

domestic sewage and offshore oil spills are to blame. But inadequate compliance even with existing environmental policies in both countries prevails against improvement.

Two implications begin to emerge from such examples. First, correcting past mistakes and instituting truly sustainable development often means fixing the dislocation between costs and benefits. If Canadians expect Thais and Chinese and Koreans to adopt sustainable environmental and economic strategies—and Canadians share the global benefits—are Canadians willing to share the costs? Is the present generation of Canadians, or Asians, prepared to invest in benefits to be enjoyed only by future generations? Finding ways of reallocating these costs and benefits, so that everyone has some stake in success, is one of the riddles of solving sustainable-development problems.

The second implication in the examples is that international action is nearly always necessary. Canadian loons in the Maritimes are ingesting mercury airborne from Eurasia (and from the United States, it should be added). South Koreans and Japanese suffer appalling air pollution from Northern China. The squalor of Manila or Jakarta cannot be eradicated by Filipinos or Indonesians alone. It has been estimated that APEC's Asian members would have to invest an additional \$42 billion (U.S.) every year to achieve sustainable growth by 2000; most of that could be financed by their own growth, but not all. Keeping in mind the benefits that Canadians stand to gain, what should Canadians contribute to Asia-Pacific's sustainable development?

Some people argue (considering the humble amounts in Canadian development aid budgets) that Canada's best contribution is to promote more trade and investment; rising prosperity, they say, provides developing countries with both the capacity and the incentive to introduce and enforce sustainable-development policies. Selling