

**Hamish Price**

Yesterday at 14:10 near Auckland · 🌐

Hi Cameron Slater, how are you?

I see that you have set forth a whole stream of largely incoherent vitriol on David Farrar's Kiwiblog on my comments in the Herald today. No doubt when you eventually compose your evident rage, there will be a post on your blog on the same theme.

So let's filter through the frenzy of your comment, to what you've essentially said.

1. You've listed me as the "unnamed" National Party source to the Herald. This is not true. I have spoken to the Herald about my concerns with the Palino campaign on a number of occasions. A few weeks before the election, the Herald noted a facebook post where I had criticised the woefulness of the Palino campaign. I don't recall if the Herald reporter asked me in advance if I minded to be publicly attributed to that article, but I wasn't.
2. You've said that my involvement in this issue is "murky". That is also not true. On Tuesday evening I became alarmed that Bevan was clearly being exploited by you and Stephen Cook, and that the two of you had zero concern for her welfare as you dragged her name through the mud, and I asked her if she was comfortable that she was around people that she trusted. My conversations with Bevan continued throughout Wednesday, when she had clearly, of her own volition and without my knowledge, spoken to the Herald expressing deep regret for the earlier statement that she made.
3. The Boag/Price connection is a convenient one for you to make, but it is not true. I haven't communicated with Michelle at any stage as these events have been unfolding. In fact, I communicated with nobody prior to checking with Bevan that she was around people that she trusted, and that her situation wasn't being exploited, as it so shamelessly had been by you and Cook. Unlike yourself, when I see somebody is in distress, I don't pay a lot of regard to the political consequences of intervening.
4. I don't hate your father. Nor do I hate you. You will recall that it was me who bailed you out of a difficult situation with you-know-who, a few years ago. Suffice to say that my intervention on that occasion was out of concern for that person's welfare, not yours. Nor, despite extreme provocation from you, have I tried to silence you with threats to reveal embarrassing information about your personal life. As has become apparent in recent days, you tried that shit on Len Brown already. It's just not what decent people do.
5. You and Stephen have been a party to a sickening, deceitful, dishonest and corrupt plan to not just steal a democratic election, but to exploit other people's misery. I'm not sure which was your lowest point in this. Was it Stephen making claims to the media that Bevan was engaged in discussions to make a porn film, when they were discussions that HE initiated and which she rejected immediately, or was it selling out to certain media sources the location of Bevan's safe hideout in Auckland, when you both knew that she was under stress as a result of the situation you had put her in? Was it your deceitful claims that Bevan had sold her story to APN—not true, she hasn't sold any stories to anybody, and nor is she in discussions with anybody—or was it your complicity with Stephen in fabricating stories about what Bevan said?

6. Next, you claim I failed to declare to media that I put a proposal to Palino's camp to write policy for him. On the contrary, I have been upfront with everybody that I had a very brief discussion with the then campaign manager, Rob Nesbit-Savage, about assisting the Palino campaign with their policy. I don't recall how much was discussed, as I never wrote anything down or followed it up, as it wasn't something I was particularly keen on doing. The discussion with Rob revolved around how much work I thought might be involved (an enormous amount, given Palino's zero policy base, to my alarm, as late as June), and what I would charge if I agreed to do it. I wasn't at all concerned that I didn't hear back about it, since as far as I was concerned it was simply an exploratory discussion about the basis on which I would be prepared to do it. As Rob Nesbit-Savage said to me in an email recalling the meeting this morning, I dodged a bullet over that one.

7. You are correct that I have repeatedly expressed, in public, my dismay at the performance of the Palino campaign. That is well recorded on facebook. A major part of my concern was Luigi's involvement, which as the Herald reported this morning, I warned the Palino campaign about, as soon as I heard of it. The concerns I had with Luigi's character date back to his conduct towards young women in and around the National Party. I've made no secret of that concern to him, or to others. I think given the revelations about Luigi in recent days, my concerns about his conduct were warranted. It speaks many more volumes about the judgement of Palino to have kept him on the campaign, despite the warnings, than it does about me for issuing those warnings.

8. On that count, I find it hilariously improbable that your father would have a deep and profound recollection of the conversation that I had with Rob Nesbit-Savage about scoping some policy work for the campaign, back in June, yet he would have zero recollection of Luigi blabbing to numerous people on the campaign about the plot to embarrass Len Brown into standing aside. Hell, I was first told about the Palino/Luigi plot to smear Len on 25 September. How is it possible that I heard the rumour, as had at least one other person outside the campaign I discussed it with, yet neither your father, nor Palino, who had already seen one campaign manager leave because of the candidate's micro-management, knew about it?

9. I'm confident in saying that John Palino is a liar. He is lying about what he knew, and what he gave approval to. I do not know specifically what your father knew, but if he didn't know, when so many others did, then I'm sorry, but that is a woeful indictment on his judgement. You and Stephen fabricated stories about Bevan, which make you liars.

10. On the new issue of the text messages, I wasn't behind them. I don't have the cellphone numbers of any of the recipients. I don't know for a fact who was behind them, but my belief is that you and/or Stephen sent them, and that you are lying about it. That, in my view, is absolutely the most plausible scenario, and true to your form. I agree that you and Stephen haven't changed your story throughout the week. But that is because you have both been desperate to maintain your lies. Not cool, buddy.

Share

 1

 19 people like this.