

Attachment 1

Political Basis Driving Climate and Related Energy Policies

Federal MPs with integrity and courage

Ten Senators and Members state or show, in writing, that they have never received logical scientific points proving that carbon dioxide from human activity causes climate change and needs to be cut. They are Mr Llew O'Brien, Mr Craig Kelly, Mr Kevin Andrews, Mr George Christensen, Mr Bob Katter and Senators Eric Abetz, Connie Fierravanti-Wells, Gerard Rennick, Pauline Hanson and me.

Copies of the letters are available at: <https://www.malcolmrobertsqld.com.au/letter-to-the-leaders-the-climate-change-scam/> and scroll down to "*Replies from Senators and Members of Parliament with Integrity and Courage to Tell the Truth*".

Many Labor, Liberal, Nationals and independent senators have privately confided to me that there is no scientific basis for their party's climate and energy policies. Yet due to the pressure to conform to party policy and due to peer and media pressure these politicians remain silent.

Former CSIRO research scientist and federal MP Mr Dennis Jensen, at the time the only scientist in parliament, has repeatedly told me of his disgust with CSIRO's betrayal of climate science and his agency's evolution to being an unscientific, politicised climate advocacy group.

Politically sourced, politically driven

Climate and associated energy policies often contradict science and have their origins in politics not science as the following points reveal:

- To comply with the United Nations 1997 Kyoto Protocol, the Howard-Anderson Liberal-National coalition government introduced the Renewable Energy Target (RET). They were the first large federal party to have a policy calling for an Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS or Carbon Dioxide Tax). They deliberately bypassed the constitution in a deal with state premiers to steal farmers' rights to use their own land in order for the Liberal-Nationals federal government to comply with the 1997 UN Kyoto Protocol. In doing so, the Liberal-National government got around our constitution's Section 51, Clause 31 requiring farmers to be compensated for loss of their rights to use their own land. Yet in 2013, six years after leaving office, former Prime Minister John Howard delivered the annual address in London of the sceptical Global Warming Policy Foundation in which he confessed that he was agnostic on climate science, meaning he did not have the necessary climate science to justify his party's policy and his government's legislation. Thus, the government that started and entrenched climate and associated energy policies did not do so based on science;
- In 2016 the then Father of the Senate, Senator Ian Macdonald stated in the senate that I had started the debate on climate science that parliament had never had;
- That debate has still never eventuated. On 9 September 2019 I challenged Greens Senators Richard Di Natali – party senate leader - and Larissa Waters to present the logical scientific points proving carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut and to debate me on the climate science and on the corruption of climate science. Neither has ever produced the science. Neither has debated me.
- Prior to that on Thursday 7 October 2010 I challenged Senator Larissa Waters to a debate on climate science and on the corruption of climate science during our joint participation in a forum in Brisbane's Powerhouse theatre almost 12 years ago. She immediately jumped to her feet to say she would not debate me. That was repeated in my May 2016 challenge to her and to Labor MP Mr Mark Butler while we attended a Brisbane election campaign event.

- Kevin Rudd's government in 2007 followed the Howard-Anderson government's lead and turbo-charged climate and energy policy. In doing so he cited his false claim that 4,000 scientists in white lab coats had provided scientific evidence as the basis for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (UN IPCC) 2007 report. In correspondence with him and his office I referenced the UN IPCC's own data that showed only five UN IPCC reviewers of the UN IPCC report's sole chapter claiming warming due to carbon dioxide from human activity endorsed the claim. There is doubt they were scientists. None of the UN IPCC's six reports contains logical scientific points proving carbon dioxide from human activity causes damaging climate change, yet all have summaries for policymakers stating or implying the reports do. None of the many UN IPCC reports provide logical scientific points quantifying the specific effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on any climate or weather factor.
- On 24 July 2020 I wrote to Senators and Members who stated or implied that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut and asked them for the logical scientific points as the basis for their claim. All failed to provide any such points or evidence. They are Senators Matt Canavan, Zali Steggall, Larissa Waters, Simon Birmingham, Jenny McAllister, Penny Wong and MPs Trent Zimmerman, Mark Butler, PM Scott Morrison, Barnaby Joyce, Anthony Albanese, Adam Bandt, David Littleproud, Josh Frydenberg, Angus Taylor, Karen Andrews, Greg Hunt, Tony Burke and Tanya Plibersek. The four replies received are available at: <https://www.malcolmrobertsqld.com.au/letter-to-the-leaders-the-climate-change-scam/> and scroll down to *"Correspondence with Senators and MPs Implying or Proclaiming Climate Alarm."*
- Senator Matt Canavan and Mr Barnaby Joyce's changes from being strong climate sceptics to later becoming climate alarmists to now apparently leaning back toward scepticism when speaking in Central Queensland and the Hunter seem to illustrate enormous political pressures apparently driving politicians. This parallels Mr Bill Shorten's contradictions in 2019 making statements supporting coal for audiences in Central Queensland coalfields that was the opposite of his statements to phase out coal in his messaging to inner city Melbourne voters;
- When Zali Steggall came to our senate offices in her 2021 attempt to persuade us to vote for her proposed climate change legislation she failed to provide any logical scientific points showing the need for her bill. When I asked her to provide such fundamental basis for legislation, she was speechless;
- When Senator Zed Seselja was presiding minister at the February 2022 Additional Senate Estimates hearings, I asked him for the logical scientific points as the basis for the Liberal-National government's policy reversal under Prime Minister Morrison. The change in 2021 from opposing to supporting the UN's 2050 Net Zero target he looked down, spoke nervously and showed his discomfort in his answers devoid of logical scientific points;
- When I repeatedly asked the Morrison government's Senate Leader, Matthias Cormann for the logical scientific points supporting climate and energy policies he repeatedly failed to answer my question and instead stated a need to fulfil international commitments and obligations. This is no basis for policy that is costing Australians billions of dollars and will cost trillions of dollars.

No Australian federal, state or territory government has ever had the scientific basis for a mandate to push, much less pass legislation cutting the production of carbon dioxide from human activity.