

At the moment, as Jim MacNeill pointed out, the north-south politics of this issue are awful. The potential for a major north-south split is very great indeed. We have access to and a certain credibility with all the major players. Although we are a member of the "rich nations club", we have had an active diplomacy with the Third World and a respectable foreign-aid program.

It seems to me that the north-south split could come from either one or both of two apparently mutually contradictory assumptions. The first, and probably most likely, is that the Third World realizes just how much leverage this issue gives them and will demand some sort of grand bargain or many little bargains in exchange for concessions on some of the issues it regards as most important.

The first evidence of this, and the easiest one to deal with, will come in June at the next ozone negotiations in London. Canada has played before a facilitating role in these types of situations—one thinks of the north-south dialogue—and might be able to do so again. Our position on official debt, recently reiterated by the Prime Minister in the case of the Caribbean, could be of enormous help here.

The second possibility is that many developing countries continue to regard this whole thing as some form of science fiction cooked up by other peoples' scientists, mainly American, to place constraints on their own energy development. We have seen this sort of thing before, in advance of the Stockholm Conference in 1972, and the only way to deal with it is to help the policy and scientific communities in the countries themselves come to their own conclusions about the magnitude of the threat to them and their own options in the negotiation process. We have other major diplomatic assets we can deploy.

.1125

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in the end, however, no matter how many extremely competent people we send abroad to be involved in this negotiating process, I suspect that our ability to change things will be directly related to how the outside world perceives our own willingness to make serious changes at home. We are in the information age, and information about domestic policies travels much faster and farther than ever before. If you doubt this, ask David Suzuki and the other Canadian environmentalists how many questions the Brazilians asked them about British Columbia's forest management policies on their last visit to the Amazon.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying that we have had a very rich session. We have had an enormous number of suggestions, only a few of which I have been able to do any kind of justice to here, about Canada's policy options in this area, about the sorts of things that might require further consideration by you and your colleagues at later meetings of one or a number of your committees. I think we have seen from a number of our speakers that the old adage of Canadian altruism is not yet dead. This is an issue that is vital to our international security and one in which we could play a constructive and very creative role. Thank you.