

**Senate Standing Committee on Education Employment and Workplace
Relations**

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Budget Estimates 2012-2013**

Agency - Fair Work Australia

DEEWR Question No. EW0165_13

Senator Abetz asked on 28 May 2012 , Hansard page 40

Question

FWA - Non attendance at national executive meetings

Senator ABETZ: Has it been suggested that any action ought to be taken against Ms Jackson for nonattendance at national executive meetings? Ms O'Neill: When you say, 'Has it been suggested that action be taken,' I am not sure what you are referring to. It is a matter that was canvassed in the report and dealt with by the delegate. Outside the investigation, I am not aware of any— Senator ABETZ: Yes, and what is his recommendation in relation to that finding? Ms O'Neill: I will have to take that on notice. Senator ABETZ: All right. Because it seems passing strange, as I understand the evidence, that you have not pursued nonattendance at meetings with any other official of any employee or employer organisation of any registered organisation. Ms O'Neill: As I indicated at a previous estimates, there has been a very small number of formal inquiries and investigations undertaken under the Registered Organisations Act. In relation to the specific question about Ms Jackson, I will take that on notice

Answer

Fair Work Australia has provided the following response.

The Delegate did not make a recommendation to the General Manager in chapter 21 of the National Office report regarding Ms Jackson's non-attendance at National Executive meetings. In chapter 19 of the National Office report the Delegate set out evidence which he had put to Ms Jackson in his letter dated 14 December 2011, including the proposed finding that Ms Jackson had contravened subsection 285(1) of the RAO Schedule by failing to attend the four face-to-face meetings of National Executive between August 2006 and December 2007. The Delegate also set out submissions that he had received from Ms Jackson in response to this proposed finding. Having considered Ms Jackson's submissions, for the reasons set out at paragraphs 53 to 66 of chapter 19, the Delegate did not find that Ms Jackson has contravened subsection 285(1) of the RAO Schedule in the manner that had been put to Ms Jackson in his letter of 14 December 2011.