

Could I have some comments from our panelists on this? We have a former Minister of the Environment here today. What kinds of moneys should the governments be spending now on a yearly basis? What does the infrastructure allow them to spend in terms of the potential for spending money and where will it come from?

.1155

Mr. Runnalls: I do not think there is an absolute answer to the question. On the issue of global warming and atmospheric change, the numbers are very vague. The kinds of numbers one is talking about internationally, which I think H el ene Lajambe mentioned yesterday, are quite large. We are talking about a minimum of probably \$20 billion or \$30 billion a year. That is what the preliminary numbers seem to be for dealing with carbon dioxide on a major scale.

I mentioned in my summary the critical importance of the ozone discussions. The next round of the ozone discussions will be in June. If we are going to defuse the politics of this, the real north-south split that is building, the easiest one to deal with is chlorofluorocarbons.

We know something about substitutes, and we know something about costs. The Dutch government commissioned McKinsey & Co., the big consulting firm, to do a series of costings to deal with these various problems. They reckoned the total cost of getting the developing countries off chlorofluorocarbons would be something in the order of \$150 million to \$200 million a year. This is not a lot of money when you consider that the current foreign aid flow is \$50 billion a year and that you in fact get a "two-for". You get a reduction of the pressure on the ozone layer itself and also a reduction of CFCs as a greenhouse gas. According to Stephen Schneider, CFCs are also about 20% to 25% of the problem of climate change.

So we have an issue in which we could spend a relatively small amount of money. The \$150 million to \$200 million a year is world-wide, that is not Canada's share. I suspect Canada's share would probably be \$10 million or \$15 million. We could also begin to change the political dynamic of what is going on now between the north and the south a little bit and we could make a very major and quite cost-effective impact on both the ozone hole and the whole question of global climate change. So I guess trying to deal with the CFC question is the low end of the spectrum.

Domestic costs in Canada of dealing with CFCs will probably be internalized. In other words, companies will make more expensive refrigerators because the substitute is more expensive and so on. But in terms of moneys paid out of the public purse, if we took a leadership role at the meeting in London in trying to provide financing for alleviating the CFC question, that would be relatively cheap.

When one begins to get into the whole question of carbon dioxide emission controls, the studies I have seen are relatively positive at least up to a point. In other words, it seems to be possible to get quite major reductions in carbon dioxide production without