

but rather impotent with action, to examine global change as a whole, which would of course then include, as you quite rightly put, the issue of energy, the issue behind climate change, and tackle the broadest possible front rather than the climate front alone. Would you care to comment, please?

Mr. Runnalls: I think that may be a more intellectually satisfying way to proceed, but I am just worried, having listened to the discussion of the last day and a half, that the mere subject of climate change itself is so immense, so complex and brings so many of the other issues you were raising.... For example, I do not see how you could deal with the climate change question without dealing with population, and I would be somewhat reluctant to open perhaps yet another Pandora's box inside of Ernie Bevin's other Trojan horse.

All of these problems are quite critical, but I think at some stage we begin to overload people's brain cells and we overload the capacity of the policy machine to respond.

I think appropriate responses to climate change will have to involve such things as population policy. They will have to involve things such as the use of soils and soil erosion. They certainly have to involve both deforestation and reforestation, in terms of carbon syncs.

If we begin to rethink energy policy on a fairly major scale, they are going to change the whole pattern of industrialization or at least the character of industrialization over the next 30, 40 or 50 years.

Although I am intrigued by the broader global change issues, I am just wondering if the climate change issue itself is not so broad that broadening it even more could lead to a very, very difficult set of policy dilemmas for any government. Climatic change is bad enough.

Mr. Fulton: I would like to thank David for such a good summation.

One of the things I think this committee and the viewing public have to reflect on increasingly—and it actually came out of one of Dr. Bates's comments—is that 10 years ago there was a net outflow from developed countries in foreign aid of \$40 billion a year to the Third World. Very few Canadians and very few people around the world know that in 1989 that had finally not only totally reversed, but there was a \$50 billion flow the other way. Developing countries are holding up the economies of the developed world.

When we are talking about CFCs and refrigerators in China, when we are talking about the expansion of non-scrubbed coal facilities, whether it is in Poland, India or China, how we get the technology to them is something we crucially have to face.

This brings me to the question I think Canadians are particularly troubled by. Whenever I have spoken about the EPA report, I have said if I were Michael Wilson, what could possibly be more popular in 1990 than saying to every man, woman and child that I have a policy that will save them \$5,000, it is actual money they can put in the bank over the next 10 years, while we reduce the amount of carbon dioxide going into our atmosphere by two-thirds?