

FILE NOTE 23/2/2006

The Chancellor called me by telephone at 10:30 am. He enquired about my involvement in the exercise at which he will be asked further questions by the Acting Vice Chancellor and the University Lawyer over his involvement in the sale of Tattersalls hotel.

I informed him that it came about as a result of a discussion that I had with the Acting Vice Chancellor last Friday evening when the Acting Vice Chancellor asked me about the Tattersalls Hotel sale. I informed the Chancellor that I repeated to the Acting Vice Chancellor the conversation that I had had with him on 9/2/06 when I suggested to the Chancellor that to tidy up loose ends and to protect the Chancellor and the University it would be appropriate that the Chancellor disclose this earlier involvement in aspects relating to the sale.

He stated a number of times that he was not involved. I reminded him of the meeting in my office that was minuted and submitted to Standing Committee of Council. He said he would check with Helen. I emphasized that I was not making any accusation and that the intention of bringing this matter to the attention of the Acting Vice Chancellor was to complete the records so that neither the University nor the Chancellor were at risk if accusations were made in future that the Chancellor had gained an advantage due to his earlier involvement in decisions relating to the sale of the hotel.

He mentioned if people are going to pursue him in this way then he would start a vendetta. I said to him that I was hoping that he wasn't targeting me. He said no that it would be a scattergun approach. I emphasized again that this was an exercise in making sure the records are complete to protect the University and him.

He then started to ask questions about the Peterson's wine deal where 500 cases were bought and only 30 sold. I said I was not aware of the details as it was arranged quite some time ago and was managed through the Development Office. He asked whether it went through a tender process. I said I didn't have the details but there would be records. I felt that he brought this up because he knew that I had some dealings with Petersons in the early days and that this was a form of a veiled threat.

Conversation ended 11:00 am.

Graeme Dennehy