

**From:** Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>  
**Subject:** Fwd: ALP Senator questions Senator Wong. She replies with falsities - No.1  
**Date:** 10 December 2012 5:11:11 PM AEST  
**To:** Roberts1 Malcolm <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>  
▶ 3 Attachments, 1.3 MB

---

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>  
**Date:** 13 November 2009 11:06:43 AM AEST  
**To:** Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>  
**Bcc:** 3 Labor MHR's, 3 Labor Senators, 3 Liberal MHR's, 3 Liberal Senators, 3 National MHR's, 3 National Senators, 3 Independents, 4 Greens  
**Subject:** ALP Senator questions Senator Wong. She replies with falsities - No.1

**ALP Senator questions Senator Wong. She replies with falsities  
and  
Supplement to my Formal Complaint Submitted to Australia's Attorney-General**

To all federal MP's:

ALP Senator Mark Furner advised me that in response to my letter to all senators on July 30th, 2009 he asked questions of Senator Wong. Seven weeks later Senator Furner received a response and immediately forwarded Senator Wong's response to me.

I've replied to Senator Furner with a response to Senator Wong's comments. Her comments and my response were submitted earlier this week through Registered Post to the Attorney-General as a supplement to my formal complaint lodged last month with the Attorney-General. Paper copies were simultaneously posted to MP's from other major parties.

For your reference, an electronic copy in the form of attachments is provided through this e-mail (No.1) and its companion e-mail (No.2).

**My immediate conclusion on Senator Wong's response to Senator Furner is that Senator Wong's response contains serious, substantial errors, omissions and falsities. It is clear to me that Senator Wong's response comprehensively misrepresents climate science.**

Referring to Senator Wong's response to Senator Furner and to my subsequent response, I conclude:

(1) Senator Wong, in her response to Senator Furner, contradicts data obtained from the UN IPCC itself on its own report writing and review processes;

(2) Senator Wong relies on partial truths and falsities. She provides a lopsided and thus distorted view possibly to deceive Senator Furner. She presented no measured scientific real world data as evidence to support her core claim that human production of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) caused Earth's modest global warming that ended around 1998. She has repeatedly failed to provide any such evidence;

(3) given serious deficiencies, falsities and misrepresentations in UN IPCC reports, and given apparent conflicts of financial and other interests among some UN IPCC report authors and in the UN IPCC's very existence, purpose and structure, Senator Wong has no sound justification for using UN IPCC reports to support her falsely and fraudulently named Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme (CPRS).

Senator Wong's position in advocating her CPRS is based on, and relies on, UN IPCC advice that deliberately misleads governments and the media.

(4) by her unsound and unjustifiable reliance on UN IPCC reports and referencing of UN IPCC reports, Senator Wong has been misleading parliament and particularly MP's in her own party. On this basis she is driving a stake through the heart of parliamentary democracy.

(5) there is no scientific, measured, observed, real-world data supporting the government's core claim and stated reason for its proposed CPRS. Lacking any evidence, the scheme needs to be nullified and immediately discarded from

parliament.

(6) an impartial independent inquiry needs to be launched immediately into the means and manner by which the government's global warming (climate change) policy and CPRS were developed and advocated.

This inquiry needs to be broad to include the role of various government agencies such as the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and CSIRO. Given the significance of distortions to date, this inquiry needs to be conducted independent from parliament.

My reply to Senator Wong's response addresses every major paragraph of her response as marked. It does so with facts.

There's no need though for you to rely on my conclusions as references are openly and freely provided for you to check for yourself.

**I appreciate Senator Furner's efforts at due diligence since it has led to exposing the manner in which MP's appear to have been 'comprehensively' misled by Senator Wong. I now have a clearer understanding of just how difficult it must be for MP's of all parties, particularly Labor MP's, to develop accurate understanding of climate alarm given that the Minister for Climate Change is spreading falsities and is facilitating UN IPCC fraud. As explained in my reply to Senator Furner, I have empathy for MP's whose deadlines and workloads limit personal research. I now better understand why some MP's seem so confused yet afraid to buck the party or challenge carefully crafted public images.**

I request that you please ask detailed questions seeking specific answers on the Copenhagen Treaty and on CPRS provisions and implementation because there's a lot at stake, including:

- **Australia's sovereignty:** if the government signs the Copenhagen treaty Australia's sovereignty could be at stake. Media reports say the government is saying very little about the Copenhagen treaty. Why?

- **Australia's economy and standard of living:** if the government's CPRS is passed there will eventually be enormous needless increased cost burdens imposed on every Australian in terms of food, fuel and energy. The cost of almost all goods and services produced in Australia will increase. Exports will suffer. Media reports say the government is providing very little detail. Why?

- **Environment: by diverting people and valuable material resources to a carefully fabricated non-problem, the government is distracting people and resources from real environmental and humanitarian challenges.**

- **Science:** by supporting UN IPCC misrepresentation of science and by smashing or bypassing normal scientific peer review processes, policy is being built on emotions and contradicts scientific fact.

The Kyoto Protocol is already recognised as a failure. Every Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) including Senator Wong's CPRS, every carbon tax and every energy tax will have no effect on climate. Science shows it cannot have any effect on climate. Immediately nullify the CPRS.

If you care and have sufficient courage please ask the questions. Parliament cannot blindly rely on cleverly crafted broad misrepresentations of climate science. Australians are entitled to, deserve and need details and facts.

Every federal MP is in receipt of reports or at the very least has been repeatedly provided with access to reports by McLean exposing UN IPCC fraud. Thus any MP who votes for any ETS, carbon tax or energy tax will be acting negligently and irresponsibly, or worse, possibly committing fraud.

I wish you well in doing your due diligence and hope the attached is of assistance to you in removing the misrepresentations and falsities it seems MP's and the media have been fed by the Climate Change minister. Australians rely on your due diligence to protect our sovereignty, economy, standard of living, scientific integrity and our precious natural environment.

On the CPRS vote, what will the enduring parliamentary record show beside your name? Ultimately we each only leave behind our name.

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

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

In June, 2009 as part of a series of e-mails exposing the UN IPCC I sent all federal MP's a declaration of my interests. Note: I receive no remuneration for my entirely voluntary work exposing climate alarm falsities. If requested I will be pleased to again send you my declaration.

Attachments are best read in this order:

This e-mail No.1:

- Attorney2.pdf
- Furner.pdf read in conjunction with
- Furner2.pdf



[Attorney2.pdf \(290 KB\)](#)



[Furner.pdf \(859 KB\)](#)



[Furner2.pdf \(180 KB\)](#)

E-mail No.2 to follow:

- 2 UN IPCC scrutiny.pdf
- Series 5.pdf
- July 30.pdf
- McLean\_deFreitas\_Carter\_JGR\_2009\_2.pdf - if you need the detail