicle's benefit wasn't it?---At times.

You in substance used money, in this particular case paid by GMS, to fund a non-related business expense didn't you?---No.

40

Have a look at the next item down. This is insurance for the horse trailer. Do you agree?---Yes.

Now, I think I'm right in saying it's for \$3,308.48. Do you agree?---I think so.

That expense had nothing to do with GLALC did it?---Set-off costs, Mr Henry.

Yeah. It was you or Waawidji claiming an expense for your or Waawidji's benefit using GMS's money wasn't it?---No.

It had nothing to do with your role at GLALC did it?---That's not correct.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson, when you say set-off costs in relation to the insurance for the horse trailer, are you referring to the fact that of the approximately 40 schools that you visited with the trailer that you didn't claim mileage therefore that was the set-off cost?---It was – I said 40 minimum, Commissioner. Yes.

Well, 40 was the figure that you originally came to after we went through your explanation in the affidavit about these schools that you had canvassed.---Minimum.

All right. Well, let's say 50, are we in the ballpark, 50?---I'd say so, yes.

20 All right. So the 3,000-odd dollars insurance on the horse trailer was by way of set-off for mileage that was not claimed in relation to the visits to 50 or so schools. Is that the position?---Yes.

Those 50 or so schools could not have been within a distance that added up to 3,000-odd dollars by way of attributing let's say \$1.20 per litre of fuel? ---That's - - -

30 Are they?---That's – I don't know where you get that figure from. The set-off would have been against the hire of a prime mover and A-class semitrailer which, I'm really testing my memory, I think at the time was going to cost us about \$600 overnight let alone the time involved in getting the prime mover and trailer to and from wherever it would have been hired. I think that's the set-off cost we should be looking at.

Just tell me this, was this the same horse trailer, the one that carried the four horses that you drove down to Tasmania for the purposes of that three-day endurance event?---I think so, yes.

And so you drove it to Melbourne with the horses and then what, it had to be shipped to Tasmania did it for the event?---Yes.

40 MR HENRY: Mr Johnson, this set-off to which you refer, did you ever prepare any sort of calculation that identified any entitlement to which you were claiming reimbursement by way of set-off?---I can't remember.

You agree don't you that there was never any need to hire a semitrailer to drive to schools for the purposes of trying to work out whether a mobile health or dental clinic would be able to navigate through the streets around those schools, do you agree?---No.

You've said on the last occasion that although the health and dental services were available to the Aboriginal students the problem was in the GLALC area the students weren't accessing those services. Do you recall saying that?---Yes.

And the concept of a mobile health or dental service, you said, was to address this failure to access the services. Do you recall?
---Yes.

10 Now, access to existing services could have been addressed, could it not, by transporting the Aboriginal children to and from the existing services in a van or a minibus, isn't that right?---To some extent.

That would have resolved the access problem to which you've referred, wouldn't it?---Very simplistically to a simple mind, without knowing all the push-pull factors. It sounds simplistically correct.

Mr Johnson, driving your horse trailer to schools didn't provide any service, did it, to anyone?---It provided a means of determining whether one part of
20 it would be viable, Mr Henry.

And you could have determined the viability or otherwise of a mobile health or dental clinic without driving to any of those schools with your horse trailer, couldn't you?---I wish I could have. You're incorrect.

The expenses that you have been reimbursed for in connection with this driving to and from schools with your horse trailer was unnecessary for any business purpose of GLALC. Do you agree?---We're repeating ourselves again. No.
30

Now, if you go, please, to page 430, sorry, 429. You'll see there this is a list of expense claims which you have repaid to GMS. Do you agree?---Yes.

Now, if you look at from the bottom of the page, far-left column, there's two claims referred to as the Oak Farm Supplies. Do you see those?---Yes.

Now, the Oak Farm Supplies supplied goods, didn't it, to was it your rural property?---Yes.

40 And you accept, don't you, that expenses incurred at the Oaks Farm Supplies were not business expenses?---Yes.

All right. You can hand back volume G18, Mr Johnson, and I'll ask for you to be provided with volume 36 of Exhibit G1. Page 283 of volume 36, if you'd go there, please. 283. You should have – have you got page 283, Mr Johnson?---Yes.

You should have there a document headed “Endurance Ride Database, Tom Quilty, 2012 Ride Entries”. Is that what you're looking at?---Yes.

Now, this is a reference to the endurance horse ride to which the Commissioner just referred, isn't it?---Yes.

And you entered this horse ride in mid-2012, correct?---Yes.

10 Indeed, if you go forward to page 289, you'll see there's a table headed “Heavyweight Ride Placings”. Do you see that?---Yes.

And you came third, didn't you?---Yes.

Now, you agree, don't you, that your participation in the Tom Quilty Endurance Horse Ride in 2012 had nothing to do with your role as CEO of GLALC?---Yes.

20 You've given some evidence this morning that you took the horse trailer to Tasmania to the Commissioner. Do you recall saying that?---Yes.

Now, am I correct in understanding this? You drove the horse trailer to Devonport?---I'd be doing well.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. You drove it to Melbourne, I'm sorry.---Yeah.

And then you put the horse trailer onto the ferry which took it to Devonport?---Yeah.

30 You yourself didn't fly to Tasmania?---No.

And am I correct in understanding that it was the same on the way back, that is, you drove the horse trailer to Devonport, put it on the ferry and then drove it from Melbourne back. Is that right?---Yes.

All right. Now, you did however didn't you book a flight in your name from Sydney to Launceston. Do you agree?---I can't remember making that booking, no.

40 All right. If you go to page 276. This is volume 36. You see – you should have in front of you a Jetstar booking for a flight from Sydney to Launceston in June, 2012. Do you have that?---Yeah.

And you will see it's – excuse me – the booking date is 16 May, 2012 at the top of the page.---Yeah.

You're the passenger.---Yes.

Then there's a flight from Sydney to Launceston on 7 June, 2012. Do you see that?---Yes.

And then there's a return flight on 11 June, 2012. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, you booked that flight but then you later changed the passenger details so that it became a flight for Lydia Thompson. Do you recall doing that?---I think this was all done by Tina but what you're telling me rings true apart from who actually physically made the booking.

10

Well, if Tina made the booking that would only have been upon your request.---Yes. Yeah.

Now, so did - - -?---You're asking me to remember bookings I didn't physically make, Mr Henry. Go on.

No, but for a horse endurance ride that you participated in in Tasmania. Correct?---Yes.

20 Now, Tina didn't participate in the horse ride did she?---Sorry?

Tina didn't participate in the horse ride did she?---No.

Now, do you agree that having made the booking or the booking having been made in your name the ticket was changed so that the passenger became Lydia Thompson?---Yes.

30

Now, I gather she was to ride one of the – she was proposing to ride one of your horses in the event. Is that right?---Yes.

But that never happened did it?---No.

She pulled out?---Yes.

Now, when that happened you got a refund on the cost of the flight didn't you?---I wouldn't have thought so, Mr Henry. I don't think that's how those flights work but - - -

40

All right. Well, I'll show you - - -.--- - - - I'm guessing here.

I'll show you an email.---I thought they had to go back into the system, Mr Henry.

I'll show you an email. You should have there an email dated 11 June, 2012 from Jetstar to yourself. Is that right?---Yes.

It refers to the booking reference doesn't it that I've shown you on page 276?---Yes.

And it says, "Please be advised that you're refund request has been approved by Jetstar." Do you see that?---Yes.

"The refund will be processed back against the form of payment used to make your booking within five business days." Do you see that?---Yes.

10 And if you just go back to page 276 you will see that the form of payment used for the purposes of booking the Jetstar flight was a Visa card. You'll see it on the bottom right.---Yeah.

So what occurred was I suggest the flight was booked in your name and paid for using the Visa card. Would that have been your Visa card?---Yes.

And you got a refund. Do you agree?---It would seem so, yes.

I tender the email of 11 June, 2012.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that email will be Exhibit G25.

#EXHIBIT G25 - EMAIL FROM JETSTAR AIRWAYS TO MARK JOHNSON DATED 11 JUNE 2012

MR HENRY: Now, in addition to getting a refund, you submitted a claim, didn't you, for reimbursement of the cost of the flight.---I can't remember submitting a claim, Mr Henry.

30 All right. Go to page, please, 295. You should see there another copy of the booking reservation in respect of the flight, the booking of 16 May, 2012. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, if you go back a page, to page 294, you'll see the spreadsheet itemising your reimbursement claims for a period in 2012. Do you see that?---Yes.

40 You'll see the seventh expense item from the top, on the left, dated 16 May, 2012, says "Jetstar, \$594".---Yes.

And you'll see the total at the bottom of the page, on the left-hand side, of \$8,282.08. Do you see that?---Yes.

And then if you go back a page, to page 293, you'll see that that amount was paid by GMS to you on 22 May, 2012. Do you see that?---Yes.

Do you agree that first of all you didn't catch any flight from Sydney to Launceston? Do you agree with that?---Yes.

You agree that you nonetheless booked a flight from Sydney to Launceston in May 2012?---A flight was booked, yes.

And it was a return flight, correct?---Yes.

You received a refund from Jetstar for the cost of that booking, correct?---Yes.

10 And then you subsequently made an expense claim to be reimbursed by GMS for that booking, correct?---No.

Who do you say made this expense claim?---It would be very unusual for me to claim travel expenses. They were normally done by Tina and her people.

Mr Johnson, you provided, didn't you, the documents in support of your expense claims for reimbursement, isn't that right?---Generally not for travel, no.

20

Could you be provided with, please, your affidavit, which is Exhibit G18?---What page? Oh, yeah. I've got it.

Your affidavit?---Yeah.

Page 30. Paragraph 142. Have you got that?---Yes.

30 You will see at paragraph 142 you say, "The process which I followed when claiming expenses was as follows. I collected the receipts for each expense which had been charged to my card. I kept the receipts in a bundle at home or at the office. From time to time and usually at the end of each month I would hand the bundle of receipts which I had collected to Shalesh or Karen or more usually one of the finance officers who worked for him or her." Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, was that an accurate statement?---Yes.

40 So you handed the bundle of receipts to Shalesh or Karen or one of the finance officers. Isn't that right?---Yes.

Tina didn't do it did she?---Yes. Yes, she did.

Well, you don't say that in your affidavit do you?---No. I also don't say that that was the only way expenses were claimed. That's been well established here I've been informed.

Mr Johnson, in your affidavit you say, "The process which I followed when claiming expenses was as follows." Correct?---The process which I followed for the receipts I had at hand is as per paragraph 142.

You were the person who – I withdraw that. In relation to this expense claim concerning the trip, return trip from Sydney to Launceston about which I've been asking you questions, whether or not it was you or Tina who handed this document over to a person in the finance department you caused this expense claim to be made didn't you?---No.

10

You knew that you'd received a refund of this expense item at the time at which you made the claim. Isn't that right?---Can you repeat that please.

You knew at the time at which you made this expense claim you'd received a refund.---That's not correct.

And the payment I suggest to you was made to you personally by GMS. ---Can you repeat that.

20 If you go to page 293.---Of?

Volume 36.---Yes.

You see that the payment that was made in respect of this reimbursement claim was made to you personally wasn't it?---That's right.

So you received the cost of this return flight personally having been refunded that cost already by Jetstar. Isn't that right?---I believe I received the payment in error. I don't believe I made the claim.

30

You say it just – the claim happened without you even being aware of it. Is that right?---That's could very easily have occurred, Mr Henry, yes.

You suggest that Tina would have taken it upon herself to make this claim without you having told her?---She normally made claims for all the travel expenses that she was arranging for the entire staff.

But, Mr Johnson, this travel expense had absolutely nothing to do with GLALC did it?---I agree.

40

You also claimed didn't you a reimbursement for your car rental whilst you were in Tasmania. Do you recall doing that?---No. Again, very rarely I claimed travel expenses, Mr Henry.

Go to page 298 please of volume 36. You will see this is an Avis Rent A Car invoice. Is that what you're looking at?---Yes.

And it provides for a pick-up date of 7 June, 2012 at the airport, do you agree, in Launceston?---Yes.

And then a return date of 11 June, 2012. Do you see that?
---Yes.

And the cost is associated with this of \$188.55. Do you see that?---Yes.

10 Now, if you had driven a vehicle towing the horse trailer to Tasmania, why were you renting – I'll withdraw that. Do you know why a car was rented?
---Yes, for my partner.

I see. I see. So where it says “Michelle Hall” at the top of the page, she was your partner at the time?---Yes.

So this expense is an expense of hers for car rental. Is that right?---Ours, yes.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, is the Visa card number on the information, is that your Visa card or her Visa card?---Mine.

MR HENRY: So you have incurred an expense on your Visa card for the cost of renting a car for your partner?---Yes.

And that expense item is the subject of a claim for reimbursement by you from GMS, correct?---I don't think so. I suggest that the Avis car would have been booked by Tina. She handled most of the travel expenses.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson - - - ---I wouldn't have asked her to make the booking.

Mr Johnson, look at the customer address. It's 80 Dietz Lane, Oakdale. The customer address on the Avis invoice number. And the name of the customer is Michelle Hall.---Yes, go on.

Well, whether or not Tina made the booking, on what possible basis did you provide Tina with this invoice for the purposes of a claim on expenses?
---I don't believe I did.

40 Well, how did it find its way into the expense claim if not provided by you?
---Tina handled all of those things. And look - - -

Mr Johnson, this is an invoice. It's not a booking form. Have another look at the form on the screen. This is an invoice. It's an invoice that would have been generated to the customer.---Yes.

The only way it found its way into Tina's possession was via you.---Not necessarily, no.

Well, there's nothing on that form that indicates that it would have been sent to GLALC headquarters in Sydney, is there?---Often these invoices went directly to Tina.

How would it have gone to Tina when there's no reference, no possible reference on that form - - - ---I'm not sure how - - -

- - - that would, let me finish the question.---Yeah.

10

How would it have possibly found its way to Tina when there's no reference on that form to any address other than your private address?---I don't know what system she had in place for making the bookings, but that's how it happened.

MR HENRY: Did Tina have a standing direction or instruction from you to include in any expense claim that was made on your or Waawidji's behalf all expense items for any travel?---Can you repeat the question, please?

20

Yes. Did Tina have a standing direction or instruction from you that she was to include for reimbursement in any expense claim all travel expenses incurred by you?---No.

You suggest, do you that, notwithstanding, this Avis invoice at page 298 refers to your partner as the customer and her address, that Tina included this expense claim on your behalf without asking you?---Errors happen. Tina booked a lot of hire cars for the organisation. A lot.

30

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson, can I just remind you, because it's important in this context that you appreciate Tina's evidence, which is that she would receive, in a manila folder or a plastic sleeve of some kind, all of the documents that you provided to her. In other words, her evidence is that she didn't receive documents one by one. She got a sleeve which contained a volume of documents, and she did nothing more than hand that sleeve to a finance officer for the purposes of a claim. So in the light of the evidence that Tina has given, I come back to my original question. It couldn't have been an error by Tina, could it? It had to have been an error, if it was an error, by you by way of including this document in your travel expenses claims.---No. The sleeve, the plastic sleeve, that Tina refers to is the sleeve that my invoices and receipts of payment, paragraph 142, I think, from memory, of my affidavit, that I would compile regularly. I'd either give them to her or directly to finance. But she was also generating, especially in the area of travel, bookings continually for staff as they travelled.

40

Except that this booking - - -.---Now - - -

- - - apparently was not made by her according to the invoice. That's the point we keep coming back to. This booking according to the invoice was

not made by her, it was made by either you or Ms Hall on your behalf.---I don't see how you can say that.

All right. Well - - -?---It's referring – where that information comes from is from the billing address of the credit card which Avis have. They retain that information, Commissioner.

10 They have to have the name of the customer by way of insuring that the person who drives the car is the relevant insured.---It would have been in my name.

What, the credit card?---Yes.

Why is her name on the invoice?---I'm not sure, Commissioner. Maybe when she picked – I have no idea how that happened.

20 Are you suggesting, Mr Johnson, that you would have instructed Tina to make the booking in the name of Michelle Hall, is that what you're suggesting?---I think it would have been made in my name. I was the one with the credit account with Avis. It would have been made in my name I believe, Commissioner. How Michelle's name got there I need to ask Avis. Probably on pick-up.

Well, did your partner in fact drive this car whilst you were in Tasmania? ---Yes. The car was hired for her use, personal use.

Well, can we - - -?---It should never have been an expense claim. I'm saying I believe it was submitted in error.

30 So was this not one of the documents which Mr Gundar Shalesh or someone from finance showed to you on occasions and queried whether or not it had anything to do with your work-related expenses?---It would have – wouldn't have got through if he had have referred it to me because I would have said no, that's personal.

40 Well, on its face it doesn't have anything to do with GLALC does it? You could hardly process that claim and not bring it back to you with a query as to how it related to your work expenses?---Clearly it was processed, Commissioner.

Well, I'm just referring - - -?---In error.

- - - to a paragraph in your affidavit wherein you say that on many occasions Mr Shalesh would come to you with questionable invoices and ask you - - -?---Yes.

- - - how it related to your work expenses but this wasn't one of those apparently?---No, it wasn't one of those.

MR HENRY: Mr Johnson, didn't you submit these expense claims in connection with your - -?---I can't hear you, Mr Henry, I'm sorry.

Didn't you submit these expense claims, that is, for the flight reimbursement and the Avis car rental reimbursement knowing that they were not business expenses?---No.

10 And you took the approach I'll submit whatever I can and see if I get reimbursed. Isn't that right?---No.

You accept that these expenses were unrelated to your business as CEO of GLALC. Correct?---Yes.

You accept that you were reimbursed for those expenses by GMS. Correct?---Yes.

20 And you've retained those expenses – I withdraw that. You've retained that reimbursement. Correct?---I think so.

And as far as Tina is concerned in the process of your expenses claims she only put forward for reimbursement expenses that you instructed her to make a claim for. Isn't that right?---No.

You provided her with a sleeve or bundle of receipts which she simply passed on to a person in the finance office to process, correct?
---At times, yes.

30 And on other occasions you directly gave the documents for processing to persons in the finance office. Is that right?---Yes.

And they were the only two ways in which your expense claims were put forward for processing, correct?---No. Absolutely incorrect.

So what you've said in your affidavit about the process which was followed is incorrect, is it?---No, it's not incorrect.

40 I see. Now, do you recall that you attended a conference in Hawaii in 2010?---I think so, yes.

The conference actually went for one day, didn't it?---I would doubt that.

Well, sorry, I should say you only attended the conference for one day, didn't you?---I would doubt that.

You don't know?---No, I can't remember. I doubt that was correct.

Now, this was whilst you were on annual leave, or holidays, from your job, correct?---I'd need to see the details for context, Mr Henry.

All right. If you go in volume 36, please, to page 223.---What page, I'm sorry?

223. This is a pay slip of yours, dated 1 September, 2010. Is that what you're looking at?---Yeah.

10 You'll see it's for the period 25 August, 2010 to 31 August, 2010. Do you see that?---Yes.

And it refers to holiday pay for 30 hours. Do you see that?---Yeah.

With that in mind, if you could go forward to page 226 in the volume, please?---Yes.

20 You'll see another pay slip of yours, this one from 1 September, 2010 to 7 September, 2010. Do you see that?---Yeah.

And the holiday pay there is for 37.5 hours. Do you see that?---Yeah.

Now, I suggest to you that's for the entire week of 1 to 7 September, 2010. Do you agree?---Yeah.

Then if you go forward to page 229, you'll see another pay slip, this one dated 15 September, 2010. Do you see that?---Yes.

30 And the period of pay is 8 September to 14 September, 2010. Do you see that?---Yes.

30 hours of holiday pay. You see that?---Yes.

So I suggest to you that between 25 August, 2010 and 14 September, 2010, you were almost for the entirety of that period on vacation. Do you agree? ---I was being paid annual leave, yes.

40 Yes. Well, you're on holidays as far as the job was concerned.---I was, well, I was being paid annual leave, Mr Henry.

Yeah.

THE COMMISSIONER: So does that mean that you were not on holidays?---I think this will, it may have meant that I wasn't on holidays, but I was claiming annual leave, yeah. (not transcribable), I'm sure.

MR HENRY: Are you suggesting that you're claiming annual leave in circumstances where you weren't on annual leave at all?---If I was attending

a conference, it should have been in work time. But I'd negotiated to claim annual leave, yeah.

Why did you negotiate to claim annual leave if you were doing work?
---I hadn't had the chance to claim annual leave and I'm led to believe I was over the legitimate limit in accrued annual leave.

Who told you about that?---Finance manager at the time, which I think was Karen Maltby.

10

Now during this period, that is between 25 August and 14 September, 2010 you flew didn't you from Sydney to Bangkok firstly?
---Yep.

If you go to page 244 of volume 36?---Yes.

You'll see there flight information relating to you on 26 August, you flew from Sydney to Bangkok. Correct?---Yes.

20 That was a business class flight. Correct?---Yes.

You stayed in Bangkok for three days from 26 to 29 August. Correct?
---Yes.

And you flew from Bangkok to Manila on 29 August. Correct?---Yes.

That was a business class flight wasn't it?---Yes.

30

And the total cost of those flights was \$2,835.47. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now you agree that none of those flights were necessary for you to take in order to attend a conference in Hawaii?---Yes.

Yet you claimed them as an expense item didn't you for reimbursement?
---Yes.

And you were paid weren't you on account of that claim?---Yes.

40

And you knew at the time at which you made the claim that you weren't entitled to those monies?---Whether I had done - - -

Do you agree or not?---No.

Now if you go forward to page 251 on 3 September you flew from Manila to Honolulu didn't you?---Yes.

That was another business class flight wasn't it?---Yes.

Excuse me. The cost of that \$2,379.50. Correct?---I'm not sure about these prices but go on.

You're doubting the accuracy of these prices?---Yeah, go on.

Well do you say, do you say that these are prices or not?---I can't remember but go on.

10 Well you claimed for reimbursement of these prices didn't you?---I can't remember.

Well go back to page 250?---What page?

250?---250.

250. You should have there a spreadsheet quantifying your expense claim for a period July to September, 2010. Is that what you're looking at/---Yes.

20 And you see the last three items are three Qantas amounts?---Yes.

The first item 283547 reflects the amount on page 244 to which I've referred you. Correct?---Yep.

And the second item 237950 reflects the expense referred to in the invoice at page 251 to which I've referred you. Correct?---Yep.

Now do you still say these prices were incorrect?---Oh look, I think they're right, but you know - - -

30 Well isn't this the truth whether or not they are correct you claimed them and received reimbursement for them?---Yes.

Now once you reached Hawaii you, you stayed in Waikiki Shores Hotel. Correct?---Yes.

Now long do you say - I'll withdraw that. Do you say that you attended the conference for more than one day or not?---Yes, I did.

40 How long do you say you attended this conference for?---I can't remember. I thought it was about a week.

You'll see at page 232 there's an email from yourself to yourself on 7 September, 2010?---Yes.

And it says it has an attachment for 10 September, 2006 the Hawaii Monday schedule. Do you see that?---Yes.

And then there's a schedule attached from pages 233-237.---Yes.

Now, correct me if I'm wrong, that schedule is for the Monday?---It would seem so.

All right. You attended the conference on the Monday?---I believe so.

You don't appear to have any other record of attendance if I could call it that at the conference.---That you've found.

10 Well, do you say – well, this is why I'm asking you, sir.---I believe the conference went for a week.

And do you say you attended it for a week?---Yes.

All right. If you go to page 266 you will see in the top left-hand corner of that page – sorry, in the top right-hand corner of that page there's a receipt for Waikiki Shores. Do you see that?---Yeah.

And it says total \$2,162.70. Do you see that?---Yes.

20

Now, that's in US dollars presumably. Is that right?---I don't know.

Well, is that handwriting - - -?---Oh, yes, yes, yeah.

Is the handwriting yours?---Yes, it is.

So the handwriting AUD2,402.22 is yours?---Yeah.

30 Now, you claimed that entire expense as well didn't you for reimbursement?---Yes.

You then – did you fly home directly from Honolulu to Sydney?---I think so.

You see at page 254 there's flight information for a flight from Honolulu to Sydney departing Honolulu on 4 September at 12.40pm. Can you see that?---Yeah.

40 It's a business class flight. Do you see that?---Yes.

And you arrive in Sydney on 5 September. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, this is a flight for two adults. Correct? Or sorry, it's a booking for two adults?---Yes.

And the handwriting at the base of the page where it says, "Note reimbursement equals 8,178.16 divided by two equals 4,089.08." Do you see that?---Yes.

Is that handwriting yours?---Yes.

So you calculated did you that this booking was for two people but only half of it should be the subject of a claim for reimbursement?---Yes.

Presumably that's because you travelled with your partner. Is that right?---I can't remember. I think so, yeah.

10 All right. Well, how do you – you see the flight information provides that you leave Honolulu on 4 September?---Yeah.

If I could ask you to return to page 266, you will see the Waikiki Shores receipt is dated 11 September.---Yeah.

Is this the position, that you didn't actually catch the flight that is the subject of the document at page 254?---Probably. I don't know. I can't remember.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well - - -?---I was there for a week, Mr Henry. The dates don't line up so I can only presume because I can't remember the detail.

Do you have a recollection of catching a direct flight from Honolulu to Sydney on or about 10 September?---At the end of the conference I, I remember catching a flight, yes.

Well - - -?---And the conference I believe went a week.

30 Well, that's why I said 10 September because you arrived on 3 September. I'm asking you if you have a recollection of catching a direct flight from Honolulu to Sydney on or about 10 September?---I believe so, yes.

MR HENRY: See you I suggest made the claim for reimbursement for \$4,089.08 in respect of the expenditure referred to at page 254. Do you agree with that?---Look, you've come up with a piece of paper with a booking on it that has some of my writing on it but the dates don't line up so I'm – I don't know where we're at, Mr Henry.

40 Well, you made the claim didn't you for the \$4,089.08. Correct?---Well, the claim was made.

Well, it's you that made it. You calculated the amount didn't you?---I'm not sure where you got this piece of paper from, Mr Henry.

THE COMMISSIONER: It doesn't really matter where he got it from. The question was you made the claim because you calculated the reimbursement amount.---I can't remember who made the claim. That writing on that piece of paper is mine but - - -

Whether or not you gave it to Tina to make the claim or whether you gave it to finance directly, you've calculated the amount that you were claiming by way of reimbursement. Is that not the correct position?---But this is a reservation sheet. It's not an invoice. The claim wouldn't have been paid on that I wouldn't think.

MR HENRY: Go back to page 253.---Yeah.

10 The last entry on the spreadsheet is \$4,089.08. Do you see that?---Yes.

And the total at the bottom of the page of all the expenses to be reimbursed was \$10,832.50. Do you see that?---Yes.

Go back to page 252 please.---25?

2. That amount \$10,832.50 was paid by GLALC to Waawidji on 17 August, 2010.---Yeah, I have no doubts about any of that. My only query is one page 254. I don't believe that was submitted as receipt of the expense but I may be wrong.

Mr Johnson, the payment on the expense claim was made to Waawidji on 17 August, 2010. Do you understand?---Go on.

Look at page 252.---Yeah. Okay.

Waawidji receives money on account of this expense claim on 17 August, 2010.---Okay.

30 Do you understand that?---Yeah.

The amount it receives is the amount you have calculated at page 254. Do you understand that?---Yes.

And as you point out the document at page 254 is a reservation only.---Yes.

And you never caught that flight from Honolulu to Sydney on 4 September did you?---I don't believe so.

40 Waawidji received the money that you calculated by reference to this reservation sheet before the flight had even taken off.

THE COMMISSIONER: The point is, Mr Johnson, 17 August, 2010 represents the date at which the moneys were deposited into your account and that clearly predated the booking or the booked flight which was clearly not taken on your evidence. Do you agree with that?---Yes, I do.

All right. Thank you.

MR HENRY: And do you agree also that in order to attend this conference in Hawaii it was unnecessary for you to fly from Bangkok to Manila in the first place. You agree with that?---Yes.

It was unnecessary for you to fly from Bangkok to Manila business class as well?---Yes.

10 It was unnecessary for you to fly from – excuse me – Manila to Honolulu. Correct?---Yes.

And it was unnecessary for you to take that flight business class. Correct? ---Well, I had approval to fly business class from 2008 onwards because of my health, otherwise I wasn't going to go anywhere. So business class was my standard mode of travel or I wouldn't fly.

Mr Johnson, the total amount that Waawidji or you was paid by way of reimbursement for this trip was \$11,706.27. Do you understand?---Yes.

20 These are expenses incurred by you or Waawidji at a time when you were on annual leave, correct?---Yes.

They were not business-related expenses, were they?---Yes, they were. To attend a conference.

And you knew, when you made the claim for the expenses, that they weren't business-related expenses, isn't that right?---Can I clarify this, Mr Henry? Might get to the point.

30 Do you agree or disagree with what I've put to you?---I can't agree with it.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson, even if the conference itself was considered work-related - - - ---Yes.

- - - then the proper claim would have been the conference fee and any related expenses associated with attending the conference, but not the flights. Do you agree with that?---Well, the flights would have been related costs, I believe.

40 But not the flights that took you from Sydney to Bangkok, and Bangkok to Manila?---If I can be allowed to explain, we can get to the point, Commissioner.

MR HENRY: What do you say is the justification for this - - - ?---Prior to the trip, I needed to go to Bangkok for health reasons. I spoke to Karen Maltby and I arranged for the following. That on the proviso that I could fly to Bangkok, to Hawaii via Bangkok for the same cost as a direct Qantas flight, there would be no additional costs incurred by Gandangara. So she

saw no issue with that. She was a hard taskmaster and she also negotiated with me that I would use up a week of my excess annual leave as well, and that I would attend the conference under annual leave as well. So, Gandangara got its pound of flesh, Mr Henry.

You were in this hearing room when Ms Maltby gave her evidence, weren't you?---Yes.

10 And your counsel representing you didn't put any of what you've just said to Ms Maltby, did he?---It didn't come up in her whatever, testimony.

You agree with me?---What do I agree with, Mr Henry?

That none of what you have just said was put to Ms Maltby by your counsel.---I don't believe so.

Is that because what you have just said is something that has come to your mind after she finished giving her evidence?---No.

20 So you were aware of what you've just said before she gave her evidence, but she was nonetheless not asked about it. Is that what you're saying?---I was reminded about it. I've forgotten all about it.

When you say you were reminded about it, is that just today?---No. I'm not sure what triggered my memory. But I was reminded about it at some stage during this hearing. I'd forgotten all about it.

30 But before she gave her evidence, you were - - - ---It wasn't before she gave her evidence. I didn't say that, Mr Henry.

Well, what prompted the recollection, do you think?---I can't remember, Mr Henry. Something triggered it.

All right. Have you got there volume 36 still, please?---Yes.

Page 50.---50?

40 Yes, please. Mr Johnson, this is a receipt for registration in respect of a conference in Peru in 2011, for \$770 US dollars.---Yes.

Now, did you attend that conference?---Yes.

All right. And you made an expense claim in March of 2011 for that \$770 expense, correct?---I believe it would have been claimed, yeah.

Well if it assists you page 49, the preceding page you'll see that expense item as being the second from the bottom of the page. Correct?---Yep.

And then on the next page back, 48, you'll see that the amount including that expense claim, the subject of the spreadsheet at page 49 was paid by GLALC to Waawidji?---Yes.

So agree that Waawidji was paid that amount or an amount including that amount on 5 April, 2011 and you get that from page 38. Now if you go forward in the volume you'll see page 55 the same document. Do you agree?---Yes.

- 10 And if you go from page 55 to 52 you'll see there a spreadsheet which records the registration fee of \$770 and a date next to it of 1 September, 2011. Do you see that?---Yes.

And then that amount is included in total of 12,743.13 pm on page 53. Do you agree? Yes.

If you go to page 51 there's a record of payment of that, that \$12, 120 13. Do you see that?---Yes.

- 20 On 8 September, 2011. Do you see that?---Yes.

And this is a payment, excuse me, from GLALC to ANZ card. Do you see that?---Yes.

That was your card was it?---I believe so, yep.

If it helps you the description on page 51 under the total amount is MJ Reimbursed. Do you see that?---Yes.

- 30 So this I suggest is you being reimbursed for the \$770 again on 8 September, 2011?---Yes.

So you're reimbursed twice for this registration fee. Correct?---Yes.

Now you provided whether to Tina or to someone in the finance office at GLALC this registration receipt twice for the purposes of being reimbursed didn't you?---No.

- 40 Who do you say did that?---Nearly all travel arrangements were handled directly by Tina, regardless of who they were for. So she would have made, I suggest, generally she would have made the booking and made the claim herself.

She wouldn't have made the booking without you asking her to make the booking. Correct?---Correct.

And she wouldn't have submitted the claim for reimbursement without your approval. Correct?---She used to make the claims directly. Had my approval to do so.

Yes. So any expense she claimed on your behalf she had approval from you to do so?---A blanket approval, yes.

Now if I could ask you please to go to your affidavit at paragraph 144. Have you got paragraph 144?---Yes.

10

You say, "I did not keep a copy of the receipts which I submitted for reimbursement". Do you see that?---Yes.

Do you agree that this receipt at page 55 of volume 36 for the registration in respect of the Peru conference was a copy of the same document at page 50?---I'm not sure.

20

Well are you able to provide any explanation – I withdraw that. You accept that this receipt was the subject of an expense claim on two separate occasions?---It would appear so.

Are you able to provide any explanation as to how the same receipt was the subject of an expense claim at different points in time without you having kept a copy of it?---Not without guessing, no.

All right. I notice the time, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. We'll take a morning tea adjournment. Resume at quarter to 12.00. Thank you.

30

MR HENRY: Thank you.

SHORT ADJOURNMENT

[11:31am]

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr Henry.

40

MR HENRY: Thank you, Commissioner. Could Mr Johnson please be provided with volume 35 of Exhibit G1 at page 145. You should be looking there, Mr Johnson, at an Avis Rent A Car reservation for you. Is that what you're looking at?---Yes.

And you will see there's an estimated total of \$179.66. Do you see that? ---Yes.

And the pick-up information and the return information is set out on the second half of the page. Do you see that?---Yes.

This is actually a reservation rather than an invoice, you agree?---Yes.

So at this – at the time of – at this point in time, that is, the time of the confirmation of the reservation in this document you hadn't paid any money. Correct?---Yes.

Nonetheless you wanted to be reimbursed for this didn't you?---I don't know what you're talking about, Mr Henry.

10

Well, do you agree that you were reimbursed for this reservation in the estimated total amount of \$179.66?---Mr Henry, this is a travel reservation. I tend to suggest it would have been made by Tina or one of her people.

Yes, I know you say that, Mr Johnson, but I suggest to you that's a convenient explanation for expenses claims that were made on behalf of either Waawidji or yourself. Do you understand?---I understand what you're saying. It's a fallacy but I understand, it.

20

Well, it appears to be a recurring theme doesn't it?---You're coming up with a couple out of I don't know how many thousands of claims.

Well, if you go to page 144 you will see a spreadsheet and the third item – itemised expense is the Avis expense for \$179.66. Do you see that?---Yes.

And then you will see the total at the bottom of the page 10,832.50. Do you see that?---Yes.

30

And then on page 143, the preceding page, that's the amount 10,832.50 that GLALC paid Waawidji on 17 August, 2010. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, that payment is made by GLALC to Waawidji in respect of an estimated total for a car rental reservation. Do you agree?---It would see so, yes.

Indeed, the payments made on 17 August, 2010 and according to the reservation at page 145 the car hadn't been picked up at that point in time. Do you agree?---It seems so, yes.

40

And you made this claim for reimbursement on behalf of Waawidji didn't you?---No.

You say Tina did do you?---Generally all travel arrangements were made by Tina and her people, yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: We're not talking about the arrangements we're talking about the claims and I think you agreed earlier that what Tina did by

way of making claims was done under your authority in any event. Is that right?---Yes. I didn't authorise her to make errors though. They happen.

MR HENRY: I'm sorry, I couldn't quite understand that.---I did not authorise Tina Taylor to make errors. They do occur.

Mr Johnson, I suggest to you that first of all you provided Tina with this confirmation of reservation. Do you agree with that?---No.

10 You provided it to her in a plastic sleeve which she passed onto the finance officers didn't she?---No.

You have a specific recollection of that do you?---That's not how these normally happened. That's why I'm saying that.

If you go to page 152 please. You will see an invoice for this car rental the subject of the reservation. Do you agree?---Yes.

20 Now – excuse me – there's some handwritten notations at the base of the page. Do you recognise that handwriting?---No.

It's not yours?---No.

You will see the amount due was \$111.28. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, the difference between the reservation estimated total back on page 145 of \$179.66 and the amount that as in fact due of \$111.28 is \$68.38. You can take that from me. Do you understand?---Yes.

30 If you look at page 151 you will see that in this spreadsheet there's a negative entry referring to that adjustment as compared with the amount that had by this point in time been reimbursed. Do you understand?---Yes.

And that adjustment was given effect to by payment on 31 August, 2010, recorded on page 150, do you agree?---Yes.

So as at 31 August, 2010, Waawidji had been paid by GLALC \$111.28 on account of this car rental, do you agree?---Yes.

40 Now, if you go to page 149, you'll see at the top of the page a copy of a printout in respect of the \$111.28. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now, am I correct in understanding that the document recording that amount due was a document provided to you upon return of the vehicle?
---I think so, yes.

And you submitted that document for reimbursement of an expense, didn't you?---Yes.

And Waawidji was paid by GLALC that \$111.28 following your submission of the document for an expense claim, correct?---I would think so, yes.

Well, if it assists you, page 147, you'll see a spreadsheet and there's an entry for Avis on 22 August, 2010 of \$111.28. Do you see that? It's in the middle of the spreadsheet on the page.---Yes.

10 And then you go to the total, which is on the next page, page 148. There's a total amount on the right-hand side, towards the base of the page, \$10,913.30. Do you see that number?---Yeah.

And then back on page 146, that's the amount that was paid to Waawidji by GLALC on 30 September, 2010.---Yeah.

So do you agree firstly that Waawidji was paid twice for the same expense on this occasion?---It would seem so, yes.

20 Do you agree that the payment on the second occasion was a payment made on account of your submission of the document at page 149, recording an amount due of \$111.28?---I'm not sure whether it was the first or the second, but one of them was based on a document I submitted, yes.

Well, the second one, I suggest to you, could only have been a document obtained by you upon return of the vehicle, and a claim on account of that document must have been made by you.---It would have been with the invoices I submitted, yeah.

30 And you knew, didn't you, at the time at which you made that claim, that a claim had already been made and paid for the same expense. Do you agree?---No.

You can hand back volume 35 and I'll ask for volume 36 to be returned to you.---Yeah.

Yes, Mr Johnson, when you made a claim for an expense, did you take any steps to ensure that you or Waawidji hadn't been previously paid on account of that expense?---No.

40 If you could go, please, in volume 36, to page 12. You should have there a Qantas e-ticket and tax invoice for a flight in your name on 10 April, 2011, from Sydney to Brisbane, and then a return flight on 12 April. Is that what you're looking at?---Yeah.

And the cost of it was \$1,305.70. Do you see?---Yep.

Now that amount was paid or an amount including that amount was paid by GLALC to Waawidji on 5 April, 2011. Do you accept that?---Yep.

Now, excuse me, you submitted that for payment, that claim?---Very unlikely.

If you go to – didn't you give the document to Tina?---Very unlikely. She would have made the booking and had the documents to reclaim (not transcribable)

10 You don't recall do you?---That is what normally happened, Mr Henry.

If you go to page 15 you'll see Mr Johnson the same booking reference E-Ticket itinerary and tax invoice for 1,305.70. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now you'll see that on page 14 that amount is included in an expense claim. Do you see that towards the base of the page dated 29 April, 2011?---Yes.

20 Sorry, 19 April, 2011 I should say. And Waawidji was paid that amount again or an amount including that amount by GLALC on 11 May, 2011. You see that sir at page 13?---Yep.

So as at 11 May, 2011 you agree that Waawidji had been paid twice on account of this particular expense?---Yep.

Do you then see at page 18 there's a further document which is an E-Ticket itinerary, receipt and tax adjustment for the same booking reference. Do you see that?[[[

30 And this involved an alteration to the booking arrangements to which I've been referring and there was an amount payable of \$10. Do you see that? ---Yes.

You'll see if you go please to page 23 a spreadsheet with your store expense claims made on behalf of Waawidji for – that include on 9 April, 2011 a \$10 item under the column meeting. Do you see that? For Qantas Mascot?----Yep.

And that amount was included in the total on page 24 of 7, 960.45. Do you see that?---Yep.

40 And that amount was paid by GLALC to Waawidji on 14 June, 2011 at page 22. Do you see that?---Yep.

So do you agree that Waawidji was paid twice in respect of this particle expense in amount of 1, 30 -1,315.70. Do you agree with that?---Yep.

It was also paid the E10 adjustment fee to the booking change. Do you agree with that?---Yes.

And if you go to page 17 there's a spreadsheet and you'll see the second last expense item is 1-3-2-5-7-0 and it's described as Qantas. Do you see that?
---Yep.

And Waawidji is paid that amount as well I suggest on 11 May, 2011 if you go to page 16. Do you accept that?---Yes.

Now, do you agree, Mr Johnson, that in respect of this one flight you submitted receipts on multiple occasions in order to enable Waawidji to be
10 reimbursed more than once for the same expense?---No.

You agree that Waawidji did get reimbursed more than once in respect of the same expense?---Yes.

THE COMMISSIONER: And how do you explain that that might occur?
---I can only presume, Commissioner, these – many of these seem to be in a narrow time frame during the changeover between Karen Maltby getting sick and leaving and Shalesh starting and also we had that very novice accountant Susan White.

20

Well, I'm not - - -?---There were errors made. I can only presume. You're asking me to guess, Commissioner.

No, no, I'm not talking about the finance department, I'm talking about whether or not you can explain how these expense were submitted on more than one occasion?---Well, I every rarely submitted travel documents, travel claims, Commissioner. I'm not sure how many times I need to repeat that but I will continue to do so.

30 All right. I understand that but you understand that - - -?---Thank you.

You understand that when you were here Ms Taylor was giving evidence. She gave evidence that whether it was receipts handed to finance by her within a plastic sleeve or whether it was receipts of invoices relating to travel she never saw those documents return and she never had anything to do with the spreadsheet that was created on the basis of those invoices. You head that evidence I take it?---Yes, and neither did I, Commissioner.

40 Well, that's why I come back to this, how do you explain that the expenses were submitted on more than one occasion, not just paid on more than one occasion but they had to have been submitted on more than one occasion.
---You'd be asking me to guess and presume, Commissioner.

MR HENRY: Do you agree that it appears to have happened repeatedly, Mr Johnson?---In this time frame, yes.

And you agree that either you or Waawidji were the beneficiary of the reimbursements?---It would seem so, yes.

You say notwithstanding that you had nothing to do with causing – I withdraw that. You say notwithstanding that that you didn't cause Waawidji or yourself to be reimbursed more than once in respect of any expense item. Is that right?---Every, every one of these invoices you've pointed to, Mr Henry, today and in the preceding day have been travel documents. I say that for the record. Very rarely I claimed travel expenses. I repeat that for the record.

10 Yes. Well, that's not true, Mr Johnson, but in any event I'll take you - - - ?---What's not true, Mr Henry?

That every document I've taken you to is a travel document. But anyway, I'll take you to one that's not. Explain this for me. Have you got volume 36 there?---Yes.

Go to page 79 please. You should see there a photocopy of two receipts. Is that what you see?---Yes.

20 Could I ask you to please look at the one at the base of the page.---Yes.

Dated 14 July, 2011 BP Rossmore. Do you see that?---Yes.

Excuse me. For \$42.29.---Yes.

Now, that appears to be a receipt for the purchase of diesel. Do you agree? ---Yes.

30 Now, you – do you agree that you submitted that receipt for reimbursement?---Quite possibly, yes.

Well, that's a document that would have been generated at the BP Rossmore wouldn't it?---Yes.

And a document that you would have received upon payment for the diesel. Correct?---Yeah.

40 You provided this document for reimbursement didn't you?---More than likely, yes.

If you have a look at page 78 you will see an itemised expense claim. The second item from the top is an item dated 14 June, 2011 BP Rossmore the \$42.29. Do you see that?---Yeah.

Now that's then part of a payment that's made from the preceding page, page 77 from GLALC to Waawidji. Do you see that?---Yes.

Now if you go then please sir, to page 82. Do you agree page 82 at the base of the page is a copy of the same BP Rossmore receipt for \$42.29?---Yep.

You submitted that receipt for reimbursement a second time didn't you?---I may have.

Well again this document is a receipt that would have been generated at the BP Rossmore. Correct?---Yes.

10 You were the person who would have received it. Correct?---Yes.

And you were the person who lodged it a second time for reimbursement of expense. Correct?---That could have happened, yes.

Well it did didn't it::Well, I'm not sure.

You were the person with the receipt weren't you?---We've gone through that Mr Henry, yes. I'm just not sure how this has happened.

20 Well have you got, and you accept don't you that you were paid, I'll withdraw that, Waawidji was paid a second time on account of that report?--
-Yes.

Do you have you affidavit there?0---Yes.

If you go back to page, paragraph 114 on page 31 of the affidavit, please?
---Yep.

30 In the first sentence of paragraph 144 you say, I did not keep a copy of the receipts which I submitted for reimbursement. Do you see that?---Yes.

Is that a true statement?---Yes. That why as I said to you a couple of sentences earlier I don't know how this happened.

So you accept that you provided these receipts for reimbursement of the diesel expenditure of 42.29 from the BP at Rossmore. Do you agree?---I believe so.

40 You accept that once you had that receipt over unless you have a copy of it it's impossible to resubmit it?---It sounds logical Mr Henry, yes.

Yet that appears to be what's happened here doesn't it?---Yes.
What explanation can you provide for that?---For just one instance, I have no explanation. Errors occur.

Well does that mean that the statement that I've read out to you, paragraph 144 of your affidavit is untrue?---No.

You agree that it cannot be true if you submitted a copy of the BP Rossmore receipt for an expense claim?---Mr Henry, I don't know how it happened. Accidents and errors do occur. You've got me one for \$42. I, I - - -

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson, make no mistake about it, I don't want you to be under any misapprehension, what is being put by way of these series of claims for reimbursements, whether they relate to travel expenses or not is that this represents a course of conduct on your part and I want you to understand that that's the basis of the questions. Not that all of these can be explained away by, by errors or mistakes. So lest you think that that's an explanation that accounts for all of these, I just want you to appreciate that that's not the basis of the questioning thus far. But can I just ask you, where, where is Rossmore? Where is Rossmore? I'm just curious?---I'm not very good on Sydney myself.

MR HENRY: I don't know I'm sorry.

20 MR DOCKER: Commissioner, can I just say something. It hasn't been put by learned Counsel Assisting that this is a course of conduct. This witness is required to answer the questions as they come one by one. And in my submission it's unfair to him to say to him now - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: It's not unfair at all, Mr Docker.

MR DOCKER: - - - that you need to understand that this - - -

30 THE COMMISSIONER: It's quite the contrary, Mr Docker. It's not unfair. I'm in fact trying to accord him procedural fairness by letting him know that the basis of the questioning and Mr Henry has made it quite clear that this has occurred over a period of time on a number of occasions. And Mr Henry has put propositions to the witness on the basis that he doesn't accept the witnesses explanation that these were simply errors that he can't explain by reference to Ms Turner's conduct or otherwise. All I'm doing is making Mr Johnson aware that that is the allegation that he is responding to. Now I'm obliged to tell him that so that he has an opportunity to answer the claim. I'm sorry if that hasn't been evidence to you, but it's certainly been evident to me from the course of the questioning.

40 MR DOCKER: Well, the only point I'd make, Commissioner, is that the witness has to answer the questions one by one.

THE COMMISSIONER: I appreciate that.

MR DOCKER: And if he's being asked about a specific expense and asked for an explanation about it, he is entitled to take that question at face value. If the import of the question is that this is a course of conduct whereby this is the third, fourth or whatever the number it is times you've done this, and this is a course of conduct, that should be put to him plainly. Otherwise he's

got to guess about an inference or an underlying assumption in the question that's not in the words that have been said.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that was precisely what I was doing, because that was, as I understand it, what Mr Henry was putting, albeit not in those precise words. Now, at the end of the process, perhaps it does have to be put in a question. But I was simply drawing Mr Johnson's attention to the fact that on the basis of each and every one of these matters over this period of time, it wasn't consistent with simply a series of errors, and that was the basis upon which Mr Henry had put propositions earlier on about that explanation not being consistent. Anyway, Mr Docker, I don't agree that it's unfair to the witness. I'm just trying to make sure that he appreciates where this line of questioning is going. But anyway, go on, Mr Henry. The objection, or rather the comment, is noted.

THE WITNESS: May I answer your statement, Commissioner, to me? I didn't get a chance.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you're entitled to do it now or you can do it when Mr Henry has finished putting these invoices to you.---I'll wait.

MR HENRY: Yes, Mr Henry. I can indicate, Commissioner, that Rossmore is near Bringelly or Badgerys Creek.

THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Thank you.

30 MR HENRY: Mr Johnson, can I ask you, please, to be provided with volume 38 at page 266? You should have there a document, or a copy, of a number of receipts from credit card transactions. Is that what you have? ---Yeah.

If you look at the one in the top left-hand corner, it's an ANZ customer copy. Do you see that?---Yeah.

And it says "Flight Experience, Harbourside Shopping". Can you see that? ---I'm sorry?

40 It says "Flight Experience, Harbourside Shopping".---No, what page are we on?

Page 266.---266? My apologies.

THE COMMISSIONER: It's on the screen as well.

MR HENRY: Can you see in the top left-hand corner, Mr Johnson - - - ? ---Yeah.

- - - an ANZ receipt for a Visa transaction for “Flight Experience, Harbourside Shopping”?---Yes.

What's Flight Experience at Harbourside Shopping?---I have no idea.

Is it an amusement ride at Darling Harbour?---A what?

An amusement ride at Darling Harbour?---I have no idea.

10 You agree that you submitted this document for a reimbursement of an expense?---Yes.

And that GLALC paid Waawidji on account of that claim?---Yes. Can you picture an amusement ride worth \$225?

Well, Mr Johnson, you're the person who made this claim.---Yeah.

Waawidji was reimbursed for this claim.---Yeah.

20 Now, have a look if you would carefully at the receipt or the copy of the receipt on page 266. Do you see it?---Yeah, the Flight Experience one?

Yes.---Yeah.

It's a document that records receipt of a refund of \$225. Do you see that?---Yeah.

30 Now, you submitted for reimbursement a receipt for a refund for \$225 in respect of this Flight Experience. You agree?---I'm not sure, Mr Henry. I, I'm at a loss. I can't answer.

All right. Well - - -?---Can't remember.

This is reimbursement I suggest to you of an expense that never occurred.---I can't remember, Mr Henry.

You must have known when you submitted this document that for an expense claim that no expense had been incurred. Do you agree?---No.

40 So you say you submitted the document stating refund and you thought you were submitting a document for an expense that had been incurred. Is that what you say?---No, I'm saying I can't remember anything about this, Mr Henry.

What if anything did Flight Experience at Harbourside Shopping have to do with your job as CEO of GLALC?---I can't remember, Mr Henry.

It had nothing to do with it did it. Do you agree?---Mr Henry, I can't remember. That's four times in a row.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson, did you have any kind of system whereby when you incurred a work-related expense it went into a particular folder either in your office at work or at home and all other receipts or invoices that weren't work related were put into some other private container?---Yes.

- 10 Well, if that's right how did this invoice – sorry, how did this receipt or refund receipt and for that matter how did the expenses in relation to the trip to Tasmania find its way into your work-related expenses folder?---The trip to Tasmania were travel arrangements that I suggest I didn't lodge the claims. This I can't explain.

MR HENRY: And your suggestion that you didn't lodge expense claims in respect of travel expenses I suggest you – firstly, this is untrue. Do you accept that?---No.

- 20 Secondly, any expense claim that was made on your behalf by Tina Taylor was made with your approval. Correct?---Blanket approval.

Yes. And you took the view didn't you that you would submit whether for yourself or for Waawidji's benefit expenses claims whether or not they were associated with your role as CEO at GLALC. Correct?---No.

Or do you say you just didn't check to see whether expenses related to your role as CEO at GLALC?---Can you repeat that please.

- 30 Do you say you didn't bother to check whether expenses claims made for your or Waawidji's benefit related to your role as CEO of GLALC?---Yes, I did but - - -

Sorry?---Yes, I did check.

You did check but you can't explain why expense claims – I withdraw that. That expenses were reimbursed in respect of unrelated expenses to your role as CEO of GLALC?---On odd occasions there'd be an error. Outside of the travel arrangements you haven't been pointing to too many here.

- 40 I suggest to you that your evidence that expenses being reimbursed more than once was an error is simply untrue. Do you agree?---No.

You caused expense claims to be made repeatedly in respect of the same expense items in order to be reimbursed more than once. Do you agree with that?---No.

They're my questions for Mr Johnson, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Now, Mr Johnson, do you want to respond, and I take it that Mr Henry's last question is the matter that you wish to explain by way of rebutting any suggestion this is the course of conduct. What do you want to say about that?---Nothing.

All right. Any questions of Mr Johnson before we get to Mr Docker? Yes, Mr Dunne.

10 MR DUNNE: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr Johnson, my name is Dunne. I appear for Ms Dorothy Shipley. I want to ask you some questions about some evidence which you gave back on 1 June in relation to motion 17 of a Board meeting that was on 11 July, 2011. Could the witness please be given volume 9. And, Mr Johnson, do you still have your affidavit there with you?---Yeah.

Can I ask you to look at page 114 please.---Off volume?

20 Of volume 9 I'm sorry.---114, Mr Dunne?

That's correct. Now, for the benefit of the Commissioner and the other legal practitioners in the room, I'm going to be referring to some questions asked to you by Counsel Assisting on pages 1328T to pages 1332T. Now, on page 114 of volume 9 is motion 17. Do you see that?---Yes.

And you will see that that motion is recorded as being moved by Ms Shipley.---Yes.

30 Do you have any independent recollection about Ms Shipley moving that motion?---No.

Now, I'm going to move straight to the answer that you gave to a question from Counsel Assisting which I want to ask you questions about but if you need more context or you find it confusing please just let me know and I'll go back, through your earlier, earlier answers. But Counsel Assisting ask you some questions in relation to motion 17 about RBA cash rates and commercial loans. Do you remember those questions that were being asked of you?---Yes.

40 And after you answered a question which referred to you speaking to lawyers at approximately point 38 on page 1332, you answered a question from Counsel Assisting about when you were speaking to lawyers and you responded, "When they referred me to the RBA rate as interest this is cut and paste. These motions that you've referred me to they cut and paste for the lawyers." Do you remember - - -?---Yes.

So in relation to motion 17 it's the situation isn't it that this motion was prepared by you before the Board meeting on 11 July, 2011?---No, it would

have been prepared by the lawyers, probably emailed to me and I would have cut and pasted it from that.

So you're suggesting the lawyers drafted the whole of the motion and you cut and pasted the motion into the minutes?---I believe that's what would have happened.

10 And when I say minutes I mean draft minutes that were prepared before the meeting. Is that correct?---Not necessarily. They might have gone onto a separate document. I can't remember.

But they would have formed part of a document which would have been shown on a screen during the Board meeting.---Yes.

Is that right?---Yes.

20 And so you'd agree that this motion 17 was not a motion that was drafted on the run during the meeting, it was a motion that had been prepared beforehand for the Board to consider. Is that correct?---Yes.

And you would agree wouldn't you that as you are a person with legal qualifications you'd be more sophisticated and better able to understand the complexities in motion 17 than the Board members and in particular my client, Ms Shipley?---No, I wouldn't presume that.

30 If you have a look at motion 17 when you were asked questions about RBA cash rates and commercial loans by Counsel Assisting on 1 June, you referred to the fact that it had just simply been cut and pasted by lawyers didn't you?---I had cut and pasted it from a lawyers, what lawyers had provided, yes.

And why do you say that you don't think with legal qualifications you are more, well why don't you agree that with legal qualifications you'd be more sophisticated and able to understand the complexities in that motion than the Board members or Ms Shipley?

THE COMMISSIONER: Can we just stick to Ms Shipley for the time being.

40 MR DUNNE: Yes, Commissioner?---It's very subjective I think, Mr Dunne.

THE COMMISSIONER: And I take it, well I take it Mr Johnson you knew that Ms Shipley did not have legal qualifications?---Yes.

Whereas you did?---Yes.

Go on Mr Dunne.

MR DUNNE: Thank you. And would you agree that when you presented this motion to the Board members because of its complexities you would have simplified the explanation of what this motion was seeking to achieve?---I would have done my best to explain it and answer any questions, Mr Dunne.

10 Well it's fin fact the case isn't it that you used words to the effect in relation to this motion and other motions of similar complexity, words to the following effect, that this motion is necessary to enable GLALC to continue to do good work for the GLALC community and to protect the funds of GLALC?---I can't remember ever saying that, Mr Dunne.

There were words to that effect?---I can't remember saying that.

Okay. Can I ask you now, do you have your affidavit don't you?---Yes.

20 Before I move on to that you heard the evidence that Ms Shipley does not recall moving this motion 17. Do you recall that evidence?---No, I don't.

And you don't recall or do you recall that she said that she didn't even understand what this motion meant. You don't recall that?---I don't recall that.

I see. Now in paragraphs 79 to 82 of your affidavit, which is on pages 18 to 19. Most paragraphs deal with the restructuring of GLALC. Do you agree with that?---Yes.

30 And at paragraph 82 you state, "the Board considered and I agreed that the ALRA regulatory regime was too restrictive and that these goals could be better pursued by ASIC registered companies." It's really a more accurate reflection of the situation isn't it Mr Johnson, that it was you who considered that the regulatory regime was too restrictive and the goals were better pursued by ASIC registered companies and that you proposed these amendments to the Board who agreed with your proposal. Do you agree with that?---I, I stick by my opening comments in paragraph 8 2 if I may, Mr Dunne.

40 You see 82 seems to suggest that it was the Board that came up with this idea and that you agreed with the Board?---I can see how it can be taken that way, but that's not necessarily how it was intended because in fact is the that, as I said, you came up with the idea, proposed it to the Board and the Board agreed with your proposal?---No overregulation within the ALRA was felt by all, the Board, the members, the staff, there was (not transcribable) and it was expressed at all members meetings . There was ifs or but's about that part of it. So it wasn't just me.

Well, you would have heard evidence from Ms Shipley that it was her understanding that she was only working, if I can put it that way, for GLALC and not for other companies. That it was all part of the one body.--
-I heard Ms Shipley say that.

And do you disagree with that?---Yes, I do.

10 Why do you disagree with that?---Because I disagree with it. I don't have the -- that's not my belief.

Well, what is the basis of your belief for disagreeing with her?---I heard Ms Shipley say otherwise on occasions. I can't remember the detail but I remember the intent.

20 Well, certainly in Ms Shipley's case, I'm suggesting to you that she did not understand the effect of a registered company or the separation of the legal entities which were proposed by you and, sorry, proposed to the Board.
---I disagree with that.

I see. Yes, thank you. Those are my questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Any other questions? Yes, Mr Chee.

MR CHEE: Commissioner. Mr Johnson, my name is Chee. I act for Gloria Provest. I'd like to take you to a meeting of the Board on 18 February, 2014. Do you recall that meeting?---18 February?

30 Yes. 2014.---Yeah.

Do you recall that meeting?---No.

There was a meeting at which the issue of expenses was raised and Ms Provest became upset. Do you recall the evidence about that?---Yes.

Well, I'd like you to accept that at the same meeting I'm referring you to, were you at that meeting?---Yes.

40 And at that meeting, the issue of a trailer was discussed. That's right, isn't it?---I think so, yes.

Did you provide, sorry, what did you say about the use of the trailer?
---Can't remember, Mr Chee.

THE COMMISSIONER: Was this a meeting where the Board was asking for some explanation about the expenses associated with the use of the trailer?---I think that's what Mr Chee's referring to.

MR CHEE: Could I suggest to you that you had said and explained that the trailer was being used to transport people back to their community for burial?---No.

You disagree with that?---Yes.

You were here when Ms Provest gave that evidence, right?---I can't remember it.

10

Well, your legal representatives were here, weren't they?---I'm not sure. Go on.

I put it to you that it was never disputed and it was never suggested to Ms Provest that you disagreed with that evidence.---Look, there's great confusion about that. And after hearing the way this room broke into laughter over the issue, which is, of my mind, a very important and very sad issue, I'd rather not go there. But what you've put to me I said no to.

20

THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm sorry, Mr Johnson. That doesn't help resolve this issue.---Did I transfer bodies in the trailer? No, I didn't. The issue was raised and I'll explain why. I hope we don't see the same laughter as we've had in the past.

Well, I don't recall anybody - - - ---Well, it's on record, Commissioner.

30

Well, Mr Johnson, can we just stick to the point? I don't recall anybody laughing. In fact what I recall was that it was a matter of some sensitivity at the time. But in any event what Mr Chee is putting to you is that there was no suggestion by your legal representatives to his client that she was wrong about that evidence. Can I just clarify, are you saying that you never did use the trailer for that purpose?---Correct.

And you never said that you used the trailer for that purpose, is that right? ---Correct.

But was there some discussion about the potential to use the trailer for that purpose?---No.

40

All right.---The issue was the fact that we were being asked – Liverpool Hospital is now I'm led to believe the largest hospital in the Southern Hemisphere. Many people, rural people get transported in for ER treatment. Often one relative goes with them. Not always do those people survive. The problem is there is no provision then or today to assist people to get the deceased back to country. What we found out – and we were being asked to provide that service. We were being asked to. It's not unusual in Sydney. In fact, Western AMS at Mount Druitt was funded for – to provide a specific vehicle for that purpose. That AMS has now been defunded so

again Sydney is in the same situation. People die in Sydney hospitals. They have no way of getting back to country.

MR CHEE: Mr Johnson, I don't quite understand how this relates to your trailer.---Neither do I but it came up at that meeting. You asked me. I've explained it.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, are you saying there was a discussion about that request from Liverpool Hospital but that it didn't revolve around the use of - - -?---Not from Liverpool Hospital, from Aboriginal people who were caught there.

All right. I'll start again. Are you saying that there was some discussion at that meeting about the request from Aboriginal people for GLALC to provide that service but that the discussion did not include the use of the trailer for that purpose?---Yeah.

I see. That's the confusion you referred to?---Yes.

20 All right. Yes, Mr Chee.

MR CHEE: I have no further questions. Thank you, Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Any other questions of Mr Johnson? No. Mr Docker.

30 MR DOCKER: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr Johnson, I just want to ask you to outline for the Commission the – your time commitment in the ordinary course to the job of CEO of GLALC and its associated entities and I know that's a very broad question because you were in that position for somewhere in the order of four years, sorry, seven years but if you could just do it in a summary way perhaps by reference year by year and if it didn't change – or some other periods of time which are more convenient in terms of average amounts of time per day and per week that you had to spend doing the job?---I'll do my best, Mr Docker. In February, 2007 when I arrived I was put up in a motel and stayed there till August, 2007. I used to get to work at about 6.00 in the morning. I've always been an early riser. I used to cook my tea, my evening meal in the kitchen and I'd try and learn what Aboriginal Land Rights in New South Wales was all about. I was
40 reading every file that we had on record especially pertaining to land claims and I'd go home, or go back to the motel whenever. We bought a place in August and my day started normally. Between 2.00 and 3 o'clock I would sit down at my desk and answer all emails. I wouldn't read or answer emails during the day. I just found them too distracting. So I would do them between 3.00 and 6.00am in the morning. I would leave for work at 6.00am, get to work before 7.00 and Tina managed my diary entirely so I would just do what was in my diary basically till 5.00 or 6 o'clock at night and then there was generally meetings at night. I worked – as we grew in

2008 onwards and we started to corporatise and started providing services my workload increased, the staff increased. It just got busier with more problems to resolve. Then in about 2011 it became – and we were having enormous problems with NSWALC getting developments approved under the statute. They just wouldn't approve developments which meant – and our entire cash flow was totally dependent on us developing land and value adding it. So on top of the workload with additional services we had issues first of all with – we always had legal issues with the Shire of Sutherland and our developments so it got to the point where we planned for and the Board approved that every town planning application that we submitted to the Sutherland Shire we would have to follow up with litigation and that occurred. It was getting to the point where our applications to NSWALC for land development that we were going to have to follow up with litigation. So workload was increasing. I think from about 2012 onwards we were just under investigation nonstop which has continued right up until today so workload just kept mounting up. I couldn't – one of the tasks I was given by the Board was to get and train a suitable replacement. I believe the life of any CEO is only five to seven years and I planned to be gone by then. We were having trouble getting staff, getting qualified staff or good staff. Just the normal rigours of Aboriginal not-for-profit entities. The only difference with us is we were trying to shed the shackles of Government control, become masters of our own destiny through managing the treasury and become truly equal in this fair and wonderful country. It didn't happen though and the system made sure of that.

So if you could put an estimate on your weekly workload on an hourly basis could you – what would be your best estimate?---For the first five to six years 70-80 hours minimum a week.

30 And after that?---Well, after that I made sure – my health was deteriorating rapidly and I made sure that I at least tried to take off every second weekend.

And were you – did you work on weekends as well as weekdays?
---Absolutely. I brought some horses down with me. I loved my horses. I loved my sport of endurance riding. For five years I never threw a saddle on a horse. I never had time.

40 And were you expected to work or be available to work on weekends as well as weekdays?---Yes, I was expected to be on call 24/7.

But was that restricted to being on call or were you expected to work as well?---If I had to work I was expected to work. If there were meetings, functions, I was expected to be there. The Board were totally voluntary. I was paid and I agreed with them that I should wear the brunt of most of that work. Just getting them to meetings and their other activities stretched their status of volunteers. It's a very poor system that the ALRA is based on, very poor.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Johnson did you appreciate that the Board members were entitled to sitting fees?---I think that's not correct. Whenever the Registrar was asked about that he said otherwise. So they never, they never asked for and were never paid sitting fees.

10 But it was something that you raised with the Registrar was it?---Yes. And so did they. And they were not the only Local Aboriginal Land Council to raise that issue. The hypocrisy was the councillors at NSWALC who did no more, no less than locals do were paid extremely well, yet the Local Boards got nothing.

Mr Johnson, you've been asked, you were asked some questions about the booking of travel on your behalf and you gave some answers about normally Ms Taylor did the travel bookings. Do you recall that?---Yes.

20 I just want to read some evidence from Ms Taylor, Ms Taylor gave to you and asked whether you agree or disagree with what she said. For the benefit of everybody who has access to the transcript, I'm reading from page 1,145 commencing at line 46. This is a question to Ms Taylor and an answer, "Thank you. Now so you mentioned doing travel bookings. If you booked travel did you receive the invoice or the receipt for the booking? Yes", was the answer. Do you agree with that?---Yes, generally, yep.

30 And then the next question to Ms Taylor and the answer was at page, this is now at page 1,146 at the top of the page. "And the incidences when you received that invoice or booking receipt what did you do with that document? Did you go to Mr Johnson?" "Pass, no I'd pass it on to finance." Do you agree with that?---Yes, I do.

Now Mr Johnson - - -

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you going to be some time Mr Docker?

MR DOCKER: I am going to be a little bit of time.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Well we'll take the luncheon adjournment.

40

LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT

[1.04pm]