

The Garnaut Climate Change Review  
Level 2 , 1 Treasury Place  
Melbourne VIC 3002

**Date 6/05/08**

### **Submission of Peter W Gallagher to the Garnaut Climate Change Review**

I wish to address only one issue: the Review's almost unqualified assertion that man-made global warming is of a scale that warrants dramatic and costly action, such as reductions of carbon emissions by 70% or even 90% by 2050. My concern is that the interim report of the Review makes no reasonably detailed attempt critically to evaluate the evidence for man-made global warming and therefore fails to provide a proportionate basis for its proposed recommendations.

The Interim Report concludes in Section 2.4 a very brief overview of the evidence for serious man-made climate change with an alarming conclusion that the 'reality of observed climate change in recent years has surprised mainstream scientific opinion'. It goes on to construct a plan for CO<sub>2</sub> mitigation efforts based on this view. The Interim Report reaches this conclusion by reference to a one-page note by Rhamstorff et. al. that has been plausibly criticized for light-weight analysis and for using a convenient statistical manipulation that distorts its report of the data.

A more reasonable conclusion from any first-hand examination of the 'reality of observed climate change in recent years' is that the evidence, while *consistent* with a degree of global warming at possibly half the rate projected by the IPCC for the current decade, **does not confirm it**. I will not offer you my own reasoning and investigations since I am sure many others have made the same point to you. Mine are available [on-line](#) . For the sake of brevity, I can say that I share the skepticism about the IPCC assertions and the value of 'consensus' in science that Professor Don Aitkin expressed in his recent paper "A cool look at global warming", delivered 19 March to the Planning Institute of Australia.

I believe it is incumbent on the Review to undertake at least the same critical examination of the data as Professor Aitkin has undertaken because a dramatic and costly policy change, even when implemented on a precautionary basis, demands a proportionate evidence or at least evidence of enquiry. In my submission the Review has not done that.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter W Gallagher', written in a cursive style.

Peter W Gallagher :: South Yarra, Victoria.