

Privileges Select Committee Meeting – Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> September

First of all on the question of debt and gift, Mr Peter Williams, QC, in his evidence before the committee, and in his September 9<sup>th</sup> letter to you has made it clear that (a) no debt existed; (b) no gift existed; (c) that I as the titular Head of a cause, had no pecuniary interest, and (d) Mr Henry was paid for his services. Mr Gary Gottlieb formerly the President of the Auckland District Law Society and the Criminal Bar Association supports in his letter Mr Williams view on how he handed the account was totally proper. I said in my letter to the committee of the 26<sup>th</sup> August 2008 that Mr Glenn's evidence "is not factual and does not coincide with my recollections." I have never spoken to Mr Glenn since this controversy broke in February, I did not want any allegations of collusion with him.

Mr Henry gave evidence on the 18<sup>th</sup> August before this committee that it was he who spoke by phone to Mr Glenn. In Mr Henry's later letter of 2<sup>nd</sup> September and before Mr Glenn's testimony yesterday Mr Henry recalled the substance of his conversation with Mr Glenn; the Downer controversy of Apec of 18<sup>th</sup> 19<sup>th</sup> 20<sup>th</sup> November 2005. This means Mr Henry had a conversation with Mr Glenn sometime after that date. In Mr Henry's letter to the committee of 7<sup>th</sup> September for this committee's perusal and before Mr Glenn's new evidence again makes it clear that the reference to a "client" in the sense that this person was behind the reference to Mr Glenn by Brian Henry is not Winston Peters. This issue broke out in February this year with claims in the media about a Glenn donation to New Zealand First.

My staff drew it to my attention when I was in Africa. They said they had already checked the New Zealand First records and advised me that it was not true. I then advised the Prime Minister of that

But, when I returned to New Zealand, that donation to New Zealand First claim had become a donation to Winston Peters.

I have had one bank account since 18 years of age. I get regular bank statements. I knew that it was not correct. So it was no to both allegations then, was on a further series of claims that was made in and on the 12<sup>th</sup> July, also no and is still no to both allegations.

The PM checked with me after the Glenn Business School opening and I told her that the newspaper claims were not true. She did not mention any conversation with Mr Glenn as I recall but the answer was no either to the donation to New Zealand First in February claim, and later to a donation to New Zealand First or Winston Peters in the July claim.

At no time was I in a position to answer any other way.

Remember it was Mr Glenn in the PR firm February 21 email that was claiming to have given money "to New Zealand First" I found the claim bewildering and challenged its authenticity and offered the Herald a complete examination of the party's accounts in July.

The Herald refused that offer, suffice to say.

The claim is proven now by Mr Glenn's changed statements to have always been untrue.

On 19<sup>th</sup> August, Mr Glenn wrote to this committee claiming the money was "to assist with the legal costs incurred personally by Rt Hon Winston Peters MP concerning his electoral petition dispute" and further," that Mr Peters sought help from me in a personal conversation sometime after I first met him in Sydney".

Those claims cannot be correct. My only conversation on my records and my memory and Mr Glenn's records after Sydney in August was 14 December and Owen Glenn spoke to me at that time about the following matters.

The following is my recollection of events on the 14<sup>th</sup> of December 2005.

1. Mr Glenn obviously called me on that date. We would have discussed a number of matters but I do not recall talking to him about money during that conversation. This is why I have always denied knowing of Mr Glenn's contribution towards my legal costs for the Tauranga electoral petition until 18<sup>th</sup> July 2008.
2. I believe now that Mr Henry had called him on 5<sup>th</sup> of December to solicit the funds and I believe Mr Glenn is aware of this which is why no evidence has been produced. My office and cell phone records confirm I made no such call on 5<sup>th</sup> December.
3. During the phone call on the 14<sup>th</sup> I believe he mentioned being interested in a roving ambassadorship with focus on trade. Mr Glenn mentioned he wanted to be in a similar position to Mike Moore.
4. To the best of my knowledge Mr Glenn also wanted a diplomatic passport to help get quickly through airports and facilitate his travel.
5. Mr Glenn did mention, I recall, that he was interested in a consular role in Monaco and I remember I told him we had no such office in Monaco.
6. Another point I recall was that he had a horse in the Melbourne Cup that year so we would have talked about horse racing and the performance of his horse in the big race.
7. It is quite possible that he asked for Brian Henry's details and the sequence of events tends to suggest this occurred.

Mr Glenn's claim on 19<sup>th</sup> August not to recall "that either I or my assistants had any discussion or communication with Mr Henry other than to receive remittance details," given Mr Henry's evidence before this committee, and Mr Henry's statement to the committee of the 2<sup>nd</sup> September, quite extraordinary.

In a further letter to the committee on the 27th August Mr Glenn wrote "my recollection is that I was called by Mr Peters to seek financial assistance for his electoral petition challenge." That, by Mr Glenn's oral and written evidence has to be incorrect; he now claims that conversation happened on the 14<sup>th</sup> December when he made the call to me not the other way around.

Mr Glenn's evidence yesterday makes it clear to me that he has been seriously coached by Mr Harley whose record as a partner for Russell McVeagh acting for Fay Richwhite during the Winebox came into extreme criticism, the nature of which I am making today.

Apparently he is acting pro bono, and the irony in that contrast to Mr Henry seems to have escaped everyone.

Mr Glenn confirms he never discussed party funding with me in Sydney.

On his letters to the Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> August Mr Glenn confirms "that the contents of both of them are true and correct in all respects." From the facts you have heard yesterday that cannot be true.

He refers to Mr Peters or "someone representing New Zealand First" first contacted my office in late November. His records on this are not helpful.

But why would I be reminding him of my biographical details in November? Further "Mr Peters left a message on my telephone answering service on 5 December." My phone records show no such call.

Mr Glenn says he will have responded over the next few days. He would have the records, not me. He does not, and I have no such memory.

But most telling is his claim that I raised with him "his need for financial assistance."

He has no records nor have I.

Page 5 para 2

Prove that Mr Glenn knew about the legal costs at that brunch, and it did not come from me.

Para 3

Glenn made the phone call 14 December not me. Why I would state a cost less than half of my own case 27 years ago in Hunua is beyond me. It's a credibility issue. On 12 August 2008 I received information that Mr Glenn had advised his lawyer 1) that it was \$70,000 and 2) Brian Henry had called him. This is coached evidence. Why would I, if Mr Glenn's 14 December memory is correct, wait a further 7 weeks to thank him at Karaka. But Mr Glenn was caught by his 19 August Karaka sales comment. 2006 Karaka is the date but I dispute the setting, know that about 14 people were present, that I sat across a wide long table from him, and never mentioned money. Mr Glenn doesn't even remember the 2 hosts' names.

Page 6, para 2

He raised Monaco on 14 December 2005.

Para 9

There is no record of me speaking with him between 5 and 14 December. Moreover, what would the 14 December call be about?

Page 8

I never answer the phone "Hello Owen, its Winston". His secretary had already established that before giving the phone to Mr Glenn. Remember he was calling me.

Page 9

Why the claim to tell the PM the donations was for legal costs. That's rebutted by his 21 February email that it was for "NZ First".

Page 10

Mr Glenn's answers to Mr Jones are totally confusing and nowhere in the evidence did Mr Henry say he was acting on his own initiative.

Page 12

Mr Glenn's "Well, that doesn't mean he contacted me personally" means just that, from Mr Henry's evidence.

Page 17

Mr Glenn on Peters "He has some unique ways of fundraising" refer to a meeting on 22 December 2007 evidence from which I will place before the committee (read out). Owen was wearing a beige sweater.

3<sup>rd</sup> to last para

14 December I was in my Wellington office

Page 18

Reference to Brian suggested Glenn knew him.

To Michael Cullen "I wasn't differentiating between Peters as a politician and his party". Surely in light of the February controversy that is not credible.

Last para Glenn "Mr Peters is very skilled at asking for donations". No. I'm not. That is why others do it.

Page 20, para 14

I was asked to call Glenn. He referred to a sunny day with Howard Morrison in Raglan sharing fine wine. That surprised me for I thought Sir Howard was not well.

Page 21

Somebody else, from the evidence, had already told Owen Glenn about the petition.

Page 22

The Prime Minister was never told that money had gone to legal costs.

Page 23

"To him personally" begs the obvious answer; but not a cent went to Peters.

Page 24

To Mr Dunn Mr Glenn now changes his evidence to something else.

Page 27

"Did the money arrive OK?" begs the answer a) surely the bank statements prove that to Mr Glenn. b) I have never seen Mr Henry's bank statements, was not told, so again why would I know that?

This is not the first time my memory has been challenged by a businessman. For over a month Sir Bob Jones gave the media more than 7 versions of an event. Professor Malcolm Wright proved every version was wrong. 1) I wasn't in the room when the subject was raised 2) became very angry when back in the room I learnt that 3) was not there the next day when the cheque was made out. Nor was Sir Robert.

Mr Glenn says Mr Williams came to Monaco uninvited - on this evening's news Mr Williams has an email inviting him.

Mr Chairman, fair minded New Zealanders know that I have never enriched myself on any battle fought on their behalf.

A former implicated Russell McVeigh lawyer for Fay Richwhite prepared Mr Glenn's evidence. All the same faces with whom over 2 decades I have had so many battles.

I have spent my whole political life to preserve New Zealand for New Zealanders. This is an attempt to undo the people's will, bring down a government, then govern alone. My enemies and an elite media have surely proven that.

My character is being impugned here and I will not stand by and let that happen. My record over many years speaks for itself. I have made more sacrifices than most.

Mr Chairman, you promised natural justice here. Do you really think that promise has been kept?

I wish to be judged by decent New Zealanders who understand justice and the essence of democracy, not bias, prejudice and pre-judgement before any of the facts are even known.

With committee members and party leaders making telephone books of comments during this hearing, that is the only enduring issue before my fellow New Zealanders tonight.

END