

The world is a ship and everyone's in steerage

'There is only one city in the world this is happening in and it is yours'

Habitat's importance stressed in Ward's speech

British economist, environmentalist and author Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson) spoke Tuesday to the University of B.C. Alumni Association at the conclusion of a cross-country tour to promote the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat). UBC will confer an honorary degree — an LLD — on Lady Jackson at its annual convocation, hence her reference to "My dear future family." Here is an edited text of her speech.

My dear future family. By curious coincidence you and I are the same age, going on 62, and clearly we have a lot of work still to do.

It's possible that you may last longer, therefore it's all the more important that you should be at it. And it is surely a wonderful opportunity of providence for this university that the Human Settlement Conference should take place here in Vancouver, because it is this series of global dialogues now beginning in which for the first time in the whole of human history, mankind is beginning to talk about the real issues.

Not the frontier disputes, not the "I want this and you shan't have that, etc." which make up so much of diplomacy — but really bread, shelter, water, work . . . the ability to live on this planet in such a way that we don't destroy it. That process which began in Stockholm, was carried on at Bucharest for the population conference, then on to Rome for food, is now coming here to this city for what could conceivably be one of the most important of all these conferences because it's in human settlements that everything comes together.

And therefore if we are going to do something serious, going to make some sort of go of the next 62 years, a lot of the decisions could be formulated and could be launched from this city. Therefore you will be able to say you are citizens of no mean city; a city which may well become connected with some of the great openings both of the spirit and of the mind in the future of this troubled planet.

Heavy responsibility

That is a very heavy responsibility but at the same time a glorious chance. I am absolutely certain that in your family, future family, will be in there with all they've got to make sure that this conference is one that gives a new turn, a new hope, a new opportunity to this planetary dialogue which has to be carried on. As Professor (Peter) Oberlander has pointed out, "there are a very

few of them, even if they are Sauria Arabians." So we've simply got to recognize that they're all Albertans . . .

So there is absolutely nothing perhaps more vital than that this dialogue, which you can critically influence, should begin to be engaged at the deepest level of human commitment and human understanding. After all, in many ways, this planet is a very perilous place, and perilous in new ways which we have to understand.

You all know that in the next 20 to 25 years we will very nearly double the number of earthlings. I think about three weeks ago we got to four billion, four billion inhabitants on this planet which only 100 years before had just over one billion, and the rate is speeding up. By the beginning of the next century we will have another world the size of this on top of the one we've got now. It's a formidable acceleration!

The people who may help this planet, the people who will be certain, are my going to be the quiet, patient, suffering poor which people often expect. They are going to be people with a lively sense of human dignity, of human right and of the absolute imperative that was first most movingly formulated for the modern generation in the Cromwellian revolution in England when Thomas Rainborough cried out: "The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the greatest he." That cry is now the cry of the whole planet — the poorest he on the planet earth has a life to live as the richest he.

Chance to live to 70

Now, we all collected together, my dear family, in this room, we are the richest he and she's, we belong to that 25 per cent of humanity who have a developed economy, who never go to bed hungry. We occasionally go to bed overfed, we even consume our grains through distilleries and go to bed in yet another state. We have a chance even people like me, we have a chance of living to 70.

We are practically sure that our children will survive. We live in the world of privilege, the world of good fortune, the world of prosperity, and this world we are going to have to share with about three to four billion more people of whom at least two-thirds are going to have annual incomes of less than \$250 per year.

We are up in the \$5,000 to \$6,000 class and confidently expect to go up to \$10,000 per capita in the next 20 years. During that period the World Bank estimates that the increase in income for one-third of humanity will be at the outside \$4. So this is the kind of sanctuary in which we live and the others are going to live with the aspirations that we breed, with the hopes that we breed, with a kind of stories of life that come to them over their transitions, that come to them globally, all around the world. This is how they are going to live.

Now, my dear friends, could you not intervene for the time being because it's very difficult to concentrate if people are moving about behind me with bags. Thanks so much. Please do not move the bags until a little bit later.

Actually, these bags are for the separation of waste and for the collection of all the food we may have inadvertently thrown away during our very, very comfortable protein feast this evening. And

as we normally — as Westerners and North Americans — tend to throw away 15 per cent of everything we eat, the reminder that there oughtn't to be just doggie bags, but there ought to be a very careful avoidance of waste, is a point worth making — I only say not just at this particular moment. Right. Thank you.

School of thought

Going back to the question of what people expect: Don't think that we are going to be accepted as a privileged oasis in the surrounding desert.

If I may take up just one example of this. There is now, I'm told, a school of thought which is known as the lifeboat school of thought — that there are some absolutely splendid specimens of humanity which must at all costs be preserved so that the great human voyage can continue.

Guess who they are? Us! You knew. We, who are white, Western, developed, extremely fortunate, we must at all costs survive.

Now, alas, if this means that an awful lot of people just happen, alas, to be brown and black, if they happen in fact to be in the water, at all costs they mustn't be let on the lifeboat because otherwise this blend of humanity might not survive and the boat might sink.

This theory is being seriously put forward. The joke is that there isn't any water, there is only a ship and in point of fact everyone's in steerage.

And if you think, if any of us think, that for the next 25 to 30 years everyone will keep quiet in steerage and not interfere with the engine while we continue in first-class, I say think again. Especially as we've now had a year in which men with handguns have pinched every single one of the energy ministers in Vienna, just think what you could do here with a little bit of plutonium.

So let's give up the idea that there's anything but a ship and let's remember that we've got to manage it well; and, if we are going to manage it well we'll have to recognize as one prime fact that people are going to want a minimum standard of human dignity and a minimum standard of human rights and decency. That is absolutely unavoidable. That, if you like is the inner limit of the life on this planet.

And that will be one of the prime issues of Habitat because many of the people who are coming are people who haven't even got to first base on health, literacy, shelter, work and, above all, the survival of children. So let's begin to be perfectly

bate at Habitat.

Moral obligation

What is fascinating is that this has been obviously building up as a human issue probably since — well, I suppose the enormous break-through was the Jewish prophets — all the way from Jeremiah to Karl Marx, all of whom were the proponents of a moral sense of obligation to the poor and a judgment on the unmindful and uncaring rich . . . the man in the Bible who filled his barns, thank God, and he was going to sit down and have a jolly good time but the Lord said "uh, uh, too bad, this might thy soul is required of thee." So that biblical strain is the beginning of this inner limit and we who claim to be in one sense people of the book, we are the last people who can afford to forget it.

But a new element which is coming to human thinking for the first time — and this is what makes this period one of intense intellectual change and activity and which makes Habitat a centre point for this new thinking — is that for the very first time we realize there could be outer limits. And that if four to five to six to eight or 10 billion people are to live a reasonable life on this planet, what kind of a strain is it going to put on the world's resources, what kind of strain is it going to put on the eco systems of soil and water.

Are we getting to the outer limit, at which the strain put upon this ship which we all share is so great that — it won't founder in the water because there isn't any, but it could in fact, founder as such?

Are we approaching an outer limit? This is one of the fundamental issues to be faced at the conference here. How do we use our resources? Are we getting to the point where just on soil, on water, on the basics of energy, we're getting to points of no return? There is no more vital question because if the answer is that these limits are coming up, how do we stand?

How do we in fact produce something like a decent planet if we are beginning to run short — not in a temporary or a local fashion but as a global system.

Problem for Habitat

You can see that this is a kind of problem that's going to be confronted at Habitat because in all these problems of human dignity on the one hand and the use of resources on the other, it's in human settlements that these issues are in fact going to be on a collision course or not on a collision course. And on that the future of humanity depends.

Let me very quickly say that there are signs, obviously, of limits. You can see it already, for example, in the water. In the developed world we get limits on water because we pollute it so frightfully. By God, flying in from Vancouver Island this morning, there were some bits of your sound where I couldn't tell where the land ended and the water began. Ugh! And this is right on your doorstep. I don't suppose you've quite got to the condition of the Hudson River where you no longer drown, you dissolve, but you're on the way.

Or take the Rhine. Now the Rhine in the last 25 years has not only become five times more salinated — it's got all the garbage from the whole burgeoning

industrial system, including some heavy metals which ought never, never get into the water at all. It's got oil seepage from the barges and from the shores and this delicious stew is then lightly heated up by all the heat from the power stations. And that unwholy broth is such that only eels can survive and one sometimes wonders . . . well, eels are very survivable and possibly the future belongs to them. What is clear is that as far as human beings are concerned the water of the Rhine is getting to a point where it is unusable and yet 20 million people depend upon it for tap water. And the Dutch, who are literally at the receiving end, are saying that if this goes on for another 10 years we will not be able to put the water through the treatment plants because it won't work. So you have an outer limit on water wherever you let pollution run loose.

Risks increased

Then in other parts of the world, of course, you've got absolute limits with the spreading of the deserts. And wherever you get the pressure of population on very, very vulnerable soils you also get increased risks for the whole of the water system.

Just take one example — North India, on which depend something like 500 million people for their food and drink. And there, because cultivation is going up into the Himalayan foothills, you're getting soil erosion. The soil no longer sponges in the water and you tend to get an alternation of inundations and draughts. Now that again is another limit.

And perhaps the most tragic limit of all is that in one-third to a half of the human settlements of the world the water is filthy and one-third of the human race, my dear friends, my dear family, suffer from intestinal diseases. And if you want to know the greatest enemy of dignity in mankind, it's to be running at both ends — I can tell you.

Now we laugh. We've forgotten cholera, we've forgotten typhoid, we've forgotten dysentery, we've forgotten infantile gastritis, that's gone. But for at least one-quarter to one-third of the human race, this is the normal condition. And if you would ask me what would do most not only to restore dignity to human lives disgraced and disgraced by these pitiful diseases, but in addition which would enable children to survive, I would say clean water in every settlement 10 years from now.

And by God, if Vancouver could be the site of that resolution, if that could be one

think we would have done more in a concrete fashion for the life of the poorest he that is in this planet than by any other route.

And incidentally, it would have the most rapidly stabilizing effect on population because when parents notice their first two or three children survive, they begin to ask whether it's necessary to have 15. One reason for the stabilization of population throughout the developed world was the introduction of drainage and sanitation. If you know little Willy is likely to die you go on having lots of little Willies, and if little Willy doesn't, after three you say why, they're still alive, let's do something about it.

It's quite surprising what can be done about it once parents want it. And I think in so much of our family planning policies we have thought so much about the techniques because we were so rich and had forgotten all about the poor. And what we had forgotten was that if you want to have people stabilize the size of their family, give them basic dignity and let their children begin to survive and then they'll manage, thank you.

Food a weapon

Otherwise we end up like Victorian duchesses going down and lecturing the poor of London on continence and thrift. I say to hell with it.

In other words, let's get on with giving people the conditions in which they know their children will survive and then you will find that they will be just as rational as anyone else. But let us not from our protein sanctuary go and lecture people about their shocking population habits — it makes me sick. I must confess. And if I were a developing person, I'd have 15 just to show 'em.

I have one. Another limit obviously is food. The whole of the world food conference was devoted to the problem, the possibility of world food supplies going short. And, of course, there are problems here, and one of the problems which is of intimate and absolutely instant importance to Canada is that you and the United States now are the grain sheikhs.

Arabia has the oil and you've got the grain. You and the United States. And when Henry Kissinger opened the World Food Conference he spoke with the utmost emotion, very movingly I may say, about no child going to bed hungry 20 years from now. Then he left instantly. Then Mr. Butz (U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz) arrived and Mr. Butz said food is a weapon.

So one has the feeling of a slight, shall we say, a slight lack of co-ordination between different instruments of government.

But the important thing is, let's face it, the important thing is that the world grain reserve which has gone up from five to 90 million tons in the last 25 years, that food grain reserve is controlled by North America. And if you want it, you have got a stranglehold on the future of humanity. Because we've only got to have one bad drought period in North America, which happens, remember the Dust Bowl, and one failed monsoon in India and you'll have to watch something like 100 million people starving on your television screen. It's as near as that.

The food reserve of the world today is 20 days and therefore we do have an

absolute limit because one thing no human being can do is provide from one harvest to the next without being fed, it's a biological impossibility. So there we have an absolute limit which the Rome food conference began to consider.

Now one reason why you've gone up from five to 90 million tons has been a tremendous input of energy. Energy has been the key to this fabulous increase in North American food supplies and energy is also going short. In another 20 years we'll have run out of natural gas. In another 30, to 40, to 50 years, depending on the speed of consumption, we'll have run out of petroleum.

What we will have done to the Beaufort Sea, meanwhile, heaven only knows. One good leak there could go under the ice irrevocably and when the black ice comes up to the top it could change the entire climatic patterns of the world because you wouldn't get the same reflectivity from the North Pole.

Might lose Toronto

So Professor Oberlander's point about inter-connectiveness reminds us that you could probably produce by his reflectivity such a large increase in the water flow from the Northern Atlantic regions that you might get oil from the Beaufort Sea but at the same time lose Toronto and Montreal. Maybe you don't care, I don't know. But let's keep these things in mind when we take these risks.

And at this point we run into one of the fascinating arguments that will certainly come up at Habitat: That is when one talks in this way, of limits, there are others who say: "Oh, you are such a Cassandra, oh dear, oh what lack of nerve, oh what lack of confidence. Don't you realize that homo-technologicus and femina-scientifica, or whatever she is, we've got the future under control, you don't have to worry, we've got every technox you need. Talk about energy shortage when we're just going into a nuclear revolution — you must be out of your teeny, cotton-picking mind."

Cotton picking is rather good because you cotton pick in Alabama and in Alabama is Brown's Ferry and in Brown's Ferry is the reactor for 1,000 megawatts that was knocked out by one candle flame.

This is one of the great legendary events in nuclear happenings. The workmen were trying to patch air flows inside the reactor and they used — guess what? — a candle flame. They always had used a candle flame. Unfortunately the padding around the reactor caught fire and

systems turned out to be fallouts because none of them worked.

Something symbolic

So they then had to close the reactors down and down went something like \$70 million worth of investment for one candle flame. There is something to me immensely symbolic about that particular mishap.

But if it is a pointer to something which is much more profound, that is okay, if we're going to jump the energy threshold, the energy barrier, by moving when we run out of fissile uranium and the sort of steam reactors we have now, moving on to the breeder reactor, let's remember that we'll then begin piling up for the human race of the future something which lasts a half-life of 25,000 years, which is so lethal that that much of it could give the entire human race lung cancer, which is totally indestructible and therefore cumulative.

Jolly little inheritance, wouldn't that be, for our future?

Money was a bore

Let's be very cautious about this and let us remember that one of the archetypal myths of western society is Faust, who sold everything in order to get everything back. Incidentally, he pulled it off, he actually got away with it. Very interesting . . . not totally irrelevant for Habitat.

At the very end Faust had got everything from the Devil, absolutely everything. He even had Helen of Troy. Power, wealth, science, knowledge, Helen of Troy. But he wouldn't say what the devil had told him to say, and that was "Oh moment, you are so beautiful, stay with me." That was the phrase which was to trigger his descent into hell. He never said it. Money was a bore, power was a bore, and he did all right with knowledge, but he never said it. And then towards the end — the Devil was getting terribly impatient, he'd made the bargain after all — finally driven to extreme, Faust began to help some very simple people. Damned their river, cleared the soil, built up a polder and created new life, new soil, new farms. And he sobbed, he said, "Oh moment, you are so beautiful, stay with me." And along came Satan and said, "You said it, come with me." But the Archangel Gabriel conveniently said, "No, he said the right thing, he's going up."

So I wouldn't be prepared to say that atomic energy is the Faustian bargain. I'm worried about something else — it might be the Promethean curse because he stole the fire from heaven, the nuclear fire, the nuclear fires of the sun.

He ended up chained to an irradiated rock. I prefer to think of that myth and to say, caution, this is not a technox — this is gambling with the entire future of mankind.

Are we going to stop at the absolute limits? The answer is of course not. Take this single critical factor on energy. Do you know what we're doing in North America? We are not quite up to this in Europe yet, but we are no doubt heading in that direction — for every bit of a power that is bought and used, 50 per cent is wasted.

Now, there are all kinds of symbols of this — 56 per cent of the United States

commuters go in single cars and out of each gallon they get six per cent of forward movement the moment they get into the centre of the city. You can imagine how much waste you can get in that — straight into fumes, straight into pollution.

Cooling pure waste

Electrical generation: Why do we have cooling towers? Cooling towers, for heaven's sake; that means you first create the heat and then you throw it all off because you're not going to use it. Now, sensible places like Sweden use total energy systems — all that heat is used in the city. Any system of generation which uses cooling towers is pure waste and you're paying for it.

Buildings, they leak like sieves, we probably get 15, 25 per cent for our heating systems and the rest goes out through the roof. We also invent these incredible high rises, built in glass, which is the worst possible of all insulators, most ludicrous building material ever invented — by property speculators, I imagine, or glass makers.

What's the result? You have to heat and cool the monsters the entire time.

The two trade towers in New York use as much energy every day as the whole city of Pittsburgh. That makes a lot of sense, doesn't it? If you take the energy inventory you will find that up to 50 per cent in every category tends to be wasted.

All kinds of little things: For example, in the construction of concrete Europe uses half the energy of that used in North America simply because it recycles the heat in the kilns. In other words we have been a throwaway, waste economy and we haven't paid the price because we didn't notice there was a price to pay.

Now, when you begin to get nearer to the limits of energy you begin to ask the right questions and these questions I think are going to be asked at Habitat because Habitat is a place where people are going to explore alternatives and see what others have done.

They will find that if you look at this conservation issue, the possibility of saving 50 per cent is not a pipe dream — it's merely a question of reason and fact.

One great theme

And if you ask me what could be one of the great themes of Habitat it, would be the conserving city in the conserving society and if we were prepared to accept this and begin to look at what's being done, we certainly could have strategies for the future which don't confront us with these limits because these are limits of waste, again and again, they are not limits of use, and these are the sort of things that are going to come up and they are going to come up here in Vancouver and you can put your mark on it.

Well, now, how do you do it? First of all, we don't do it by going on as we are now because we are what we are now because we've gone on like we did in the past. If that doesn't work, we've got to change direction. Very simple statement. If you look at the inner and outer limits it is very interesting the way they define the degree to which the market system does and doesn't work.

Markets work beautifully in the middle because a price signal can work wherever a price going up encourages more people to produce what's wanted and a price going down encourages people to produce less. It's a wonderful mechanism and up to a point Adam Smith, God preserve him, who is 200 years old, is absolutely right. But it doesn't work under two limiting conditions.

One is it doesn't work for people who can't get into the market so if you are borne poor the market isn't ever going to help you. One of the great inventions of the 19th century was the realization that if you based your system on pauper children going manacled to the mills they weren't even going to get into life. We've got to extend that 19th-century realization that the poor must have a platform underneath them, we've got to extend it to the planet — that's the meaning of the great planetary reforms that we have to bring in to end this sense of violating the limits of dignity. We've done it domestically — if we have the political wit we can do it on a planetary scale.

Arms double waste

That's point number one. And one reason why we can do it, incidentally, is that we spend — the biggest form of waste on our planet now — \$300 billion worth of arms every year. \$300 billion. And this is waste in a double sense. It's not only waste of all the materials — do you know that one B1 bomber uses up as much gasoline in one year as the entire bus fleet of the United States, and if that's not taking the economy for a ride I don't know what is — it's a waste also because the goods produced by arms programs can't be mopped up by the purchasing power created by the wages — you can't go and get your friendly neighborhood machine-gun around the corner.

The result is that all this purchasing power stashes about pushing up pricing and increasing inflationary pressures. It's a double waste.

Now the World Bank tells us that cleaning water in every settlement by 1986 would only cost \$2 billion a year. My God, \$3 billion for water, \$300 billion to blow up the planet 20 times over — I think once is enough, well, too much, really.

'Let's begin it here'

In other words, let's keep some proportions: Water, could that not be another resolution from Vancouver?

That we, the governments and peoples of the world make sure that by 1986 no babies are dying of gastritis and no humans are dying of cholera. Isn't that worth doing? Let's begin it here.

Now, food, let's take up the work, don't let's forget what's been done. Let's take up the resolution for the World Food Conference: First, an emergency grain reserve — that is already in place.

Secondly, and this is where Canada can play a tremendous part, let's get at a general international grain reserve which is on an ever-filled granary basis with one year's consumption always in reserve and we never have to face 100 million people starving.

Prod your neighbor so he makes up his mind — you may have to wait until November, but keep prodding — then send to Europe and remind them that they still haven't put up the money they said they'd put into this scheme at Rome and until they do the Arabs won't because the Europeans and the Arabs are behaving in that diplomatic poodle deax in which one says he'll begin if the other will take the second step. You know how it is.

No farming land

And the third part of the Rome world food program was, of course, massive investment in Third World agriculture. If we are going to get third world agriculture again you come back to Habitat; we've got to develop the cities, the centres, the market, the structures in which a farming population can do the job. One of the most important things that is going to come up at Habitat is planning for the distribution of population in countries so that the agricultural sector can flourish so that 25 years from now the world will not go to bed hungry and where you get a rational use of land.

And I would have to say that probably the most important decision to be taken here is that land is regarded as a sacred plot and not just as a market commodity and I'll tell you why. If you go on as you are now in Canada you're not going to have any farming land at all between the American border and probably Ottawa — it's all going to be in second homes.

We've got to have land use maps that tell us the best use of our territories and if we have to take things out from under the soil there have to be absolutely strict regulations that the soil and the topsoil in the forests are put back afterwards because otherwise it's a permanent loss.

Now, on this critical question of urban land, it seems to me that one of the things that is being tried out in a number of European countries, Scandinavians and the French for instance, is to get some control over land speculation around cities because one thing is certain — if you have speculative land markets you cannot control inflation because the cost of these skyrocketing land prices goes into everything, into mortgages and houses, into all goods produced in commercial premises and you will not get any kind of proper urban planning unless you have control over the land.

Incidentally, you also won't have any control over appearance and I am asked by one of my kind friends to point out that you've still got a lot of very, very



BARBARA WARD . . . to receive degree

unattractive little bathhouses on what could be prime park land and I'm delighted to pass on the message.

This does not mean that you have to give up the private ownership of land. I myself regard the private ownership of land as an absolutely indispensable defence against government which can tend to be very intruding if you let them get away with it, as you can see all around the world.

But I don't see why, for instance, merely for living near Crawley, a town near London, a man should get \$3 million for 200 acres and his entire contribution to life has been living near Crawley. Therefore I would say private ownership with sales through a land commission so the unearned income as it is called goes back to the community which created it.

Another reason

There is another reason for this — unless we get some control over speculative excesses we will not begin to deal with inflation. How can you go to the man working at the coal face and say, "Hi, old chap, you are very valuable and we need the coal and you're a splendid chap and it's a dangerous job, if we give you more than \$12 more a week we shall have inflation" — he turns around and Mr. Smith has got \$3 million. I won't exactly tell you what he'll say — it wouldn't be suitable.

Remember that this kind of uncontrolled land market is one of the prime causes

of inflation and we're not going to get rid of it unless we have rational control, which many countries are experimenting with.

The Scandinavian land bank, they buy the land . . . the French have a designated date beyond which the price can't go up . . . All kinds of techniques, . . . and back to Habitat. We can then begin shopping around and finding out what people are doing.

Another whole field in which this is possible in urban policy, another form of conservation, not only conserving beauty and conserving land, not wasting the way we do now. How many people know that a city like Dusseldorf doesn't waste any of its urban garbage at all — it separates it, the organic side is used for fuel, for district heating, and the metals are resold.

What happened? Dusseldorf makes a profit for heaven's sake.

More solar energy

In other words, if we could apply this conserving mentality, conserving spirit to our settlements, for heaven's sake, we'd stop wasting fifty per cent of what we use, stop the waste of energy.

We would begin to get these total systems which are, as it were, cycles of income energy. We could go out and we could use far more solar energy and wind-power. Incidentally, I'm told that it is very difficult to get a mortgage in Canada for any house that's got solar equipment — that must be madness, it can't be true, I hope I read wrong.

In America they are actually giving people subsidies for solar things on their houses because the penny is beginning to drop and Saudi Arabia won't be providing forever but the sun will — well, for six million years.

These are the things that are going to come up at Habitat. These are the kind of exchanges of information, exchanges of techniques, possibilities . . . countries like France where they've got one of the most extensive population distribution plans in the world. On the other extreme you have China pushing all its development out into the countryside — these are the examples people can look at and say well, maybe it isn't very sensible to cover the whole of the Niagara Peninsula with second homes, perhaps we will need more food, perhaps we should have spatial planning in Canada, perhaps there are some things that we can learn right here in Vancouver and thank God everyone's coming to Vancouver to tell us about it. What luck.

Formality, rhetoric

There is only one city in the world to which this is happening and it's yours. I think the thing I would like to end on is that all these interesting, fascinating and exciting possibilities are going to be discussed in this city. They will be discussed with a certain amount of formality, rhetoric and even, I fear, occasional pomposity in the official delegations.

Then over the river at Jericho Bay you've got already a very exciting site with an incredible amount of recycling — do you realize that it's all being built with logs retrieved from the river — that's the conserving spirit if you like and you're going to have there an enormous number of people that are going to come and blow their tops, bring up interesting ideas.

Now the people of Vancouver are going by their attitude, by the way they