



Standing Committee on Finance and Public Administration
Legislation Committee
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

9 April 2012

Senate Estimates – PM78

Dear

Thank for your correspondence dated 4 April 2012. I am grateful to be provided an opportunity to respond to the adverse comments made about me by the Office of the Official Secretary (OOSGG) in response to reference number PM78, Question 1.

That the Official Secretary chose to make misleading and disparaging comments about me under Parliamentary Privilege reflects very poorly on him and his office. The correct answer to Senator Ronaldson's question is that I suggested mediation in writing long before my matter ended up before the AAT. Further, I offered this at my own cost. Rather than give this due consideration Stephen Brady chose the involvement of the AGS, thereby wasting taxpayers money. It is his actions and those of his staff who have caused an expensive court case which, given his response to Question 3 in PM78 may be open ended. I quote:

“The Australian Government Solicitor (AGS) has not indicated how much this case is likely to cost. The total cost will depend on whether the issue is resolved on the preliminary issue or whether further hearings are conducted.”

The above answer suggests the Office of the Official Secretary has no intention of settling the matter. Rather it is prepared to use taxpayers money in further court hearings should I prevail on the preliminary issue currently before the AAT. This is cause for grave disquiet and it is hoped that such an outcome will persuade the committee to give my matter high priority. Also, it needs to be noted that the answer to PM78, Question 2 does not include the earlier costs (from 2009) related to my matter, nor the legal fees for the AAT hearing 27/2/12. Thus, the answer is misleading and the actual cost to the taxpayer is a lot more than \$38,511.53.