

From: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
Subject: Fwd: Re[2]: Submission to the Inquiry into Australia's clean energy future
Date: 9 October 2011 12:49:41 PM AEST
To: malcolmr@conscious.com.au

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Xxxxx XXXXXXX" <xxx@xxxx.com.au>
Date: 7 October 2011 9:17:43 AM AEST
To: malcolmr@conscious.com.au
Subject: Fwd: RE: Re[2]: Submission to the Inquiry into Australia's clean energy future

Xxxxx XXXX's earlier email to me. Mentions a name at the secretariat
XXXX

***** BEGIN FORWARDED MESSAGE *****

On 2011-10-06 at 16:48 XXXXX XXXX <XXXXX.XXXX@XXXXXXXXX.COM.AU> wrote:

This government stinks.

Steven Boyd from the secretariat for the "Joint Select Committee on Australia's Clean Energy Future Legislation" called me back. There were over 4000 submissions.

He said "the committee took a hard line on what was a submission and what was correspondence".

The excuse was: to be classified as a submission it had deal with the actual legislation.

That's rubbish. Tell me how many of the 69 selected as "submissions" were any closer to dealing with the legislation than mine (attached), for example submissions: 6, 7, 31, 40. Many others also do not address the legislation either.
<http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jscacefl/subs.htm>

It seems that the length of the submissions was the key criteria. For individuals, only short ones were accepted as submissions. Why didn't they give a page limit beforehand if that was the criteria.

This defines what should be in a submission:
<http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/documnts/howsub.htm#what>

I'm pissed.

Regards

Peter Lang
P: 02 xxxx xxxx
M: 04xx xxx xxx

-----Original Message-----

From: XXXXX XXXXXXX [mailto:xxx@xxxx.com.au]
Sent: Thursday, 6 October 2011 3:27 PM
To: XXXXXXXXXXXX@XXXXXXXX.COM.AU; XXXXXXX XXXXXXX;
XXXXX.XXXX@XXXXXXXXX.COM.AU

Subject: Re[2]: Submission to the Inquiry into Australia's clean energy future

My immediate broadside

Dear Sir or Madam,

I contributed a submission; the committee received a submission. There were no terms of references. You are telling me that my submission was not a submission and that now in retrospect a submission must go into specific details about the Bill.

Do you have no notion of transparency or due process?

Are you, Secretary of the Joint Select Committee on Australia's Clean Energy Future Legislation, prepared to defend your decision in public?

I hope to receive your committment to publish all submissions received by return email.

Yours sincerely,

Xxxxx XXXXXXX, AM

***** REPLY SEPARATOR *****

On 2011-10-06 at 02:12 Committee, JSCACEFL (REPS) wrote:

Thank you for your contribution to the inquiry by the Joint Select Committee on Australia's Clean Energy Future Legislation.

The committee has received your email as correspondence. While the committee considers the views in correspondence, it does not publish correspondence on its webpage. This does not lessen the importance of your contribution, however only those documents that went to specific detail about the Bills were published as submissions.

In the report, the committee discussed some of the key themes raised in correspondence. The report of the committee will be presented on Friday, 7 October 2011. The report can be accessed from the committee's website at <http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jscacefl/index.htm>

Thank you for your interest in the inquiry.

Secretary
Joint Select Committee on Australia's Clean Energy Future Legislation

***** END FORWARDED MESSAGE *****

At stake is human freedom, your freedom, *our* freedom