

**Amy Coney Barrett Denies Having
An Opinion On Climate Change,
But She Has Close, Personal Ties To
Multinational Oil Corporations
That Deny Climate Change**

ACCOUNTABLE .US

Amy Coney Barrett Says She Has No Opinion On Climate Change, But Has Ties To Multinational Oil Giants Like Shell Oil

Amy Coney Barrett On Climate Change: “I’m Certainly Not A Scientist.”

When Asked About Climate Change, Barrett Said, “I’m Certainly Not A Scientist” And Shad She Has No “Firm Views On It.” “Not a ton is known about Amy Coney Barrett’s views on climate change, but this exchange on day two of the Senate hearings was telling. Senator John Kennedy (R-La.) questioned Barrett, trying to prove a point about Democratic objections to her confirmation: ‘My colleagues think you’re only qualified if you’re dumb, if you have a blank slate. If you’ve never thought about the world. Have you thought about the world?’ Barrett answered that indeed she had. He asked her if she’d thought about social problems and economic problems. She answered yes to both. Then he asked, ‘How about climate change?’ and Barrett launched into a non-answer. ‘I’ve read about climate change,’ she said. ‘I’m certainly not a scientist. I mean, I’ve read things on climate change. I would not say I have firm views on it.’” [Mother Jones, [10/13/20](#)]

But She Has Close Personal And Family Ties To The Multinational Oil Giant Royal Dutch Shell...

Amy Coney Barrett’s Father Spent “Most” Of His Career As A Lawyer For Shell Oil. “Most of my legal career was spent as an attorney with Shell in New Orleans. But early in my career I was promoted and transferred to Shell’s main office in Houston. From a career perspective it was fantastic. The salary increase and the potential for further management promotions were a dream. There was one problem. By then we had 6 children, one a baby. After jointly discerning what was best for our family and after securing another job, I resigned. Our discernment had told us that money and success were not as important as what was best for our family. Later Shell rehired me with the promotion and a promise to keep me in New Orleans.” [St. Catherine Of Siena Parish, accessed [10/14/20](#)]

Amy Coney Barrett Listed Shell Oil And Many Of Its Affiliates In A Recusal List On Her 7th Circuit Judicial Questionnaire. Barrett’s judicial questionnaire lists SHELL OIL COMPANY at 4760 One Shell Plaza in Houston, TX, SHELL OIL COMPANY at 4806 One Shell Plaza in Houston, SHELL OIL COMPANY at 909 Fannin Street in Houston, Shell Oil Company, Shell Oil Products Company LLC, Shell Oil Refinery, and Shell Petroleum, Incorporated. [Amy Coney Barrett Senate Judiciary Committee Questionnaire Appendix 14, [09/28/20](#)]

...She Was Even A White Collar Criminal Defense Attorney For A Law Firm Representing Multinational Oil Giants, Including Shell And Exxon

Amy Coney Barrett Worked In White Collar Criminal Defense For A Law Firm Whose Clients Included Major Oil Corporations, Including Shell. At Baker Botts, Amy Barrett Specialized In White Collar Criminal Defense. "Amy C. Barrett is an associate with Baker Botts L.L.P. Prior to joining Baker Botts in January 2001, Ms. Barrett was an associate at Miller, Cassidy, Larroca, and Lewin, L.L.P. Her practice includes white collar criminal defense, general civil litigation and appellate litigation." [Baker Botts, archived [04/15/01](#)]

- **Baker Botts Has A Major Energy Practice With Many Clients In The Oil And Gas Industry.** "The oil and gas practice at Baker Botts covers the full spectrum of legal services for major integrated oil and gas companies, independent oil and gas producers, developers and investors in oil and gas reserves and infrastructure, and lenders and other financing sources for the oil and gas industry. The firm's U.S. oil and gas practice dates from the Spindletop era of the 1920s, while our international energy practice began in earnest in the 1960s and 1970s. Today, our practice spans the globe, with experience in nearly 50 nations, and the firm is frequently called upon to help structure and document complex, challenging or novel oil and gas projects." [Baker Botts, archived [04/23/01](#)]

While Barrett Worked At Baker Botts, The Firm Successfully Defended Shell Oil In A Federal Antitrust Case Brought By Over 600 Independent Gas Stations. "On December 14, Judge Scott Brister of the 234 Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas, entered a final order granting summary judgement in HRN, Inc., et al. v. Shell Oil Co., et al., a case brought by more than 600 independent service station dealers against Shell Oil Company and its joint ventures with Texaco, Equilon, L.L.C. and Motiva, L.L.C. The Firm represents all defendants in the case. The case began in New Orleans as a federal antitrust case. On defendants' motion, the case was transferred to Houston and assigned to U.S. District Judge Nancy Atlas. Shortly after the transfer, Judge Atlas granted defendants' motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' various antitrust theories. The plaintiffs filed a new suit in state court attempting to convert their antitrust claims into common law tort and contract actions. In April, Judge Brister granted partial summary judgment relating to several issues but permitted plaintiffs to proceed with their claims that the defendants had increased rent and charged the dealers excessive prices for gasoline in order to drive the dealers out of business so Shell could convert all the plaintiffs' stations to company operated stations. The case was then set for trial in October. A team of 16 Baker Botts lawyers deposed over 250 plaintiffs in only a few months' time. While the trial date slipped to November 27, on November 10, Judge Brister issued a second preliminary order disposing of the remainder of the plaintiffs' claims. After three more hearings on the preliminary order, the final order was issued." [Baker Botts, archived [07/10/01](#)]

Baker Botts Represented Exxon In A Case Against The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. "On March 24, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit handed down a highly favorable decision for natural gas producers in Exxon Corporation v. Federal Energy

Regulatory Commission. The court held that FERC had failed to provide a lawful basis for imposing a rate design for gas transportation on the Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line system that reduced producer netback gas prices at the wellhead by as much as \$50 million per year. The dispute arose in a series of proceedings before FERC that spanned over seven years. In these proceedings the FERC rejected arguments by producers that Transco should be permitted to adopt a so-called firm-to-the-wellhead rate design in which all pipeline fixed transmission costs are placed in the pipeline's reservation rates. Although the FERC had previously approved this FTW rate design for other pipelines, the FERC concluded that Transco must retain its previously adopted IT-feeder rate design. Under the IT-feeder approach, over \$50 million per year of pipeline fixed costs are placed in the pipeline's commodity rates. [...] In a 2-1 decision authored by Judge Stephen Williams, the court agreed and reversed and remanded the orders to FERC." [Baker Botts, archived [07/10/01](#)]

When Barrett Worked For Shell's Law Firm, The Corporation Knew Climate Change Was An Impending Crisis

In 1998, Shell Researchers Predicted That Climate Change Could Become A Major Crisis. "In 1998, Shell researchers wrote an internal memo about future scenarios that could harm their business. They determined that 'only a crisis can lead to a large-scale change in this world,' according to the memo, recently uncovered by De Correspondent with a trove of company documents. The scenario planning process was based on climate science, political realities and economic projections. It suggested that a major storm on the East Coast in 2010 could turn public opinion against Shell and other oil and gas conglomerates, while pushing governments toward strict environmental regulations and investments in renewable energy." [E&E, [04/05/18](#)]

In 1998, Shell Recognized That Fossil Fuels Contribute To Climate Change. "The revelations about Shell's internal deliberations on climate change were contained in a series of Shell documents obtained by De Correspondent, an online investigative news outlet based in Europe, and shared with E&E News. The documents, published online by Climate Files, show that Shell has long recognized that fossil fuels contribute to climate change. The disclosure comes as Shell and other oil companies are being sued by California municipalities for exacerbating sea-level rise." [E&E, [04/05/18](#)]