

Kia ora Kathryn,

**Pre-Mediation Discussion**

Thursday 30 October 2025

I have previously ignored allegations against me that are included in letters from Mike and you. They aren't true, and seemed more intended to put me on the defensive to deflect from claims raised against MUMA. And frankly I had no wish to waste my time.

However I on reviewing matters I acknowledge you may believe them to be legitimate.

Therefore as we are meeting tomorrow it might lower the temperature if I give you some feedback. I'll stick to what I think are the main points.

1. I had no intention to have any involvement with MUMA after my departure. Frankly I had other priorities. My email to staff on my departure was intended to be a generic farewell after discussion with Leshan.

2. My focus is on immigrant exploitation. And still is.

3. Despite your belief, at no point have I ever initiated any contact with any MUMA employee since my departure. Even now.

4. As I advised you earlier, apart from the current three cases, I was formally approached by three other employees for PG representation. I referred them to other advocates.

5. Separate from that I had a few calls to be referee for various staff or a few request for generic entitlements advice which I was happy to do.

6. The two main calls that pulled me back into MUMA business was from Deborah and Mike about serious concerns about the CEO behaviour.

7. My memory about [REDACTED] case was I only agreed to help her after she left MUMA because I thought she was badly treated. I had referred her to someone else's but she couldn't afford their fees.

8. The first time I spoke to [REDACTED] after I had left MUMA was after Mike phoned me very distressed about [REDACTED] being bullied and him asking me to help her.

9. Over this time a staff delegation came to see me and asked to be unionised because they wanted protection from the CEO bullying and wanted a CEA. I reluctantly told them they will have to recruit a certain number. As a consequence I started a process to reregistered my old union.

10 During this period, [REDACTED] raised a PG after Tania said she wasn't even going to consider a pay rise recommended by her manager. After MUMA recieved her complaint, a manager laid a complaint against her. This seemed clearly a retaliatory action.

11. As way of background Mike and I has discussed pay structure prior to my departure. He was supportive, but somehow it had been shelved.

12 After the disciplinary meeting with [REDACTED] and Mike, I tabled an initiation for bargaining to start a process to address the pay structure. You claimed this was bad faith as there was no prior notice. This is not required under the Act. As such you emailed me a trespass order later that night. The following week you then issued me a written trespass order. This is the same process you accuse me of.

13. To deescalate matters I put the matter on hold to calm things down, I decided to wait until we have an outcome of these three cases. However you claim I have hassled staff to join the union. This is not true. I have not approached anyone. Nor even produced a leaflet. However people have joined online.

14. In recent weeks to find a way through I have contacted three other unions. One union is open to organise the site and negotiate a CEA. Obviously I would need to consult union members first.

15. My intention is if these three cases can be settled fairly then we can discuss a healthy way forward that may not include me, provided protections are established for staff.

16. My entire motivation was to settle these cases amicably and informally and move on. You have been resistant to that. This has dragged on for far too long and if we can resolve these cases I would be grateful.

Now I have listed my responses I can see if they are left unaddressed it will impact our mediation engagements. If you want to raise other grievances I will be happy to address them.

As such, would you be open to having a pre-mediation meeting tomorrow with the mediator, or not, to discuss your grievances with me? This could be discussed before [REDACTED] mediation.

This can be 'in confidence' and 'without prejudice'. This is confidential process and I would be happy to abide by any agreement in writing. This may not resolve anything, but I think it would be beneficial to clear the air regardless whether we accept them or not.

I think it's worth a shot. Even if there is no acceptance by either of us, we at least will have some understanding of each other's perspective which can only be for the good. In any event I believe it will help us to focus on addressing a fair outcome for the three workers.

What do you think?

Matt McCarten