

of the following, however, would provide a subject for future hearings of one or two committees, or indeed the subject for another forum in the future.

I must say that like one of the previous speakers, I was disappointed not to see either the finance or the foreign affairs committee here, although I realize the latter had an unavoidable engagement. In fact, I believe they are now in Moscow at this very moment.

As you can see from the testimony, climate change and the responses to it are critical to the future of the Canadian economy and to Canada's place in the world trading system. Most of the solutions proposed have major consequences for the tax system and could profoundly affect those industries, such as forestry and energy, which have traditionally provided much of our export income and employment for large numbers of people. I think it is therefore a subject one will discover your colleagues in the finance committee will have to deal with in the fairly near future.

Climate change is not just an environmental issue. It is also the quintessential global issue. As Jim MacNeill and others have pointed out, global warming may well dominate the foreign policy agenda throughout much of the rest of this century. The coming round of negotiations over strengthening the Montreal Protocol, the World Climate Conference, and the 1992 conference in Brazil will be critical to the prospects of achieving one or a series of global bargains between the north and the south on these issues.

What have we learned, or what have I learned, from listening in the last day and a half? The first is that climate change is real and the climate scientists agree on the essentials of it. I thought Dr. Schneider's remarks were enormously helpful in isolating for a layman like myself where the real scientific uncertainties lie. I also found helpful his advice to us that we are experimenting not with a laboratory but with our own planet, and if we wait for absolute certainty to emerge from more scientific research it could be too late.

Despite the fact that Mr. Bush has resorted to the old American acid rain ruse that much more research is needed before action can be taken, it is clear even from the carefully stage-managed White House conference last week that the majority of European governments disagree with this approach, as neatly summarized by *The New York Times* in its headline, "More Research, Says the President; Action, Say the Visitors".

It is also clear the members of the prestigious Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, led by the Swedish climatologist Dr. Bert Bohlin, agree with the general lines of the analysis presented by Dr. Schneider yesterday. The IPCC is the expert body that has been designated by the international community to produce some form of scientific consensus on the issues. I am told by members of IPCC that its final report, which will come out later this year, will not be much different from the sorts of remarks you heard from Dr. Schneider yesterday morning.

.1110

This is not to say that more research is not needed. After all, I do come from the Institute for Research on Public Policy. We do need to know far more about the effects of