

The Joint Chairman: I believe the founder of Earth Day in Canada would like to say a few words.

Mr. John McConnell (Founder of Earth Day): Thank you. By the way, when we are talking about climate change, I noticed in today's *Ottawa Citizen* that the mastodon was not eliminated by a larger animal but by changes in climate. I guess what we need all over the world is a change of climate in our thinking.

I wanted to address a couple of things and ask a couple of questions. There are so many solutions to energy: for instance, nitanol—there has been a great deal of work done on this; it is a most efficient and clean energy and could change the world. I see so little reference to these solutions.

Another thing I want to mention is there is no mention, for example, of Alden Bryant, a leading scientist in California, who testified at the United Nations that our danger is not global warming but global cooling, that we are on the verge of the ice age. I just wonder if the thinking on that stand in regard to the future could be addressed. Certainly one thing that is certain is no longer is nature deciding the future. Now nature is dead and man is deciding the future. But we had better learn some of nature's secrets before we proceed. Again, I would like an answer to the global cooling. Thank you.

.1210

Mr. Runnalls: I am sorry, Mr. McConnell, I did not hear the entire question. I was busy, as you can see, positioning myself over there so the television cameras would point at me rather than the minister.

My impression is that the warming or cooling debate has been resolved. There are very few, if any, remaining exponents of the new ice age theory.

Mr. McConnell: Well, Alden Bryant testified recently at the United States—

Mr. Runnalls: I am aware of that. I think one of the things one has to remember is what Steve Schneider said yesterday, that there is a very real danger in paying attention to either the last piece of testimony or the last study done on this issue.

I think one of the great services the National Academy of Sciences has done in the United States is to put these sorts of things through the appropriate peer review process, so that when a study actually comes out that is comprehensive, it is one that has allowed for a wide range of comment on the part of the scientific community.

I am not saying this gentleman is necessarily wrong. He is certainly well off the beaten track in the consensus these days. My guess is that if he has followers of his particular approach, it will come out in the normal scientific peer review process.

I take Stephen's point very much that the scientific review process is an important part of the scientific method. By springing various studies on the press and on the public, one after the other, studies that are not peer-reviewed, one contributes to the air of confusion.