

I think that might be the most difficult single issue that you are going to face as political leaders trying to deal with these sorts of problems, reconciling the fact that the public has an enormous amount of enthusiasm for all of these issues.

As Doug Miller pointed out, there is an enormous concern for public health, and this was reinforced by Dr. Bates this morning. When people become concerned in that way they tend to want solutions, and there is then a kind of disappearance of the relative cost of this as opposed to that. I am glad that is your job and not mine.

**The Joint Chairman:** A person from the public would like to ask a question. Madam.

**Ms Jackie Rourke (Reporter, *The Weather Network*):** My name is Jackie Rourke and I work at *The Weather Network*. I want to address an issue that was raised yesterday, the confusion among the public. Working in the media, we are trying to sort all this out, just as you are. I would like to hear from the witnesses and from the panelists just whose role is it to clear up some of the confusion. Just this morning Dr. Arthur's speech itself added even more confusion as to whether or not we should even be concerned about climate change and global warming. I think the conclusion from this is that we should be. But whose role is it to explain the causes and effects to the public? Yesterday we heard that 51% have confidence in the science experts, 26% rely on television, only 2% have confidence in politicians. Who do you think should be disseminating the information? Is it in fact important that the public gets a good understanding?

**Dr. Arthur:** Science is better at creating controversy than solving it. I am not sure it is our place, except maybe in the aggregate bodies to decide where the trend of research is going, and that can put you in a bad place because that is what I tried to do here. In the impacts research the trend is going towards, in climate change not air pollution, benefits to northern latitudes, countries in northern latitudes. I would have been academically dishonest not to present that picture, because I would not be presenting the way that science is moving even though they are individual studies moving in other directions. As these larger scientific bodies develop a sense of where all the research is going, then maybe they can sort it out.

The problem with this issue is we are so early in it that you are getting studies instead of whole scientific consensus.

**Ms Rourke:** But so often we have heard that we cannot wait the 10 or 20 or 50 years to get that signature that this in fact was caused by global warming. If we cannot wait, is it not important that the public gets educated about it?

**Dr. Arthur:** I think you are doing a good job. They are getting both sides of the issue. They are confused, like science is confused. I think confusion is the correct stance.

**Dr. Bates:** I think the answer to your question is on several planes. I would draw your attention to the series *Planet Earth*, produced by the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, for which I do a lot of work. That provides a major source of public education