

## Attachment 2

### Cross-examining Government Science Agencies

- From September 2016 to March 2022, I cross-examined CSIRO and the Chief Scientist on climate science. CSIRO's climate science team made three presentations to me and my senate office team each of two and a half to three hours duration with the first including CSIRO's Chief Executive Dr Larry Marshall. Two presentations were arranged from the Chief Scientist.
- During CSIRO's presentations:
  - CSIRO admitted that it has never stated that carbon dioxide from human activity poses a danger. Instead, statements of danger came from politicians;
  - **CSIRO never quantified any specific impact of carbon dioxide from human activity on any climate or weather variable such as temperature, rainfall, droughts, floods, storms, ocean alkalinity, ... Yet these are fundamental to a valid basis for climate and energy policy;**
  - CSIRO admitted that today's temperatures are **NOT** unprecedented;
  - CSIRO then claimed unprecedented rate of temperature rise. After our team exposed blatant inaccuracies that discredited the papers CSIRO had provided as evidence, CSIRO's climate science team stopped discussing those papers, effectively withdrawing its papers;
  - CSIRO thus failed to provide the logical scientific points showing that carbon dioxide from human activity causes climate change and needs to be cut. **The term "logical scientific points" means the empirical scientific data within a logical scientific framework proving causality.** It is the fundamental basis of science. It is what decides science;
  - CSIRO instead relied upon unvalidated, erroneous and discredited computer models;
  - CSIRO has failed to provide statistically significant evidence of change in any climate factor. CSIRO has never provided logical scientific points that past, current, ongoing and ever-present variability in climate factors is not entirely natural;
  - CSIRO initially relied upon one discredited, erroneous paper on temperature (Marcott 2013) and one discredited, erroneous paper on carbon dioxide (Harries 2001). When our colleague scientists identified blatant errors and absurdities in both papers CSIRO stopped discussing and effectively withdrew those papers. CSIRO then cited one more paper each on temperature (Lecavalier 2017) and on carbon dioxide (Feldman 2015) that again proved ridiculously faulty. When CSIRO stopped discussing these and in effect withdrew the papers CSIRO produced five papers that contradicted the papers CSIRO initially gave us;
  - CSIRO admits to not doing due diligence on data relied upon from external agencies;
  - CSIRO admits to not doing due diligence on reports from external agencies nor on supposedly scientific papers it provided;
  - CSIRO revealed little understanding of papers it cited as evidence;
  - CSIRO allows politicians and journalists to misrepresent CSIRO without correction;
  - CSIRO misled parliament.
- Seventeen internationally respected climate scientists from six nations including Australia and covering many disciplines of climate science and climatology confirmed our conclusion that CSIRO has never presented logical scientific points needed as the basis for policy and science.

Feel welcome to check for yourself the details supporting the above statements in Attachments 6 and 7 presenting the discussions and transcripts from my team's meetings with CSIRO's climate science team. Our rebuttal of CSIRO relies on peer-reviewed scientific papers. Attachment 6 presents half-page list of conclusions is on page 11 and recommendations on page 12.

CSIRO's "science" on climate policy-making amounts to a gross misleading of parliament. Serious questions need to be asked of the current CSIRO Chief Executive Dr Larry Marshall, Executive Director Dr Peter Mayfield and former Chief Executive Dr Megan Clark.

### **Freedom of Information and Parliamentary Library searches confirm no evidence given to MPs**

Requests made under Freedom of Information provisions and subsequent Parliamentary Library searches confirmed that neither CSIRO's Chief Executive or CSIRO itself nor Australia's Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) has provided reports to members of parliament presenting Logical Scientific Points containing empirical data as evidence of the need to cut carbon dioxide from human activity. Yet this is what decides science.

### **Bureau of Meteorology admits State of the Climate Report contains no evidence of human cause**

During Additional Senate Estimates hearings in February 2022 BOM's CEO Dr Andrew Johnson admitted that the biannual joint BOM-CSIRO publication titled *State of the Climate* (SOTC) contains no evidence that carbon dioxide from human activity is affecting climate and needs to be cut. Yet several politicians cite this document as evidence to cut carbon dioxide from human activity.

BOM has never provided logical scientific points justifying a cut in carbon dioxide production.

### **Chief Scientist**

AT his first presentation to us, Dr Alan Finkel proceeded freely with no interruption for about 20 minutes until we asked him a simple question. This led to a brief discussion in which he admitted that he is not a climate scientist and that he does not understand climate science.

We note that despite this he had been criss-crossing our nation for five years speaking about climate change and the need to cut carbon dioxide from human activity. After his admission he continued unscientifically advocating for such unfounded cuts.

During senate estimates hearings in 2017 in answer to Senator Ian Macdonald's question about the impact on climate of cutting all Australian human production of carbon dioxide ("100 per cent") Dr Finkel admitted the impact would be "virtually nothing".

Dr Finkel is publicly known as "an Australian neuroscientist, inventor, researcher, entrepreneur, educator, policy advisor, and philanthropist".

### **Australian Institute of Marine Science, AIMS**

AIMS has never produced the logical scientific points including the empirical scientific data proving that carbon dioxide from human activity needs to be cut.

No Australian federal, state or territory government has ever had the scientific basis for a mandate to push, much less pass legislation cutting the production of carbon dioxide from human activity.