



CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

**Report on investigation into Western Power:
Suspected misconduct concerning a payment of \$35,000
made by Western Power Corporation
to the Australian Services Union**

December 2004
© CCC

This publication is available in PDF format on the CCC website www.ccc.wa.gov.au

ISBN 0-9757248-0-0

© December 2004 Copyright in this work is held by the Corruption and Crime Commission. Division 3 of the *Commonwealth Copyright Act 1968* recognises that limited further use of this material can occur for the purposes of "fair dealing", for example; study, research or criticism etc. However, if you wish to make use of this material other than as permitted by the *Copyright Act 1968*, please write to the Commission at PO Box 7667, Cloisters Square, St George's Terrace, Perth WA 6850.

This report and further information about the Corruption and Crime Commission can be found on the Commission's website at www.ccc.wa.gov.au

Corruption and Crime Commission

ADDRESS Level 5, 141 St George's Terrace
 PERTH WA 6000

POSTAL ADDRESS PO Box 7667 Cloisters Square
 St George's Terrace
 PERTH WA 6850

TELEPHONE (08) 9215 4888
 1800 809 000 (toll free, for callers
 outside metropolitan Perth)

FACSIMILE (08) 9215 4884

EMAIL info@ccc.wa.gov.au

OFFICE HOURS 8.30 am to 5.00 pm, Monday to
 Friday



CORRUPTION AND CRIME COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Hon John Cowdell MLC
President
Legislative Council
Parliament House
PERTH WA 6000

Hon Fred Riebeling MLA
Speaker
Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
PERTH WA 6000

Dear Mr President
Dear Mr Speaker

In accordance with section 84 of the *Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003* I am pleased to present the report of the Corruption and Crime Commission of an investigation into alleged misconduct concerning a payment of \$35,000 made by the Western Power Corporation to the Australian Services Union.

The opinions contained in this report are those of this Commission.

I recommend that the report be laid before each House of Parliament forthwith pursuant to section 93 of the *Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003*.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Hammond
COMMISSIONER

17 December 2004

Contents

Chapter 1 – Background to this report

What is this report about?

1. On 23 March 2004, the Corruption and Crime Commission of Western Australia (the Commission) received from Mr Michael Megaw, Chief of Staff to the Deputy Premier, a complaint of suspected misconduct concerning a payment of \$35,000 made by Western Power Corporation ("WPC") to the Australian Services Union ("ASU") in November 2002. The substance of the allegation was that WPC had made a \$35,000 payment to the ASU to help fund a campaign against the State Government plan to reform WPC.
2. The Commission has conducted an investigation into this allegation to determine if any "misconduct" has occurred (as defined in the *Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003* (the "Act"), refer to the extract at Appendix A). This report details the Commission's investigation including the resultant opinions it has formed in accordance with section 22 of the Act.

Origin of investigation

3. In mid March 2004, an employee of the ASU provided information regarding the payment to the Leader of the Opposition and to another union. This union then passed on this information to the Sunday Times.
4. On 17 March 2004 Sunday Times reporter, John Flint, met with the Deputy Premier Eric Ripper and advised him of the allegation. Acting on advice from the State Solicitor, the Deputy Premier, through Mr Megaw, formally notified the Commission of this allegation by letter dated 22 March 2004 and received the following day. The proposition advanced by the Deputy Premier was that a \$35,000 payment made to the ASU by WPC on November 2002 might have been made for the purpose of helping to fund a campaign against the State Government plan to reform WPC.

5. Additionally, WPC through its solicitors by letter of 26 March 2004, notified the Commission pursuant to Section 28 of the Act. WPC was concerned as to whether misconduct might have occurred due to the failure of their officers to find any formal justification for the payment.

After assessing the matter, the Commission decided to investigate it, pursuant to section 33(1)(a) of the Act.

Jurisdiction

6. WPC was established, by the *Electricity Corporation Act 1994* ("EC Act") on 1 January 1995, when the former State Energy Commission of Western Australia ("SECWA") was split into separate electricity and gas utilities. Accordingly, WPC is a statutory corporation. Allegations of misconduct on the part of officers of the WPC fall within the jurisdiction of the Commission for the following reasons:

- Section 4 of the CCC Act defines those actions on the part of public officers that constitute misconduct and sub section 6(1) states that the Commission may receive information and otherwise perform its functions in relation to acts, omissions or conduct alleged to have been done, omitted or engaged in by a person who was a public officer at the time of the alleged acts, omissions or conduct even if the person has ceased to be a public officer; and
- The term "public officer" is defined in section 3 of the Act by reference with section 1 of the *Criminal Code 1913* to include "a member, officer or employee of any authority, board, corporation, commission, local government, council of a local government, council or committee or similar body established under a written law".

An officer of the WPC is an officer of a corporation established under written law and is therefore a "public officer" under the Act.

Scope of the investigation

7. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to dealing with misconduct by public officers, as defined by section 4 of the Act. It does not extend to dealing with the conduct of privately employed people, such as the union officials employed by the ASU.

Use of the Commissioner's powers

8. The following Section 95 "Notices to Produce Documents and Other Things" under the Act were issued during this investigation:
 - 30 March 2004: ASU office. Obtained a copy of ASU accounts and receipts.
 - 18 August 2004: ASU office. Obtained a copy of the Burlinson letter to Gillies dated 11 November 2002.
 - 8 October 2004: ASU office. Examined the contents of Burlinson's ASU computer.

The following private hearings, on oath before the Commissioner, were conducted during this investigation:

- 21 August 2004: Laurence Shane O'Byrne, Organiser with the CEPU from 1989 - 2003.
- 30 September 2004: Garry Gillies, Advisor to WPC Managing Director February 2001 - June 2003.

Interviews conducted by Commission investigators in first Commission investigation

9. Interviews conducted during first investigation:
 - Maree Cameron, Gillies' personal assistant between May 2002 and January 2003.
 - David Eiszele, Managing Director of WPC from January 1995 to December 2002.
 - Pete Feldhusen, Manager WPC Risk Assurance and Audit.
 - Garry Gillies, Advisor to WPC Managing Director February 2001 - June 2003.
 - Neil Fry, Senior Human Resource Advisor with WPC.

- David Taylor, employed by WPC and also holding an honorary position with ASU.
- Jeffrey Williams, employee of WPC, seconded to ASU.

Reason for a second Commission investigation

10. In early June 2004, an initial Commission report, based on the investigators' report, was completed. Matthew Byrne, Chief Consultant to the CCC, reviewed this report and investigation in conjunction with feedback from WPC and recommended additional lines of inquiry. A new investigation plan was approved and further inquiries were commenced.

Interviews conducted by Commission investigators during second Commission investigation

11. Interviews conducted during second investigation:
 - Julie Brooks, Management Secretary of WPC between October 2002 and April 2004.
 - Brian Burke, employed as a consultant for the ASU.
 - Paul Burlinson, Branch Secretary of the Western Australian branch of the ASU.
 - Pauline Cheryl Byng, employed as the Principal Finance and Operations Officer with the ASU from June 2003 until December 2003.
 - Lois Christensen, ASU Finance and Administration Manager from June 2002 until April 2003.
 - Maree Cameron, Gillies' personal assistant at WPC between May 2002 and January 2003.
 - Harvey Collins, Chief Executive Officer of WPC.
 - David Eiszele, Managing Director of WPC from January 1995 until December 2002.
 - Pete Feldhusen, Manager WPC Risk Assurance and Audit.
 - John Flint, Sunday Times Reporter.
 - Bill Game, State Secretary of the CEPU.

- Andrew Georgiades, WPC Risk Assurance and Audit.
- Erin Gisborne, Fruition Communication Solutions.
- Michael Megaw, Chief of Staff to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Energy.
- Steven Van Der Mye, Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer of WPC from April 2003 until February 2004.
- Christine Ping, Executive Assistant to the Managing Director of WPC.
- Norman Francis Salisbury, previously employed as an industrial organiser with the ASU.
- Aileen Elizabeth Stanley, WPC Management Secretary.
- Debbie Sutton, Principal Finance and Operations Officer for the ASU.
- Michael Whitbread, ASU Branch Executive Council.

Chapter 2 – WPC pays \$35,000 to the ASU

WPC Reform Progress

12. During 2002, the Western Australian Government announced a proposal to reform WPC. At this time David Eiszele was the Managing Director and Gary Gillies was Advisor to the Managing Director and acted in the role of Managing Director in the absence of the Managing Director. The WPC Board agreed in principle that reform was required but did not agree with the proposed manner of implementation. The Board forwarded a list of recommendations to the Minister for Energy, Deputy Premier the Hon Eric Ripper.

WPC and ASU meeting

13. Just prior to 12 November 2002, the ASU invited Eiszele and Gillies to a meeting to present to representatives of the ASU and other unions, the position of the WPC Board in relation to the reforms. This meeting was held at the offices of the ASU, and was attended by Brian Burke a consultant to the ASU, David Taylor of the ASU and Gary Wood of the Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union (CFMEU) and Paul Burlinson who was at the time Branch Secretary of the Australian Services Union (ASU). Investigations have found no evidence of any agreement, formed at this meeting between the ASU, CFMEU, and WPC Board, to conduct a campaign against the proposed reforms or funding for any such campaign.

ASU request to WPC for funding

14. A short time after this meeting, Burlinson telephoned Gillies and requested funding from WPC to enable the ASU to conduct research into the impact of the reforms. At the time of this phone call, Eiszele was overseas and Gillies was acting in the role of Managing Director. Gillies had the authority to approve a payment of \$35,000, although on this occasion he telephoned Eiszele to seek his input. Eiszele told Gillies to use his own judgment.

15. The Commission's investigations located two documents relevant to the transaction. The first document (Appendix B) is an ASU invoice for \$35,000 dated 6 November 2002 to the WPC. This invoice was supplied to this Commission, by the WPC as a result of a Section 95 Notice. The invoice is for:

Contribution/assistance towards training and research into renewable energy industry.

16. Burlinson stated that he had never previously sighted this invoice and his position has always been that at no time did he ever state that the ASU were going to use this funding for "training" as indicated in this invoice. The Commission's investigations have been unable to establish who created this invoice. Of concern is that there is no internal record of this ASU invoice within the books and records of the ASU. Enquires with current and former ASU accounting staff have revealed that it is possible for an invoice to be generated and there be no record remaining.

17. The second document is a typed letter, dated 11 November 2002, addressed to Garry Gillies from Paul Burlinson (Appendix C) and was produced by the ASU as a result of a Section 95 notice. This letter seeks \$35,000 as a contribution to a total estimated cost of \$64,500 for the retention, maintenance and supplementation of external expertise concerning the reform of WPC. Commission investigators and WPC Internal Auditors could find no record of this letter at WPC. Burlinson stated that he typed this letter himself and although he cannot specifically recall actually posting the letter, he stated it is likely that he did. He also stated, in Commission interviews, that he had telephone discussions with Gillies regarding this letter. Commission examinations of Burlinson's personal computer indicates that the document

was created by Burlinson on Wednesday 6 November 2002 and printed on 11 November 2002. Gillies denied on oath ever having seen this letter prior to a copy being shown to him at a private hearing before the Commission on 30 September 2004.

WPC processing of payment

18. When an invoice is received at WPC it is forwarded to the appropriate section for authorisation, payment and recording. The person authorising the payment provides instructions to the accounts clerk on the appropriate cost code within the internal WPC accounts system. In this instance the invoice was forwarded to Gillies who approved the payment on 12 November 2002. It was then processed and entered into the WPC account system on 14 November 2002 by Maree Cameron, who was Gillies' personal assistant.

The \$35,000 payment was allocated to two debit areas: \$17,500 of the payment was attributed to "Admin Legal Fees" and the other \$17,500 payment to "Admin Miscellaneous Services".

Two styles of handwriting appear on the invoice (Appendix B). The Commission has established that the following extract is in Maree Cameron's handwriting.

SUPPLIER NO# 006910
\$17,500 to cost code 9005 6155-453
\$17,500 to cost code 9005 6155-460

The second extract is in Gary Gillies' handwriting:

Approved for payment
G.Gillies (signature) 12/11/02

19. Cameron stated that she did not have authority to split the payment or to cost code the payment. Cameron stated that, although she cannot specifically recall, she believes that, as Gillies' signature appears on the invoice, it was his decision to split the payment and allocate the cost codes. Gillies stated that he did not make the decision to split the payments or allocate these cost codes into the WPC accounts system nor can he provide a name of a person who did.

In relation to the cost codes mentioned above:

- "9005" is a responsibility code attributed to Advisor to the Managing Director.
- "6155" is an activity description of Support Service Administration Support.
- "453" is an expense element of Administration Legal Fees.
- "460" is an expense element of Administration Miscellaneous Services.

20. The ASU invoice describes the invoice as for "training" and "research". The Commission's investigation has revealed that Gillies did not have a budget for Training but did have a budget of \$31,697 for Administration Miscellaneous Services. This budget code appears to be the most applicable code relative to the description of the service on the ASU invoice. It appears that Gillies has split the payment and allocated \$17,500 to "Administration Miscellaneous Services" and \$17,500 to "Administration Legal Fees" for which he had a budget of \$26,414. The recording of this payment in this way may appear questionable. However, it is most likely that the payment was split into the pre-existing internal WPC budget codes as a matter of administrative convenience, an apparently acceptable practice for WPC's auditors.

ASU processing of funds

21. The ASU operates one general sundry account for routine income and expenditure. The ASU use the Mind Your Own Business (MYOB) accounting package to cost code items coming in and out.

22. The \$35,000 payment from WPC was received by the ASU on 27 November 2002 and placed in the general sundry income account. On 30 November 2002, \$35,000 was transferred to an account entitled "Energy Projects".

23. Burlinson stated that due to the deficiencies in the account keeping at the ASU it is not possible to identify where the \$35,000 was spent. This does not appear correct as the "Energy Projects" ASU account transactions (Appendix D) provides a clear record of the \$35,000 being credited into the account on 30 November 2002 and a large number of debits from this account. This is also contradicted by Pauline Byng, who was employed as the Principal Finance and Operations Officer at the ASU between 18 June 2003 and 24 December 2003, who stated that Burlinson told her that the \$35,000 was for a specific purpose and to put it into a separate account called the "energy fighting fund" as he wanted to keep track of all the expenditure. Byng understood the energy-fighting fund was for the Western Power campaign, which was a campaign against the separation of WPC into different units.

24. Other current and former employees of the ASU, including Debbie Sutton and Lois Christensen, understood that the \$35,000 and the "Energy Projects" account were for the ASU campaign against the proposed government reforms of WPC.

25. Of concern are comments made by Lois Christensen, a former ASU Account Manager who stated that Burlinson wanted the WPC funds deposited into the ASU accounts as soon as possible as his contact was either leaving WPC or "moving sideways" and he wanted to make sure that the ASU received the funds. Christensen was also of the opinion that this payment to the Union was not common knowledge, a fact supported by the following passage from Burlinson's letter to Gillies dated 11 November 2002 (Appendix C): which letter is acknowledged by Burlinson, but not Gillies.

I can assure you of complete discretion and confidentiality in this matter.

An analysis of the debits listed in the "Energy Projects" ASU account (Appendix D) indicates that most of the funds were used for the ASU campaign against the reforms of WPC.

26. Michael Whitbread is a member of the Branch Executive Council for the ASU and became aware of this \$35,000 payment only in March 2004. Whitbread stated that all ASU requests for external funding should have been approved by

the Branch Executive Council but in this case, no such approval was sought. He stated that the ASU was in a sound financial position and did not need to obtain external funding. Whitbread did not agree with using ASU funds to pay for a lobbyist such as Brian Burke and caused all ASU payments to Burke to cease immediately.

ASU campaign against the reforms of WPC

27. It is public knowledge that the ASU mounted a public campaign against the Government's proposed reforms of WPC. Burlinson stated that the ASU did not decide to mount this campaign until 2003. Examination of the ASU "Energy Projects" account indicates that the first confirmed payment regarding the campaign against the reform was made in May 2003. (a payment to Fruition Communications of \$2,916.36.) Although payments to Burke's company, Abbey Lea, are apparent from February 2003.

28. The ASU represents "white-collar" workers at WPC and the CEPU (Communication, Electrical, Plumbers Union) represent "blue-collar" workers. Both unions were involved in this campaign although the ASU appears to have been the more energetic body.

29. There is some evidence that ASU employees did travel to the eastern states, however, it is clear from Appendix D, that the majority of the \$35,000 was used to fund this campaign and also employ Burke as a consultant.

30. It is evident, as indicated in the following quote contained in Burlinson's letter of 11 November 2002 to Gillies (Appendix C), that the ASU and CEPU were working together:

Further to our recent discussions, I am now able to confirm the fact that ASU together with CEPU ... are conducting research and other activities to properly prepare our response with respect to the proposed reform of the Electricity Industry within Western Australia.

31. Of interest is that the ASU at no stage acknowledged to the CEPU that the ASU had received \$35,000 from WPC and, that the ASU had actually billed the CEPU for a share of the cost of the work done for the campaign. The first time the CEPU became aware of this payment was when the story appeared in the media in March 2004.

Agreement between ASU and WPC

32. The Commission's investigations did not uncover any evidence of an agreement between the WPC and the ASU that the \$35,000 payment would be used to campaign against the proposed governments reforms of WPC. Both Burlinson and Gillies deny that there was any agreement for the funds to be used for the campaign. Burlinson himself stated that the ASU did not decide to mount the campaign until some time in 2003 when it was decided it was in the best interest of the ASU and its members.

33. At the time of making this payment both Eiszele and Gillies maintain that the money was to be paid to the ASU to enable the ASU to acquire experience and knowledge to answer the concerns of their members in relation to the reforms. It was considered a good business decision to keep the union fully informed on matters, which in turn might prevent industrial unrest and ultimately benefit the Western Australian public. Eiszele has stated that neither at the November meeting at the ASU premises, nor at any later time, was it discussed with him that the money was to be used on a campaign against the reforms or to pay Brian Burke and that, if he had become aware, he would have stopped the payment. Gillies adopts the same position.

34. The position of the ASU is that the funds were to be used for assistance in resourcing the research and investigation of the energy reform initiative for the benefit of the ASU and its members and at no time was any service/product to be provided back to WPC. Gillies maintains that the intention of the payment was for the benefit of WPC employees. Burlinson stated he never received any request from WPC asking for details as to how the funds were to be spent. He

stated that at no time did he request any form of assistance for training. Burlinson himself suggested the figure of \$35,000.

35. Burlinson stated that he did not cost the "research" and had arrived at this figure as he was attempting to get as much money as he could. Gillies never asked Burlinson to substantiate the request in any detail.

Involvement of Brian Burke

36. A matter that arises as a result of this allegation is the role of Brian Burke and a company Abbey Lea Pty Ltd. Burke was engaged as a consultant by the ASU. Burke stated that he advised the ASU to mount a campaign to have the Government accommodate the union's position about some aspects, while accepting the principle of disaggregation. He stated that he was not aware of the \$35,000 WPC payment to the ASU until he saw reference to it in March 2004 in the media. Burlinson stated the ASU did employ Brian Burke as a consultant in relation to a number of areas but was not paid out of the \$35,000 and was not involved in the campaign, a fact which appears contradicted by the ASU "Energy Projects" account (Appendix D). Burke maintains that his brief from the ASU was to advise generally regarding the process of reform and that he advised acceptance of the Government's policies in this regard.

Other WPC payments to the ASU

37. Eiszele has stated publicly that the WPC has in the past made similar payments to the ASU. Investigations have found that the WPC did support the ASU by providing staff secondments, travel, accommodation etc. WPC would fund these activities upon receiving receipts or invoices from the ASU. This particular \$35,000 payment differs, as it was not paid upon receiving receipts and was recorded under a WPC "non order invoice." WPC internal Auditors have found only two other WPC payments to unions using a "non order invoice", one was for damage to property for \$514 and the other for a public liability claim of \$16,892.

38. Notwithstanding Gillies claim that the payment was consistent with previous long-term practice the quantum (\$35,000) and manner of attribution of WPC funds paid to the ASU does not appear consistent with previous practice.

Chapter 3 – Summary and Commission’s Opinions

Summary

39. The payment made in November 2002 by Western Power Corporation (WPC) to the Australian Services Union (ASU) in the sum of \$35,000 was made on the authorisation of Mr Garry Gillies who was at that time acting as Managing Director of WPC [refer para 18].
40. The payment followed negotiations and dealings between Burlinson of the ASU and Gillies of WPC and in the body of the report attention is drawn to differing accounts as to the nature of the negotiations and dealings between these two persons [refer paras 14 to 17].
41. There is evidence that previously WPC had paid funds to the ASU. However, notwithstanding Gillies claim that the payment in November 2002 was consistent with previous long-term practice, the Commission concluded that the quantum and manner of attribution of WPC funds paid to the ASU on this occasion does not appear to be consistent with past practice [refer paras 37 and 38].
42. The Commission’s investigation did not uncover any evidence of an agreement between WPC (or any employee thereof) and the ASU that the \$35,000 payment would be used to campaign against the proposed governmental reforms of WPC. There is a difference between Mr Burlinson and Mr Gillies as to the purpose for the funding [refer para 17]. The Commission’s investigations, however, found that a large portion of the \$35,000 was in fact ultimately directed to and utilised in the ASU campaign against the proposed reforms of WPC [refer paras 23 and 29]. There are a number of possible interpretations of these conflicting circumstances but ultimately, there is insufficient evidence to enable the Commission to reconcile them.

Commission’s Opinions

43. It is the Commission’s opinion that Gillies appeared unconcerned in not properly assessing and not seeking further justification of the request for funding prior to making the payment nor for ensuring that the services paid for were actually provided. It appears that, on this occasion, there was an inadequacy in Gillies’ approach to the control and use of public funds.
44. Notwithstanding the above, at the conclusion of a lengthy investigation, the Commission has found no evidence that revealed “misconduct” within the definition of the *Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003* on the part of WPC management or current or former employees.

Appendix A

Extract - Section 4 *Corruption and Crime Commission Act 2003*

4. "Misconduct", meaning of

Misconduct occurs if -

- (a) a public officer corruptly acts or corruptly fails to act in the performance of the functions of the public officer's office or employment;
- (b) a public officer corruptly takes advantage of the public officer's office or employment as a public officer to obtain a benefit for himself or herself or for another person or to cause a detriment to any person;
- (c) a public officer whilst acting or purporting to act in his or her official capacity, commits an offence punishable by 2 or more years' imprisonment; or
- (d) a public officer engages in conduct that -
 - (i) adversely affects, or could adversely affect, directly or indirectly, the honest or impartial performance of the functions of a public authority or public officer whether or not the public officer was acting in their public officer capacity at the time of engaging in the conduct;
 - (ii) constitutes or involves the performance of his or her functions in a manner that is not honest or impartial;
 - (iii) constitutes or involves a breach of the trust placed in the public officer by reason of his or her office or employment as a public officer; or
 - (iv) involves the misuse of information or material that the public officer has acquired in connection with his or her functions as a public officer, whether the misuse is for the benefit of the public officer or the benefit or detriment of another person,

and constitutes or could constitute -

- (v) an offence against the *Statutory Corporations (Liability of Directors) Act 1996* or any other written law; or
- (vi) a disciplinary offence providing reasonable grounds for the termination of a person's office or employment as a public service officer under the *Public Sector Management Act 1994* (whether or not the public officer to whom the allegation relates is a public service officer or is a person whose office or employment could be terminated on the grounds of such conduct).

Appendix B

Australian Services Union
102 East Parade
East Perth WA 6004

Bill To:

Western Power Corporation
365 Wellington Street
Perth WA 6001

A.B.N.: 65 118 845 644
A.C.N.:

Tax Invoice
Invoice #: 00000091
Date: 6/11/02
Ship Via:
Page: 1
Ship To:

Western Power Corporation
365 Wellington Street
Perth WA 6001

Description	Amount	Code
CONTRIBUTION/ASSISTANCE TOWARDS TRAINING & RESEARCH INTO RENEWABLE ENERGY INDUSTRY	\$35,000.00	N-T

SUPPLIER NO # 006910

\$17,500 to cost code 9005 6155-453
\$17,500 to cost code 9005 6155-460

Received for Payment
L. J. Lewis 12/10/02

Your Order #:	Customer ABN:			Freight:	\$0.00 GST
Shipping Date:	Terms: C.O.D.			GST:	\$0.00
COMMENT	CODE	RATE	GST	SALE AMOUNT	Total Inc GST:
	GST	10%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$35,000.00
	N-T	0%	\$0.00	\$35,000.00	Amount Applied: \$0.00
				Balance Due:	\$35,000.00

Printed from MYOB www.myob.com.au

CCC 00007946



Appendix C

Private and Confidential

11th November 2002

Mr Garry Gillies
A/g Managing Director
Western Power Corporation
GPO Box L921
PERTH WA 6842

Dear Garry

Further to our recent discussions, I am now able to confirm the fact that ASU together with CEPU, CFMEU (Coal Division) and AMWU are conducting research and other activities to properly prepare our response with respect to the proposed reform of the Electricity Industry within Western Australia.

As you aware ASU provides representation as a member of the Electricity Reform Review Group established to consider the final report of the Electricity Reform Task Force that was recently released for public comment.

Whilst we have gathered a substantial amount of relevant material during the last 9 months, ASU is concerned at our capacity to adequately resource this critical phase of the reform process in a sufficiently timely manner, and about the negative consequences that may result.

ASU has arranged to retain expertise that is outside of our ranks and for this professional resource to be maintained and supplemented as required until the end of this calendar year. The total cost of providing this external expertise, for the period stated, is expected to be approximately \$64,500.

Consistent with your Corporations recognised attitude towards assisting worthwhile community groups, the renewable energy industry etc, ASU seeks your support in our obtaining external expertise and would be grateful to receive a contribution towards the total cost in the amount of \$35,000.

I can assure you of complete discretion and confidentiality in this matter. Please contact me at any time on (08) 9427 7711 or 0412 947 053 to discuss any aspect of this correspondence as required.

Yours sincerely

Paul Burlinson
Branch Secretary

CCC 00008129



Appendix D

2

Australian Services Union

102 East Parade
East Perth WA 6004

Account Transactions [Accrual]

01-07-2002 To 23-12-2003

Page 1

23-12-2003 10:04:48 AM	ID#	Src	Date	Memo/Payee	Debit	Credit	Job
	4-2505	Energy Projects					
	GJ001829	GJ	30-09-2002	TO CORRECT POSTING	\$3,750.00		
	GJ001830	GJ	31-10-2002	TO CORRECT POSTING	\$3,750.00		
	GJ001788	GJ	30-11-2002	To Transfer Income to correct a/			\$35,000.00
	GJ001831	GJ	31-01-2003	TO CORRECT POSTING	\$5,775.00		
	EFT	CD	10-02-2003	ABBEY LEA PTY LTD	\$1,375.00		
	EFT	CD	04-03-2003	ABBEY LEA	\$1,375.00		
	EFT	CD	04-04-2003	ABBEY LEA	\$1,375.00		
	EFT	CD	06-05-2003	ABBEY LEA	\$1,250.00		
	00604197	PJ	13-05-2003	Purchase, Fruition Communicati	\$2,916.36		
	00604198	PJ	13-05-2003	Purchase, Techniprint General	\$940.00		
	EFT	CD	12-06-2003	ABBEY LEA	\$1,375.00		
	00604299	PJ	27-06-2003	Purchase, Fruition Communicati	\$840.91		
	00604320	PJ	27-06-2003	Purchase, Fruition Communicati	\$2,095.45		
					\$26,817.72	\$35,000.00	

CCC 00007939

