

From: [Jeremy Marel](#)
To: [Jeremy Marel](#)
Subject: FW: STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL
Date: Wednesday 11 September 2024 03:13:19 PM

From: Moira Deeming <Moira.Deeming@parliament.vic.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 1 March 2023 9:09 PM
To: Cam Wilson <[REDACTED]>; Gina Rushton <[REDACTED]>
Subject: STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Hi Cameron & Gina,

I reiterate once more that the falsehoods published as fact in this article have damaged my reputation and caused me personal and professional harm.

This will be my last correspondence on this matter prior to taking legal action against Crikey, unless the following actions are taken.

1. Unpublish this article by COB Friday 3rd February and never republish it.
2. Publish an agreed upon public retraction and apology by COB Friday 3rd February.

I am challenging Cameron's justifications/"clarifications" as follows:

1. *This document is clearly a speech written from the perspective of Moira Deeming based on the references in the speech that uniquely match your biography. Crikey wrote that it is a "In a speech contained in her emails, Deeming makes the case". It does not say it is a speech that was delivered nor does it say it was written by you.*

-There is no subject named in the alleged speech, you are merely of the opinion that it is 'clearly a speech written from the perspective of Moira Deeming'. You know full well that you have an ethical and legal duty to be crystal clear about what you allege and what you know.

-"Deeming makes the case" is clearly attributing authorship to me whereas, "allegedly written from the perspective of" does not. I'll happily take that to the lawyers, the Press Council and Media Watch. How absurd.

2. *Further, your email does not dispute that you are the author (instead you say "there's no proof that I am the author or the subject"). We would like to extend to you an opportunity to specifically respond to the claim that this is a speech and that it was written from your perspective. Additionally, we would ask you to confirm or deny if you did write or deliver this speech.*

-My email doesn't need to do anything other than point out your lack of due diligence, which it

did. I have disputed your right to attribute authorship to me for documents that have no author-in general, as a rule! I am amazed that I would even have to remind a journalist, an editor or a news outlet, of this basic standard of conduct.

3. *The article states that “other emails highlight the role ... In a speech written after her preselection, the future MLC said”.*

- Again, I am disputing your right to attribute authorship to me for documents that have no author-in general-ever-at all. I’m disputing your right to claim that I “said” anything at all-in general, ever- just because you are of the opinion that I did. You breached my rights and your duties. You should never have published these as claims as facts, and it was entirely predictable that in doing so, I would suffer defamation.

4. Again, this is a statement about the documents obtained via freedom of information request from your council email. It is a agreed upon fact that these are real documents (unless you are claiming that these documents are not legitimate).

- The only thing that we are agreed upon is that I have never agreed upon any facts with you.

5. *The speech or speaking notes are clearly written from the perspective of Moira Deeming (including reference to your husband, Andrew, that was seemingly erroneously left unreacted). We would like to take you up on your offer of “the truth” but, as above, we ask that you submit it in writing.*

-“Clearly written from the perspective of” is your opinion, not an established fact. Once again, you have breached my rights to accurate reporting and your duty to provide balanced and accurate reporting as a journalist/editor/news outlet.

In summary, I feel (and am confident that I can prove) that you have repeatedly defamed me and harmed my reputation. With the help of all my supporters, I intend to pursue this issue legally if Crikey refuses to do the right thing by taking down this article and publishing a proper retraction and apology by Friday. I have had enough of journalists unfairly trashing my reputation with impunity.

Regards,

Moira Deeming

Regards,

Moira Deeming

Thanks
Cameron

On Tue, 28 Feb 2023 at 3:49 pm, Moira Deeming <Moira.Deeming@parliament.vic.gov.au> wrote:

To the Editor of Crikey,

I appeal to you to ring me directly, immediately, on [REDACTED].

If not, for future reference, please have your writers email me directly for comments. I do not respond to any queries unless they are in writing.

And as you can appreciate, you contacted my office during a sitting week, which can make it difficult to respond in a timely manner.

I demand that you remove two of your articles, as well as publish a public retraction and an apology of comparable size and for a comparable length of time, for any harm caused to me or my reputation by these articles, because

1. They contain unsubstantiated claims and falsehoods.
2. I believe they are both seriously defamatory to me and have harmed my reputation.

Summary

Firstly, the articles were factually incorrect and/or based on a biased and curated selection

of documents obtained by FOI.

You might take note that the SWLRV website has been suddenly updated to include the caveats- which you did not include, despite the fact that a plain reading would have revealed the spurious nature of their claims that they are by or about me. "The document appears to be written by Mrs Deeming, but this is not explicitly stated in the document."

Further, I have the full set of those FOI documents- the vast majority of which, SWLRV, declined to publish. I strongly suspect that this is because in totality, they exonerate me and in fact, disprove every single one of the SWLRV website's claims about my views, my goals and my actions. (They- and indeed multiple other news outlets are also about to be pursued for defamation, and many have clearly gotten wind of that fact and begun updating their websites. However, I will not be satisfied with anything less than full retractions and apologies). Your authors are presumably professionals, and should have known better than to print unsubstantiated and unsupportable claims that defame people.

*You should also know, that I alone, have the full set of all those documents **in context, within full email threads, which actually have information about who they are sent by and who authored them**, unlike the SWLRV group or your organisation.*

Secondly, your articles accepted and published-at face value- the SWLRV interpretations of these FOI documents, even when a close read of those documents would easily counter their own claims! And which have now of course, been updated with caveats admitting that! *But prior to these changes, even the scant public history between myself and the gentleman who obtained the FOIs should have been enough of a red flag for any journalist to triple check the facts and the veracity of the claims.*

Your articles published the original SWLRV site claims that I am the author of documents- which are in fact, very clearly unsigned, and which contain no record of who wrote or sent them.

Your articles published the original SWLRV site claims that I am the subject of many documents, which in fact, do not name a subject at all.

Thirdly, your articles reference other articles that I have finally decided to lodge legal action for defamation against.

This may or may not influence your decision to take down the articles. Nevertheless, you may as well know that your reprinting of the heinous and misleading characterisations of my views and actions as fact rather than as allegations, will form part of my evidence.

The simple reality is, that I am the only person in Victoria in receipt of the evidence regarding the identities of the subjects, and the actual authors of those documents. I am also the only person in receipt of the vitally important context necessary to interpret the vast majority of the documents released under that FOI.

Article 1: "Why is Dan Andrews so popular? Allow us to introduce Victoria's opposition. With yet another IBAC report impugning yet another former Labor minister, why can't the Victorian Liberals make any headway?" By CHARLIE LEWIS, published on FEB 23, 2023.

1. The following quote is an outright falsehood

"sex workers and abortion — and jamming them together like ill-fitting puzzle pieces"

I never mentioned abortion at all in my speech. Nor did I say anything against sex workers in my speech.

And for your information, I have never campaigned against sex work- and that is publicly available based on all my commentary at Council. You have totally misrepresented my views and mislead readers into believing that they are akin to Bernie Finn's- which, had you done your due diligence in reading the FOIs from the SWLRV site, or simply asked me, you would have known- is simply not true.

2. The following is claimed as a fact, whereas it was never established as a fact. It was an allegation made by an unnamed source, never owned by the Liberal Party, much less by Scott Morrison.

Mrs Deeming “was deemed “too extreme” for the liking of then prime minister Scott Morrison — yep, Morrison, who bet the house on Katherine Deves, found Deeming’s views a bit alienating.”

Article 2 “I won because God arranged it’: New Liberal MP’s emails show promise of \$100,000 donation for preselection. Emails from controversial new Victorian Liberal MP Moira Deeming show behind the scenes of her successful run for state Parliament.” [CAM WILSON](#)
FEB 23, 2023

1. The following quotes are taken from an unauthored document about an unnamed subject. There is no proof that I am the author or the subject. The only reasonable statement is that this was a document in my inbox. Had you bothered to give me time to answer your queries, as other journalists did, I would have saved you this current embarrassment by explaining the real context- which I can indeed prove.

“The emails provide insight into Deeming’s successful attempts for preselection and election to the Victorian Legislative Council. In a speech contained in her emails, Deeming makes the case that the Liberal Party needed someone who can “attract funding”. “My work in the media and on council has attracted proven, long term [sic] financial backers who are already known to many in the Liberal Party. To date they have raised almost \$1.5 million for the party,” it said.”

2. The following quote is an outright lie. Even the SWLRV website has had to add a disclaimer- which your journalists should not have needed in order to see the lack of evidence for the claim that I’m the author. “The speech appears to be written by Mrs Deeming, but this is not explicitly stated in the document.” It is not titled as a speech, or signed with a name or even proven to be an actual email. It is simply a document that was in my inbox. If you are interested in the truth, feel free to call.

“Other emails highlight the role Deeming’s Christian faith played in her election and time as councillor. In a speech written after her preselection, the future MLC said: I did not win on merit, I did not win because I was popular in the party, I did not win by being a part of a faction. I won because God arranged it, and because Christians joined up and voted according to their consciences.”

3. The following quote, in the context of the articles, misleads and gives the impression that I am anti-LGBTQI+ in general and on the basis of my religious beliefs, which is untrue.

“A constituent sent Deeming a nine-page email filled with long passages from the Bible, which culminated in a claim that the COVID pandemic was a punishment from God for sinning, and that the solution was to overturn laws allowing abortion, contraception and homosexuality. ”

The truth is that I didn't even read that email beyond the first sentence. I just saw a long religious email that seemed to be bunches of sentences that would have no relevance to me as a Councillor. I didn't read it in full, which is my fault, and sent a simple in-kind religious thank-you in return. Of course I don't agree with that email- I wouldn't ever have responded at all had I read it properly, but sadly I didn't read it properly and was simply trying not to be rude towards someone who appeared to be unwell.

4. The following quote is also untrue. I did not "ORGANISE OPPOSITION" to sex work rezoning- I organised a community feedback survey, and the other information is actually Council's official and publicly available government submission. I did not object to 'youth outreach programs'- I objected to the obvious lack of safeguards and breach of the law in our youth programs. Objections, shared by Council and staff and currently being amended. Information which should have been provided, because, of course, I was right.

"organising opposition to rezoning changes to allow sex work within the area, and objecting to youth-outreach programs (including an LGBTQIA+ group) run by youth workers."

5. The following claim is absolutely untrue and cannot be substantiated. It is highly insulting, hurtful and harmful to my reputation. Your journalist did not care to make sure they were viewing the full set of FOI documents- which they were not- or they knew, and they went ahead and published these spurious statements anyway. This is a gross misrepresentation and oversimplification of my views, my character and my actions- for which first hand contradictory evidence is publicly available on the [full uploads](#) of Melton City Council meetings and countless other places. I have never campaigned against 'sex work' or 'trans people' or 'sex education'.

"Deeming's emails also show the extent of her campaigning against sex work, trans people and sex education."

That will do for now, as I am busy and my lawyers are taking over.

Regards,

Moir Deeming

Cam Wilson.

On Tue, Feb 28, 2023 at 11:00 AM Moira Deeming <Moira.Deeming@parliament.vic.gov.au> wrote:

Good Morning Cam,

I would appreciate a reply to my last email. I find it alarming that you have not sought fit to seek to rectify or clarify any mistakes you have made.

I am currently putting together a portfolio of letters regard code of conduct complaints to the Australian Press Council, and private letters from my Lawyers demanding apologies and retractions. Your article is in my list for complaints.

However, I have already secured corrections and retractions via simple communication with other authors.

I am happy to give you the same opportunity, however the letters will go out by COB today.

Should you like to have the chance to update your article voluntarily, please contact me.

Kindest Regards,

Moir Deeming

--

Cam Wilson

[REDACTED]

@cameronwilson

--

Cam Wilson

[REDACTED]

@cameronwilson