

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.
180 Haven Road,
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Email: malcolmr@conscious.com.au
Phone: 04 1964 2379 and 07 3374 3374

Thursday, April 19th, 2012

Mrs. Jane: Prentice., MP
Member representing Ryan electorate
PO Box 704
Indooroopilly QLD 4068

Dear Jane:

Re: Call from your office's Chris Cahill in response to Greg Hunt. And, Liberal Party climate policy contradicts science and is based on corruption.

Chris Cahill called last Tuesday and continued the pleasant and efficient contact I've had with your office staff.

She mentioned that in a message you were sent from Greg Hunt's office there are some points about which he is upset in an email. I confirm that I am responsible for the email from which Chris Cahill apparently read.

I'd like to meet with you please to firstly clarify this situation and secondly, as you are my representative in federal parliament, to discuss Liberal Party policy. The party continues to contradict empirical science despite massive documentation of orchestrated corruption that is the basis of the position Greg Hunt publicly advocates.

My view that Greg Hunt's position on climate is dishonest is supported by empirical science and by logical, scientific reasoning. They reveal Greg's position is not *'worthy of trust or belief'*.

I have now given Greg five opportunities to correct any errors in my personal presentation and letters. He has failed to do so.

Quoting Chris, she said that Greg is "saying that I (Greg) met this gentleman (me) on your (Jane's) introduction, can you find out whether he's really saying this".

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.

Based on your pride in your support for genuine environmental matters and your support for Campbell Newman as Lord Mayor I asked if there was a possibility of meeting with him. At the time he had become understandably busy. You suggested meeting with the Chair of the LNP's Environmental policy committee. I agreed.

Later I was pleasantly surprised that your staff contacted me without having to be reminded. They advised Greg Hunt had agreed to a telephone conversation and would call me. That he did. On the basis of our conversation he agreed to meet with me in his electoral office in Hastings, Victoria. We met there on Wednesday, April 27th together with Gordon Alderson.

Both Gordon and I were very pleased with that meeting. Initially both Greg and his staff emphasised that we had been allotted only 30 minutes and that Greg had engagements thereafter. In the meeting Greg initially seemed somewhat wary. As soon as I demonstrated empirical evidence on carbon dioxide he opened up and engaged with Gordon and me. The meeting lasted 75 minutes before Greg had to leave already late for his prior appointment. He had effectively chosen to run late for that engagement. He requested material. We left a thick pile of documents and promised to send him electronic versions so that he and his staff could more easily do their due diligence.

Two days later I kept my promise. That same day my material was copied to you in an email reinforcing your view that the Coalition needed to set the environmental agenda.

On July 5th, 6th, 12th and 20th though his email responses failed to answer my simple question to him, 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."*

He failed again in response to my letters dated March 10th and April 13th, 2012.

Greg has no empirical evidence supporting his position on climate. There is no scientific basis for Liberal party policy to spend billions of dollars to cut human CO₂ production. Greg's position contradicts empirical science and defies scientific reasoning presented to him in writing. His position is demonstrably irrational and based on corruption of science funded by government abuse of national finances and taxpayers

Although it is true that your office introduced me to Greg Hunt it is not true that he met me on your introduction. At your suggestion he called me around early April. During that conversation he agreed to meet with me in his office for my presentation. That was his choice and his action in response to my offer during his phone call.

I expressed to Chris Cahill during our conversation that I would be happy for Greg to call me to discuss the situation and his being upset. She rightly explained that she does not work for him. I'll copy Greg hereto.

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.

Sadly, after many deferrals by the state LNP environmental committee representative I decided his promised meeting would not eventuate. I let it lapse.

I will be pleased to discuss this with you and to debate any Liberal federal MP on three core aspects of climate change: namely, (1) the empirical science; (2) the corruption and/or misrepresentations that are the basis of the position advocated by CSIRO, BOM, UN IPCC, government, Greens and prominent academics funded by government; and (3) the damaging impacts of reducing human CO₂ production. These topics cover three important aspects of policy: foundation in empirical science, due diligence on the claims produced by government and, thirdly, environmental and humanitarian impacts.

Based on my conversations with voters and on social media the party's position is hurting your party's image. Liberal supporters are wondering why a self-declared sceptic in Tony Abbott is continuing to publicly contradict science by advocating Direct Action.

I do not take responsibility for the position in which Greg has placed himself. I admire that your commitment to the environment and what I assessed as your support for truth and integrity led you to make offers to arrange meetings with senior members of the Liberal Party. Given my discussions with other Coalition MP's, including senior MP's, it is clear that they too are concerned that Liberal policy contradicts science. They reassure me that Tony Abbott remains a climate sceptic. It seems that Liberal climate policy is based simply on matching Labor-Greens policy and not making waves before the next election. From their comments I have concluded that the party is afraid of telling the truth for fear of the possible initial media response.

Malcolm Turnbull is an intelligent barrister. Because of his former senior position in Goldman Sachs and the reputed loyalty of former senior executives he is referred to by some as *'the member for Goldman Sachs'*. He is paid to be the member for Wentworth and to represent interests of Australians and act as a member of the Liberal Party.

I mention this because the Liberal Party is being seen as lacking integrity and as possibly supporting Goldman Sachs, a firm that has invested heavily in carbon dioxide *'trading'* and that reportedly stands to gain enormous windfall profits from *'trading'* despite the collapse of *'trading'* in North America and plummeting prices in Europe.

Malcolm Turnbull is copied hereto.

There is an easy way for Greg and the Liberal Party to escape the hole he has dug: Greg can start telling the truth on climate based on empirical science and logical scientific reasoning. The Liberal Party needs to do its due diligence. It needs to stop apparently unquestioned parroting of false and unfounded claims about carbon dioxide as pushed by those advocating suppression of Australian sovereignty to UN treaties.

Surely an MP aspiring to be a minister in a future Coalition government must take responsibility for his decision to meet with me and for the consequences of advocating a position that is dishonest in that it contradicts empirical science and supports misrepresentations fabricated by corruption.

The ALP is now reaping the result of adopting the '*Richo strategy*' of reportedly "*doing whatever it takes*". When the Opposition Leader and two aspiring ministers in a future Abbott government seem to be afraid of facts and take positions contrary to the facts I have grave concern for the Liberal party.

Extensive documentation reveals our nation is threatened by a UN global agenda enabled by ALP-Greens deceit and lies. That threat is abetted by Coalition complicity and/or gutlessness. Is not destruction of Australia's sovereignty through further erosion of national governance and subverting of Australia's Constitution treasonous?

I remain willing to assist the Liberal Party with a formal presentation at which I can arrange to be joined by eminent scientists and/or by engaging MP's in a debate.

I look forward to hearing from you and to meeting you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Original personally signed

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.

cc:

Tony Abbott, Andrew Robb, Greg Hunt, Malcolm Turnbull, Barnaby Joyce, Warren Truss, Cory Bernardi, Gordon Alderson