Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2012
Latest update:

APPENDIX 12

PROMINENT POLITICAL PLAYERS

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with,
all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

"*No matter if the science is all phony, there are collateral environmental benefits … Climate change [provides] the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world*"
Christine Stewart, Canadian Environmental Minister, December 1998

Definitions

Please refer to Appendix 1d for definitions of words including science, scientist, scientific, corruption, lie, fraud and propaganda.

Context

During the last three years I've used a combination of Registered Post letters with Delivery Confirmation and confirmed facsimiles to write to most members of federal parliament prominent in the climate debate. During the same period my emails shared information with all members of parliament.

Subsequently, all federal parliamentarians prominently advocating cutting human CO2 have failed to provide evidence for their claim. Many have contradicted empirical scientific evidence. Some have continued with their advocacy despite being presented in writing with irrefutable documented evidence and with statistics of massive orchestrated corruption of climate *science*.

This appendix reveals significant misrepresentations of climate science within parliament. Its conclusions mirror those in recent months of prominent political reporters in the media: Australian federal politics and many politicians are out of touch with reality and instead of providing leadership are playing a costly game.

Sadly, this applies to both major parties, the Greens and some independents. As they play games Australia and Aussies are stealthily being threatened by our greatest threat to national sovereignty since federation in 1901.

Contents

Government: ALP-Greens alliance 3
Kevin Rudd (as Prime Minister) 3
Senator Penny Wong 6
Correspondence with Senators Mark Furner and Claire Moore 8
Greg Combet 11
Robert McClelland 17
Julia Gillard, Prime Minister 19
Mark Dreyfus QC 22
Wayne Swan, Martin Ferguson, Kate Ellis 23
Craig Emerson 24
Anthony Albanese 26
ALP Members of Parliament 27
Greens 29

Federal Coalition political parties 31
Greg Hunt 32
Malcolm Turnbull 35
Tony Abbott 37
Coalition Members of Parliament 40

Lib-Lab climate opponents or colluders? 41

Independent Members of Parliament 45
Rob Oakeshott 45
Tony Windsor 47
Andrew Wilkie 48
Bob Katter (now Katter's Australia Party) 48

National governance smashed 49

State and local governments under siege by climate catastrophists 50

Honest, courageous politicians with integrity 53

There is hope 55

Conclusions 55

Government: ALP-Greens alliance

Quote: "*Before the 2007 election, Rudd said climate change was "the greatest moral, economic and environmental challenge of our generation". In an interview he gave to a newspaper last week (April 2010), Rudd reaffirmed those remarks (although instead of the greatest challenge it morphed into a fundamental challenge), as he has done repeatedly during his 2 1/2 years in office.*"
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/features/politics-trumps-a-moral-challenge/story-e6frg6z6-1225859592923

Within weeks of his quoted statement Kevin Rudd dumped his CO2 '*trading*' scheme, reportedly at the urging of Julia Gillard and Wayne Swan.

Within months, various promises were made by his replacement, Julia Gillard including her promise to not introduce a '*carbon tax*' on carbon dioxide. That was adamantly reinforced by her Deputy Prime Minister, Wayne Swan.

Within months, the Prime Minister told Australians that she would be introducing both a tax on CO2 AND a CO2 '*trading*' scheme.

My conclusion from events and statements by ALP members of parliament during and since 2007 is that the ALP is playing a purely political game that used global warming emotionally to secure government and thereafter to cling to government. It backed itself into a corner from which there is now only one honourable escape: to admit its contradiction of empirical scientific evidence and its support for corruption of climate science.

As Nature and empirical scientific evidence expose climate corruption and deception, the once proud people's party faces decimation unless it admits its errors as part of restoring integrity.

As shown below, Liberals have shown many twists, turns and reversals on global warming (aka climate change).

Kevin Rudd (as Prime Minister)

As Prime Minister Kevin Rudd advised Australia that 4,000 scientists claimed human CO2 caused global warming.
http://sixtyminutes.ninemsn.com.au/stories/tarabrown/614370/crunch-time

In response my letter dated Thursday, September 18th, 2008 queried Kevin Rudd's false claim and requested the number of UN IPCC scientists on whose advice his government built its climate change policy?
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.1_RuddletterSep18,2008.pdf

Kevin Rudd's response failed to address my request. In response my letter dated

Wednesday, December 10th, 2008 advised of my continuing investigation and future further response.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.2_RuddletterDec10,2008.pdf

My letter of Tuesday, 26th, May 2009 advised, quote: "*I hope this new information is helpful to you. I trust you will see their significance. ie, the IPCC's claim that human activity was responsible for the global warming that ended in 1998 was endorsed by just five reviewers and that further, there is doubt they were objective scientists*". My letter explained the reality that such figures were obtained from the UN IPCC itself. Two URL links were provided for the Prime Minister's staff to check for the PM.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.3_RuddletterMay26,2009.pdf

On Tuesday August 4th, 2009 a copy of my letter dated Thursday, July 30th, 2009 personalised to all federal senators was received via Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation by Kevin Rudd's office. It contained links to four papers by climate analyst John McLean. It was accompanied by paper copies of each of four papers by John McLean. John McLean's papers provided documented evidence of UN IPCC corruption. They cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present data from the UN IPCC itself on UN IPCC reporting processes. The papers undermined Kevin Rudd's false claims of a (non-existent) scientific consensus as the basis for his proposed carbon dioxide *trading* scheme. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.4_SenatorsJuly30,2009.pdf

John McLean's papers cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present data obtained from the UN IPCC itself. His papers reveal that the UN IPCC's core claim that human CO2 caused global warming is made not by thousands of scientists. It is made in one chapter written by 53 authors centred on a tight-knit cabal of computer modellers selected in breach of UN IPCC guidelines. Many have financial conflicts of interest. The claim about human CO2 was endorsed by only five reviewers. (Appendix 2)

My facsimile dated Monday, August 31st, 2009 provided further written confirmation.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.5_RuddFaxAug31,2009.pdf

My first facsimile dated Monday, October 12th, 2009 asked Kevin Rudd the reason for preventing me posting on his blog despite my compliance with his blog's protocol. My blog provided hard evidence that his climate policy was not based on science.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.6_RuddFaxOct12,2009.pdf

My second facsimile dated Monday, October 12th, 2009 reconfirmed that the purported basis for his proposed CO2 '*trading*' scheme contradicted empirical scientific evidence and that if he continued to promote human CO2 as the cause of Earth's latest modest global warming period he would be committing fraud.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.7_RuddFaxOct12,2009.pdf

My letter dated Wednesday, February 10th, 2010 provided further documented evidence and inquired as to his number of self-proclaimed '*number one priorities*'.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.8_RuddLetterFeb10,2010.pdf

His office's response to my first letter failed to address my letter's key point. All my subsequent letters, facsimiles and emails failed to produce any response from the Prime Minister's office.

This video introduces the destruction of property rights as a result of Kevin Rudd's climate policy:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GstnDGtQCus&feature=plcp
This is explained further in Appendix 14 and below within this Appendix 12. It explains how Kevin Rudd's policy contradicts Australia's Constitution.

My conclusion is that Kevin Rudd ignored hard data revealing that his climate policy contradicted science and was based on corruption of science. Much of that data cannot be sensibly refuted. He has failed to refute it.

Kevin Rudd's behaviour has parallels with that of the corrupt UN IPCC. His behaviour raises serious questions. Did he fabricate global warming as an issue to ride to electoral victory? Did he fabricate and foment unfounded and unscientific alarm to drive fear to swindle votes? Did he use vague long-term goals to give the illusion of taking action? Did he simply waste taxpayer money on unjustified *initiatives* to fabricate perceptions of action? Did he simply use fear to drive control? Where is his philosophy on real-world climate and on serious environmental issues bulldozed aside by fabricated climate alarm? What agenda and whose agenda was he following?

Senator Penny Wong

Senator Penny Wong was the first federal Minister for Climate Change from 2007 to 2010.

My letter dated Thursday, July 30th, 2009 was personalised and sent to all federal senators including Penny Wong via Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. It contained links to four papers by climate analyst John McLean. It was accompanied by paper copies of each of four papers by John McLean. John McLean's papers provided documented evidence of UN IPCC corruption. They cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present data from the UN IPCC itself on UN IPCC reporting processes. The papers exposed Penny Wong's and Kevin Rudd's false claims of a (non-existent) scientific consensus as the basis for her carbon dioxide and climate policy. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.4_SenatorsJuly30,2009.pdf

John McLean's papers cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present data obtained from the UN IPCC itself. His papers reveal that the UN IPCC's core claim that human CO2 caused global warming is not made by thousands of scientists. It is made in one chapter written by 53 authors based on a tight-knit cabal of computer modellers selected in breach of UN IPCC guidelines. Many have financial conflicts of interest. The claim about human CO2 was endorsed by only five reviewers. (Appendix 2)

No response was received. Post office records reveal that the letter lay idle in the parliament house post office for four (4) weeks awaiting collection by Senator Wong's staff. Eventually Delivery was confirmed yet no reply received from Senator Wong office.

An Australia Post consultant advised that another Registered Post package to Senator Wong had languished seven weeks awaiting collection.

My facsimile dated Monday, August 24th, 2009 to Senator Wong advised her of the package awaiting collection in the parliament house Post Office. Accompanying by facsimile was one of John McLean's papers. No response was received.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.1_WongFaxAug24,2009.pdf

Both my facsimiles dated Tuesday, August 25th, 2009 reiterated the importance of John McLean's articles and expected that she as a lawyer would understand their significance. Each was accompanied by another of John McLean's papers. No response was received.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.2_WongFaxAug25,2009.pdf
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.3_WongFaxAug25,2009.pdf

My facsimile dated Wednesday, August 26th, 2009 reiterated the importance of John McLean's articles. Accompanying by facsimile was another of John McLean's papers. My assistance was offered. No response was received.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.4_WongfaxAug26,2009.pdf

My second facsimile dated Wednesday, August 26th, 2009 reiterated the importance of John McLean's articles. Accompanying by facsimile was another of John McLean's papers. My assistance was offered. No response was received.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.5_WongFaxAug26,2009.pdf

My facsimile dated Friday, August 31st, 2009 reminded Senator Wong that my Registered Post letter dated July 31st had still not been collected from the parliament house Post Office.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.6_WongFaxAug31,2009.pdf

My first facsimile dated Monday, October 12th, 2009 requested Senator Wong to name the sources of her government's advice to legislate a CO2 '*trading*' scheme. It requested the basis for her labelling CO2 a pollutant. No response was received.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.7_WongFaxOct12,2009.pdf

My second facsimile dated Monday, October 12th, 2009 advised Senator Wong that other ALP senators with whom I'd corresponded had separately advised me that they had deferred responsibility on the matter to Senator Wong. I asked why Senator Wong had not advised them of the UN IPCC misleading parliamentarians. I advised that by continuing to promote her CO2 '*trading*' scheme she would be committing fraud. My assistance was again offered. No response was received.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.8_WongFaxOct12, 2009.pdf

My email dated February 3rd, 2010 sent to all federal parliamentarians contained three attachments discussing Senator Wong's misrepresentations of climate science. These had earlier been sent by Registered Post to Senator Wong's Canberra office and her South Australian electorate office. I expressed the opinion that her actions in regard to the UN IPCC's fraudulent claims make her complicit in UN IPCC fraud.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.9_WongLetter.pdf
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.10_WongSummary.pdf
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.11_WongDetails.pdf

My letter dated Tuesday, February 9th, 2010 accompanied my document entitled '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*' detailing UN IPCC fraud and misrepresentations and corruption of science.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.12_Wong.pdf
Personal letters were sent similarly to all senators.

On February 23rd, 2010 my analysis of a speech by Senator Wong was sent by email to all federal parliamentarians. Senator Wong's speech was delivered in opening her First National Forum on Coasts and Climate Change last week. It's available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.13_Wong Wrongs.pdf
My email concluded, quote: "*Many of Senator Wong's statements seem either lies or breathtakingly incompetent, irresponsible and/or negligent.*"

Subsequently, as people became aware that atmospheric temperatures had not risen since 1998, media reported Penny Wong advising people to focus on ocean temperatures. Yet Penny Wong was using old data on ocean temperature that had been supplanted by systematic worldwide ARGO ocean temperature measurements at many ocean depths.

That extensive and highly respected data revealed that ocean temperature was at most flat and more likely falling since 2003.

Previously on June 15th, 2009 Senator Steve Fielding's science advisers had brought the ARGO measurements to Penny Wong's attention.
http://joannenova.com.au/?p=2292&preview=true
The article provides an insight into tactics used by Senator Wong to lecture rather than listen. Why? Is Senator Wong afraid of empirical scientific evidence and is that the reason she excludes and thereby contradicts such evidence?

Senator Wong has repeatedly used the term '*carbon pollution*' to describe CO2. Yet CO2 is not a pollutant. How can it be a pollutant when 97% of Earth's annual CO2 production is by Nature? How can it be when CO2 is essential to all complex life on Earth? How can it be when data cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC reveals that Nature alone determines completely the level of CO2 in Earth's atmosphere? In the open atmosphere CO2 from human sources is not and cannot be a pollutant.

Pages 3 and 4 of the document entitled *Reclaiming our Country and our Planet using Truth: Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Facts* reveal that CO2 does not meet any of the criteria needed for being classified a pollutant. Replying to John Cribbes' inquiry, Dr. Mary Jean Bürer scientific consultant with the UN IPCC reveals that, quote: "*On your question about whether CO2 is a pollutant, I can not answer that as I have not found the answer in one of our reports.*"
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom1-CO2.pdf

Yet Senator Wong has publicly stated that UN IPCC reports are the basis of her party's climate policy. On what basis did Senator Wong repeatedly state or imply that CO2 is a pollutant?

Although the level of CO2 in Earth's atmosphere is determined by Nature alone, scientific studies repeatedly prove conclusively that higher levels of CO2 are highly beneficial. Earth's history confirms that plant and animal life thrived when CO2 levels were many times current levels.

Carbon is a black solid or clear diamond. *Carbon pollution* is a black solid. CO2 though is a clear, odourless, tasteless gas essential for all life on Earth. Why does Senator Wong repeatedly misrepresent CO2 as carbon pollution?

Correspondence with Senators Penny Wong, Mark Furner and Claire Moore

My letter dated July 30th, 2009 to federal senators accompanied by paper copies of John McLean's papers exposing UN IPCC corruption of science brought few responses from senators. One senator who did reply by letter dated November 2nd, 2009 is Senator Mark Furner from Queensland.

His response dated November 2, 2009 seems to indicate that he attempted to conduct due diligence by asking Senator Wong for her comments in response to my letter. Although Senator Wong did not respond to my letter, she did respond to Senator Furner. He then forwarded her response to me. Senator Wong's letter to Senator Furner dated October 26th, 2009 and Senator Furner's subsequent letter to me dated November 2nd, 2009 are available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.14_Furner&Wong.pdf

Please note that Senator Wong's letter to Senator Furner fails to provide any empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. It fails to provide any logical scientific reasoning for causation. It fails to cite any document or organisation having empirical scientific evidence and/or logical scientific reasoning as evidence of causation of warming by human CO2.

My reply dated Tuesday, November 10th, 2009 to Senator Furner specifically addressed each of Senator Wong's falsities and misrepresentations of climate science. It was sent to Senator Furner by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation and copied by Registered Post to Queensland Senator Claire Moore at two addresses, to Senator Wong and to Attorney General Robert McClelland. It was copied electronically to all federal MP's. It's available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.15_Furner.pdf

My associated letter dated Wednesday, October 11th to the Hon Robert McClelland, Attorney General was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. It is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.16_McClelland.pdf

My email with the four letters above as three attachments was sent to all federal MPs on November 13h, 2009. It was copied to prominent journalists and media personalities and is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/122.17_EmailToMPs.pdf

My second email of the same date and associated subject was sent to all federal MPs. Its attachments included a summary of extensive UN IPCC corruption of climate science, a copy of the letter dated Thursday, July 30th, 2009 previously sent to all Senators and a copy of a scientifically peer-reviewed paper by McLean, de Freitas and Carter (2009) revealing natural climate cycles responsible for global temperature variation.

Please note that the senators and the Attorney General were provided with many sound references documenting UN IPCC contradiction of empirical scientific evidence and UN IPCC corruption. Such documentation is now far deeper and more extensive than in 2009. Similarly empirical scientific evidence comprehensively contradicting UN IPCC reports is now stronger and even more comprehensive and compelling.

No further response was received from Senator Furner. Apart from receipt of acknowledgment by email from a handful of MP's including the Attorney General no

substantive personal responses were received from any federal MP's in response to either my personal letters sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation or to my emails.

From Senator Wong's letter to Senator Furner I conclude that Senator Wong misrepresented climate science to her parliamentary colleagues.

Senator Wong finally responded with a letter written on her behalf by Anthony Swirepik dated March 16th, 2010. Its second paragraph contained conflicting statements. Her response failed to provide empirical scientific evidence for her core claim that human CO2 caused warming. Her letter provided an erroneous and misleading count of UN IPCC authors. Her letter stated many falsities and misrepresents climate and climate science.

Why did Penny Wong repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence? Why did she repeatedly mislead her parliamentary colleagues and the parliament of Australia? Why has she made many false statements misrepresenting CO2, global warming, climate change and science? Why did she maintain a position contradicting empirical scientific evidence despite receiving plentiful varied credible material from me and from others including Senator Fielding and eminent climate scientists? That material in written form and in personal presentations revealed her position as unscientific and unfounded.

Greg Combet

On February 26th, 2011 Ed Husic ALP federal MP for Chifley sent me an article by Greg Combet published in *The Australian* newspaper on February 26th, 2011. My analysis of Greg Combet's article is available here:
http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/Combet2011March03.pdf
It includes background and specific responses to his claims with a link to his article available here:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/archive/national-affairs-old/carbon-price-is-the-best-way-forward/story-fn5oad9h-1226012246858
Ed Husic is the current Government Whip in parliament.

Accompanied by my brief cover letter dated Thursday, March 3rd, 2011 my analysis was sent to Greg Combet by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. My letter requested answers to simple requests underlined in the enclosed analysis. No reply has been received.

My conclusion about Greg Combet's article is, quote: "*Greg Combet's article is pure propaganda riddled with falsities. Based on what I've learned and seen during the last four (4) years researching the science and politics of global warming, I conclude the falsities are largely deliberately misleading. If not deliberate, they expose an abysmal and dismally inaccurate understanding*"

My analysis was preceded by my letter to Greg Combet dated Wednesday, March 2nd, 2011 and sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. It was accompanied by a summary of findings from four (4) years' investigation into global warming. That summary has been extended by appendices in this report, particularly appendices 2, 4 and 4a. A copy was sent electronically to all federal MP's. My letter to Greg Combet is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/123.1_Combet.pdf

Please note that a copy of my letter and summary to Greg Combet was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to Julia Gillard in her capacity as Prime Minister. It was accompanied by my letter to her available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.1_Gillard.pdf

No response has been received from Greg Combet. No response has been received from Julia Gillard.

My letter dated Thursday, March 24th, 2011 to Greg Combet was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. It was accompanied by a copy of my letter to Ross Garnaut dated March 22nd, 2011. See Appendix 9. It itemised his misrepresentations of climate science and raised serious concerns about corruption of climate science supposedly the basis of Greg Combet's policy and the government's CO2 tax and CO2 '*trading*' scheme.
My letter to Greg Combet is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/123.2_Combet.pdf

Electronic copies of my letters to Greg Combet dated March 2nd, 3rd and 24th were sent electronically to all members of federal parliament.

Did the Government Whip, Ed Husic conduct any due diligence after these significant matters were raised to his attention in response to his communication to me? Why did Greg Combet mislead ALP members of parliament and the Australian community?

Lawyer Tony Cox analysed Greg Combet's letter to one of the latter's constituents here: http://theclimatescepticsparty.blogspot.com.au/2011/01/youre-so-wrong-wrong-greg-youre-so.html
Do Greg Combet's profound errors appear accidental or sloppy or deliberate or carefully contrived or ...? We cannot know. It's clear though from Appendix 2 presenting the UN IPCC's contradictions of empirical scientific evidence and its smashing of scientific peer-review that Greg Combet has no grounds for his claim that human CO2 causes global warming. Why did he repeatedly spread his misrepresentations of science, climate and Nature?

He has been informed in writing of his many errors. That information cited detailed evidence and credible references. Why does he continue spreading his misrepresentations? Appendix 14 provides possible explanations.

Greg Combet is a mining engineer who graduated from a reputable mining engineering course at UNSW. That course would have included instruction on atmospheric gases including the trace gas CO2 and geology revealing Earth's past more extreme natural climate changes. With his intelligence and education it would be expected that Greg Combet should have questioned and examined the UN IPCC's supposition on HUMAN CO2 and found it wanting. Why did he endorse the UN IPCC's unfounded and unscientific reports that contradict empirical scientific measurements? Why did he base a massive open-ended upward-ratcheting tax and a Renewable Energy Target on unscientific reports contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

Greg Combet claims scientific evidence when no such empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning of causation exists. Is this simply one of his tactics to foment unfounded climate alarm and avoid or deflect scrutiny?
For example, on ABC-TV's '*4 Corners*' program entitled '*The Carbon War*', broadcast Monday, September 19th, 2011 Greg Combet stated, falsely, quote: "*The scientific evidence is clear that we need to tackle climate change.*" Greg Combet has no such evidence of causation by HUMAN CO2. As a graduate engineer he should understand what is required to conclude causation of global warming by HUMAN CO2. Why does he make false, unfounded and unscientific statements contradicting empirical scientific evidence?
http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/stories/2011/09/15/3318364.htm

On ABC-TV's '*QandA*' program broadcast Monday, July 2nd, 2012, Greg Combet said, quote: "*Look, I understand it's a very difficult issue in this debate for people but we have to return to some basic principles, I think, in addressing it. One is that the scientists are telling us that greenhouse gas emissions are causing climate change and when governments accept that advice, they have a responsibility to deal with it by putting in*

place policy measures that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in partnership with other nations." Isn't the minister's responsibility first to ensure the veracity of the advice received? When he is presented with much documented evidence of empirical scientific evidence contradicting that advice isn't the minister's responsibility to conduct an open and independent impartial inquiry into the science. When he is advised of extensive corruption in reports which the minister claims as the basis for policy isn't it the minister's responsibility to question the veracity of those reports? Isn't an Australian federal minister's primary responsibility to the people and nation of Australia and not to a foreign body such as the UN or to other nations? Greg Combet's words seem to be a clever way of avoiding taking responsibility, as he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for his implied claim.

Another tactic used by federal Labor ministers and MP's in their responses is to advise that that they have forwarded my letter to Greg Combet (or prior to that to Penny Wong) for an answer. Yet on each occasion Greg Combet and Penny Wong subsequently failed to respond. This tactic has been used by Peter Garrett, Simon Crean, Wayne Swan and others. Is their response simply a tactic to avoid scrutiny and accountability?

A strategy seemingly used by politicians, by CSIRO executives and by academics without evidence is to initially respond cheerily before falsely claiming solid evidence or deflecting or stalling. If an inquirer persists the next step by politicians and others seems to be to wear down inquirers by citing many and/or lengthy references falsely purported to contain evidence of causation of global warming by HUMAN CO2. After this, politicians and other advocates of cutting human CO2 production often ignore subsequent communication. The repeated use of this strategy indicates that these tactics are successful with all except the most persistent inquirers. Accountability to taxpayers seems to be withering and largely dead. The game for politicians seems to be evading the truth and reality to avoid accountability.

As recent former director of union superannuation fund, Greg Combet now presides over legislation and grants to that union superannuation fund

Journalist James Delingpole identified what he claims as the scandal involving wind farms and guaranteed government subsidies. In The Australian newspaper on May 3rd, 2012 he stated, quote: "*Even more shocking than this, though, were my discoveries about the finance arrangements and behaviour of the wind farm companies. What we have here, I believe, is the biggest and most outrageous public affairs scandal of the 21st century -- one in which the Gillard government is implicated and that far exceeds in seriousness and scope of the Slipper or Thomson sideshows.*

At the heart of this scandal are the union superannuation funds that are using the wind farm scam as a kind of government-endorsed Ponzi scheme to fill their coffers at public expense. One of the biggest wind farm developers -- Pacific Hydro -- is owned by the union superfund Members Equity Bank. To meet its carbon reduction quotas, we're told, Australia needs to build about 10,000 new wind turbines like the ones that have destroyed Waterloo (and dozens of communities like it from NSW to South Australia).

The figures are mind-boggling. Each of those turbines will cost about $3 million, which means $30 billion even before you've started building the power lines. And where's this money coming from? The consumer, of course -- mostly via tariffs whacked on to the price of conventional, fossil-fuel energy prices, in the form of payouts called Renewable Energy Certificates.

Note that wind turbines produce very little power. Because wind is intermittent, they operate at between one-fifth and one-third of their capacity, meaning they are erratic, unreliable and have to be fully backed up by conventional "black" (mostly coal-fuelled) power. Where the money is to be made is through the REC subsidy. A 3MW wind turbine that generates (at most) $150,000 worth of electricity a year is eligible for guaranteed subsidies of $500,000 a year. A ridgeline hosting 20 or 30 turbines generates very little power -- but an awful lot of free cash for those lucky enough to get their snouts in the trough.

If the unions were merely exploiting government environmental legislation to milk the taxpayer it would be bad enough …"
End of quote.

Industry Super Holdings Pty Ltd Annual Report for 2007 is here:
http://www.membersequity.com.au/pdf/reporting/ME_Annual_Report.pdf
The report states that Greg Combet was director of Industry Super Holdings Pty Ltd until the middle of 2007, the year he was elected to parliament. The report states that, quote: "*In January 2007, Members Equity Bank (ME) and Industry Fund Services (IFS) came together under the umbrella of the financial institution known as Industry Super Holdings*".

James Delingpole's article and Greg Combet's close connections with unions and with union superannuation funds raise serious questions about Greg Combet's interests.

During his tenure as Minister for Climate Change his Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency included this disclaimer beneath fact sheets provided by CSIRO, quote:
"*Prepared by CSIRO for the Department of Climate Change ©Commonwealth of Australia, 2009*
This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the Commonwealth. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to the Commonwealth Copyright Administration, Attorney General's Department, National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600 or at www.ag.gov.au/cca
IMPORTANT NOTICE – PLEASE READ
This document is produced for general information only and does not represent a statement of the policy of the Australian Government. The Australian Government and all persons acting for the Government preparing this report ***accept no liability for the accuracy of*** *or inferences from the material contained in this publication, or for any action as a result of any person's or group's interpretations, deductions, conclusions or actions in relying on this material.*"

(Emphasis added by this appendix's author)

In an interview broadcast by ABC-Radio on Monday, July 9th, 2012 Greg Combet revealed that a tax on carbon dioxide has always been ALP policy. Quote:
"*SAMANTHA HAWLEY (ABC reporter): Well we have a carbon tax today because of the alliance the Labor Party has with the Greens; would you agree with that?*
GREG COMBET: Well no, this has actually been Labor Party policy for many years."
That contradicts Julia Gillard's reported explanation that she broke her promise to ensure continued government via the Greens.
http://www.abc.net.au/am/content/2012/s3541427.htm

Greg Combet has repeatedly used the term '*carbon pollution*' to describe CO2. Yet CO2 is not a pollutant. How can it be a pollutant when 97% of Earth's annual CO2 production is by Nature? How can it be when CO2 is essential to all complex life on Earth? How can it be when data cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC reveals that Nature alone determines completely the level of CO2 in Earth's atmosphere? In the open atmosphere CO2 from human sources is not and cannot be a pollutant.

Pages 3 and 4 of the document entitled *Reclaiming our Country and our Planet using Truth: Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Facts* reveal that CO2 does not meet any of the criteria needed for being classified a pollutant. Replying to John Cribbes' inquiry, Dr. Mary Jean Bürer scientific consultant with the UN IPCC reveals that, quote: "*On your question about whether CO2 is a pollutant, I can not answer that as I have not found the answer in one of our reports.*"
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom1-CO2.pdf

Yet Greg Combet has publicly stated that UN IPCC reports are the basis of his party's climate policy. On what basis did he repeatedly state or imply that CO2 is a pollutant?

Although the level of CO2 in Earth's atmosphere is determined by Nature alone, scientific studies repeatedly prove conclusively that higher levels of CO2 are highly beneficial. Earth's history confirms that plant and animal life thrived when CO2 levels were many times current levels.

Carbon is a black solid or clear diamond. *Carbon pollution* is a black solid. CO2 though is a clear gas essential for all life on Earth. Why does Greg Combet repeatedly misrepresent CO2?

Greg Combet has publicly stated that some countries are joining the list of those adopting CO2 *trading*. Why does Greg Combet not mention those states and nations withdrawing from CO2 *trading* schemes? Why does he not discuss those nations refusing to enter such schemes? Why does he not discuss major nations refusing to renew the Kyoto Protocol? Why does he not mention those banning CO2 *trading* or those banning UN Agenda 21?
Please see Appendix 14 and Graham Williamson's extensive documentation advising politicians of UN Agenda 21:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy.php
Individual documents are accessible through this link:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy_links.php

Despite face-saving wording the UN FCCC's Copenhagen meeting failed. Despite face-saving wording the UN's Doha meeting failed:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/junk-kyoto-and-the-carbon-tax/story-e6frgd0x-1226533235739

The UN IPCC has admitted that there is no statistical link between HUMAN CO2 and extreme weather events. Empirical science reveals no changing trend in either frequency or severity of extreme weather events. See Appendix 4a. Why is Greg Combet committing Australia to an open-ended international financial liability? Without empirical scientific evidence the climate circus appears to have nothing to do with climate. It is simply a means of financial control. Why is Greg Combet pushing and endorsing this control over Australia and over Aussies by unelected foreign bodies?
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/experts-greg-combet-at-odds-over-impact-on-taxpayers-of-deal-to-help-third-world/story-e6frg6xf-1226533487427

As an Australian federal minister Greg Combet's duty is to advocate policy based on empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning. It is not to push policy based on other nations conned by the UN IPCC and international bankers seeking quick profits *trading* on thin air and Nature's colourless, odourless, tasteless trace gas essential to all Earth's major organisms.

Greg Combet has no empirical scientific evidence for his political claim that human CO2 production needs to be cut. He has no logical scientific reasoning for his claim. His claim contradicts empirical scientific evidence and scientific reasoning. He has repeatedly ignored documented evidence revealing that his position is unscientific. He and/or has department and the government of which he is a senior minister have repeatedly ignored public and private advice from internationally eminent scientists presenting solid empirical scientific evidence and sound scientific reasoning strongly contradicting his claims. Why does he continue to support and endorse corruption of climate science?

Has Greg Combet been deliberately dishonest on climate science or grossly negligent and irresponsible? What explanation can he provide?

Attorney General Robert McClelland

My letter dated Tuesday, October 27th, 2009 to then Attorney General the Hon Robert McClelland was accompanied by an extensive package of material documenting corruption of climate science. It was quote: '*A Formal Complaint and Request to Investigate matters including apparent ministerial fraud or negligence*'. It was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/124.1_AttorneyGeneral.pdf

My letter concluded with statements based on responsibilities defined on from the Attorney General's website, quote: "*As you are our nation's 'first law officer' whose responsibilities include law enforcement with primary responsibility for fraud control and national security and with ministerial responsibilities including legislative drafting, I now turn to you to conduct a thorough, independent investigation to protect our nation.*"

An electronic copy was sent to all federal MPs. It was acknowledged by Robert McClelland's email.

No further response was received.

My letter dated Wednesday, October 11th, 2009 provided supplementary materials. It was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/124.2_AttorneyGeneral.pdf

An electronic copy was sent to all federal MPs. It was acknowledged by Robert McClelland's email. No further response was received.

My letter dated Friday, November 20th, 2009 provided supplementary materials. It was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/124.3_AttorneyGeneral.pdf

An electronic copy was sent to all federal MPs. It was acknowledged by Robert McClelland's email. No further response was received.

My letter dated Wednesday, February 3rd, 2010 provided supplementary materials. It was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/124.4_AttorneyGeneral.pdf

An electronic copy was sent to all federal MPs. It was acknowledged by Robert McClelland's email. No further response was received.

My letter dated Thursday, February 11th, 2010 provided supplementary materials. It was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/124.5_AttorneyGeneral.pdf

An electronic copy was sent to all federal MPs. It was acknowledged by Robert

McClelland's email. No further response was received.

My letter dated Thursday, March 24th, 201 was a legal notice and provided supplementary materials. It was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. A copy is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/124.6_AttorneyGeneral.pdf

An electronic copy was sent to all federal MPs. It was acknowledged by Robert McClelland's email. No further response was received.

Julia Gillard, Prime Minister

My letters dated March 2nd, 2011 and March 24, 2012 were sent to Julia Gillard via Australia Post with Delivery Confirmation and provided extensive evidence of corruption of the climate science that was supposedly the basis of her policy. Copies are available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.1_Gillard.pdf
And
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.2_Gillard.pdf

My letter to Julia Gillard dated Sunday, October 9th, 2011 by facsimile drew to her attention that her Multi Party Climate Change Commission was apparently misled by its sole *Expert Adviser* on climate science, Will Steffen. See Appendix 9. The facsimile identified the fact that none of the prominent bodies upon whom her CO2 tax and CO2 *trading* scheme and/or ALP MP's and/or members of the MPCCC rely has empirical scientific evidence for her policy. It identified extensive, orchestrated corruption of climate science as documented by its accompanying references. It stated, quote: "*Australians were invited to make submissions to the "Inquiry into Australia's Clean Energy Future". People were given only 7 days to submit. Over 4,000 submissions were received. Only 73 have been accepted as submissions and published. The remainder have been classified as correspondence. Yet parliament's web site says: "There is no prescribed form for a submission to a parliamentary committee." The Deputy Chair is Christine Milne.*" Her office provided auto confirmation of my facsimile's receipt.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.3_GillardFax.pdf

Julia Gillard has repeatedly used the term '*carbon pollution*' to describe CO2. Yet CO2 is not a pollutant. How can it be a pollutant when 97% of Earth's annual CO2 production is by Nature? How can it be when CO2 is essential to all complex life on Earth? How can it be when data cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC reveals that Nature alone determines completely the level of CO2 in Earth's atmosphere? In the open atmosphere CO2 from human sources is not and cannot be a pollutant.

Pages 3 and 4 of the document entitled *Reclaiming our Country and our Planet using Truth: Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Facts* reveal that CO2 does not meet any of the criteria needed for being classified a pollutant. Replying to John Cribbes' inquiry, Dr. Mary Jean Bürer scientific consultant with the UN IPCC reveals that, quote: "*On your question about whether CO2 is a pollutant, I can not answer that as I have not found the answer in one of our reports.*"
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom1-CO2.pdf

Yet Julia Gillard has publicly stated that UN IPCC reports are the basis of her party's climate policy. On what basis did she repeatedly state or imply that CO2 is a pollutant?

Although the level of CO2 in Earth's atmosphere is determined by Nature alone, scientific studies repeatedly prove conclusively that higher levels of CO2 are highly beneficial. Earth's history confirms that plant and animal life thrived when CO2 levels were many times current levels.

Carbon is a black solid or clear diamond. *Carbon pollution* is a black solid. CO2 though is a clear gas essential for all life on Earth. Why does Julia Gillard repeatedly misrepresent CO2?

Terminology around carbon has evolved to drive the politics for taxing energy and to hide reality. Initially, in the mid-1970's the supposed problem was global cooling due to use of coal and oil. Four years after 1976's small step rise in global temperature and without any empirical scientific evidence the forecast claim was for catastrophic global warming due to human CO2. That became forecast catastrophic climate change due to CO2. That was twisted into climate change due to carbon. Then it became climate change due to carbon. That became climate change due to carbon. That morphed into climate change due to carbon pollution. An attempt was then made to morph into climate disruption due to carbon. Then we were fed claims of extreme weather due to carbon. Then the action needed was to *trade* and/or tax carbon. Then when the word *tax* soured it became necessary to put a *price on carbon*. Then according to journalist Niki Savva in April 2012 polls soured dramatically for the government and the word *tax* was dropped. Treasurer Wayne Swan "*carefully omitted any reference to it in his (budget) speech*".

Quoting Niki Savva further: "*The new (carbon tax) ads make no mention of it, and now the Prime Minister and her ministers studiously avoid it too*." That was after Julia Gillard said she wouldn't play semantics and was "*frank enough*" to say it would be a tax.
(The Weekend Australian, Saturday, April 19th, 2012, entitled *X-rated carbon talk gets wiped out* located by Google here:
http://chrisback.com.au/HotIssues/tabid/88/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/226/X-rated-carbon-talk-gets-wiped.aspx

Reluctantly, and only when necessary to discuss the tax, government MP's now refer to the tax as *pricing carbon*. The government was careful to talk about the "*compensation*" described as the "*household assistance package*" without mentioning the tax. Why did they not mention that the tax is an upward-ratcheting open-ended tax designed to be ratcheted upwards without limit? Why did the advertisements not mention that the intent, as previously publicly stated by Julia Gillard, is to hurt energy users with the intent to deter use of energy? Why does the government not mention that future rises will not be compensated?

Julia Gillard initially bragged that the tax was designed to deter energy use by raising prices significantly to hurt energy users to change behaviours. Why does she now not discuss that? Why does the government not discuss the fact that advances leading to modern civilisation and protecting the environment result from cheap, reliable, high-energy-density fuels containing carbon?

Together with Wayne Swan, Julia Gillard advised Kevin Rudd to dump his CO2 *trading* scheme in 2010. Soon afterwards, to depose Kevin Rudd Julia Gillard condemned the government she co-led since inception in 2007 as "*losing its way*". Yet she had personally assessed Kevin Rudd before entering into partnership with him to depose Kim Beezley as party leader. She was Deputy Prime Minister of the government that she said had lost its

way. She was part of the government that proudly pushed increases in coal exports from Australia yet wanted to raise prices to deter Australians from burning that same clean coal. Why did she want to give our nation's competitors the advantage of high-efficiency clean Aussie coal yet stop Australians using the same coal? CO2 produced from Aussie coal burned overseas is identical with that burned in Australia. Yet within Australia it now attracts an open-ended upward-ratcheting tax and *trading* scheme. This is designed to belt electricity users and consumers throughout the nation with massive future price increases across markets of almost all goods and services—without compensation.

Before her election she promised to impose no tax on CO2. Within months of being elected she pushed a CO2 tax AND a CO2 *trading* scheme.

Is Julia Gillard employing deception in regard to Tony Abbott? He's apparently happily married to his wife and is father to three daughters. He has two sisters. His Chief of Staff is a woman. Yet while defending Peter Slipper MP and despite his anti-female comments Julia Gillard fabricated a case claiming that Tony Abbott is a misogynist.

Perhaps in some ways the job Julia Gillard is attempting to do on Tony Abbott reminds of the job he did on Pauline Hanson. That reportedly was based on Tony Abbott's deviations from the truth.
http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2003/08/22/1061529330032.html

The Australian newspaper's Editor-At-Large, Paul Kelly details Julia Gillard's empty promises in his article entitled *Incurable addiction to over-promising in PM's 'government for all seasons'*. Quote:
"*Ultimately, it goes to character. Whether it is Rudd or Gillard as PM, Labor has an incurable addiction to over-promising. It makes, for reasons of short-term politics without proper assessment, pledges of long-run consequence. This is a bad way to run a country. Yet Labor has done this from day one to the present day. It cannot help itself.*"
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/addiction-to-over-promising-in-julia-gillards-government-for-all-seasons/story-e6frg74x-1226537092324

The government is being hurt by the three-letter words: *tax* and *lie*. If the European carbon pricing system does not collapse and CO2 *trading* prices rise astronomically as the Greens and ALP desire, we will be using two more three-letter words because industry will *die* and cost of living will *fly*.

Mark Dreyfus, QC, Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change

In joining my presentation to Greg Hunt, environmentalist and engineer Gordon Alderson realised the significance of the material presented. Upon conclusion of a public forum addressed by Mark Dreyfus at Melbourne University, Gordon asked Mark Dreyfus to listen to my presentation. Mark Dreyfus invited Gordon to arrange it with a member of Mark Dreyfus' staff. Gordon then exchanged emails and had phone conversations with the nominated staff person. After securing an invitation for me to present to Mark Dreyfus, Gordon's communication with the MP's office culminated in the following email sent to Mark Dreyfus' office on May 4th, 2012:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.4_Dreyfus-Alderson.pdf
Neither Gordon nor I received a reply from Mark Dreyfus' office.

Gordon continued to follow through with the staff member referred by Mark Dreyfus at Melbourne University. Gordon ceased attempts a few weeks later after that person advised that Mark Dreyfus was too busy to have the information presented to him.

As Cabinet Secretary, Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency and Parliamentary Secretary for Industry and Innovation, Mark Dreyfus, with others, is responsible for setting and prosecuting Labor Party climate policy.

Why did Mark Dreyfus renege? He is a QC. He had an opportunity to cross-examine evidence that might be contrary to his Party's beliefs. Gordon conveyed to Mark Dreyfus' staff member that being too busy is not a valid excuse. Was Mark Dreyfus daunted by, or possibly afraid of, the agenda topics?

Months later, on a confidential basis, one of Mark Dreyfus' Labor Party colleagues, with an even busier set of portfolios, had the good grace to accept a presentation. In the subsequent meeting we introduced fundamental points on empirical scientific evidence and on corruption of climate science. My presentation was cut short by the Map's busy schedule and his engaging and productive questions. Nonetheless, he expressed sincere appreciation for receiving significant new material and committed to learning more for himself. As we departed we continued our discussion continued enthusiastically.

The offer remains for Mark Dreyfus to have the presentation delivered to him.

Wayne Swan

Both the current Prime Minister and her predecessor contradicted themselves on their response to the unfounded and fabricated issue of human causation of global warming. As did the current Deputy Prime Minister.

With the reversals and misrepresentations shown by Kevin Rudd, Julia Gillard and Wayne Swan national governance is shattered:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/swan-a-repeat-offender-in-art-of-political-backflip/story-fn53lw5p-1226431097678

This was recently confirmed by comprehensive analysis of Australian federal and state parliaments and governments by Tony Fitzgerald. He concludes that in Australia, quote: "*The body politic is rotten*":
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/the-body-politic-is-rotten/story-e6frg6zo-1226532286572

Martin Ferguson:

Kevin Rudd confirmed on ABC-TV's '*QandA*' program that the federal government cabinet includes many opponents of taking action against human CO2.

It has been reported and widely discussed among scientists, politicians and members of the public that Labor Minister the Hon Martin Ferguson is strongly sceptical about human causation of global warming. Watch Tim Flannery confirming Martin Ferguson as a climate sceptic after 32 minutes elapses in the video available here:
fora.tv/2010/05/12/Tim_Flannery_Now_or_Never

Kate Ellis

My facsimile to Kate Ellis dated Thursday, October 6th, 2011 discusses the ALP preventing federal parliament's only physicist, Dr. Dennis Jensen from tabling relevant documents in parliament:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.5a_KateEllisfax.pdf
She failed to reply. Is the ALP afraid of scientifically peer-reviewed papers? If so, why?

Craig Emerson

My analysis of an article by Craig Emerson, Minister for Trade and Competitiveness published in The Weekend Australian on Saturday, December 8th, 2012 reveals that his article raises many serious questions:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.5_CraigEmerson.pdf

Craig Emerson's article contradicts empirical scientific evidence on climate. His article endorses, supports and promotes corruption of climate science.

The core issue is that contrary to what Craig Emerson claims, Earth is not warming. Yet merely by responding to and thereby effectively debating with the range of tax and economic topics he raises one can fall into the trap of apparently legitimising his view that human CO2 production needs to be cut. Fundamentally, empirical scientific evidence reveals no need to consider any cuts. Instead, history and real-world evidence from modern industrialised nations reveals that benefits of cheap, reliable, environmentally responsible electricity need to be promoted for the sake of humanity and the environment. This is a clear result from the last 160 years of industrialisation. See appendices 14 and 15. Why is economist Craig Emerson advocating reversing the lessons from history, science and the environment?

Appendices 4 and 4a reveal that the Earth is not warming and there has been nothing unusual in either the modest amount or rate of warming during cyclic warming periods during the last 160 years. Nor has there been anything unusual in the intervening cooler periods.

Why is Craig Emerson validating and pushing unfounded claims in reports by the World Bank and the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO)? Why is he endorsing their contradiction of empirical scientific reasoning? Why does he endorse their spurious unfounded scary claims of a projected four-degree and six-degree rise respectively? Did he not wonder that one is double and the other triple the previous unfounded feared claim previous two-degree claim? Did he not wonder that the WMO's scary report is fifty percent more than the World Bank's?

Aren't such basic questions fundamental for a supposed economist?

Whether conscious and deliberate or lazily negligent, Craig Emerson's behaviour illustrates how senior MP's worldwide pushed the global agenda.

His article raises several serious questions including:

- What is Craig Emerson's motive in pushing the UN's global agenda?
- How many senior MP's of both major political parties are doing the same?
- Why?
- What other policies currently claimed to be based on scientific evidence or processes are similarly unscientific and unfounded? eg, decimation of Australia's fishing industry and regulation of Murray Darling Basin food growing.

It's disturbing that the federal Minister for Trade and Competitiveness is endorsing the shackling of Australian industry and families with a cost burden not levied on our international competitors. It's disturbing that in doing so he contradicts empirical scientific evidence and economic fundamentals. It's disturbing that an economist considers the imposition of an arbitrary tax and cost burden to be an economic enhancement. Is the real role of the minister to thwart trade and Australia's economic competitiveness consistent with the Lima Declaration? Why?

Craig Emerson's article raises profoundly serious questions and issues explored in Appendix 14.

Soon after his endorsement of the unscientific WMO and World Bank reports, the UN IPCC's draft Fifth Assessment Report was leaked to the public. Embarrassingly it reveals that even the crooked UN IPCC is now admitting that solar factors influence climate.

Craig Emerson's predicament is a warning for all politicians. Empirical scientific evidence is again asserting itself over dogma, supposition and unscientific projections from unvalidated computerised numerical models contradicting empirical scientific evidence. It's becoming dangerous for politicians to speak without doing their due diligence.

Broadly, whereas previously politicians fomenting unfounded fear were lauded they're now being seen increasingly as fools—or worse, dishonest.

Analysis of Craig Emerson's article and the position he advocates reveals the following:

- His core claim about HUMAN CO2 is false;
- His core claim about HUMAN CO2 contradicts empirical scientific evidence;
- His advocacy is supporting and enabling corruption of climate *science*;
- He is advocating economic madness that will seriously damage Australia and Australians economically;
- He is supporting two unelected corrupt foreign organisations being the World Bank and the UN with the latter acting through its World Meteorological Organisation. In doing so he is endorsing their global agenda in a way contrary to Australia's national interests and while undermining Australia's sovereignty.

Anthony Albanese

On Thursday, September 1st, 2011 I personally handed Anthony Albanese's office staff in Marrickville a letter introducing him to the corruption of climate science and to the empirical scientific evidence on climate. It was written in my voluntary capacity as Project Manager for independent, non-aligned voluntary organisation known as The Galileo Movement. A copy of the letter is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.5d_AnthonyAlbaneseletter.pdf
My letter was accompanied by a succinct summary of facts on carbon dioxide available here:
http://www.conscious.com.au/galileodocuments/CO2_4page_summary.pdf
The summary to which the letter refers summarised the empirical scientific evidence surrounding the claim that human CO2 caused global warming and detailed the massive corruption of climate science that is the basis of government climate policy. Anthony Albanese is the Government's Leader of the House and Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

No reply was received from Anthony Albanese or his office.

ALP Members of Parliament

Beyond Martin Ferguson, another senior government MP personally advised scientist Stewart Franks that he is strongly sceptical that human CO2 caused warming. Scientists and politicians have reliably informed me that many ALP federal MP's are sceptics.

Yet none speak publicly about their position. Or is it that they're not reported publicly? Or, as seems more likely and as Tony Fitzgerald states, individual MP's are herded into parliament like sheep in the sheep-crush of party-politics.

I have provided written material via Australia Post Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation and/or confirmed facsimile to other federal MP's including all senators and individually to many MP's including Kim Carr, Simon Crean, Peter Garrett, Alan Griffin, Joel Fitzgibbon, Mark Furner, Claire Moore, Richard Marles and John Faulkner.

Emails have been repeatedly sent to all federal ALP MP's providing empirical scientific evidence contradicting ALP climate policy and detailing corruption of science as the basis of ALP climate policy.

When MP's fail to act our nation is being comprehensively undermined. The Labor-Greens policy on CO2 as part of the UN's global Agenda 21 campaign (Appendix 14) extends far wider and deeper than does the tax. It has far reaching consequences and cedes national sovereignty to UN bureaucrats. Graham Williamson documents his concerns for Australia based on careful gathering and analysis of publicly available facts and correspondence with national and state MP's and local councillors. Why is the once-great people's party selling out the people?
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.6_PoliticalResponsestoAG21.pdf
And:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.7_ClimateJusticeDebtLegalOwe.pdf
Graham Williamson widens the scope of his questions of Labor's actions on climate as part of a broader picture.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.8_WereWePushedV2.pdf
For more on UN Agenda 21 see Appendices 14 and 16 and:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy.php
Individual documents are available through this link:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy_links.php

As shown below, Greg Hunt's position on global warming is untenable. That has not stopped him though from analysing scrapped ALP programs. Such immense governmental waste and confusion is expected when policy is based on perceived popularity and/or ideology rather than scientific facts:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/climate-change-policy-made-on-the-run-greg-hunt/story-e6frg6xf-1226498135598
And:
http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/just_talking_about_the_weather/

My conclusion is that ALP members of parliament include a surprisingly large percentage of politicians afraid to speak honestly of their own views. It seems clear that party power brokers hold enormous power over individual MP's. This is aided by the sadly widespread human condition that prevents many people from speaking their truth.

Tony Fitzgerald has come to the same conclusion:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/the-body-politic-is-rotten/story-e6frg6zo-1226532286572

Strength within individuals and organisations comes from diversity of viewpoints openly considered and tolerated. History and personal experience reveal that strength is undermined by control that breeds weakness. Aboriginal and former bureaucrat Kerryn Pholi illustrates this outstandingly in her article entitled *Feelings no Motive for Respect*:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/feelings-no-motive-for-respect/story-e6frg6zo-1226531719332

Arguably Graham Richardson's mantra of doing "*whatever it takes*" has guided the NSW Labor Right faction to devastation and is destroying the ALP federally. Control and subservience have replaced freedom and initiative. The result is decay and naked opportunism that reveal to the electorate that the ALP does not care.

Sadly, the opposition Liberal Party reveals little improvement. Before examining the Liberals though, let's review the ALP's alliance partners: the Greens Party.

Greens

During the last three years I have sent letters by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to Bob Brown and Christine Milne. These include letters revealing false, unfounded and disrespectful claims made by them against power station workers and coalminers providing valuable service to the community and nation. Their claims contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Written correspondence has been exchanged with Greens Senators Scott Ludlam and Sarah Hansen-Young. In their responses both failed to answer my request for evidence.

I have letters from Greens Senators advising me that they rely on Christine Milne for their position on cutting CO2 production and on increasing energy prices.

During a public forum in Brisbane I shared the podium with Larissa Waters, then senator-elect for Queensland. I requested her to provide real-world (empirical scientific) evidence that HUMAN CO2 caused global warming. She failed to provide such evidence. Yet she publicly advocates cutting HUMAN CO2 production and increasing energy prices.

At the same time, I publicly challenged her and Christine Milne to a debate on global warming's three key topics: (1) the UN IPCC—the basis of the government's and Green's climate policies, (2) real-world empirical scientific evidence—the only sound basis for climate policy, and (3) the economics—the impacts of climate policy. I proposed that such a debate be followed by an open forum enabling the audience to hold speakers accountable for their statements and data sources.

Larissa Waters jumped to her feet to quickly reject any debate. Immediately after the forum she quietly reaffirmed personally that the debate "*would not happen*". Yet this is the party that publicly states it will freely enter discussions with and listen to the public. Of what are the Greens afraid?

Christine Milne uses climate fabrications contradicting empirical scientific evidence to justify taking and locking up land:
http://www.smh.com.au/environment/conservation/federal-wildlife-corridors-plan-heading-in-the-right-direction-20121104-28rz9.html

Why are the Greens enabling international bankers to make windfall profits out of thin air by fabricating and *trading* CO2 credits. The Greens are said to be socialists. The bankers are falsely said to be capitalists. We'll return to this in Appendix 14.

When I raised this at the forum, why did Larissa Waters respond only with implied ridicule?

Globally, the Greens, their allies and/or their policies have their roots in controlling people. Many references document this fact. They include:

- Robert Zubrin (2012) *Merchants of Despair*, Chapter 14 and other pages;
- Elaine Dewar (1995) *Cloak of Green*, throughout the book;

- James Delingpole (2012) *Killing the Earth to Save it*, throughout the book.

The Greens are traced back to German NAZIs cloaking antihuman policies in green camouflage to attract youth supporters. That's documented.

Appendix 14 expands on this. For now consider *Welcome to the New World Order* as Chapter 8 in James Delingpole's book *Killing the Earth to Save It*. It's available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1409_Delingpolechapter8.pdf
The book is available at:
http://www.connorcourt.com/catalog1/index.php?main_page=product_info&products_id=197#.UOnrZI4WzRo

The Greens are openly sponsoring and supporting the UN's Agenda 21 campaign for global control of people, resources, finances and energy and for theft of private property rights. Why are the Greens supporting this undemocratic campaign to control people? Why are they supporting an unscientific program contradicting empirical evidence? See Appendix 14 and the work of Robert Zubrin, Elaine Dewar and James Delingpole referenced above.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/125.9_RaceToTheBottomFinal_15.06.12.pdf

Former Greens Party leader Senator Bob Brown publicly advocates global government. In doing so is he committing treason?
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2_MpLocFQus&feature=player_embedded

My conclusion is that Bob Brown and Christine Milne misled the people of Australia on climate and on taxing and *trading* CO2. Why? In repeatedly misleading the people of Australia the Greens, at best, failed to do their due diligence. Why?

Combined with an understanding of material presented in Appendices 14 and 15, it's becoming easy to understand why social media now contains comments such as, quote: "*Greens lie, people die*". Australians are now rightly turning against the Greens.

National connections and global alliances within the UN's Agenda 21 campaign for global control of resources, energy, finances and people together with stealing and abolishing private property rights lead to the question: *What is the Greens' real agenda?*

Next consider the supposed parliamentary opposition: the Coalition.

Federal Coalition political parties

In my naïve belief that politicians are honest, strong and loyal to the electorate I held personal discussions with members of the Coalition including senior MP's and junior MP's. All such discussions revealed politicians strongly sceptical that human CO2 caused global warming. All consistently reassured me that Tony Abbott seems sceptical. They assure that the overwhelming majority of opposition MP's are sceptical. It seems likely that all National Party MP's are sceptics.

My understanding of the broad timeline of the Coalition's position on human CO2 is as follows. Prior to 2007 many coalition MP's were publicly sceptical and strongly so. Canny politician John Howard seemed sceptical yet remained uncommitted while opposing action against human CO2.

Kevin Rudd made inroads on the Coalition electorally using Work Choices and global warming during the 2007 election campaign. As he did so John Howard stated that he would introduce a CO2 '*trading*' scheme in 2012 on the apparent presumption that other nations would do the same. That became part of the Liberal Party's election campaign and policy.

It effectively endorsed Kevin Rudd's and Penny Wong's unfounded and unscientific claims that human production of CO2 needed to be cut.

After the election defeat the Coalition timidly continued its climate policy under leadership of Brendan Nelson and later under Malcolm Turnbull.

Later Tony Abbott stated publicly that he personally disliked the policy yet thought it necessary politically.

Reportedly when attending a Victorian country hall meeting Tony Abbott felt people's hostility to the CO2 tax. He realised that the tide was changing rapidly on global warming. He moved to change the policy. Reportedly he could sense the growing strong opposition from Liberal Party members.

Significantly, the Liberal Party was reportedly awoken from its climate slumber by a massive spontaneous uncoordinated grass roots campaign. *The people* deposed Malcolm Turnbull as leader. Liberal MP's replaced him with Tony Abbott who had previously publicly declared himself to be sceptical.

Yet within days of his election as leader Tony Abbott made it clear that the Liberal Party would spend billions of dollars on *direct action* and regulations to cut CO2 production.

Through failure to do their due diligence and/or their weakness and lack of integrity the Liberals effectively endorsed the need for action to cut human CO2 production. Subtly, the Liberals endorsed Kevin Rudd's and Julia Gillard's call for action. In doing so they added perceived legitimacy to ALP-Green calls for CO2 taxing and *trading*.

Afraid of the rampant, ignorant media driven by its emotive herd mentality Liberals abdicated governance. The media effectively ruled Australia.

Greg Hunt:

Greg Hunt is Coalition spokesperson on global warming (aka climate change). On Tuesday, January 11th, 2011 I met with my federal MP, Jane Prentice in her office and in the company of her aide Emma Yabsley. I presented material revealing the corruption of climate science and shared fundamental empirical scientific evidence that Nature, not human CO2 drives climate. It was clear that while much of the material was new to Jane and Emma, they were not surprised. Jane offered to arrange meetings with Malcolm Turnbull and Greg Hunt. I agreed.

During a phone call from Greg Hunt we agreed to meet at his electorate office in Hastings, Victoria. On Wednesday April 27th, 2011 we met in the company of engineer and environmentalist Gordon Alderson.

For the initial minutes of our meeting Greg seemed closed. After he was presented with a demonstration illustrating CO2 levels and sources he opened, showed sincere interest and engaged in the meeting. The half hour meeting was extended by Greg to 75 minutes and beyond his other commitment to address a public meeting. Greg concluded by saying it was one of the best presentations he'd had and requested material. A file of material four (4) centimetres in thickness was left with Greg and an electronic copy forwarded two days later to make it easier for him and his staff to check my documents.

Two months later on July 5th, 6th, 12th and 20th though his email responses failed to answer my simple question, quote: "*Have you found any evidence to contradict my basic points on the corruption of climate science by the UN IPCC and the government? Have you found any evidence contradicting my points on carbon dioxide? If you have found any such evidence, please send."* Thrice his answer avoided my fundamental yet simple question.

A summary of my dealings with Greg Hunt and dated Saturday, March 10th, 2012 was sent to him. It is available here:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Greg_Hunt_March_2012_Highlight.pdf

Greg Hunt's reply dated April 16th, 2012 expressed his quote, "*belief*". That's a curious basis for political policy affecting 22 million people and our nation's future. Has the Coalition spokesperson for climate become the Coalition high priest for pagan rituals? Are we reverting to ancient sacrificial practices to climate gods? Is this a return to witchcraft?
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.1_GregHunt.pdf

My reply dated Friday, March 13th, 2012 stated, quote: "*You continue to support a lie based on fraud. Your unfounded advocacy contradicts empirical science and is harming Australian citizens. I call on you to either publicly start telling the truth based on empirical evidence or resign.*"

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.2_GregHuntResign.pdf
Please note that the date on my letter was in error since Friday was the 16th not the 13th.

Other earlier correspondence with Greg Hunt includes my letter dated Wednesday March 2nd, 2011
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.3_GregHunt.pdf

Thursday, March 24th, 2011 accompanying his copy of my letter to Ross Garnaut:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.4_GregHunt.pdf

My letter dated Thursday, April 19th, 2012 to my local MP, Jane Prentice following contact with her office by Greg Hunt. My letter openly discussed the behaviour of Greg Hunt and Malcolm Turnbull. Copies of my letter were sent to both.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.5_JanePrentice.pdf
What prevented Greg asking me directly? Why have I not received a reply from either Jane Prentice my representative in federal parliament or Greg Hunt or Malcolm Turnbull?

There are many other emails, facsimiles and letters in my correspondence with Greg Hunt. It all seems so pointless. One wonders whether Greg Hunt cares about integrity, science or the environment. What is the point of having intelligence, debating skills, a legal background and experience in international government relations without the courage to abide by facts and advocate a policy based on empirical scientific evidence?

In his email dated April 15th, 2012 Greg Hunt advised Peggy Balfour that, quote: "*And no, I am not aware of the details of Agenda 21.*" He worked on strategy for The World Economic Forum in 2000 and 2001 and is Coalition and Shadow Cabinet spokesperson on the Environment. Yet Greg Hunt professes lack of detailed knowledge of the key UN program driving global environmental policy. As an MP protecting the rights of people in his Australian electorate why does he not know of the insidious UN Agenda 21?
Graham Williamson has shared some of his carefully researched material with Greg Hunt. His material is now available here:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy.php
Individual documents are accessible through this link:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy_links.php

Greg Hunt was interviewed on Radio 2GB, Monday, November 5th, 2012:
http://www.2gb.com/audioplayer/5565

After 1 minute and 32 seconds elapsed time (1:32) he said, quote "*We all have to be obsessive about making sure that we deal with the facts. We don't fit the facts to the politics* … (2:00) *Yes, I do believe that there is a human impact but people are entitled to their views and what they're not entitled to do though is to falsely attribute outcomes where the evidence isn't there.*"

(2:45) "*We should all be focussed on practical things that we can do in our own lives rather than trying to fit the facts to the politics*."

(4:00) "*We'll make sure that science is done on a scientific basis without any political input.*" On this he's already failing by supporting corruption of science.

Greg Hunt has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for his belief that human CO2 caused warming. His belief contradicts empirical scientific evidence. His belief continues despite extensive documented evidence that corruption of climate science is orchestrated, pervasive and extensive. That evidence of corruption cannot be sensibly refuted. Despite my repeated requests, Greg Hunt's responses have failed to refute that evidence.

Greg Hunt correctly claims that the government is forcing people to pay more for their electricity (and for other goods and services) directly via the CO2 tax and through taxes paying $11 million dollars for advertising the CO2 tax.

Just as Julia Gillard has no scientific or ethical moral basis for her CO2 tax and CO2 *trading* scheme, Greg Hunt has no scientific or ethical moral basis for his Direct Action plan requiring billions of dollars in taxpayer funding.

My conclusion is that Greg Hunt cannot be trusted to pursue policy based on scientific facts. What restricts him from pursuing honest policy based on empirical scientific evidence? What stops him pursuing the restoration of scientific integrity by rooting out corruption of science?

Greg Hunt is an intelligent and articulate debater. He has been educated as a lawyer. His behaviour raises questions including the following: What drives his belief and his public, political stance contradicting empirical scientific evidence? Is he stifled by weakness of character or lack of integrity or is he bowing to party power brokers afraid of the media or is he pursuing another agenda?

Malcolm Turnbull:

Malcolm Turnbull is known as a highly intelligent barrister. He was Chair and Managing Director of international bank Goldman Sachs in Australia from 1997 to 2001 and partner in Goldman Sachs from 1998 to 2001.

He is known for advocating that human CO2 controls Earth's global climate. How is it that a barrister could hold such a view while lacking any empirical evidence and lacking any supporting logical scientific reasoning proving causation?

Goldman Sachs has been described as a company whose former executives remain strongly connected with and loyal to the company. Goldman Sachs is intimately connected to CO2 '*trading*' and reportedly owned 10% of the Chicago Climate Exchange when Al Gore's company was the Exchange's fifth largest shareholder. Goldman Sachs is one of the major international banks expected to earn huge windfall profits by trading on thin air (Appendix 14). Malcolm Turnbull illogically sacrificed his position as Liberal Party leader by pushing his CO2 '*trading*' scheme against the wishes of federal Liberal MP's.

Malcolm Turnbull has been sent extensive referenced documentation of UN IPCC corruption that is the basis of the UN IPCC's core claim on human CO2. For example, material accompanying my letters dated:
Thursday, July 30th, 2009 copy of letter to all senators when Malcolm Turnbull was Opposition Leader:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/121.4_SenatorsJuly30,2009.pdf
Wednesday, March 2nd, 2011:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.6_Turnbull.pdf
Thursday, March 24th, 2011:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/126.7_Turnbull.pdf

Quoting from my letter dated Thursday, April 19th, 2012 to my local MP, Jane Prentice:
"*Jane, on Tuesday January 12th, 2011 you will recall that I met with you and your assistant Emma Yabsley in your Chapel Hill office. During our meeting I felt very encouraged because you seemed to convey that you had previously been wary of public claims that human carbon dioxide caused global warming, aka climate change. You seemed relieved and delighted with the evidence I presented. You then enthusiastically asked if I'd like to meet with Malcolm Turnbull. I relished the thought and accepted immediately. You asked if I'd like to meet with Greg Hunt. My response was lukewarm because, based on my observations of Greg in the media I didn't think it would mean much. I declined. Then changed my mind and accepted your offer.*"
And:
"*Returning to last year, from memory after our meeting Emma called me to initially advise that Malcolm Turnbull's staff had advised that they would call to arrange a meeting for me with him. After receiving no call I happened to meet Emma in a parliament house Canberra hallway and advised that Malcolm Turnbull's staff had not called. She was surprised and promised to follow through. As usual, Emma kept her commitment and subsequently advised that Malcolm Turnbull's staff had advised that he would not meet me.*"

Malcolm Turnbull publicly claims global warming caused to human CO2 production. His position and advocacy for *trading* CO2 contradicts extensive credible written evidentiary scientific documentation. As a respected former barrister did he avoid or did he merely fail to exercise adequate and essential due diligence?

Tony Abbott:

My letter dated Wednesday, March 2nd, 2011 by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to Tony Abbott accompanied a summary of four years' research into global warming and associated corruption of climate science.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/127.1_Abbott.pdf

My letter dated Thursday, March 24th, 2011 by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to Tony Abbott provided him with a copy of my detailed letter to Ross Garnaut detailing extensive corruption of climate science.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/127.2_Abbott.pdf

On ABC-TV's "*4 Corners*" program entitled '*The Carbon War*' broadcast on Monday, September 19th, 2011 he was asked this question, quote:
"*MARIAN WILKINSON: Do you endorse the CSIRO position on this issue?*"

His answer, quote: "*TONY ABBOTT: Well, I accept that climate change is real, that humanity makes a contribution and that we should have a strong and effective policy to deal with it.*"
http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/stories/2011/09/15/3318364.htm

My letter dated Saturday, March 10th, 2012 by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to Tony Abbott accompanied a copy of my letter of the same date to Greg Hunt. It said, quote:
"*The attached letter to Greg Hunt raises serious concerns about the opposition you lead. It discusses the opposition's lack of integrity. It uncovers a huge opportunity for you to reclaim government benches quickly.*

We cannot afford another 18 months of Julia Gillard's lies, waste and abuse. Instead of timidly waiting, you can capture government benches soon by exposing massive systemic corruption and demanding resignations of at least four vulnerable ALP and Greens MP's and two independents.

Julia Gillard is languishing in polls. As is the government. Yet you too are personally low in polls. People are not rushing to you; they're running from Labor. That means that after you enter government every little challenge you face will see people falling back to Labor.

Showing strength of character in exposing corruption at the heart of Labor and Greens climate policies that threaten all Aussies will earn you enormous respect, admiration, loyalty and trust.

***Trust is achievable with lower risk than your current strategy's risk**. The opportunity is enormous and when grasped will end internal party dissent on climate to unite your Coalition. We cannot afford Julia Gillard as PM. Nor Malcolm Turnbull. Please step up.*"

Tony Abbott's reply dated March 26th, 2012 is here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/127.3_AbbottReply.pdf

My response dated Friday, April 13th, 2012 said, quote:
"*Your letter dated March 26th, 2012 is acknowledged. Re-reading it I feel deeply dismayed, annoyed and concerned. It fails to address serious matters raised in my letter of March 10th, 2012. It essentially says: 'thank you, please visit Liberal Party websites'.*

Tony, you have been reliably reported as publicly stating the science underpinning claims that human CO2 caused global warming are, quote, "crap". Senior and other Coalition MP's with whom I've had personal meetings confirm that as your current view.

Yet your publicly stated position over time has varied wildly. In some of those positions your statements have been disarmingly truthful. At other times you contradicted truth.

The Gillard-Rudd government has been disastrous. It threatens huge damage to Australia. I would be pleased to share extensive detailed documentation of the government-Greens orchestrated corruption of climate science using taxpayer funding.

From five years investigating climate science and corruption it's become clear that your political strategy is risky. Social media reveal it needlessly confuses and annoys your core constituency. It reinforces Labor's dishonest, deceitful and destructive position.

Is it not your responsibility to stop dishonesty and restore honest national governance?"

On Wednesday, August 22nd, 2012 I met in parliament house Canberra with one of Tony Abbott's staff. In response to me providing many examples of serious corruption of climate *science* the staff member repeatedly simply affirmed that Tony Abbott would not be changing his climate policy before the next election. That confirmed yet again for me that parliamentary governance in Australia has been smashed.

My discussions with Coalition MP's and their staff reveal that they believe Tony Abbott lacked the courage to tackle the non-problem of global warming openly because he seems afraid of possible media backlash.

My understanding of Tony Abbott's changing positions on global warming (aka climate change) are:

- Sceptic on the supposed science and against taking action against human CO2;
- Quiet during 2007 election campaign;
- Openly disagreed with Malcolm Turnbull's CO2 '*trading*' scheme yet gave his support by publicly stating that it was politically necessary;
- After reportedly witnessing growing public hostility toward Malcolm Turnbull's scheme he opposed Malcolm Turnbull and became Opposition Leader;
- Advocate for Direct Action to cut human CO2;
- Prominent senior and other Coalition MP's advise that Tony Abbott is sceptical of the supposed climate *science* pushing cuts to CO2 production yet wants to maintain a low profile to the next election.

Reportedly, the common thread through this period is his sceptic view on the supposed *science* pushing cuts to human CO2 production.

Given comments by senior and backbench Coalition MP's and given Tony Abbott's own words my conclusion is that the opposition leader lacks the courage of his own convictions and is afraid to publicly express his personal view. This raises questions about the power of the global warming spin machine, the power of nongovernment organisations, the influence of the mainstream media and the motives of Liberal Party powerbrokers.

Coalition Members of Parliament

When articulate and publicly strong climate sceptic Senator Barnaby Joyce falls silent on the issue as he has for many months it raises questions about party groupthink.

I've sent letters by Registered Post and/or facsimile to many federal Coalition MP's. Visits have been made to electorate and/or parliamentary offices for personal meetings with MP's at my family's financial expense.

Emails have been repeatedly sent to all federal ALP MP's providing empirical science and detailing corruption of science as the basis of ALP climate policy.

I know personally of a number of competent federal Coalition MP's including senior MP's who have expressed their frustration with Tony Abbott's silence on known extensive corruption of climate science. They express deep disappointment and bewilderment with his endorsement, contrary to extensive empirical scientific evidence to cutting human CO2 production. They pine for a position that restores integrity.

In Greg Hunt the Liberal Party has someone who was runner-up in an international debating competition, yet fails to debate the science and instead quotes *belief*. Concurrently, Tony Abbott who was previously described as *the hard man of conservative politics* seemingly lacks the courage to publicly speak to his own sceptic convictions and fails to tell the truth on climate science.

The ALP-Greens stance reveals deliberate corruption of Australia's governance. The Coalition's stance confirms that skills and knowledge are for nought without courage, heart and integrity. Australia's governance has been smashed.

Although less frightening than the blatant lies and deceit peddled by the government, the opposition gives little hope for restoring national governance.

Lib-Lab climate opponents or colluders? (Liberal Party-Labor Party)

The Labor Party and Greens have revealed often that they cannot be trusted. Their climate policy contradicts the ALP's and Prime Minister's commitment to the electorate. In pursuit of their political agenda, ALP and Greens MP's contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Sadly the official position of the Liberal Party on climate contradicts empirical science and overrides massive documented evidence of systemic, systematic, pervasive orchestrated corruption of climate science within Australia and across the UN IPCC. In continuing to do so after Coalition MP's, including senior MP's, have been advised in writing of the corruption of climate science makes this an issue of integrity.

On climate I, and both sceptical organisations with which I'm associated (The Galileo Movement and Carbon Sense Coalition) are apolitical, non-aligned and independent.

Despite Prime Minister John Howard's stated refusal to sign the Kyoto Protocol, the government he led effectively stole farmers' property rights without compensation. They did so by working at the time with state ALP premiers to destroy farmers' private property rights. The stated reason for the collusion was to comply with the UN's Kyoto Protocol.

John Howard's letter to then Queensland Premier Peter Beattie, dated February 16th, 2002 was tabled in Queensland parliament. It reveals that effectively farmers' private property rights were stolen using tactics that reportedly circumvented the Australian Constitution.
http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/Hansard-1_Beattie.pdf
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/127.4_HansardReport21stAugust2012SenatorJohnMadiganandSenatorEdwards.pdf

A video of Bob Carr, in his role as NSW Labor Environment Minister, reveals him seemingly boasting of destroying farmers' private property rights without compensation and to aid John Howard:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OBiBOdle-4

This action by the federal government teaming with NSW and Queensland state governments is consistent with the UN campaign to smash freedom by smashing private property rights under its Agenda 21 campaign. This is discussed in Appendix 14 and other appendices. It is introduced here:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GstnDGtQCus&feature=plcp

Here are some consequences of Liberal party policy complying with Kyoto based on unfounded and unscientific claims that human activity will cause global warming:
http://justgroundsonline.com/forum/topics/peter-spencer-101-for-new
http://justgroundsonline.com/group/barnabyjoyce/forum/topics/vegetation-laws-discriminatory?commentId=3535428%3AComment%3A90734&groupId=3535428%3AGroup%3A5934
http://justgroundsonline.com/profile/BarnabyJoyce?xg_source=activity
http://justgroundsonline.com/forum/topics/objectives-from-landowners

This theft of farmers' private property rights was extended by state Labor governments to theft of coastal residents' private property rights under so-called coastal protection legislation. It was based on unvalidated computerised numerical modelling by CSIRO and the UN IPCC. That extension contradicted empirical scientific evidence and occurred despite strong informed protest by residents using empirical scientific evidence.

In 2011 John Howard wrote the foreword for the report entitled *What is Wrong with the IPCC: Proposals for a Radical Reform*. In his foreword he stated, quote: "*Professor McKitrick's report focuses on the reporting procedures of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The intellectual bullying, which has been a feature of the behaviour of some global warming zealots, makes this report necessary reading if there is to be an objective assessment of all of the arguments. The attempt of many to close down the debate is disgraceful, and must be resisted.*"
http://www.rossmckitrick.com/uploads/4/8/0/8/4808045/mckitrick-ipcc_reforms.pdf

Greg Hunt worked for the World Economic Forum from 2001 to 2001, reportedly another global organisation advocating global governance.

How many federal MPs know that Australia has reportedly already signed more than 7,000 UN treaties that effectively destroy national sovereignty? How many of these treaties, if any, were ratified by parliament? Are Map's aware of the specific treaties and their impact? Are Australian citizens aware of them and the pivotal role they play in restricting Australian industry and wealth?

How many MPs know that Gough Whitlam's 1972 signing of the Lima Declaration sold-out Australia?

How many MPs know that the Lima Declaration was ratified in 1975 by Malcolm Fraser, reportedly a member of the Fabian socialists and critic of the Liberal Party for 20 years?

How many MPs know Paul Keating potentially gave away Australia by signing the 1972 Rio Treaty?

How many MPs are aware of Greg Combet's comments leading to Rio +20 in June 2012 when the sinister UN Agenda 21 Sustainability campaign was enshrined to the detriment of Australians?

How many federal MPs are aware of the Copenhagen Treaty that Kevin Rudd wanted so desperately to sign? He tried to do so without a parliamentary debate or even mention of its key clauses? Are Map's aware of Copenhagen's provisions that ceded national sovereignty to the UN, gave UN control over aspects of national finances, over resource allocation and over energy policy? Are they aware it eroded private property rights? Ceding sovereignty over so many crucial aspects of our life and lifestyle would've given the UN control over Australia and smashed national sovereignty. Governance does not require elections. A general overview is provided here on Copenhagen and Agenda 21 provisions:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/restoring_morality_justice.php

And:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/protecting_freedom.php
With more details here:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy.php
Individual documents are available through this link:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/australia_democracy_links.php

Are Map's aware that Copenhagen's failure didn't stop UN bureaucrats because some of the provisions were then implemented by the G20? Others are being pushed as part of the UN's Agenda 21 campaign stage-managed at the UN's Rio +20 conference.

Are Map's aware that private property rights are fundamental to personal freedom and rule of law?

The self-proclaimed party of personal enterprise and freedom, the Liberal Party, in effect has acted as a socialist state controller.

Are Map's aware of the erosion of common law based on the Magna Carta and replacement by arbitrary and sometimes unfounded regulation? Are they aware that reportedly some of our current regulations could be unconstitutional? Are they aware that bogus *science* is not restricted to justifying loss of national sovereignty? Are they aware of reportedly serious shortcomings in the supposed *science* driving government control of the Murray-Darling Basin, marine reserves and parks, land-clearing restrictions and vegetation regulations, … and many other aspects of agriculture and industry?

Are Greg Hunt and Tony Abbott treating Aussies as if they think we're stupid? Or asleep?

Other nations have awoken to the reality of climate fraud. They've, dumped or bypassed or undermined their costly useless and wasteful renewable energy subsidies, scrap CO2 '*trading*' schemes, dismantle climate change bureaucracies and begin investigations into climate '*science*'. Despite this, Australia is introducing a CO2 ''*trading*' scheme beginning with a fixed price for two years as a CO2 tax. Australia is in this mess because of party politics trumping and overriding integrity. Gutlessness and/or weakness and/or lazy ignorance are overriding integrity and national governance.

Greg Hunt leads Coalition climate policy by ignoring documentation of extensive UN IPCC corruption together with misrepresentation of climate science by prominent alarmist academic advocates and the CSIRO. He contradicts empirical science. He fails to provide any empirical evidence or scientific logic for his position that he admits is just a *belief*.

The NSW Coalition promised to end coastal protection legislation that was based on CSIRO projections from unscientific unvalidated computerised numerical models. Now local council officers are attempting to destroy coastal residents' private property rights in contradiction of empirical scientific evidence. This is discussed in more detail below.

In recent years and until recent NSW and Queensland state elections, Aussie voters have turned away from the main parties and turned to independents and minor parties. Let's consider them next.

Independent Members of Parliament

Rob Oakeshott

Independent federal MP and member of Julia Gillard's Multi Party Climate Change Committee (MPCCC), Rob Oakeshott was advised by me in writing that Will Steffen seemingly misled the committee. Separately and independently Peter Bobroff AM advised him similarly in writing. See Appendix 9.

From his responses he seems unconcerned that the Committee that recommended parliament impose a tax and *trading* scheme on CO2 was itself apparently misled by its sole so-called '*Expert Adviser*' on climate science, chemical engineer Will Steffen.
http://tome22.info/SteffenMtgCooma/IncompetentBriefing.html
And:
http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20111020-aj2-willsteffen.mp3
And:
http://tome22.info/
And:
http://tome22.info/Top/Articles.html
And:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/SteffenMPCCC&IPCC.pdf

Rob Oakeshott had previously agreed to meet with me to discuss his office spreading material misrepresenting climate science. Yet in the weeks leading up to parliament's vote on the CO2 tax he seemed evasive about fulfilling his commitment. Decide for yourself in my facsimile dated Tuesday, October 11th, 2011 summarising communication with his office in that period:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/128.1_Oakeshott.pdf
My facsimile stated, quote: "*As previously offered, I can arrange for you to be briefed by reputable scientists and by experts investigating the fraud and misrepresentations that are the basis of the government's climate policy*".

Why did he fail to honour his commitment to meet with me?

During the previous three years I sent Registered Post letters with Delivery Confirmation, facsimiles producing delivery receipts and emails to Rob Oakeshott. These included my Registered Post letter with Delivery Confirmation dated October 1st, 2011. This was copied to Rob Oakeshott by email the following day:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/128.2_Oakeshott.pdf

Rob Oakeshott has advised that he relies on advice from Australia's government-funded Chief Scientist. On such an important matter that is not adequate. Regardless, the Chief Scientist has no empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global warming that ended in 1998. (Appendix 8). MP's need wider evidence from impartial sources.

A Member of the NSW Legislative Council, Melinda Pavey spoke about Rob Oakeshott during a radio interview on June 6th, 2012:
http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120606-aj-paveshott.mp3
If accurate, her description of Rob Oakeshott's behaviour raises many questions. Could it explain why Rob Oakeshott failed to honour his commitment to meet with me?

Rob Oakeshott is a keystone in the Gillard-Greens coalition government. He effectively holds a casting vote. This makes him the ultimate arbiter and supporter of dishonest and unethical policy and activity. He is thus responsible for the federal government's legislation and activities.

As an indirect consequence of Rob Oakeshott's failure to take action against documented extensive corruption of climate science citizens in his own electorate have reportedly been threatened by Port Macquarie Hastings council with forced eviction from their homes. These include elderly citizens who have dutifully served their community for decades. Yet now, in their well-deserved retirement they face unfounded claims of sea level rise that contradict empirical scientific evidence. That they do so is due partly and significantly to their federal member of parliament, Rob Oakeshott.

What drove the previous ALP state government to enact its coastal protection legislation based on unvalidated CSIRO computerised numerical models projecting future sea level rises that contradicted empirical scientific evidence?

My conclusion is that Rob has failed to fulfil his responsibilities and has not merely failed to do his due diligence he has seemingly avoided doing his due diligence.

Tony Windsor:

Independent federal MP and member of Julia Gillard's Multi Party Climate Change Committee, Tony Windsor was advised by Peter Bobroff in writing that Will Steffen seemingly misled the committee.
http://tome22.info/SteffenMtgCooma/IncompetentBriefing.html
And:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/SteffenMPCCC&IPCC.pdf
And:
http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20111020-aj2-willsteffen.mp3
And:
http://tome22.info/
And:
http://tome22.info/Top/Articles.html

During the previous three years I've sent Registered Post letters with Delivery Confirmation, facsimiles whose receipt was confirmed and emails to Tony Windsor MP. They advised him of extensive corruption of climate science.

My conclusion is that Tony Windsor has failed to do his due diligence. He received detailed correspondence documenting corruption of the supposed climate *science* that is the basis for his parliamentary vote supporting a CO2 tax and *trading* scheme. His behaviour and public statements raise serious questions: has Tony Windsor been negligent in his approach? Has he fulfilled his responsibilities to his electorate and to the people and parliament of Australia?

Andrew Wilkie

During the previous three years I've sent Registered Post letters with Delivery Confirmation, facsimiles whose receipt was confirmed by his office and emails to Andrew Wilkie MP. They advised him of extensive corruption of climate science.

My conclusion is that Andrew Wilkie has failed to do the necessary due diligence.

Bob Katter

General advice sent to all MP's by email together with a personal facsimile to Bob Katter during the previous three years advised him of extensive corruption of climate science.

Bob Katter respected his electorate and economics by proudly voting against the government-Greens tax on CO2.

I've met twice with Bob Katter to discuss corruption of climate science. I conclude that he's surrounded in parliament by weak MPs that place him in a very difficult position. Yet he continues speaking publicly against the CO2 tax and CO2 *trading* scheme. He openly discusses corruption of climate science. As people abandon the major parties offering spin over substance many people are taking issues to Bob Katter for support. He seems swamped yet seemingly continues working sincerely for Australia and his electorate.

National governance smashed

From behaviour of the government and especially its supposed '*leaders*', the opposition Liberals and its '*leaders*', antihuman Greens and most supposed '*independents*' it's clear that national governance has been smashed.

The question that remains is to determine the extent to which loss of governance is deliberate and involving collusion or due to ignorance, confusion and human weakness and reluctance to voice minority opinions within a group?

Are federal politicians victims or perpetrators of climate fraud?
http://www.abc.net.au/news/2010-08-12/survey-reveals-pollies-climate-change-confusion/941166
Please note the following:

- On the so-called *science*, the ABC only presented comments from academic scientists advocating cutting human CO2 production. They were Ove Hoegh-Guldbergh and Andy Pitman. Their behaviours are discussed in Appendix 9. No sceptics' comments were presented;
- Barely half (56%) Australia's politicians trust the UN IPCC. Yet those who do not trust are not heard. Is that because they do not speak of their doubt or because their comments are not reported?
- According to the survey 70% of Australia's politicians state that they're influenced by scientists (and by the UN IPCC). Are they aware of the enormous funding and media profile of scientists advocating cutting human Co2 production? Have politicians done their due diligence? Are they able to do due diligence when government funding controls science and government locks sceptic scientists out of the debate?

Should national governance today be in the hands of national parliament with its growing tentacles into every aspect of Australian life contrary to the Australian Constitution?

Respected corruption fighter Tony Fitzgerald summarises contemporary Australian politics very effectively and succinctly:
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/the-body-politic-is-rotten/story-e6frg6zo-1226532286572

This will be further discussed in Appendices 14, 16 and 17.

State and local governments under siege by climate catastrophists

In 2009 the former New South Wales state Labor government proclaimed coastal protection legislation provisions in a policy based on unvalidated UN IPCC and CSIRO computerised numerical modelling. That modelling contradicted empirical scientific evidence.

The NSW Labor initiative was reportedly driven by federal government relying on unvalidated computerised numerical modelling of sea levels by CSIRO and the UN IPCC.

The policy gave state and local councils control over people's private property rights. Residents were no longer able to obtain permission to renovate or build on their land. Other requirements removed previous rights by owners to make decisions with regard to their land. Property prices plummeted. Insurance costs soared. People's livelihoods were damaged. Futures were insecure and uncertain.

Consistent with UN Agenda 21, NSW Labor's 2009 policy stole private property rights.

The new NSW Liberal-National Coalition state government rescinded the 2009 policy in September 2012. Local councils are now again free to make rational decisions based on empirical scientific evidence.

Yet green ideologists contradicting empirical scientific evidence continue to thwart residents.

In December 2012 the Wyong Council in NSW weighed up the evidence. It chose to not rely on unscientific UN IPCC projections projecting 100 years into the future and contradicting empirical scientific evidence. Instead, council decided to rely on empirical scientific evidence presented by property owners. On that basis it allowed construction of a home by property owners.

Yet at the time of writing in December 2012 council bureaucrats are reportedly objecting to council's decision. That's despite the state government rescinding the old unscientific, unsound and unjustified legislation. The bureaucrats are reportedly doing so without empirical scientific evidence and contrary to empirical scientific evidence. Quoting radio host Chris Smith: "(the elected) *Council decides on what to do*" ... "*Public servants with their own agendas, their own political agendas, their own green political agendas and they won't listen to reason. And of course they won't want to present the data from Fort Denison* (tide gauge, see Appendix 4a). *Oh no, because it doesn't back their own green catastrophes*". His interview of a Wyong councillor and a resident is available here:
http://www.2gb.com/audioplayer/6472
Note the Councillor's comments on the UN IPCC's so-called *data*.

This reveals methods used by bureaucrats and supposed *environmental* groups stealing the political agenda driven by unaccountable bureaucrats. This reflects methods used by the USA's EPA (Appendices 8 and 14) and methods used by federal and NSW Labor governments pushing a green agenda supporting the UN's global UN Agenda 21 campaign.

Councils in Australia, America and elsewhere have been hijacked by the UN Agenda 21 campaign. Councils, states and federal bureaucrats are implementing UN Agenda 21 globally. They incorporate its rules, regulations and restrictions controlling resource use, energy, public movement and transport, finances, food and private property rights. It is revolution by regulation.

Appendix 14 reveals that councils and states are now awakening to greenspeak. They're banning UN Agenda 21. In 2012 Alabama legislated to protect people's rights by becoming the first state in the world to ban UN Agenda 21.

As discussed earlier in this appendix, farmers' private property rights were stolen without compensation by the then Liberal-National federal government colluding with state Labor governments in NSW and Queensland.

The smashing of private property rights is a fundamental component of the global UN Agenda 21 campaign. Unfounded climate alarm is one of its three main components. See Appendix 14.

The following were provided by the NSW group *Coastal Residents Incorporated* protecting private property rights:
Firstly the Bureau of Meteorology's report entitled *Australian Mean Sea Level Survey 2009*:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/128.21_AustMSLsurvey2009(2).pdf
From the BOM's Figure 1a-1e on pages 3-7:

- Sea levels relative to land levels correlate with the Southern Oscillation Index, SOI. This is confirmed in the next reference on *NSW Ocean Water Levels*, below;
- Comparison with the baseline SOI index reveals that some BOM graph trend lines are drawn with a dubiously exaggerated upward slope. Fremantle is the exception although where the slope is exaggerated only since the 1950's;
- The reality is that most tide gauge graphs are fairly flat (see Appendix 4a) and some reveal falling trends. This illustrates the need to check land movements for uplift or slumping as noted repeatedly by Professor Ian Plimer to understand absolute sea level trends.

Note that it is now reportedly difficult to obtain updated *Australian Mean Sea Level Surveys* since 2003. Even the 2009 Mean Sea Level Survey that was previously available through the federal Department of Climate Change is no longer available. Yet that the 2009 Survey includes this comment "*The Australian Mean Sea Level Survey is updated annually* ". The BOM is funded by taxpayers. Why are surveys in recent years now not easily available publicly, if at all? Is it because the survey reports reveal no significant rising sea level trend?

Secondly, from the NSW Department of Public Works report (2011):
http://www.coastalconference.com/2011/papers2011/Ben%20Modra%20Full%20Paper.pdf
And:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/128.22_NSWOceanWaterLevelsNov2011DiscussionPaper.pdf

- Quote: "*Ocean water levels are influenced by a wide range of forces, from regular astronomical forcing, irregular meteorological-driven variability, long period oceanic and climate change effects*". The analysis of these influences requires detailed monitoring over long periods. It says sea level variations (increases/decreases) in the short term are driven by factors such as, quote: "*storm setup, coastally trapped waves, freshwater events and others*".);
- Data needs to be captured over at least 40 years to incorporate known drivers of cyclic sea level variation;
- Sea level rises and falls correlate with the Pacific Oscillation Index;
- The paper says that, quote: "*there are clearly other influences* (on sea level) *that are either unknown or the complex interaction of several drivers*".

Lessons from the Wyong experience include:

- Regardless of their political affiliation, federal and state governments are pushing or at least enabling the stealing of private property rights;
- They do so contrary to the empirical scientific evidence and rely instead on bogus UN IPCC and CSIRO projections from unvalidated computerised numerical modelling that contradicts empirical scientific evidence;
- Bureaucrats pushing green ideology act independently and in doing so contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- The difficulty of changing legislation provisions and opinions once legislation is enshrined. Even when initial legislation contradicts empirical scientific evidence, rescinding is fraught with political and bureaucratic hurdles. Legacies remain to stifle personal freedoms.

Honest, courageous politicians with integrity

Not all politicians are ill informed and/or dishonest and/or weak and lacking in character. We've seen Coalition MP's such as Dennis Jensen (parliament's only physicist), Craig Kelly, Luke Simpkins and many Coalition senators including Barnaby Joyce, Ron Boswell, Julian McGauran, Nick Minchin and Cory Bernard speaking out in public on the utter stupidity of taking action against human CO2 production. Indeed many Coalition senators and members of the House are publicly opposed to taking action against human CO2. Many have failed to endorse the unscientific claim that action is needed to cut human CO2 production.

From ABC-TV's '*4 Corners*' program entitled '*The Carbon War*' broadcast on Monday, September 19th, 2011, quote:
"*MARIAN WILKINSON: But Abbott's own parliamentary secretary is a vocal advocate for climate sceptics.*

CORY BERNARDI: I stand with the mainstream of Australia. The mainstream of Australia do not buy the lies and the disingenuous statements that are being peddled by people who seek to profit from this whole climate change hysteria, and that means that's the Government.

It's a lot of these green groups that have been discredited. It's the paid mouthpieces of the Government...

MARIAN WILKINSON: What about the CSIRO or the Australian Academy of Sciences?

CORY BERNARDI: Well, th-this is this is the issue. There are lots of different organisations that will take different positions on this, but what I've found invariably is that those - or not invariably, there may be some exceptions - but the majority of those that advocate the catastrophic, you know, anthropogenic climate change position are funded by governments."
http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/stories/2011/09/15/3318364.htm

How can it be that on a supposedly objective scientific topic the opposition Leader's Parliamentary Secretary, Senator Bernardi has the opposite view to that promoted by the Opposition Leader? Senator Bernardi's response is strong and clear: government has tainted science. Why is the Opposition Leader pushing policy contradicting empirical scientific evidence and supporting corruption of science?

Former Liberal senator Nick Minchin has spoken out against climate alarm and its corrupted underpinning *science*. He responded to my correspondence with him by providing a copy of his letter holding Kurt Lambeck accountable. One wonders whether Nick Minchin received any reply from Kurt Lambeck and if so whether it was factual and meaningful.
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/128.3_Minchin-Lambeck.pdf

Former Victorian senator and engineer Steve Fielding did his independent due diligence. Senator Fielding listened to scientists from both sides of the discussion. He asked Senator

Wong three fundamental questions that she failed to answer scientifically despite assistance from the Chief Scientist. He then voted against the ALP's CO2 tax and '*trading*' scheme.
http://joannenova.com.au/?p=2292&preview=true

Victorian senator John Madigan has spoken publicly against the claim that human CO2 caused warming. He has discussed extensive corruption underpinning the claim that contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Former NSW ALP Treasurer Michael Costa spoke strongly on the absurdity of penalising human CO2.

Former independent Queensland MP Rob Messenger spoke vigorously against the corruption of climate science underpinning unfounded climate alarm and policies by the state and federal ALP governments and Greens.

Czech Republic President Vaclav Klaus and American Senator James Inhofe speak against the false claim that human CO2 caused warming. Both go further by revealing the fraud driven by the UN to control people and curtail basic human freedom.
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/not_planetary_emergency.pdf

Vaclav Klaus' book entitled *Blue Planet, Green Shackles* provides empirical evidence and common sense proving that freedom is essential to protecting and caring for our natural environment.

The work and dedication of James Inhofe and his staff resulted in the American senate rejecting Cap-and-trade (CO2 *trading*) 95 votes to nil. American senators and House Representatives from both main political parties oppose and denounce taking action against human CO2.

Yet America's EPA continues to do so in defiance of the will of the American people.

A video of Senator James Inhofe discussing UN corruption, UN IPCC corruption, the hidden agenda controlling government agencies bypassing America's congress and its constitution, the UN's hidden agenda driven by George Soros, and Al Gore pushing a socialist agenda:
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/11/20/first-wuwt-tv-video-now-online-senator-inhofe-interview/#more-74567

Smatterings of politicians within the EU and in various nations worldwide are now gathering courage and growing in numbers opposing wasteful renewable energy subsidies and opposing taxing or '*trading*' CO2.

Political opposition is growing worldwide. Encouragingly, politicians are revealing the UN's corruption of climate science as part of the UN's political agenda to cut people's freedom. This agenda will be investigated in Appendix 14.

There is hope

Despite their strong pre-election commitment to rescinding NSW coastal protection legislation changes, the current Coalition government in NSW has seemed reluctant to honour its promise. After pressure from coastal residents and media personalities such as Alan Jones the government has been forced to take action, albeit slowly:
http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/MinMedia/MinMedia12090801.pdf

Conclusions

Federal governance is hostage to the false claim that human CO_2 drives global climate. Parliament lacks empirical scientific evidence of any causal link between global climate and human CO_2. Parliament lacks logical scientific reasoning of causation. Yet both major parliamentary parties advocate cutting CO_2 at huge cost to taxpayers and our nation.

Prominent politicians across parliament contradict empirical scientific evidence and entrench corruption of climate science. They continue to do so despite having received massive irrefutable documented evidence of corruption.

Federal parliamentarians have received solid evidence from many sources disproving government funded *research* and reports. They have had access to considerable publicly available data drawn to their attention. Yet most have failed to do their due diligence.

My voluntary work has included providing many letters by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation and/or facsimile confirmed by recipients. Not one MP has provided any empirical scientific evidence that human CO_2 caused global warming. It is clear that none have empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning that supports cutting human CO_2.

Backflips, twists and turns characterise both main parties on climate. Misrepresentations including some seemingly deliberate deceptions and lies reach to the very top of government. Contradictions and inconsistencies are rife. Integrity and governance are casualties.

A small minority of MP's have done their due diligence and acted with integrity by speaking out and voting against measures to cut human CO_2 production. For example, assisted by scientists with empirical scientific evidence Senator Fielding exposed Senator Wong's misrepresentations of climate and science. Yet his efforts simply revealed that truth is not sufficient in our current parliament.

Bob Katter, MP appears to be swamped despite his apparently sincere efforts to represent his electorate. Increasingly people disillusioned with the major parties' apathy, weakness and/or disinterest seek his support. Many parliamentarians seem swamped in systems undermining our national constitution. Fundamentally, many issues confronting federal MP's contravene the national constitution of our **federation of states**.

I have successful experience in managing and leading within diverse organisations here and overseas. From that it's clear that formal and informal systems now drive counterproductive parliamentary behaviours detrimental to the national interest and detrimental to MP's.

In Australia's federal parliament survival trumps service. Spin trumps substance. Personal and party agendas override and defeat the national interest.

The consequent volume of work and breadth of issues makes it difficult for MP's to make considered decisions based on solid data and sound analysis. I've witnessed the frenetic activity first-hand on many occasions and empathised with parliamentary staff. Under such circumstances rationality and integrity give way to spin as MP's lurch from issue to issue, driven by media demands and fear of embarrassment.

From my interactions with MP's I conclude that most entered parliament for sound reasons. Many MP's are doing the best they can. Yet party systems, massive unnecessary workload and ignorant media combine to derail MP's sincerity and effectiveness.

Government spending is out of control in terms of quantity, breadth and depth of interference. Low accountability combines with easy credit to drive the behaviours discussed in Appendices 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.

Internationally politicians are increasingly revealing the UN's role in fraudulently fabricating unfounded climate alarm pushing a global agenda to control people.

Many politicians are sceptical that human CO_2 drives global warming yet are afraid to speak out or are failing to have their comments reported. Both major parties appear to stifle dissenting opinions. The power of political parties is destroying national governance. Party reselection depends on a bastardised concept of *loyalty* that undermines party integrity and breeds disillusionment among voters and MP's.

Parliamentary accountability is generally low and on climate policy is non-existent. Parliament is easily manipulated. Australia's national governance has been smashed.

My faith in the once-proud people's party (ALP) and the supposed protector of liberty (Liberals) has been shattered. An apparently growing number of Australians are similarly disillusioned. Lib-Lab is coming to be seen by some as two sides of the same coin. We have a choice between Tweedle Dumb and Tweedle Dumber.

At their core both parties reveal they do not care about the electorate or the nation. That lack of care is becoming clear to the electorate.

Former senator Graham Richardson's mantra—"*Whatever it takes*—is eating Labor's soul. It's infecting the Liberals. When integrity is lost, an organisation's heart is lost. The organisation's future is lost.

The remaining question is simple: in the orchestrated deception that is climate alarm aimed at driving the taxing and *trading* of CO_2, are prominent political advocates victims of the deception or are they colluding in perpetrating the deceit?

Patterns of deceit and of ignoring irrefutable data reveal that policies to cut CO_2 production contradict empirical scientific evidence and are based on corruption of science. Appendix 14 identifies drivers of the scientific and political corruption. There is more involved than merely human weakness and fear of admitting error.

These conclusions and many other observations are symptoms of glaring breaches of Australia's constitution, smashing of governmental accountability and governance and breaches of public trust.

Given the CSIRO's deep involvement in the UN IPCC's unscientific fabrication of unfounded climate alarm and the BOM's involvement in fabricating WMO reports, what role have Australian agencies played in fomenting unfounded politically driven alarm? To what extent have Australian taxpayers unwittingly funded global climate misrepresentations? The role of Australia's taxpayer funding of governments, bureaucrats and ABC broadcaster in fomenting unfounded and unscientific climate alarm contradicting empirical scientific evidence needs to be investigated.

Systems driving Australia's national government produced a self-admitted climate sceptic (Tony Abbott) leading a major political party whose MP's are largely climate sceptics yet they silently or verbally endorse and promote cutting human CO_2 production. Both major parties have policies to cut human CO_2 based on false claims contradicting empirical scientific evidence and driven by a corrupt, unelected foreign entity, the UN. Australia's national governance system is faulty. Appendix 14 reveals it's being manipulated by a small group of UN bureaucrats and globally powerful financiers. Australia's governance currently breaches our constitution. It's not working for the Australian people.

Significantly, restoration of governance is straightforward: we need to simply comply with our constitution and restore personal freedom.