

29th June 2012

**A Statement summarising Bullying, Abuse and Extraordinary Mental
Stress inflicted on
Scientist and other staff
, Senior Principal Research
between 2001 and 2009**

Summary

Between January 2001 and March 2009 failed to implement a functional management system within that was capable of providing an acceptably psychologically healthy work environment. was subjected to various name changes and amalgamations during that period: the forest science joint venture with Research in New Zealand (2005 – 2008), (2008), and the section within and (2008 – 2009). appointed no less than four divisional Chiefs during that period with poor leadership skills who, in turn, appointed deputies and human resources staff with sociopathic and unethical behaviour patterns characterised by chronic bullying and disrespectful and anxiety inducing behaviour towards the majority of less senior staff in the divisions, ranging from Level 8 senior principal research scientists to Level 3 and 4 Scientific Officers. The effect on me has been one of long lasting and possibly permanent mental health problems that were not in evidence prior to his employment as a Level 8, Deputy Program Manager with in January 2000. In 2000 I regarded as a good employer that was creating technological benefit for Australian industry in and the community. In the ensuing eight years, under the leadership of , I was forced through personal experience to downgrade that opinion of to certainly that of the unhealthiest, most psychologically dysfunctional workplace I have experienced in my 42-year research and managerial career. Many concrete specific examples of managerial dysfunctionality over that 8-year period are provided below in the full text of this document. The real names of the perpetrators of the bullying and dysfunctional behaviour and their victims have been redacted because the author does not have the victims' permission to reveal what was done to them and wishes to respect their privacy and I do not wish to prejudice any subsequent legal action against the perpetrators.

My Career Background

Between February 1980 and May 1998, I was employed in various senior research and technical roles by Australia's largest pulp, paper and packaging company,

Employed initially as a Research Organic Chemist, I soon showed myself to be a very capable manager and leader and I was rewarded by being sent to the prestigious School of Management at Columbia University in New York State, in July 1987, for a 6-week intensive live-in course in senior management called the Columbia Senior Executive Program held at Harrington House in New York State.

I graduated from that course. Following my return from Columbia, I was promoted to be General Manager of Manufacturing Technology for the whole of [redacted] with a staff of 16 scientists and engineers reporting to me. I ran my team with distinction and was rewarded each year with increases in salary significantly above the CPI. [redacted], like most companies had its expansionary periods and its periods of contraction and budgetary restraint that I took in my stride as a result of my training at Columbia. In the mid-1990s there was a change in CEO of [redacted] with the appointment of [redacted] to that position. Unlike previous CEOs of [redacted], [redacted] did not encourage investment in in-house R&D and I was required to make several significant reductions in the staff reporting to me through retrenchment. Although stressful, I complied with these directives dutifully and with respect and compassion. By late 1986, [redacted] had replaced all the people in [redacted] to whom I reported with people with what I regarded as highly unethical values. When I was directed to retrench another 33% of my staff in April 1998, I elected to include myself on the list of people to be made redundant, having mentored and groomed a highly able deputy and successor, [redacted]. [redacted] was shown later to be both unethical and incompetent by being the first CEO of a large Australian public company who was forced to resign after admitting that he and some of his direct reports had knowingly breached Australia's anti-collusion laws, resulting in a multi-million dollar investigation and legal prosecution by the ACCC of both [redacted] and its co-accused, [redacted]. I cite my recognition of [redacted] poor leadership qualities in 1998 as evidence that I am more capable of recognising those qualities in people than any of the paid Directors on [redacted] in 1996 when they appointed [redacted] to be CEO of [redacted]. I regard myself of an excellent judge of leadership qualities and someone who is capable of manifesting them myself.

Following my retrenchment, I established a consulting company, [redacted] that offered scientific consulting services to public- and private sector clients. I ran that company as Sole Director successfully between June 1998 and January 2000. One of [redacted] clients was [redacted] had been reviewed by the [redacted] Executive in 1998 and found to have almost no relevance to the Australian pulp, paper and packaging industries. [redacted] retrenched 40% of the [redacted] related staff of [redacted] with little sensitivity, or compassion in 1999 and [redacted] was contracted to prepare for the then divisional [redacted] a research strategy recommendation aimed at making the division more industrially relevant and enabling it to attract more research funding from industry. I delivered that recommendation in late 1999 and was invited by [redacted] to apply for the position of Deputy Program Manager – [redacted] with the aim of putting my recommendations into action if my application was successful. This I did and was appointed to the position at the end of January 2000 reporting to the Program Manager [redacted], one [redacted] who, in turn reported to [redacted].

In this challenging position I was responsible for retraining 15 senior scientists and technical staff in technologies and research areas that industry would be prepared to support financially and also for raising the morale of these people. Their morale had been severely dented by the 1999 retrenchments and re-

building them into a functional motivated team was my major challenge. I had taken the precaution, before accepting the appointment, of interviewing all my future potential staff and ascertaining that they had the appropriate psychological dispositions and personalities to make my future task possible. Satisfied on that score, I accepted the position, converted to a non-profit organisation with the sole activity of administering my self-managed superannuation fund (with the approval of) and commenced work at on 31st January 2000.

January 2000 – January 2001

My initial year working as Deputy Program Manager – was challenging, but quite satisfying and mostly enjoyable as I moulded the dispirited team back together, retrained them and visited my former colleagues in the pulp, paper and packaging industries to let them know that my section of was now headed by someone with industrial experience and responsiveness who was eager to help them solve their problems and to undertake R&D in their behalf in return for appropriate funding. The only less than enjoyable aspect of the year was the many appearances of in my office unannounced. On these occasions he asked questions like, ‘So what’s going on?’ in a highly accusative tone. I soon came to learn that was a highly ambitious man who trusted no one and who spent much of his time walking the corridors spying on less senior staff and drawing quite erroneous conclusions whenever he saw somebody who looked as though they were not fully occupied, or listening in to private conversations between staff members. Fortunately, I only had to complain to about the dysfunctional and highly demotivating behaviour of and was ‘kept under control’ for a short period until he repeatedly relapsed into his habitual dysfunctional behaviour. Although quite stressful and very time wasting, the situation in my first year working for was bearable because I had an ethical and very capable Chief above who could curb his errant behaviour. During that year, in addition to attracting my targeted industrial funding of 20% of total budget, I led a successful joint application for funding in conjunction with colleagues in , the paper and security printing industries and academics from Monash University School of Chemical Engineering. That funding was approved by the Department of Industry Innovation and Science in July 2001 and led to an injection of over \$10 million of much neXXXXXXd fundamental into over the following 7 years. Other significant events in 2000 included the appointment of a to a position as Leader of the Team, reporting to . It later became apparent that was a person with whom had an existing relationship. He had employed as a deputy in a previous job that he had held in the UK. Clearly had played a major role in influencing the selection of and it became clear in following years that relied on as an unimaginative ‘yes man’ who was highly introspective, conflict averse and incapable of making of making decisions effectively. Dr soon earned the nickname of ‘Captain Inertia’ from all members of his own research group. At the very end of 2000, decided not to renew his 5-year contact as Chief and to resign. , an eminent forestry scientist, later

confided in me that the position of Chief of [redacted] was extremely stressful because of the political machinations of [redacted] and his executive at the helm of [redacted] and their 'anti-forestry' views and unethical tactics – [redacted] intimated very clearly to me that he had had quite enough of the Machiavellian behaviour of the [redacted] Executive.

January 2001 – March 2009

It took the [redacted] Executive many months to advertise for a new Chief of [redacted] in early 2001 and almost a year before a man, [redacted], who had industry experience working in the eucalypt plantations associated with a large pulp mill in Portugal, was appointed to the position. In the hiatus between the retirement of [redacted] and the appointment of [redacted], chaos reigned in [redacted] with [redacted] performing the role of Acting Chief of [redacted]. The chaotic and highly stressful working conditions were created by [redacted] acting in concert with the divisional human resources manager, [redacted]. [redacted] is a woman who had 'risen through the ranks' – starting as a filing clerk in [redacted] in the mid 1950s and who had no formal training in human resource management, or organisational psychology. [redacted] was another incompetent and dysfunctional person who [redacted] described to me privately as 'not capable of getting a job anywhere outside [redacted]'. Nevertheless, holding power of veto over any divisional promotions, reclassifications and hirings, [redacted] was a formidably powerful figure in the division – liked by the small number of staff, who did her bidding and whom she favoured, but loathed by the majority of staff for whom she had decided to make life in [redacted] as difficult as possible.

[redacted] is one of those unethical people who works on a system of personal 'favours' – if you complied with her none too subtle suggestions, you remained 'anointed'; if you disagreed with what she was suggesting you were instantly relegated to the group in whose path she threw administrative obstacles at every turn. As a [redacted] veteran of over 30 years, [redacted] knew every obstructive bureaucratic obstacle to functional organisational performance in the overly voluminous [redacted] Policies and Procedures Manual and did not hesitate to use them whenever she wished to frustrate changes that might lead to greater efficiency and better morale in [redacted].

[redacted] had a violent temper and could be extremely sarcastic. These lamentable qualities became unbridled during the hiatus in 2001 and many times I had to console [redacted] Personal Assistant, [redacted], who was frequently reduced to tears by [redacted] bullying outbursts. Other staff under [redacted] stewardship were similarly subjected unpredictable and frightening outbursts of rage. At the time, there was no one in [redacted] above [redacted] to whom staff could turn in order to make formal complaints about this unacceptable behaviour. The one person who had the responsibility for counselling ALL staff, [redacted], always took [redacted] point of view and refused to entertain any official complaints by less senior staff against him. The autocratic dysfunctional oligarchy constituted by the partnership of [redacted] and [redacted] quickly became known as 'Adolf and Eva' in the mouths of 99% of divisional staff in reference to Adolf Hitler and his wartime mistress.

One of the many outbursts of rage from [redacted] was inflicted on a Senior Research Scientist working in my Team, [redacted]. [redacted] had taken an instant dislike to [redacted], whom he categorised as 'unimaginative'. My view of [redacted] was totally different. Whatever lack of imagination [redacted] had displayed was entirely due to his having been 'parked' in what was largely a repetitive and boring service role by pre-2000 management (that included [redacted]) measuring the yields pulp obtained under standard conditions from commercial samples of export woodchips. Despite the tedious and soul-destroying nature of the work, [redacted] had carried it out in a highly professional manner and had managed, by working long hours, to supplement this service work with research into the effects of geography, climate and species on Australian commercial wood species. By this means, [redacted] had become nationally recognised as an expert in this area and he has along list of peer-reviewed publications on the subject to his credit. Some years later with the additional freedom conferred by [redacted] funding, I was able to give [redacted] acted02 a COMPLETE change of research area from wood chemistry to the materials science and chemistry of electrochromic and photovoltaic devices, despite [redacted] protestations. [redacted] has adapted to his new area extremely well and today, some 10 years later, he is a leading member of a team investigating this important area of solar energy production.

Back in 2001 however, [redacted] was still working in my [redacted] group and was given the challenge by [redacted] of developing closer links with a wider variety of industry technical people. This he achieved with flying colours in 2002, when he was elected Vice-President of the [redacted] organisation, the peak body of the industry's researchers and technologists in both Australia and New Zealand. [redacted] went on to be elected President of [redacted] the following year. Nevertheless, the first time [redacted] sought [redacted] approval to attend a meeting of the [redacted] Executive Committee in New Zealand, [redacted], as Acting Chief refused to sign the authorisation for overseas travel until [redacted] had 'prepared a cost-benefit analysis of how much additional funding for [redacted] would accrue as a result of your travel'. Such a demand was completely unreasonable and completely at odds with the business of the [redacted] meeting. Accordingly, [redacted] sent an e-mail to his fellow Committee members advising them that he was unlikely to be able to attend the meeting because of an apparent change in divisional policy regarding support for [redacted] activities. In my opinion the e-mail was polite, factual and the professional action to take under the circumstances. [redacted] also foreshadowed that he might have to step down as Vice-President if he was prevented from attending meetings of the [redacted] Executive Committee, in his view a courteous forewarning of possible future outcomes of [redacted] requirements. Dr [redacted] naturally sent a courtesy copy of his e-mail to [redacted]. The result was that [redacted] flew into one of his rages and picked up the phone and screamed at [redacted] that, 'I do not appreciate [redacted] stupid e-mails [redacted] which he followed with a 10-minute tirade of bullying verbal abuse.

After he had collected his wits following the abusive telephone conversation, _____ came to my office clearly upset and visibly shaking from the encounter. I knew that it was pointless confronting _____ in his enraged and irrational state of mind, so I listened quietly while _____ unburdened himself of the harrowing experience and I did my best to calm and console him while noting the salient facts. In my 18 months at _____, I had never seen, nor met the person to whom the Chief of _____ reported. As far as I knew that person had never visited our site and we were not ever provided with organisational charts that told even senior scientists which person on the Executive was responsible for which division. This lack of organisational charts and pastoral visits ran directly counter to my previous experience in _____. Indeed, positions on the _____ Executive seemed to be like positions in a revolving door and no sooner had I learned the name of one Chiefly overseer, than someone else replaced him, or her. Such was the state of flux in _____ Avenue Executive Offices in _____ in the early days of _____ tenure as _____. At the time however, I had met one person who reported to _____ and who seemed to have the best interests of _____ staff at heart. This man's name was _____, a consultant who was hired by _____ at huge expense under conditions that were later subjected to a Commonwealth Senate Enquiry with quite a damning outcome. Nevertheless, I believed at that time that _____ was an ethical man who might be able to alert _____ to our problems with the dysfunctional behaviour of _____. I wrote a private e-mail to _____ outlining _____ unacceptable behaviour during the incident with _____, stated that it was not an isolated incident, but part of a pattern that was eroding the morale of all staff, including scientists, in _____ and subjecting staff to unacceptable levels of stress. Rather than a constructive reply outlining measures that would be taken to try and change _____ behaviour, I received a curt reply stating that the actions of _____ were some of the most unprofessional that _____ had witnessed in a 40 year career and opining that _____ had received appropriate discipline from _____. I later learned that _____ point of view was forged during a long career as an officer in the army of the Republic of South Africa under the apartheid regime. Friend's in other divisions informed me that he was in fact what is known as a 'smiling assassin' contracted by _____ to essentially spy on all staff and 'weed out' any who expressed doubts about _____ management and strategy. I learned through this exercise that the dysfunctional covert, backstabbing bullying culture that I had witnessed in _____ and other people in equivalent positions in other divisions was endorsed at the highest level, despite all sorts of mealy-mouthed platitudes and management speak coming out of _____ and his office.

I simply wrote back to _____ that if _____ behaviour was among the worst he had seen in a 40-year career, that in my opinion, he had had very little experience of corporate life and was therefore unfit to act as a highly paid consultant, with a copy to _____. I never received a reply to that e-mail, however, I was gratified to learn that _____ had suffered a significant myocardial infarct some weeks later and had been sent back to South Africa to convalesce. _____ was not

heard of again within [redacted], but his appointment by [redacted] contrary to [redacted] tendering policy was examined by a Senate Select Committee of the Australian Parliament with an adverse finding against [redacted] actions.

[redacted] received no adequate apology from either [redacted], or [redacted]. He was however invited to 'a meeting' with the two of them without the benefit of having a colleague, or a Union representative present. [redacted] would not tell me what happened in that meeting, but only that he was far from satisfied with the comments, or attitude of either individual. That was a common experience in [redacted] between 2001 and 2009, even under the subsequent Chief, [redacted], who was absent from the division most of the time. Staff, both junior and senior would be subjected to long term bullying, belittlement and lack of respect and then be told by [redacted] and [redacted] that it was really their fault for failing to comply with the stifling and overly bureaucratic administrative procedures that they had implemented before any approval to conduct scientific research could be obtained. I liken the situation within [redacted] to an organisational equivalent of what behavioural psychologists call the 'battered wife syndrome'.

Following this event, one of my responsibilities was to prepare a detailed research plan for the newly created [redacted] for [redacted], interfacing with industry sponsors and fellow scientists in the Department of Chemical Engineering at Monash University. One of my first 'bad experiences' performing this role in 2002 was the Chief of our sister division, then known as [redacted], deciding unilaterally that they would not commit staff, or funds to the new [redacted] despite constant assurances to the contrary for the previous 2 years during the application process. This 'chop and change on a whim' mentality was also endemic in the senior echelons of many divisions. I slowly learned that Chiefs were effectively 'laws unto themselves alone' and could be as disruptive as they chose to be, essentially without fear of any personal repercussions. Nevertheless I saw this 'hiccup' as an opportunity and forged a new alliance with [redacted] Research Institute at the University of [redacted] to fill the gap left by the abrupt decision of the Chief of [redacted]. Later I developed quite a good working relationship with [redacted] following her retrenchment from [redacted] had had far more face-to-face dealings with [redacted] than I and she warned me privately that [redacted] was a snake in a suit with a MERIT management style. MERIT is an acronym that stands for 'Mates Earn Rewards Irrespective of Talent.'

Having successfully secured funding of over \$1 million per annum for the next 7 years from the [redacted] and repaired the damage done by [redacted] disruptive decision, I was 'rewarded' by [redacted] by being demoted from the position of Deputy Program Manager and told to report to the new deputy to [redacted], the ineffectual, non-decision making, conflict averse, [redacted], who was appointed to his new position by [redacted] and [redacted] without prior advertisement. [redacted] by this time had become an 'absentee landlord' known throughout the division as 'The Ghost', because he was notionally Chief, but was rarely seen in any building occupied by [redacted]. We later learned that [redacted]

major objective in accepting the position of Chief of [redacted] was to secure paid passage of himself and his family back to Australia from Portugal to enable him to set up a sheep station near [redacted]. [redacted] contribution to [redacted] was token at best. Meanwhile Adolf and Eva ran their defacto fascist state within [redacted] with a rod of fear and favouritism – ably assisted by [redacted] who rubber-stamped every illogical and morale-destroying decision made by the two of them. [redacted] was later joined by one [redacted], a wood scientist from New Zealand whose major contribution to [redacted] had been the securing of a \$600 service contract from a furniture manufacturer in late 2001. Based solely on this less than laudable achievement and the fact that he was a sycophant to [redacted] and [redacted] were sent, flying business class, to a very expensive management training school in London for around 2 months by [redacted] at a time when the rest of the division was being asked to cut even essential expenditure. Both [redacted] and [redacted] returned from that training having only grown in their own self-importance and authoritarian behaviour.

In 2001 I was fortunate to attract a very capable deputy to my [redacted] team – one [redacted], the same man with whom I had worked at [redacted]. Naturally, I disqualified myself from any influence over the [redacted] process that resulted in the hiring of [redacted]. Together, [redacted] and I worked extremely hard throughout 2001 and 2002 to organise [redacted] contribution to the [redacted] for [redacted]. During this time I was bullied and hectorated by [redacted] and [redacted] in a manner that I had never witnessed during my 18-year career in [redacted]. As a consequence I suffered an episode of acute depression in mid 2002 and had to take two months sick leave to recover. I knew that I would get no assistance from either [redacted], or [redacted] and would run the risk of being bullied even further by [redacted] who viewed any sign of mental illness as a weakness to be exploited. I therefore disguised my episode of depression as ‘glandular fever’ and paid for my own treatment by a psychiatrist that enabled me to return to work at [redacted] two months later. I still suffer from chronic mild depression to this day and must continue to take anti-depressive medication on the advice of my physician and former psychiatrist.

While this was occurring in 2003, I secured a major research contract (amounting to some \$250,000) for [redacted] with the company, [redacted] and [redacted], a notably hard-nosed company that had previously entertained a huge amount of scepticism towards [redacted] ability to be industrially relevant. This contract required me and two other [redacted] staff to travel to [redacted] and [redacted] in Tumut, NSW for extended periods – usually five days at a time, with weekends only spent in Melbourne, over a 9-month period. My work at Tumut was of great importance to [redacted], because the Company had promised the local community that the [redacted] would ‘emit no odours beyond the Mill boundary’ before construction was approved by the NSW Environmental Protection Authority in the early 2000s. All kraft pulp mills at that time produced highly offensive sulphurous ‘foul gases’ as by-products and, despite sophisticated pollution control measures, none had achieved the ‘odour-free’ status promised by [redacted]. In 2004, [redacted] Pulp Mill was still experiencing odour complaints at the rate of 50 – 60 per month 3 years after the mill had commenced operating. After 9

months of very stressful and dangerous work in an area of the pulp mill that is constantly bathed in these foul gases (which are well-known to cause chronic headaches and nausea in areas of the mill make use of self-contained breathing apparatus completely impractical (because of the hundreds of hours worked and the summer heat that extended over 4 of the nine months), I managed, with my two assistants, to develop THE FIRST low-cost odour monitoring system for foul gases in the world and to use it to track the source of the odour. I then designed and built a 6-metre high pilot plant that demonstrated how the source of the foul gas could be treated to reduce odour leaving the mill boundary by 98%. Complete removal of foul gas odour is a challenge that still eludes the kraft pulping industry, nevertheless, my small team and I managed to assist Visy to find a cost-effective odour abatement solution that made it the lowest odour kraft mill in the world and to reduce odour complaints from the local community from 50-60 per month to less than 5 per month. That achievement was absolutely crucial in allowing Visy to proceed to invest another \$400 million in Tumut and double the production capacity of the Mill. The expansion in production would not have been possible without the success of my small team. My 'reward' in late 2004 for this achievement was to have my Commonwealth car taken from me (it was part of the terms of my employment in 2000 when I joined). No attempt was made by or to recognise my achievement, or to facilitate a monetary reward or promotion. In contrast, other members of the 'in-group' were given monetary rewards for relatively minor achievements such as 'contributing to the Management Change Team' – something that I would argue was part of their normal responsibilities. I mention this incident as just one of many completely dysfunctional demotivating behaviours by and in rewarding a small group of 'yes men' and 'yes women' and to penalise anyone who advocated more consultative and team-building management strategies. Based on what I had learned in 1987 at Columbia University, I assess the management of in the years between 2001 and 2009 to be based on failed authoritarian principles that had been rejected by most well run companies in the 1950s.

In late 2003 it was decided by someone above , presumably , that would form a joint venture with the Crown Research Institute in New Zealand responsible for that country's forestry Research. The new joint venture was called and one of its prime aims was to reduce significantly the amount of government funding going to both institutes and to replace it with industry sponsorship. Industry funding levels of 50 and 60% were commonly talked about, levels that neither organisation had been able to achieve at any time in their histories. There were countless bureaucratic meetings aimed at setting business strategies and target income levels from industry, all of which were patently unachievable in my view and the views of most of my scientist colleagues. Additionally, the senior management of both organisations saw and eagerly grasped the many opportunities for trans-Tasman travel for lengthy periods, running up crippling hotel bills that made the budget deficit levels of both organisations far higher than had been achieved prior to the formation of the joint venture. Additionally, research staff were required to prepare presentations on how would work and make many visits to industry

partners, actual and potential, to explain the complex and poorly thought out advantages of [redacted] for industry. All of this activity was government funded and naturally it eroded significantly the amount of actual contract [redacted] work that could be conducted and paid for by industry. Despite countless poorly run 'strategy' meetings, the one factor that was not considered adequately by senior management was working conditions and line responsibilities for the 100% of [redacted] staff who were seconded to [redacted]. All of these aspects of the operation of the joint venture were clouded in nebulous motherhood statements and management speak – we were constantly told that they were 'works in progress' – further evidence of [redacted] lack of professionalism in my view. People who asked probing questions were designated as recalcitrant and 'not on-board'. In her habitual style, [redacted] did almost nothing to comfort or counsel junior and middle-level staff who were quite naturally unnerved by these significant changes. That activity was left very much in the hands of senior scientists like myself. As a result of the formation of the joint venture, I was relieved of my managerial responsibilities and the [redacted] team was amalgamated with its New Zealand counterpart and placed under the leadership of a New Zealand manager, [redacted]. My former deputy [redacted] was made 'Commercial Manager' [redacted] for the new team. Because the supposedly 'technologically elite' [redacted] had been incompetent in applying new video conferencing technology, I reported on a day-to-day basis to [redacted] – a fact that I welcomed, because it relieved me of the responsibility of trying to answer the many unanswerable questions people in the new group had about their future. I became a Senior Principal Research Scientist in charge of the new area of [redacted] and was successful in attracting major funding from the [redacted]. In early 2004, I also attracted considerable funding from the [redacted]

[redacted] an independent quasi-judicial body established by the Tasmanian State Parliament to coordinate the approval of major development projects in the State. I was appointed [redacted] (not [redacted]) to represent [redacted] on a four-man committee set up by the [redacted] that was given the responsibility by both the Australian Government and the Tasmanian State Government of reviewing the best available technology economically achievable ([redacted]) for reducing pollution loads discharged to the environment from new pulp mills using the dominant kraft process to make bleached kraft pulp from eucalypt wood chips. Throughout 2004 I spent about a third of my time working on this committee whose aim was to prepare a document entitled 'Environmental Emission Limit Guidelines for any New Bleached Eucalypt Kraft Pulp Mill in Tasmania' for the approval of both the Minister for Environment in Tasmania and his counterpart in the Canberra. Because of my long background in industry and experience with new pulping and pollution control technologies, I became the principal advisor to the [redacted] Committee on these matters. The Chairman of the committee was an eminent Tasmanian constitutional lawyer, [redacted], a man with whom I formed an excellent and close working relationship. Although nominally 'Tasmanian Guidelines', the involvement and oversight of a committee member nominated by the Australian Government and subsequent approval by the Commonwealth Minister meant that the 'Guidelines' would be applied nationwide until technological advances required their updating.

The Guidelines were duly prepared in draft form and approved by the Tasmanian and Australian Governments in late 2004, when the Committee was thanked for its work and disbanded. In November 2004 the forestry company and major exporter of Tasmanian woodchips, , announced publicly that it wished to seek approval to build and operate a bleached eucalypt kraft pulp mill in Tasmania. Shortly after that announcement I was asked by whether I would be willing to be appointed, as an individual technical expert (not a representative of) to an Assessment Panel to be convened in February 2005. Naturally I said that I would have to seek approval from both and before accepting such a role. Nevertheless, I was personally delighted at the prospect as it seemed to me to be a very concrete way in which I could use my 25 years of industry experience to ensure that the pulp mill proposed for Tasmania would add many hundreds of millions of dollars in export income to Tasmania while keeping environmental discharges to the minimum level consistent with the requirements in the 2004 'Guidelines'. I applied for and received formal approval from both and to act in this capacity under a formal contract between and the on the basis that the would pay for the hours that I worked on matters at standard consulting rates and that I would continue to be paid by as a scientific officer. The agreed with these conditions and accordingly a contract was entered into between and the signed, as I understand it, because I was never shown the contract, by who had become overall Commercial Manager for . I commenced work as part of the four-man Assessment Panel in February 2005. I was informed by at that time that I was serving in a quasi-judicial capacity and that I would be subject to the same stringent terms and restrictions governing magistrates and judges in Australia. These conditions effectively meant that I was:

- Not able to discuss any matters brought before the Panel with other people who were not members of the Assessment Panel (including and staff);
- To limit myself in any deliberations that I made to information that was presented formally to the Panel by the and to disregard any information concerning the application that I read, heard or saw in the news media;
- To exclude myself from any discussion of, or communication about any work that might be carried out by my colleagues in , or relating to the Tasmanian Forestry Industry.

I made these conditions abundantly clear to my colleagues and to the senior managers of and , including the new Chief, had resigned from to run his sheep station in early 2005.

The task of the Assessment Panel was made very difficult by virtue of the fact that the project proponent, Limited, kept changing its proposal and consistently failed to provide information to the Panel in accord with the timetable that it itself had set. The information that was eventually provided by was voluminous (eventually running to well over 10,000 pages of tightly typed text), was poorly written, with almost no cross-referencing and editorial oversight, to the extent that it was confusing even to me as an expert in pulping technology. had announced in November 2004 that they would conduct

two full feasibility studies on two separate potential sites for their proposed mill: one an 'ideal site' (my term) at a remote location south of Burnie where there were no domestic dwellings to be affected by offensive odours that are an inevitable by-product of the kraft pulping process. The second site was a 'non-ideal site' (my term) located only a few kilometres from many domestic dwellings in the Tamar Valley near Bell Bay, a region notorious for poor air quality because of the stagnant air flows through the Valley and the frequent atmospheric inversion layers that cover it. In May 2005 [redacted] announced that they had ruled out the 'ideal site' on economic grounds and that the mill proposal would be focussed exclusively on the 'non-ideal site' near Bell Bay. At that point the task of the Assessment Panel became far more difficult because the 'Environmental Guidelines' approved the year before were, of necessity, written for an ideal site and were not adequate to protect a community living only a few kilometres from the proposed location of the mill. Much of the ensuing 17 months was made more stressful for me by [redacted] lack of any experience in the technology that they were proposing to employ and their refusal to provide information on vitally important matters such as how much odour would escape the mill boundary and any special measures that they planned to take to eliminate the odour. I had become the main technical advisor to the Assessment Panel (that had no other scientist or engineer among its members) and I gradually found myself 'drowning' in thousands of pages of documents from overseas consultants that the [redacted] had commissioned and from dozens of community proponents and antagonists as a result of the [redacted] invitation for public submissions on the proposal – the largest single private investment project in Tasmania's 200+ year history. The proposal, if approved by the [redacted], would have permitted construction of the world's fourth largest kraft pulp mill in the Tamar Valley. I requested secretarial assistance from both [redacted] and [redacted] on many occasions to help with filing of documents, booking travel arrangements and the like. Excuses were always found for why it could not be provided on each occasion and I was forced to work absolutely alone apart from the monthly meetings with the other Panel Members organised by the [redacted]. Eighty hour working weeks were the norm throughout the second half of 2005 and almost all of 2006 and by mid-2006 I found that I had to increase the daily dose of my anti-depressant medication as a result of the extremely heavy work load and lack of support from [redacted] and [redacted]. On 25th October 2006 the first of many public hearings organised by the [redacted] was scheduled and all members of the Assessment Panel were required to be present in Launceston for that event. At that meeting, the barrister representing the Australian and Tasmanian branches of the Greens political party made a formal submission to the Panel Chairman, [redacted], that I should be disqualified from the Panel because the Greens alleged that I had 'apprehended bias', a legal term meaning that a reasonable person (as defined in Australian Law) might apprehend that I was biased in favour of recommending approving the mill proposal. This allegation came as a huge shock to me as I had assiduously complied with all of the instructions given to me by [redacted] over the previous 20 months. [redacted] requested that the barrister submit a written case for my removal from the Panel citing reasons and the public hearing proceeded to its conclusion. [redacted] advised me privately following the conclusion of the hearing that he believed that the allegation was baseless and simply a 'stalling tactic' by the

Greens party that was aimed at delaying the assessment process. This allegation was reported in the media and was picked up by [redacted], Communications Manager,

I was phoned by [redacted] that evening in Launceston while waiting to board a plane back to Melbourne and she asked me what the allegation meant and I simply relayed the opinion given to me by [redacted]. One week later the [redacted] received the written case from the barrister for the Greens and it was faxed to me in Melbourne that day. According to the written case, [redacted] had entered into a contract with a section of the Tasmanian State Department of Economic Development to prepare a review of the environmental performance normally associated with modern kraft pulp mills around the world. This written review had subsequently been prepared by employees of either [redacted], or [redacted] (I do not know who prepared the review to this day) and given to the Department who had subsequently published it on their website at some point in early 2005 making clear that it was a review prepared by [redacted]. In the strict legal precedents applying to all judicial offices and quasi-judicial offices in Australia the alleged fact that [redacted] had entered into a monetary contract with a department of the Tasmanian public service that was promoting the mill proposal, mean that a 'reasonable person' might apprehend that I, as a member of [redacted] staff shared the same views. I was advised verbally at that time by [redacted] that the *prima facie* allegation of apprehended bias was a weak one and that it was unlikely to succeed. [redacted] also advised me that an opinion would be sought by the [redacted] from the Tasmanian Solicitor-General.

I had absolutely no knowledge that [redacted] had entered into the contract, or that a review had been prepared 'behind my back' and subsequently published. I felt extremely disappointed and angry that 20 months of hard work and the planning process for the largest private development in Tasmania's 210-year history had been undermined in this way. Both [redacted] and [redacted] refused to tell me who had signed the contract and proceeded to 'close ranks'. I was effectively 'sent to Coventry' and given absolutely no support from [redacted] senior management. About a week later I was contacted by a member of the Legal Staff, [redacted], who made it clear that she was acting on behalf of [redacted] and that, in her opinion, I should hire my own legal counsel, despite the fact that the only pecuniary benefit from my activities on the [redacted] Panel had accrued to [redacted]. [redacted] required me to attend a meeting with herself, [redacted] and two representatives of a major Melbourne law firm the following morning at 8:30 am. I attended that meeting stressed by the events of the previous week and mentally confused by conflicting messages that I had received from [redacted] and [redacted]. I was subjected to 90 minutes of interrogation and very forceful legal persuasion by the three lawyers present who did their utmost to persuade me that I should resign from the Panel that day. [redacted] 'very conveniently' found a conflicting 'more important' engagement and did not attend the meeting, so I was left completely unsupported in the presence of three senior lawyers, none of whom had any of my interests, or wellbeing at heart. At the conclusion of the meeting [redacted] offered to drive me back to my place of work at the [redacted] campus at Clayton where she stated that she had already prepared a letter of resignation for me that I should sign. It

was clear to me, even in my confused state that I was 'being hung out to dry' by [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted] who had one interest and one interest only – that of avoiding the embarrassing public revelation that it was one of them that had signed the contract that had created the *prima facie* case against me, thereby putting into jeopardy some 20 months of work and many millions of dollars of expenditure by the [redacted] and by [redacted] in preparing information regarding the major development proposal. It was apparent to me then, as it is today, that the whole series of activities by [redacted] and [redacted] that week was a well-orchestrated and coordinated attempt to coerce me into resigning from the Assessment Panel to prevent the completely negligent and unprofessional actions of either [redacted], or [redacted] becoming public.

I therefore declined [redacted] 'invitation' and took public transport back to [redacted] in order to give myself time to calm down and collect my thoughts. En route I phoned [redacted] and told him that I was under pressure to resign from [redacted] that day. [redacted] advised me not to resign, but re-iterated his view that the Greens' case was weak and unlikely to succeed. I decided to take [redacted] advice as my resignation would have put the [redacted] assessment back by at least 6 months while my replacement on the Panel was found and given time to read the 10,000 pages of [redacted] information. In taking this course I recognised that it left [redacted] at risk of being sued by [redacted] for causing the 6 plus months delay in the assessment once the cause became public. [redacted] had previously advised on many occasions that they wanted the Assessment completed by 30th June 2007 and that the assessment was costing them one million dollars a day. A potential damages award against [redacted] of more than \$180 million was something that I assessed to be a possibility of which the CEO, [redacted] should be made aware as soon as possible. I also knew that there was a very low probability of any communication that I sent to [redacted] via either [redacted], or [redacted] reaching its intended recipient, in view of their likely complicity in the 'cover up.' I therefore sent an e-mail directly to [redacted] from my home on the following Saturday and described what had happened and my fears about a 'cover up'. [redacted] responded saying that the situation came under official 'whistle blower policy' and that he had referred the matter to [redacted], the member of the [redacted] Executive who had responsibility for such matters.

I was interviewed by [redacted], who was courteous and not intimidating in any way. [redacted] advised me that my whistle blower case was only the second in [redacted] history – a fact that I did not find surprising in view of the general atmosphere of intimidation and abuse in [redacted]. Colleagues in other divisions had told me privately that the culture of intimidation of people who spoke out about unprofessional behaviour on the part of their superiors was very widespread. The Human Resources section of [redacted] was widely regarded as 'a joke' in the Organisation – it was a joke whose aim was purely to protect the interests of the [redacted] Executive and divisional senior management.

The whistle blower case that I had initiated dragged on for months. [redacted] investigation dragged on for nearly four months and I was summoned to a meeting with him to hear his conclusion. He had concluded that there had been a 'stuff up' [redacted] words) by [redacted] and [redacted] but that they had

not conspired to conceal it and that no action would be taken against any of them.

asked me whether I was satisfied with his conclusion and I lied and said that I was satisfied, because I could see by then that the whole senior management of [redacted] was one giant 'cover your [redacted] club' and that I had everything to lose and nothing to gain by expressing a dissenting view.

Meanwhile, I attended the next scheduled meeting of the [redacted] Assessment Panel in mid-December 2006. When the Panel members were assembled, [redacted] announced there would be a 30-minute adjournment while he spoke to me privately. [redacted] then took me aside and said that he had received the legal advice from the Tasmanian Solicitor General regarding the [redacted] allegations of apprehended bias against me. The advice was to the effect that the Greens case against me was very strong and that, in this instance, the apprehension of bias was contagious and extended also to [redacted]. This was because [redacted] had a strong influence on the deliberations of the Assessment Panel as Chairman and he relied on me 'completely' ([redacted] word) on technical matters. [redacted] conjectured that a judge would almost certainly rule that if a 'reasonable person' apprehended that I was biased towards my employers published 'pro-mill' view then that would, on the balance of probability, extend to his guidance of the Assessment process. The Solicitor-General advised both [redacted] and me to resign from the Assessment Panel. [redacted] apologised to me with tears in his eyes and said that he apportioned no blame to me and thanked me for the valuable work that I had performed for the [redacted] over the previous 32 months. [redacted] and I then returned to the other Panel members and the meeting was reconvened where upon [redacted] announced his intention to resign as the Chair of the Panel and that he had advised me to do likewise. In view of the circumstances there was little point continuing with the scheduled agenda and [redacted] thanked all members of the Panel for their services and closed the meeting.

I returned to my office and informed [redacted] that I intended to resign from the Assessment Panel. I prepared my own draft letter of resignation and e-mailed it to [redacted] for comment. He approved my draft and I submitted a signed copy by e-mail to [redacted] with courtesy copies to [redacted] and [redacted]. On 20th December I received by e-mail copies of an acknowledgement of my resignation from [redacted], re-iterating his regret at events and confirming that the situation had not arisen from any fault on my part. [redacted] also sent me a copy of his letter of resignation in which he laid blame squarely on the shoulders of the Tasmanian Premier for not heeding a warning [redacted] had given him 20 months earlier to prevent the Tasmanian Department of Economic Development from entering into any dialogue or contracts with [redacted]. While that was undoubtedly a factor in the sequence of events, I maintain that it was the total lack of professionalism (and courtesy) on the part of both [redacted] and [redacted] who clearly failed to consult [redacted], or me, before signing a contract with the Tasmanian Department of Economic Development. I asked myself what they might have learnt at the expensive UK senior management course on which [redacted] had sent them – it certainly was not common courtesy or respect.

Three months later, on 17th March 2007, following the appointment of replacement for [redacted] and me on the [redacted] Assessment Panel, [redacted] withdrew unilaterally from the [redacted] assessment process complaining that the 8 months that the new [redacted] Assessment Panel Chairman ([redacted]) had foreshadowed that it would take to get the new technology assessor up to speed was too great a delay. Instead of allowing the [redacted] to assess the [redacted] proposal as 'critically non-compliant, Premier [redacted] had the State Parliament designate the proposal as 'not a project of State significance', despite it being the largest private investment in the State's history. Parliament subsequently enacted a Bill approving the proposal based on a sub-standard technical assessment made by a company that was not at arm's length from [redacted] proposed major supplier of pulping equipment. Many people in the Tasmanian community became worried about the possible effects that the huge mill would have on their future lives and businesses under conditions where no full review by the [redacted] had been completed. I was contacted at [redacted] by an eminent Melbourne barrister acting on behalf of a dozen owners of small to medium-sized businesses with operations in the Tamar Valley. The group had incorporated and called itself Friends of the Tamar Valley incorporated (FTV). The barrister asked me whether I would be prepared to act as a paid consultant to the group he represented and provide them with my assessment of the likely impact of the mill on their businesses. I told the barrister that my terms of employment at [redacted] prevented me from acting in the way he suggested. In so doing, I was also aware of my moral and ethical duties as a scientist, who had been educated using money provided by Australian taxpayers, to provide my knowledge to prevent avoidable deterioration in people's quality of life and adverse impacts on the environment. [redacted] had recently allowed experienced scientists to make public statements in their areas of expertise as long as they did not use [redacted] resources and that they made it clear that the views they published were purely personal views and that they were not views endorsed by [redacted]. I decided that my moral and ethical responsibility was to use my knowledge to help the group represented by the barrister 'pro bono' and using my accrued annual leave. I told the barrister that I would help his clients on four conditions:

- That they represented a significant view held in the Tamar Valley and that that they did not hold extreme environmental views;
- That they allowed me to express my opinions uncensored and unedited; and
- That none of them derived income from business activities that I regard as being detrimental to the wider community and I specified, gambling, tobacco, illicit drugs and prostitution as falling within that category.

Having satisfied myself on these criteria with documentary evidence provided by the barrister, I agreed to act and advise his clients.

On 19th March 2007, I was contacted by a member of FTV who asked me to come to Launceston and address the press on the potential implications of a huge pulp mill in the Tamar Valley. I was also to brief members of the Tasmanian Legislative Council representing electorates in and around the Valley and a public meeting organised by another community group called Pulp the Mill. All of

these groups were formed from people of moderate environmental views who had concerns about the potential impact of the mill on their lives and their business activities. In accord with my undertaking to present a scientifically objective view of likely impacts of the mill, I entitled my talk 'Right Mill, Wrong Location' and focussed on both the low environmental footprint of well-run kraft pulp mills and also the reasons that my experience told me that the Tamar Valley with its poor atmospheric air flows was a poor choice as a potential site. I was somewhat apprehensive that a group called 'Pulp the Mill' would not receive my message favourably and might become quite boisterous and strident in their opposition to what I was saying. Nevertheless, I felt it my ethical duty to give the same objective message to all three audiences despite any potential consequences.

I duly applied for and was granted two days annual leave from [redacted] and presented my talk to the press and to the [redacted] on the morning and afternoon of 26th March 2007 respectively. Following my presentation to the group of [redacted] representing north eastern electorates, I was invited by the speaker of the Legislative Council, independent [redacted] to come to Hobart the next day and to address the Tasmanian Parliamentary sub-committee that was hearing submissions on the pros and cons of the Mill proposal. Following withdrawal from the [redacted] Assessment, Premier [redacted] had refused to allow the application to lapse and pushed an 'Assessment Bill' before the Parliament with the aim of legislating the Mill into existence. The Parliamentary Sub-Committee was part of the Parliaments review of the pros and cons of the Mill proposal and I made a thirty-minute presentation to it. Following that presentation, I was taken to dinner by members of FTV who told me of the many unethical and illegal acts perpetrated by [redacted] and their agents in the Valley aimed entirely at intimidating any local residents who refused to sell land to [redacted], or who spoke out against their logging practices. I was particularly aghast when one member of FTV (who runs an internationally accredited resource management company in Launceston) told me that [redacted] General Manager for the Pulp Mill Project, a [redacted], had physically threatened her in a public meeting for asking the very reasonable question, [redacted], you claim that not one more tree will be cut if this mill is built and that woodchips currently going overseas will be diverted to the mill. If this is indeed correct, how do [redacted] plan to honour their existing export woodchip contracts?' The woman received no reply and [redacted] walked over to her and held his fist and face inches from her face and said, 'Do not ask questions like that in a Public forum!' in an exceedingly aggressive and threatening manner. There were several witnesses to this alleged assault and the woman was still visibly upset in relating the incident to me 18 months after the event. After she had gained her composure, I asked the woman why she had not reported the incident to the Tasmanian Police. The woman replied, 'Had I done so I would have had a box of matches placed in my letterbox the very next day. [redacted], I have to live and work in this Valley!' I did not know at the time the meaning of the box of matches in the letterbox, but I was quickly told that it was the standard first stage of [redacted] intimidation tactics in the Valley: the message was simply, we know where you live and we will burn your house down if you continue to act in opposition to us. A clear implication was that a significant proportion of the lower ranks of the Tasmanian Police in

Launceston were corrupt in order for allegations given to the Police to be transmitted to [redacted] and their agents. I was given further evidence of this entrenched Police corruption by the local Coordinator of an Australian ethical group called Whistleblowers Australia. There were many cases of unsolved arson on farms owned by people in the Valley who refused to sell their farms to [redacted] for conversion to eucalypt plantations and indeed, a deputy Police Commissioner had been forced to leave Tasmania after threats to his wife and children were made following his allegations of Police aiding and abetting abalone poaching in return for corrupt payments of substantial sums of money. Even the well-respected and eminent former Executive Director of the [redacted] had warned me that there were corrupt links between the ALP and Liberal Party in Tasmania, senior public servants and police. [redacted] referred to Tasmanian having a 'Tasminster' system of government rather than a Westminster system.

It was with this compelling list of evidence of intimidation and corruption from many reliable sources that I received a call from my wife at around 6PM on 26th March 2007, one hour before I was due to give my talk to the public meeting organised by Pulp the Mill. My wife was in a highly distressed state and told me that she had been contacted by my boss at [redacted], who said that he had been contacted by [redacted] who had attempted to intimidate him into ordering me to cancel my talk. 'We have a loose cannon on the decks', had been his opening gambit. My wife had been given the firm impression by [redacted] that if I went ahead and addressed the public meeting [redacted] would sue me for every cent that I had to my name and that my wife and I would lose our family home as a result. I did my best to assure my wife that no such series of events could happen because I was only presenting the incontestable scientific facts in the presentation. Nevertheless my wife was still in a most upset and anxious state as a direct result of [redacted] totally unprofessional behaviour. By way of context [redacted] had issued a [redacted] writ against 20 forestry protesters (including [redacted]) 18 months earlier and that case was on-going at the time, so I was well aware that a law suit against me was no idle threat on [redacted] part. After assuring my wife that our family home was not in jeopardy I rang [redacted] to find out exactly what [redacted] had said. It was to the effect that if [redacted] did not prevent me speaking that [redacted] would sue me for damages and that [redacted] would never see any further research funds from [redacted]. [redacted] also said he would ring someone in the [redacted] Executive and get me summarily dismissed and had apparently already spoken to 'someone much higher up'. That description was the only indefinite description of the person from [redacted] who had apparently phoned [redacted] later in the day to urge him to stop me talking. I was incensed at this attempt at intimidation from Mr [redacted] and told [redacted] that I fully intended to present my public lecture and to make [redacted] actions that day public during the lecture. [redacted] begged me not to take that action and said, 'There could be serious repercussions for your career in [redacted]'. I told him that I strongly believed that there was a greater public good to be served by 'naming and shaming' and I ended the phone call.

Thirty minutes later I began my lecture to a packed audience of well over 500 mothers, fathers, grandparents and children in the Congregational Church in Launceston by announcing that [redacted] had threatened to sue me if I went ahead. I then said that that sort of intimidation and unethical conduct by [redacted] had to stop and no threats by [redacted] would prevent me from publishing my experiences of environmental emissions from large kraft pulp mills. I talked for 90 minutes on the topic of 'Right Mill, Wrong Location' and was heard in silence. At the end of my talk I was given a standing ovation that lasted a full five minutes. I am providing at this point what may seem to be irrelevant information to provide the context of my public actions and to establish how far [redacted] has strayed from its often-mouthed objectives of 'providing technological benefits to Australian Industry, the Australian Environment and Australian Society.'

Following my trip to Hobart to address the Select Committee of Parliament, I returned to Melbourne and to work at [redacted] the following day. I sought a private meeting with [redacted] at which I very forcefully expressed my displeasure at his having contacted my wife without my permission and told him that I thought his actions had been 'absolutely [redacted] gutless'. A month later I was invited into a private meeting with [redacted] boss, [redacted] scientist [redacted] who proceeded to accuse me of 'breaching [redacted] confidentiality conditions' and that I was to be summarily demoted from my position as Leader of the 'biorefinery [redacted] group' and that henceforth I would report to a junior scientist. This was done without giving me the opportunity to have a Union representative present, as is standard [redacted] procedure. It was in effect a kangaroo court perpetrated by a kiwi! I explained to [redacted] that I had not breached [redacted] confidentiality because [redacted] name and attempt at intimidation had entered the public arena when [redacted] informed my wife of the facts. My wife is not and has never been a [redacted] staff member. I asked [redacted] whether what he was saying meant my personal HR file was to be marked 'never to be promoted'. He simply shrugged his shoulders and said, 'Read into it what you will.' I reminded [redacted] that his actions were in breach of [redacted] standard procedures and left the meeting feeling very angry and upset.

About two weeks later I was issued with a formal letter by [redacted] boss, [redacted] manager [redacted] alleging that I had breached [redacted] confidentiality conditions and that my confrontation of [redacted] had amounted to 'insubordination'. The letter stated that I was required to attend a disciplinary hearing on 25th May 2007 and that I could be supported a Union official, or a colleague of my choosing.

I attended that meeting that was chaired by [redacted] with [redacted] representative [redacted]. Also present were [redacted] and a manager from [redacted] Human resources whose name I do not recall and who took notes of everything that was said. [redacted] commenced the meeting by reading the breaches of [redacted] procedures that I was alleged to have committed. I was asked to respond. To the charge of breaching [redacted] confidentiality conditions, I stated that naming an executive of a rogue public company who had attempted to deny my democratic rights to express concerns over potential adverse impacts of a major development project based on a technology in which I had over two decades of first hand, detailed industrial experience was not the

sort of information that confidentiality conditions were intended to protect. I reminded and that the name of the executive had entered the public domain when had revealed it to my wife. I then went on to describe the unethical behaviour of s Limited to the meeting and asserted that I had done precisely what any ethical and public-minded citizen would have done when faced with the same information and circumstances. I asserted that my actions would add to reputation as an employer of ethical public-spirited scientists. then asserted that 'senior people' in had quite a contrary view and that they were concerned that had stated that they would not fund any research in in future. I asked who these 'senior people' were and simply said that he was not going to provide that information. I replied that denying me the names of my accusers was contrary to natural justice and simply shrugged his shoulders and said 'point noted' and went on to the next breach of insubordination and my use of 'foul language'. I replied that such a charge was nonsensical - was not the police force or the army and I was not some 'other rank' failing to salute an officer. I said that as had acted in a most unprofessional manner and caused completely unnecessary anxiety and suffering to my wife and under the circumstances, giving a dressing down was entirely appropriate. I asked whether was going to apologise to my wife for the breach. Again, all I received in reply was a shrug and 'point noted'. As to using the word 'when addressing , I reminded all present that I had complained to personal adviser about the use of the very same word by six years earlier and absolutely nothing had been done about it. I said that, under those circumstances, it was reasonable for me to conclude that the use of the word was officially condoned at the very highest level within shrugged and said 'point noted'. A week after that meeting came to my office and presented me with a copy of what he asserted was an accurate representation of what had been said at the meeting. I read the supposed minutes in presence and found that none of my assertions had been included and that none of the points stated that had been 'noted' had in fact been noted or even alluded to in the document. I said that the note was simply as restatement of view and did not reflect my responses. then asked me to sign a letter from him to me saying that I had been given an 'official warning' and that any further breaches of conditions of employment would be regarded very seriously and could result in my demotion, a reduction in salary or dismissal. I refused to sign the letter and said that I would refer the letter to my solicitor and that any reply would come from him. then attempted to engage me in discussion about my research, so I simply turned my back on him and ignored him until he left my office.

By that stage, I had decided that was run predominantly by people who had absolutely no interest in using technology to protect the environment of Australia, or in allowing its senior scientists to speak out on matters of concern to the public at large. For me, had become an ethical vacuum. At that point I was 59 years old and I made the decision to simply continue my research until my superannuation entitlement had reached a level where I could resign from and live without having to be managed by people whose behaviour I could

not respect. I had insufficient financial resources to hire legal counsel and battle injustices and no appetite to waste what remained of my life in what I could see would be a long and expensive process. A senior administration employee had earlier advised me that the Legal section had 'projects' in exactly the same way that the scientific staff had research projects. This employee asserted that Legal received a 'bundle of money from [redacted] to keep him out of trouble. Legal have to spend this money each year, or their allocation is reduced next year. They ensure that all the money is spent by turning each dispute between [redacted] and another party, or employee, into a project where they write as many legal letters as possible and attempt to keep the dispute rolling as long as legally possible. Rapid resolution of the dispute is the very last thing on their minds.'

In late 2007, [redacted] announced summarily that [redacted] would withdraw from the [redacted] joint venture. Staff were given absolutely no warning of this. On 2nd January 2008 the former [redacted] was renamed [redacted] under a new Acting [redacted], who was also Chief of [redacted]. [redacted] had virtually identical staff to [redacted] but had a new very complex matrix organisation, in which most staff reported to at least two, and often three or four managers and project leaders. Two senior management positions were advertised: one responsible for managing research staff the other for obtaining funding from industry and managing all research projects. I decided that the new Chief might provide an opportunity to raise divisional morale and to restore the sound operational principles in force prior to 2001 under [redacted] leadership. I therefore applied for the position responsible for managing and motivating staff. Based on my previous experience in management, I knew full well that the two new managers would have to work closely together in a very ethical and open fashion if the challenging matrix structure was going to work. I therefore made it clear when I was interviewed for the position that I would not accept an offer of the position if either [redacted], or [redacted] were appointed to the research management position. [redacted], who appeared to suffer from Asperger's Syndrome and consequently could not communicate appropriately with industry clients, or staff, was widely regarded as 'a walking disaster area' by the majority of scientists. He was also known to be a plagiarist, to be duplicitous and to be 'no longer welcome' at the premises of his previous employer, the [redacted].

Needless to say, having made my conditions clear, my application was unsuccessful and I continued to work on a project that I had generated that was funded by the [redacted] within [redacted] aimed at evaluating potential new chemistries for converting forestry and crop wastes into renewable liquid fuels. [redacted] and [redacted] were duly appointed to the two new management roles in an acting capacity. Six months after the formation of [redacted] the division was abolished and staff and equipment were transferred into the large division of [redacted], where [redacted] was Chief. [redacted] appeared to me at first to be a capable and ethical leader and I was enthusiastic about the new change in organisation. At this time, another senior scientist, [redacted], who had won the top international research prize in forest science (awarded by King

Karl Gustav VI of Sweden) came to me and expressed the anxiety and stress he had experienced by working under the supervision of [redacted] who had been 'stealing my ([redacted] work and presenting it to the Chief as his own'. [redacted] had a close working relationship with senior scientists at [redacted] and had been told how [redacted] had left that organisation 'under a cloud' and had been denied an invitation to attend an important [redacted] official function. I have known [redacted] for over 30 years, when we worked side by side at [redacted]. [redacted] is one of the most brilliant and committed scientists that I know and he is thoroughly objective and honest in everything he says. I was very concerned to see [redacted] stressed in this way and to see his work suffer. He asked me for my support in going to [redacted] and explaining the problems with both [redacted] leadership and that of [redacted]. We both hoped that by pointing out the destructive and unnecessarily stressful management behaviours of [redacted] and [redacted] that [redacted] would remove them from their positions and appoint people who were far better qualified. By that stage, I had made a firm decision to retire from [redacted] in March 2009, so I made it clear when I went to [redacted] that I was not interested in performing either of the roles occupied by [redacted] and [redacted]. I explained what I assessed to be grave deficiencies in the management styles of both [redacted] and [redacted]. During the interview I made it abundantly clear to [redacted] that if he wanted the new forest science group within [redacted] to be successful that he would have to replace both [redacted] and [redacted] with much better managers. [redacted] also had an interview with [redacted] and told me that he had expressed exactly the same view to [redacted]. [redacted] had listened sympathetically to both of us and assured both of us that he was committed to making his new forest science group a success. [redacted] subsequently confirmed both [redacted] and [redacted] in what had been their acting managerial roles. I took [redacted] action as evidence that he was just as duplicitous as [redacted] and [redacted] and had every intention of creating a management structure that would cause his new forest science group to fail financially as soon as possible. Staff morale sank to an all time low when the appointments of [redacted] and [redacted] were confirmed. Every day thereafter I had good honest, formerly enthusiastic scientists coming to my office to complain about some new piece of dysfunctional behaviour perpetrated by one or both gentlemen. I spent about half my final 9 months in counselling my former scientists and technical officers because none of them felt comfortable taking their problems to the HR officers of [redacted]. [redacted] had 'left' [redacted] when [redacted] was absorbed into [redacted]. Her departure was not announced officially and she received no formal [redacted] retirement celebration. On the bright side, when [redacted] departure became public knowledge via the grapevine, it caused a few days of rare celebration among the majority of staff who had suffered at her hands.

I wrote to [redacted] in September 2008 stating that as he had paid no heed to my advice, or that of [redacted] in appointing [redacted] and [redacted], I saw no point in wasting any more of my life in [redacted] and I formally tendered by resignation effective on 9th March 2009 at which point my superannuation entitlements made one of their six monthly step increases. [redacted] announced the closure of the forest science group in June 2010 and 95% of staff

were retrenched in October 2009, confirming my belief in the duplicity of

I was asked by a chemical manufacturing company to start consulting for them in April 2009 and I have fulfilled that role until now. The effects of an entirely psychologically unhealthy workplace has lasted with me ever since. I continue to take anti-depressant medication under medical advice and still continue to suffer periodic anxiety attacks despite paying for extensive psychotherapy. I regard it as certainly the unhealthiest most dysfunctional workplace I have