

Submission to the Climate Change Bill Inquiry

By Australian Senator Malcolm Roberts, 25 August 2022

Opening Hearts and Minds to COVID Mis-management

On Wednesday 17 August my office hosted 12 hours of interviews with medical, legal and human rights professionals, pharmaceutical experts, lawyers, academics and politicians to focus on the threats to the doctor-patient relationship, treating long COVID and the aftermath of COVID injection injuries.

The mis-management of COVID and the mandating of experimental “vaccines” are global issues. My national and international guests provided compelling testimony on many deeply concerning issues. All interviews and transcripts can be found on [my website](#). Below are a few very worthy testimonies.

[Brook Jackson](#): Pfizer Testing Regime

[Dr Phillip Altman](#): Death Data and Fertility Rates

[Julian Gillespie](#): Is the doctor-Patient Relationship Under Threat?

[Peter Fam](#): Human Rights

[Professor Iain Benson](#): Medical Ethics

As elected members of parliament we have a shared solemn duty to behave with integrity.

This embraces our duty to ensure legislation and policies are solidly based on accurate and objective data so that the consequences on our constituents and nation are safe, affordable, reasonable and fair.

Yet [Attachment 1](#) shows there has never been, and there remains no, factual scientific basis presented in parliament for legislation cutting or limiting the production of carbon dioxide from human activity. Parliament has never debated the climate science.

The term logical scientific point means the empirical scientific data within a logical scientific framework proving causality. Senators and members of parliament have never been presented with the necessary logical scientific points to justify legislating the cutting or limiting of carbon dioxide from human activity. Nor has parliament ever been presented with the specific, quantified effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on any aspect of climate or weather.

[Attachment 2](#) shows that CSIRO, the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) and The Chief Scientist have never produced the logical scientific points needed as the necessary and essential basis for climate change legislation. The supporting detailed scientific documents are [Attachments 6 and 7](#).

I acknowledge and thank Senator Arthur Sinodinos as then Minister for Science and his predecessor Mr Greg Hunt for supporting me in arranging for my science and senate office teams to cross-examine government climate science agencies.

[Attachment 3](#) concisely summarises facts explaining that no government, institute, agency or entity of any kind anywhere has produced the necessary logical scientific point. Together with climate scientists and climatologists internationally and within Australia we have held agencies, institutions, universities and individual academics accountable.

[Attachment 3](#) notes that Maurice Strong was the United Nations Under-Secretary-General who triggered and fanned global climate alarm. He did so while having many serious conflicts of interest including being a director / shareholder of the Chicago Climate Exchange trading global Carbon Dioxide credits and being disgraced for his involvement in the UN Oil-for-Food program. Following allegations of serious breaches of American law he fled from American law enforcement agencies to exile in China. The United Nations Environment Program that he founded and led stands accused of contradicting scientific evidence and causing the avoidable deaths of 40-50 million people from 1972 through 2006.

[Attachment 4](#) reveals the repeated results of two global natural experiments and prove that cutting carbon dioxide from human activity can have no effect. The associated limited summary of the science introduces concepts explaining why the cutting of carbon dioxide from human activity can have no effect on global or regional climate or weather. Included are basic facts on Earth's essential, natural atmospheric trace gas that is the focus of legislation before our parliament.

[Attachment 5](#) presents the fundamental basis for policy and legislation and for measuring progress toward achieving legislative aims and targets. This is combined with core questions that are at the heart of senators' responsibilities to our constituents and I ask the committee to consider and deliberate upon these fundamental questions that must precede any consideration of the climate change legislation.

[Attachment 6](#) summarises the staggering and sometimes crippling cost burdens of climate and energy policies.

[Attachments 7 and 8](#) provide details underpinning [Attachment 2](#). [Attachment 7](#) provides a detailed scientific report documenting our discussions with CSIRO, an entity whose advice politicians claim is the basis for climate and related energy legislation. Attachment 8 cites associated peer-reviewed scientific papers in a scientific and statistical analysis of CSIRO's presentations of its climate science claimed to underpin legislation. Please note particularly our scientific analyses of Marcott (2013), Lecavalier (2017), Harries (2001) and Feldman (2015) being papers upon which CSIRO relies and note the conclusions.

[Attachment 9](#) provides detailed supporting statistics and analysis for [Appendix 6](#). It cannot be sensibly refuted since the data was professionally and independently sourced from federal and state government budget papers and reports.

The attachments prove that the effect of Australia's human production of carbon dioxide has never been specified or quantified in any way. Yet sound legislation should be based on quantified and measurable evidence so that we can assess its cost-benefit and measure implementation to track whether the legislation is effective and achieves the desired outcomes.

This is impossible with current climate and related energy policy and the government's latest climate change bill.

I hope that you, as a fellow member of parliament, share my commitment to doing our due diligence in fulfilling our duty to serve our constituents, state and nation. I hope that the attachments are of assistance to you in fulfilling our duty to the people of Australia.

I would welcome meeting with the committee and welcome an opportunity for me and my team to address the committee in its hearings to afford senators an opportunity to scrutinise our scientific team. We welcome you holding us accountable

Our principal scientist has legally gathered 24, 000 datasets worldwide on climate and energy from peer-reviewed scientific papers, institutes and government agencies including CSIRO and BOM. He is the recipient of an Order of Australia Medal for his services to research.

I hope every member of the committee agrees that in assessing legislation we each have the onus to produce the logical scientific points including the specific, quantified effect of carbon dioxide from human activity on climate or weather. As senators and before endorsing legislation we each have the onus to prove that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut as proposed in government legislation currently before the committee and before all senators in parliament.

The attachments reveal the need for detailed scrutiny and serious consideration of all climate and related energy legislation.

Our Earth's climate has been changing for 4.5 billion years. Historical empirical scientific evidence shows there is nothing unusual or unprecedented about our current temperatures or weather events.

Climate science has been hijacked. Special interest groups pushing ideological societal change, rent-seekers wanting to profit from taxpayer subsidies and politicians looking for easy new ways to tax citizens are hijacking our nation's governance and sovereignty. Alarmingly, once highly regarded agencies such as the CSIRO and BOM, have allowed themselves to become a part of the climate change industry and have failed to provide government with robust competent science advice, upon which to base policy.

There is no logical scientific point with empirical evidence linking carbon dioxide from human activity as the cause of climate variability. No entity or person has ever proven that the ongoing natural climate variability is not entirely natural.

This lack of vigorously tested evidence has allowed governments to create policy that is permanently damaging our once cheap and reliable electricity system. Our manufacturing industries are disappearing overseas, families are struggling to pay their exorbitant power bills, farmers are under pressure, and our once reliable electricity system is on its knees, due to government regulations forcing intermittent [wind and solar](#) into the electricity grid.

Even our children are not safe from this alarmism, with eco-anxiety finding its way into the innocent world of our children.

Nor is the environment safe due to the lack of recycling of many solar, wind and battery components with relatively short working lives and due to other inherently damaging aspects of solar and wind.

I implore you to apply the utmost of analytical and sceptical scrutiny to the claims underpinning climate and related energy policy. The effects of climate policy are historic, and Australia has never before faced such a fundamental and arguably monumental change to our way of life and lifestyle. Your extra scrutiny on the claims underpinning climate and related energy policy could be the difference between millions of Australians suffering if the proposed legislation is passed, or alternatively, having a more prosperous nation if existing climate and related energy legislation is rescinded.

I sincerely hope that your decision on legislation is mindful of the costs and burdens on our constituents, on our nation and on our national security. Your vote if in favour of the climate change bill will prevent sound governance while your vote against the bill will enable sound governance, fairness and integrity.

A mandate for a policy and legislation lacking the claimed scientific basis is a mandate based on lies or misrepresentations. As such it is not a mandate.

Every one of us though has a mandate and responsibility to tell the truth and to vote with integrity.

CONCLUSION

After 14 years studying and investigating climate science, along with in-depth research into the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and profound cross-examining of CSIRO and BOM, we know there is no empirical scientific data as evidence proving that carbon dioxide from human activity has changed or will change temperature or any climate or weather factor.

Importantly, the effect, if any, of carbon dioxide from human activity on any climate or weather variable has never been quantified.

In its presentations to my team and I, the CSIRO stated that **there is no danger from carbon dioxide from human activity and that there is nothing unprecedented about our planet's temperature**. Therefore, there is no scientific justification for any government to introduce policies designed to reduce carbon dioxide from human activity.

We are calling for all climate-based policies and subsidies for renewable energy to be rescinded. The consequences of climate alarmism cost the Australian economy in productivity and growth, and in our ability to compete in the highly competitive international arena.

Clearly, it is time to change our approach to climate change. These Bills must be rejected.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts

Enclosures: Attachments 1 through 9

- [Attachment 1 – Political Basis Driving Climate and Related Energy Policies](#)
- [Attachment 2 – Cross-examining Government Science Agencies](#)
- [Attachment 3 – Other Agencies, Institutions and Universities Fail to Prove Causality](#)
- [Attachment 4 – Natural Global Experiments Confirm Carbon Dioxide's Innocence](#)
- [Attachment 5 – The Basis for Honest Policy and Legislation](#)
- [Attachment 6 – The Savage Economic Burden of Policies Contradicting the Science](#)
- [Attachment 7 – Restoring Scientific Integrity](#)
- [Attachment 8 – CSIRO Report Executive Summary](#)
- [Attachment 9 – The Hidden cost of Climate Policies and Renewables](#)