

Mr. Frank Dottori

Ladies and gentlemen, as an entrepreneur and industrialist, I feel a little bit intimidated among this elite group here, but I'll try to give you my opinion and I won't be as outspoken as I usually am.

My question in my speech is "Why did the stone age end?" Did they run out of rocks? Or did technology evolve and move into a new era? And why did the fossil fuel age end? Which I believe it will. And are we going to run out of fossil fuels? Just as in the stone age, they ran out of rocks? Or, will the fuel age leave us vulnerable like the dinosaurs, and you know what happened to them. And I think the choice is ours to make, we didn't run out of stones and I can guarantee you we won't run out of fossil fuels. There's enough oil and gas there to last us another century. But can we afford to put 125 million tons per day into the atmosphere? That's a lot of tons, that's not per year or per month, that's per day. And look at the signs—you can see the global temperatures are going up. I think there's a lot of discussions here: ice caps melting, the other day I heard something about we're going to run out of water in Ecuador and that's going to affect the Amazon. So, I think somebody's going to have to do something.

Having meetings like this are great, but are we going to come out with any conclusions or is it just going to be a great discussion, we all walk out of here knowing a little bit more than we did when we came in? Some effects on the Canadian forestry. This is probably the biggest devastation of the forests that has been seen in modern history. In central Canada we have dieback from forests from the acid rain that continues to destroy forests, and we get a lot of persecution as an industry, but we only harvest about 0.6% of the forest, the rest gets lost in insects and dieback, and some other issues.

And here's some pictures and you can see what happens for example in British Columbia where 10 million hectares are being wiped out due to the fact that we haven't had a cold spell. These will devastate the industry and in 10–15 years probably 30–40% of the forests will have disappeared. But, again, Mother Nature adjusts and trees especially, they'll grow back up, but what happens to the human and species dislocation which I think is very significant? And what's the problem? As I mentioned I think it's the 125 million tons, and the atmosphere is large and big but it cannot continue to absorb this. Now you see a lot of reaction from business and a lot of governments saying this is all just statistical evidence and I guess the question we have to ask ourselves is if we want to wait and see if this is for real, because if it is, we are going to be like the dinosaurs. Or are we going to do something about it? And what are the biggest problems?

There are a lot of numbers out there and it took me a little bit of time to try and get numbers and I'm not sure that these are 100% correct but there seems to be a consensus, that in the industrial process, there's about 15% of the gases come from there. Transportation is another 20–25%, but the biggest is the power generation. The coal plants and the gas plants that generate basic electric power. And I guess my view as an engineer is can we fix it? I think we can, I think the solution's there but I don't hear anybody talking about it. And I just personally, from what I've managed to look at, I

think if you compare Europe with North America—Europe I think is more advanced than most countries in the world with urban systems—you know how do you do it? Cars, for example. A recent medium like this, where the new cars coming out will probably cut energy emissions or emissions by using more efficient processes by 30%. So those are steps in the right direction because you are not going to eliminate cars, that's reality. We all talk about it, but none of us are going to go back to bicycles. And biofuels, electric trains instead of trucks, as I think somebody mentioned.

So there's a lot of potential, but the biggest one is nuclear energy and when I make this speech, even though I sit on environmental boards, everyone just quivers and says you know there's all these problems. Nobody takes the time to really understand it. When I was going to university, there was a nuclear reactor at my university and I'll bet every university out there has a nuclear reactor. They're not atom bombs. People have got to take the time and I hope this organization, IASA, also takes a look at the alternatives. France has, what, 75–85% nuclear power? Now there is a danger if you have fast reactors you can create bombs and do things like this, but if you use the can-do, unless you have \$2 billion to put into separation of the plutonium from the uranium it's not going to happen. And again, the waste material can be handled, and I know how to handle do it myself and I'm an amateur. But it'll take 10–15 years. Question now is who's going to do it? Industry is not likely. I can tell you from running a business—we're paid to generate wealth for shareholders and if we don't, someone else will do it for us. And we all do a lot of public posturing like, you know, the corporate social responsibilities, but we're paid to get financial results. And we do it— if there's a tax, we hate paying taxes. And we do it if there's an incentive, and we do it because all corporations, at least 95% or more, adhere to government regulations. We operate within the parameters that are set by the public and by governments. And I guess I'm a believer in carbon taxes. Very simple ones—if you burn it you pay it. And I think that incentive, as I heard might apply in some countries already, you put it into a pool to go into new technology, and I'll bet you'll see the amount of creativity the human mind and entrepreneurs can come up with to solve the problem.

Will governments do it? They're the ones that set the regulations, they're the ones who can put the incentives in; they're the ones can put the taxes in. But will they do it? I guess with the exception of maybe Costa Rica, I haven't seen too many initiatives with governments because they tend to be influenced by big business in many cases. So I think a lot of it is up to us. Public opinion can force governments in saying, "We want a change." And you know, there's lots of big concepts. The United Nations—and you look at what they've done in terms of settling world issues to date—the United States, big governments, could probably solve the world's problems. Two billion could eliminate leprosy. Ten billion could provide water and eliminate all the problems with drinking water in Africa and some of the issues. But what do we do? We're going to put 150 billion in bombing Iraq and that part of the world, and our priorities somehow are morally biased here. You know, we talk about the US but are the rest of the countries doing much better? Canada just announced they're going to put 10 billion in the military. And why don't we do like Costa Rica—get rid of the military and put 10 billion into social services? Or into education in Afghanistan? I think a good part of the global problem is

that it's going to bring a new perception from all of us on a global issue—air. Because you know it's not my air, it's not your air, it's not China's air. And I think it's going to create an issue where everybody's focused on this issue, and I think if we take corrective action it will be positive for the world. But the question is, will we wait until we have a crisis? Will we wait until 2050 and say, jeez, you know the world is going to get wiped out here. And then, as I think was mentioned with the case of the fish, it's going to take 250 years to fix it. It's too late. So we need action.

You know, tonight we're going to go out there and have dinner but yet all of us accept this because, we don't really see it except on TV, unless you've gone there. You know we've got people buying a \$350 million jet, spending maybe another \$150 refurbish it, and then burn a lot of gas. When you think half of that money could cure leprosy in the world. So the question is, who really cares? Do we care? Are we going to do anything about it? As I think was mentioned, I was happy to see that it's people, included like me that have 2–3 homes that are part of the problem, and we're going to have to adapt if we want to survive. And the question is we're all going to have to do it. The stone age ended because technology was used to make the world a better place. And the question is, can we do the same thing with the fossil fuel? We have the technology. We can do it in the next 10–15 years, and I think it's up to us to get it done. Thank you very much.