

**24 May 2019**

**Media Watch is interested in Alan Jones' recent broadcasts related to Clive Palmer, which are in contrast to his broadcasts in 2016 when Queensland Nickel collapsed.**

**In April 2016, Mr Jones was scathing of Clive Palmer and condemned his role in the collapse of Queensland Nickel, including how he left workers high and dry. We can provide some examples if you'd like.**

**Recently Mr Jones taken a different approach to Clive Palmer.**

**He made supportive comments about Mr Palmer on Sky's "Richo and Jones" (15.5.19). He also interviewed Mr Palmer twice on his 2GB/4BC radio program, after Mr Palmer announced UAP preferences would go to the Coalition. These interviews did include questions about Queensland Nickel and also briefly, the Coolum Resort. But the majority of time was spent with Mr Palmer on politics, where he promoted his policies and also criticised Labour.**

**We're wondering what caused Mr Jones' change of heart in relation to Clive Palmer? Did Clive Palmer's decision to direct preferences to the Coalition play a role? If not, what is the reason?**

**A response as soon as possible would be helpful but if you can please come back to us by 10am Monday 27 May, that would be appreciated.**

**27 May 2019**

**Response:**

MediaWatch up to its old tricks. Where would MediaWatch be without Alan Jones! However, in response to your e-mail let me make the following points. If the programme is to be fair, which it rarely is, though I can't confess to watching it (cynicism was never a long suit of mine) it can offer the following on my behalf.

You sent an email 2.09 pm Friday to 2GB and Channel Nine. It may surprise you to know that, given I've been up since 2.30am, I'm not in receipt of business e-mails at 2.09pm. Nor do I check e-mails from Friday until I come off air on Monday. I now note the e-mail re Clive Palmer.

There are some points of agreement. I was scathing of Clive Palmer in 2016. In fact I went to Townsville to address the workers, at my own cost. But if you cared to listen to my interviews with him, I raised this issue again. I think I talked about "clearing the decks". I have checked correspondence between Palmer and the liquidator in relation to moneys owed. I made the point about taxpayers' money and I thought Palmer answered the question about liability in a way which indicated that the responsibility for payment may not have been his.

I asked also about third party payments and cited examples. The answers are there for anyone to hear. But I was in receipt of continuing correspondence about what he was saying in those ads. I believe the substance of what he was saying was consistent with public concerns about the Labor Party's policies. My "supportive comments" were based on his prosecution of those points. Unlike MediaWatch, I don't believe people are wholly bad or wholly wrong. I am still corresponding with Mr Palmer to seek answers on the Coolum issue but on the detail of the advertising, his views were consistent with many in the electorate and he proved a significant force in educating the electorate about the difficulties that lay ahead under a Shorten Government.

Of course MediaWatch can't avoid the cynical. Obviously you have your noses out of joint because some of your Labor mates didn't prevail. Hence this latest communication with me. But you can check with Mr Palmer and anyone else. My interviewing of him had nothing to do with preferences, though he made it quite plain that his whole role in this advertising campaign was to prevent Mr Shorten from forming government.

As to the reason for interviewing Mr Palmer, I offer the usual response to MediaWatch. Mind your own business. But the reason is consistent with everything we do, designed to better inform the public. Unlike MediaWatch we offer all sides of the argument. Perhaps you can offer this answer to your e-mail. As requested the answer will be delivered by 10am.

Yours sincerely,

**Alan Jones AO**