

Article by Greg Combet, Minister for Climate Change

Author's qualifications:

Greg Combet has degrees in mining engineering and economics. He has a diploma in industrial relations and law. (<http://www.alp.org.au/federal-government/labor-people/greg-combet/>)

From the UNSW School of Mining Engineering's web site: (http://www.mining.unsw.edu.au/pdf/Poster_YourProspects.pdf)

It asked, quote: "*why mining Engineering?*" UNSW's answer, quote: "*Simple, it gives you the skills to do almost anything.*" Not 'to say anything'.

From the UNSW's web site:

'Greg Combet, secretary, Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) Greg Combet started his career in the mining industry and, after further studies, moved into the field of industrial relations and now holds the position of Secretary with the ACTU.'

(UNSW) Q: *'why did you study mining engineering?'*

Greg Combet's answer, quote: *'I had an interest in geology and the history and role of the mining industry in Australia's economic development. I also felt, and still believe, that a career in mining offers a range of interesting work options with opportunities in both engineering and business – it even took me into a union career. The studies embrace a good range of disciplines.'*

Mining engineering studies encompass a wide range of disciplines including ventilation of underground mines. This provides an understanding of natural atmospheric gases, including carbon dioxide. Sound mining engineers know that carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a naturally occurring trace gas not capable of doing what Greg Combet claims.

Mining engineers study geology. In effective mining engineering courses, geology forms a large part of material studied. That reveals Earth had past periods far warmer than current. Sound mining engineers know those warmer periods were highly beneficial to life.

Engineers study chemistry and know that '*carbon dioxide*' is made from, but is not, '*carbon*'. To deliberately mix these, in the context of the current political climate misrepresents reality. I consider it dishonest. It is misleading.

Greg Combet's article:

The article can be located by manually typing these words into Google search: '*Carbon price is the best way forward greg combet the australian*'.

Greg Combet's article was available at these links although both links seem unreliable when this document is saved as a PDF file:

www.theaustralian.com.au/.../carbon-price-is-the-best-way-forward/story-fn5oad9h-1226012246858

and,

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/people-in-politics/carbon-price-is-the-best-way-forward/story-fn5oad9h-1226012246858>

The article is copied from The Australian newspaper and pasted below, twice.

The first copy provides an analysis of each of Greg Combet's statements.

In the second copy, individual paragraphs are numbered and responses provided to each. These elaborate on the first analysis.

I conclude that, in his article, Greg Combet is being deliberately deceptive to achieve a political objective, the unfounded raising of taxes. Based on the dictionary definition of the word 'lie', and on Greg Combet's qualifications, I conclude Greg Combet is lying.

Almost every paragraph contains falsities, unfounded claims, empty rhetoric or yet more spin typical of the Rudd-Gillard government.

Decide for yourself.

First analysis—categorising Greg Combet’s statements.

This analysis uses the following colour key. In each category, the number denotes the number of statements classified into that category:

Falsities = 16

Misleading statements = 5

Unfounded statements = 4

Statements contrary to science = 5

Sixteen falsities in an article of 798 words. That’s one falsity for every fifty words.

Forty falsities, misleading statements, unfounded statements and statements contrary to the science. That’s one in every 20 words.

Carbon price is the best way forward

Greg Combet From: [The Australian](#) February 26, 2011 12:00AM

AUSTRALIA needs to tackle climate change by cutting pollution and driving investment in clean energy.

It is in our long-term national interest to build our economy on the technologies and energy sources of the future, not the past.

Given that we are, per person, the highest polluters in the developed world, we must start a transformation of our economy.

The cheapest and fairest way of embarking upon this transformation is to introduce a carbon price into the economy through a market mechanism.

A carbon price puts a price tag on pollution and would be paid by businesses that are the biggest polluters. A market mechanism ensures pollution is cut where it can be done most cheaply.

The fact is that unless there is an incentive for businesses to reduce their pollution, and invest in low-emissions technology and clean energy, little will change.

And change is necessary. The scientific evidence is clear that carbon pollution is contributing to climate change. Every government around the world is

attempting to come to grips with the challenge that this represents. Australia is not acting alone.

The Gillard government took an important step towards implementing a carbon price when the Prime Minister announced on Thursday the framework for a carbon price mechanism.

The mechanism would be an emissions trading scheme commencing with a fixed permit price for every tonne of pollution. If the required legislation can be agreed on and passed through parliament in time, the objective is to start the carbon price on July 1 next year.

With Australia's enormous clean energy resources, putting a price on carbon and shifting to clean energy will have big benefits for our economy. The sooner we begin, the sooner we can seize these opportunities for new investments and new jobs.

As the Prime Minister has said, the carbon price will work in a similar way to a tax in the initial fixed-price period. Our intention is to move to a fully flexible emissions trading scheme after that.

Every dollar raised by the carbon price will be dedicated to supporting households with any price impacts, and supporting businesses through the transition to a clean energy economy. Because we are a Labor government, we will support the most vulnerable in our community -- the people who need help the most.

A carbon price is also vital to provide certainty for investors in important parts of the economy such as the energy generation sector. When investing in assets such as electricity generation plants that last for decades, it is crucial to know there will be a carbon price and how that price will be set.

As a report published by the peak business group AIG made clear this week, electricity prices will continue to rise with or without a carbon price. This is because of the tens of billions of dollars of investment needed for electricity infrastructure.

However, the AIG report also made clear that some of the present cost drivers fuelling electricity prices could be reduced by a well-designed carbon price, because it could eliminate the uncertainty investors are facing.

A carbon price is a significant economic reform, comparable with the floating of the dollar and the liberalisation of trade in the 1980s.

They were difficult reforms but they were the right things to do for our future. With climate change, the longer we delay, the greater the cost will be.

To underpin Australian industries and jobs we need to be competitive in a world where other countries are cutting their emissions. Thirty-two countries and 10 US states already have a carbon price that is set by an emissions trading scheme.

China, Taiwan, Chile and South Korea, as well as a number of Canadian provinces, are either considering developing their own scheme or already have trial schemes. A number of developed countries have carbon taxes and some developing countries are introducing them.

The US has introduced a range of initiatives. In addition to the 10 eastern US states already participating in a regional cap and trade scheme, California has legislated to introduce a carbon price and is developing the details with a view to starting next year. The US Environmental Protection Agency is taking steps to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the US Clean Air Act.

The government is committed to beginning this vital economic transformation because it is in our long-term interests.

The detailed features of the carbon price mechanism, including the starting price, the length of the fixed-price period, and assistance arrangements for households, communities and industry, are yet to be decided.

These are important decisions that will be considered over the next few months.

The Australian public can be confident these decisions will reflect our long-term national interest and the need to act on climate change.

My initial conclusion:

Greg Combet's article is pure propaganda.

Next, consider the detail.

Second analysis—responses to Greg Combet’s statements.

His opening paragraphs imply carbon dioxide to be a pollutant—eight (8) times. In one paragraph that falsity is repeated three times.

Yet the reality is that carbon dioxide is a harmless natural trace gas essential to all life on Earth. It is not a pollutant. Frequently repeating a falsity until it becomes accepted is a known propaganda tool. Yet a sound mining engineer knows CO₂ is not a pollutant.

In a parallel, the NSW ALP government runs propaganda advertisements showing families in living rooms with black balloons rising from the floor. Yet carbon dioxide is colourless and invisible. It is 50% heavier than air and falls until intimately mixed in the open atmosphere. It’s essential for all life on Earth.

Repeatedly contradicting known facts is pure propaganda. Contradicting one’s own knowledge, the contradiction becomes a lie.

Below, Greg Combet’s statements are in black text. My responses including my analysis are in red text, italicised. Underlined text are questions for Greg Combet.

Carbon price is the best way forward

Greg Combet From: [The Australian](#) February 26, 2011 12:00AM

1. AUSTRALIA needs to tackle climate change by cutting pollution and driving investment in clean energy.

This is a falsity based on deliberate misrepresentations by the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—fraud. There is no real-world scientific proof that unusual climate change is occurring. Nor that it is threatening. Nor that it is due to human production of carbon dioxide.

Please, Greg, provide specific real-world scientifically measured proof that:

(1) climate change is due to human production of carbon dioxide;

(2) climate change is threatening the planet, the environment or humanity; and

(3) carbon dioxide is ‘carbon pollution’.

Please advise the temperature drop that will occur by achieving your target cut in carbon dioxide production.

2. It is in our long-term national interest to build our economy on the technologies and energy sources of the future, not the past.

This is empty and unfounded rhetoric. What is not suitable about using the cheapest, reliable, environmentally responsible sources of energy—coal and natural gas? The reality is the opposite of his claims.

Please provide specific proof of your claim.

3. Given that we are, per person, the highest polluters in the developed world, we must start a transformation of our economy.

Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant? Why does he refer to it as a pollutant? Why must we start a destructive transformation of our economy? As an economist, surely he knows the crucial and core role played by cheap, efficient energy in lifting productivity and standards of living and reducing birth rates?

4. The cheapest and fairest way of embarking upon this transformation is to introduce a carbon price into the economy through a market mechanism.

False. History shows people seek efficiency to reduce costs—in terms of time, resources and money. True markets are the cheapest way. A carbon price imposed by government is a regulation aimed at controlling energy and raising revenue. It is an arbitrary, destructive and inefficient imposition. It is not a market. Markets arise when people meet freely to exchange goods and services that meet specific real-world needs. Carbon dioxide trading meets no real-world needs. It raises revenue and gives the government power to control energy, the lifeblood of modern lifestyles and civilization.

5. A carbon price puts a price tag on pollution and would be paid by businesses that are the biggest polluters. A market mechanism ensures pollution is cut where it can be done most cheaply.

Carbon dioxide is not pollution. As he implies, under a carbon price, government puts a price tag on carbon dioxide. It would be paid by businesses who then have a choice: absorb increased prices and go out of business, or cancel future investment, or switch to subsidized less efficient alternative energy sources with subsidies at the whim of government and thus introducing needless uncertainty. As Julia Gillard admitted, it will increase prices because carbon dioxide ‘trading’ schemes are designed to do that, raise prices. Fundamentally, energy users will have two options: absorb increased costs and go broke thereby cutting employment that will move

offshore, OR pass costs onto customers, thereby raising prices in other industries sending employment offshore. The end result is fewer Aussie jobs and increased prices for end users—that's us, the people of Australia. Due to the multiplier effect of energy throughout our economy, the eventual increased price to the consumer will be huge. That means a lower standard of living. One doesn't need to be an economist to understand this.

6. The fact is that unless there is an incentive for businesses to reduce their pollution, and invest in low-emissions technology and clean energy, little will change.

Carbon dioxide is not pollution. Investing in 'clean' energy yet again implies carbon dioxide is dirty and a pollutant. Already the Gillard-Swan government has cut the Rudd-Gillard 'clean energy' programs. European nations and the USA are cutting subsidized 'clean' or 'green' energy programs. If government interferes with the market, things will change, of that there is no doubt. The change will be more government inefficiency like pink batts tragedies and the extraordinary sloppiness of Julia Gillard's own Building the Education Revolution waste.

7. And change is necessary. The scientific evidence is clear that carbon pollution is contributing to climate change. Every government around the world is attempting to come to grips with the challenge that this represents. Australia is not acting alone.

There is no real-world scientific proof that human production of carbon dioxide changes climate or even temperature. There is extensive scientific proof humans are not responsible. Refer to Summary enclosed. As above, please provide one specific piece of scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide caused global warming or in any way affected global climate.

It is true that every government is coming to grips with the challenge presented by the UN's fraud. They are now endeavouring to save face while disentangling themselves from expectations built misleadingly by the UN and national election/propaganda campaigns.

8. The Gillard government took an important step towards implementing a carbon price when the Prime Minister announced on Thursday the framework

for a carbon price mechanism.

Sadly, true, in another example of needlessly interfering with people's lives and increasing waste.

9. The mechanism would be an emissions trading scheme commencing with a fixed permit price for every tonne of pollution. If the required legislation can be agreed on and passed through parliament in time, the objective is to start the carbon price on July 1 next year.

Unless people awaken to the government's deceit and dishonesty.

10. With Australia's enormous clean energy resources, putting a price on carbon and shifting to clean energy will have big benefits for our economy. The sooner we begin, the sooner we can seize these opportunities for new investments and new jobs.

False. There is no scientific justification. There is no economic justification. Already, nations in Europe, Britain and states in the USA are retreating from the misnamed 'clean' energy. They are experiencing first hand the economic destruction and loss of jobs with needlessly higher costs reflecting inefficiency. They are experiencing blackouts and higher prices as alternate energy sources prove unreliable. Please provide proof that the sooner we begin the destruction of our economy, the sooner we can seize new opportunities, new investments new jobs.

11. As the Prime Minister has said, the carbon price will work in a similar way to a tax in the initial fixed-price period. Our intention is to move to a fully flexible emissions trading scheme after that.

Greg Combet wants to move to a carbon dioxide 'trading' scheme. At the same time, other economies are proving carbon dioxide trading is damaging and produce widespread corruption. It's proven that 'trading' does not reduce atmospheric CO2 levels. The schemes cannot affect climate. Yet, Julia Gillard wants us to adopt yet another Greens' tax idea in the interim so that she can fulfill a commitment made by Kevin Rudd, who she said lost his way. It's widely reported that Julia Gillard encouraged Rudd to drop his carbon dioxide 'trading' scheme.

12. Every dollar raised by the carbon price will be dedicated to supporting households with any price impacts, and supporting businesses through the transition to a clean energy economy. Because we are a Labor government, we will support the most vulnerable in our community -- the people who need help the most.

Yet Julia Gillard said clearly there will be “price rises”, there will be “pain”. Otherwise people’s behaviour won’t change. Now she wants to bring in yet another layer of bureaucracy to shuffle money around after it’s collected as a tax to then redistribute it under ‘compensation’. Bureaucrats will then determine how we should best spend our income. People won’t have a say in how to spend our own money. That means further erosion of choices and freedom, forever.

Although many disagreed with its socialist approach, the original Labor Party was admired because it was a true grass-roots people’s party. Graham Richardson changed that. He changed the People’s Party based on Principles and Philosophy to a Political machine controlled by Power-brokers, manipulating Perceptions through clever use of Personalities. Now the ALP is harvesting the sour, inedible fruit of that approach. Its internal task force attempts to reenergize plummeting membership. Genuine Labor people are replaced by Party hacks and union powerbrokers—who last year reportedly decided the current prime minister. To many Aussies, Greg Combet’s words, quote “*Because we are a Labor government*” now produce skepticism, derision and fear. Perhaps he’s relying on the myth to con people after he was parachuted interstate by Kevin Rudd into a safe Labor seat. The incumbent Labor representative was discarded in favour of yet another powerbroker.

13. A carbon price is also vital to provide certainty for investors in important parts of the economy such as the energy generation sector. When investing in assets such as electricity generation plants that last for decades, it is crucial to know there will be a carbon price and how that price will be set.

The uncertainty was introduced by Kevin Rudd and Penny Wong—aided by John Howard facing electoral defeat and Environment Minister Malcolm Turnbull in his then-vulnerable electorate. They called for an eventual carbon dioxide ‘trading’ scheme. Instead, to return to certainty, make decisions based on science and facts not propaganda. Hold a Royal Commission of inquiry into the government’s basis for its climate policy.

Open-ended carbon dioxide 'trading' schemes are controlled by government. Unlike the GST, the 'trading' schemes are vulnerable to future fiddling at government whim. Adjustments to the carbon dioxide price create huge uncertainty. That will kill investment. That the legislation will introduce a formula rather than a price set in stone allows future politicians to change the 'price' without compensation.

14. As a report published by the peak business group AIG made clear this week, electricity prices will continue to rise with or without a carbon price. This is because of the tens of billions of dollars of investment needed for electricity infrastructure.

Where's the logic here? Apparently, because electricity prices are already rising, that justifies raising them even more? With a needless carbon dioxide 'trading' scheme, the investment will be 'tens of billions' PLUS more billions.

15. However, the AIG report also made clear that some of the present cost drivers fuelling electricity prices could be reduced by a well-designed carbon price, because it could eliminate the uncertainty investors are facing.

Uncertainty was created by Kevin Rudd and Penny Wong. Adding more uncertainty will not remove the uncertainty. Replacing UN climate misrepresentations and fraud with real-world science will eliminate uncertainty.

16. A carbon price is a significant economic reform, comparable with the floating of the dollar and the liberalisation of trade in the 1980s.

False. Inflicting a carbon dioxide 'trading' price is not a reform. It is a drag, a needless inefficiency and uncertainty inflicted on Australians contrary to the science.

17. They were difficult reforms but they were the right things to do for our future. With climate change, the longer we delay, the greater the cost will be.

False. This is a propaganda technique to legitimise a falsity by associating it with a perceived past noble act.

18. To underpin Australian industries and jobs we need to be competitive in

a world where other countries are cutting their emissions. Thirty-two countries and 10 US states already have a carbon price that is set by an emissions trading scheme.

Agreed, we need to be competitive. The paragraph though falsely implies other nations are moving toward carbon dioxide 'trading'. Already the pact of America's western states known as the Western Climate Initiative is unraveling and states have left <http://www.businessspectator.com.au/bs.nsf/Article/Mode-of-attack-pd20100219-2SRC4?opendocument&src=rss>). Why did Greg Combet not mention that many American states are challenging in court the USA's politicized EPA's attempt to regulate carbon dioxide. Why did he not mention that the USA's House of Representatives last month voted to stop any funding of the UN's climate body and to impede President Obama's politicized and unscientific escapades on climate. Why did he fail to mention that the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) last year ceased trading on carbon dioxide? Why did he fail to mention that Goldman Sachs bank (Malcolm Turnbull's former employer) owned 10% of the CCX and that one of Al Gore's companies is the fifth biggest CCX shareholder? Why did Greg Combet not mention that Barack Obama was a director of the foundation that provided money to establish CCX? Why did he not mention that the world's largest (human) producers of carbon dioxide have categorically ruled out ever inflicting their economies with a carbon dioxide tax? These include: China, India, USA, Japan, Brazil.

Inflicting a carbon dioxide 'trading' price is not a reform. It is a drag, a needless inefficiency and uncertainty inflicted on Australians.

Please advise:

(1) Are you aware that CO2 is less than 0.04% of the atmosphere? That's less than 4 one hundredth's of one percent;

(2) Are you aware that humans annually produce a mere 3% of Earth's annual carbon dioxide production, while Nature produces 32 times more, 97%? (UN IPCC figures)?

(3) Are you aware that Nature completely controls atmospheric carbon dioxide levels? Please refer to the enclosed Summary.

(4) Are you aware that Australians produce an estimated 1 to 1.3% of the annual human production of carbon dioxide?

(5) Are you aware that you're really claiming that in every 85,800 molecules of air, the one (1) molecule of carbon dioxide produced by human activity is responsible for catastrophically heating our entire planet? While the other 32 molecules of Nature's carbon dioxide are beneficial?

That's what I call SENBB: it's what comes out of the South End of a North Bound Bull.

It's propaganda.

19. China, Taiwan, Chile and South Korea, as well as a number of Canadian provinces, are either considering developing their own scheme or already have trial schemes. A number of developed countries have carbon taxes and some developing countries are introducing them.

Is it sound policy to justify policy based on other nations whose politics differ? As some of those nations have changed their approach recently, will we change? As they change and drop 'trading' schemes and 'clean' energy schemes, will Australia change? That's yet more needless uncertainty inflicted by the government. Who does govern Australia—Bob Brown who advocated a carbon dioxide tax despite Julia Gillard's firm promise to never have a carbon dioxide tax? The UN climate body? Foreign governments changing their policy? ...

20. The US has introduced a range of initiatives. In addition to the 10 eastern US states already participating in a regional cap and trade scheme, California has legislated to introduce a carbon price and is developing the details with a view to starting next year. The US Environmental Protection Agency is taking steps to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the US Clean Air Act.

In court it's necessary to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Not so, it seems in Greg Combet's world. The USA's EPA is currently facing lawsuits from American states opposing its bureaucratic attempt to control the American economy on behalf of the Obama administration. Many states are taking the EPA to court to prevent its action. The USA's House of Representatives is making it impossible for the EPA to regulate on behalf of the Obama administration. California is ceasing some alternate energy subsidies ...

21. The government is committed to beginning this vital economic transformation because it is in our long-term interests.

Completely unfounded statement contrary to real-world science. Refer to the enclosed Summary.

22. The detailed features of the carbon price mechanism, including the

starting price, the length of the fixed-price period, and assistance arrangements for households, communities and industry, are yet to be decided.

With pink batt deaths on its hands and a trail of enormous financial waste, who will trust this government with an open-ended scheme that can apparently at any time after introduction be changed at a whim to increase the economic burden without compensation? Who can trust a government based on spin? Who can trust a government on climate when its minister contradicts the real-world science and uses propaganda techniques over rational argument based on facts?

23. These are important decisions that will be considered over the next few months.

The people need to determine this. Demand a Royal Commission requiring evidence given under oath. Given the uncertainty and the public outrage, why not settle this once and for all. Who could oppose a Royal Commission to clear the air?

24. The Australian public can be confident these decisions will reflect our long-term national interest and the need to act on climate change.

Simply consider the Rudd-Gillard government's huge list of failures, broken promises and misrepresentations. Julia Gillard herself, one of that government's architects, said that the government had "lost its way". There are no signs that the Gillard-Swan government even knows where it is. Maybe it should first complete the process it has started of reforming its party before it 'reforms' us.

Britain abolished slavery in 1833. With energy crucial to all aspects of our society and life, carbon dioxide taxes and 'trading' schemes are calls for slavery's reintroduction. Even when labeled a 'reform', slavery benefits only powerbrokers.

Greg Combet is Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Minister.

End of article published in The Weekend Australian

Background:

In 1974, media spread wild, emotive and unfounded forecasts of supposed imminent, irreversible, catastrophic global **freezing**—blamed on particulates from burning fuels containing carbon (oil, coal).

Two years later, in 1976's Great Pacific Climate Shift, global atmospheric temperatures rose slightly—in one year.

Four years later the UN changed the scary forecast to supposed imminent, irreversible, catastrophic global **warming** due to carbon dioxide from human use of carbon fuels, coal, oil and natural gas.

Global warming from human carbon dioxide morphed into **climate change** from human carbon dioxide. That subtly morphed into climate change due to **carbon**. That's currently being changed to **climate disruption** due to carbon.

In 2007's election campaign, warnings were spread by Kevin Rudd, Peter Garrett and Penny Wong, of catastrophic future sea level rises. Soon after Greg Combet was parachuted into a safe Labor seat. He then bought a home outside his electorate and on the ocean-front.

<http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/combets-new-luxury-home/2007/11/15/1194766872658.html>

Kevin Rudd has reportedly since bought a house on the beach.

<http://news.domain.com.au/photogallery/domain/kevin-rudds-new-beachside-getaway/20110215-1auw1.html>

In recent years the federal and Queensland Labor governments have supported, encouraged and enabled new coal mines and increased coal exports. Yet they want to tax Australian production of carbon dioxide. Somehow Aussie coal burned overseas is beneficial while the same coal burned in Australia is damaging and has catastrophic consequences that justify taxing Aussies.

When mentioning that during a public forum shared with Greens senator-elect Larissa Waters, she joined me in ridiculing the ALP stance. Just wait until after July when the senior member of the Greens-ALP coalition wields the balance of power in the Senate.

The dictionary defines a lie as: a false statement made with deliberate intent to deceive; an intentional untruth; a falsehood; something intended or serving to convey a false impression;

Given the above, and given his degrees in mining engineering and in economics, I conclude Greg Combet's statements to be knowingly false. That makes them lies, doesn't it?

For apparent election benefit, Kevin Rudd and Julia Gillard fabricated the need in 2007 to address global warming. Together they dug a huge carbon dioxide hole for the ALP. Julia

Gillard deepened it in 2010 by embracing Greens to cling to power. Greg Combet is reportedly the ALP's fix-it man. Is he simply charged with digging Julia Gillard out using any possible means? Is that why he's using propaganda and falsities, seemingly lies? Telling the truth would be the end of Julia Gillard and the ALP.

My Conclusion

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.

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

March 3rd, 2011

www.conscious.com.au

My personal declaration of interests is at:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf>

(or manually go to www.conscious.com.au, look for 'Summaries' then click on '[Aims, background and declaration of interests of Malcolm Roberts, Dr Vincent Gray and John McLean](#)')

180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone:
Home 07 3374 3374
Mobile 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

Abound in the wondrous Oneness of Nature and Life