

sentence on mankind. Neither do I wish to offer any bromides. There is a way out if we apply our knowledge and willpower. That, of course, is a very large "if".

It is certainly the job of politics, religion, philosophy and the academic world to animate us. I do not think any of us alone can do the job, the scope of which is totally unprecedented. I believe there is absolutely no hope if politics remains devoid of spiritual principles as a priority, and religion remains aloof from deep involvement in the human condition.

We must not think that we are struggling here alone in the darkness. Great minds are at work on the problems before us. But solutions in the practical order will be possible only when we have recovered the direction of man who lost his way long before the age of future shock.

Twenty years ago Walter Lippmann pointed us in the direction of a truly human society with his call for the revival of a "public philosophy." In a public philosophy the highest laws are those upon which all rational men of goodwill, when fully informed, will tend to agree. All men, governors and governed, are always under, never above, these laws which can be developed and refined by rational discussion.

The revival of the public philosophy—

Lippmann says

—depends on whether its principles and precepts, which were articulated before the industrial revolution, before the era of rapid technological change, and before the rise of the mass democracies—depends on whether this old philosophy can be reworked for the modern age. If this cannot be done, then the free and democratic nations face the totalitarian challenge without a public philosophy which free men believe in and cherish, with no public faith beyond a mere official agnosticism, neutrality and indifference. There is not much doubt how the struggle is likely to end if it lies between those who, believing, care very much—and those who, lacking belief, cannot care very much.

To give a vivid projection of Lippmann's public philosophy we can look at our environmental dilemma as but a symptom of the much deeper problem facing us. No one decided to dehumanize life with crowding, traffic jams, noise and squalor. No one decided that air pollution and dying waterways should be the price of unlimited growth. No one decided these things, but neither were they accidents. They are what we have done because we have assumed, unconsciously, that we had the right, indeed the obligation, to do them. But now we are forced to change our thinking from plunderers to stewards.

How, then, does Canada fit into this global perspective? As Maurice Strong observed at a recent meeting of the Canadian Club in Ottawa, the question is going to be raised as to the rights of 22 million people to a substantial fraction of the world's land area, fresh water, agricultural and fish resources, and mineral wealth. Although we may regard our natural resources as an heritage to be dispensed and utilized at our pleasure, other less fortunate members of our global society may tend to view us as custodians of natural wealth to be shared more generally for the good of men.

With the broader and more rapid dissemination of information around the world they are going to expect more from us. The present rate of population growth, as I have indicated, really means that in the next few years produc-

tion and growth rates will have to increase by factors of 10 to 15.

Given the environmental disruption, the increased economic and energy costs, and the mineral finding rates that this implies, such massive development hardly seems likely on a time scale of three or four decades. In other words, the tremendous gap that exists today between the rich and the poor, between the developed and the under developed, does not seem likely to become very much smaller in the year 2000. Rather, given the present course of events, it seems that there will be greater shortages, deeper poverty, and more environmental damage than society experiences today. The have-nots in world society will not tolerate such conditions.

Canadians will not, however, simply be facing difficult situations of external origin. Failure to look beyond the immediate future can lead to internal problems of a vexing nature. Once again the energy situation provides us with a good example. Even though we like to think we are going to become self-sufficient from the production of oil in western Canada, if our present growth rate persists, then in the 1980's we will still be suffering a deficiency in oil production, given the methods that are now being used.

Three variables bear on the extent to which the supply short-fall will develop over the coming decade: the finding rate for conventional oil in western Canada; the rate of oil export to the United States; and the extent to which the rate of growth in domestic demand can be modified. These are not perfectly clear.

Whether or not Canada subsequently re-establishes its net self-sufficiency in oil depends upon the rate at which the Alberta oilsands are developed beyond 1985; it depends upon the future availability of oil from frontier regions; and, most important, in the final analysis it depends upon the degree to which Canada views this as a desirable goal.

Such problems of national concern, of which future oil supply is but one example, will require for their handling a spirit of co-operation between the provinces and the federal government, which spirit is at present lacking. Lengthy debates over short-term interests and problems are not conducive to attacking the longer term difficulties which we face. Moreover, I suspect that the bickering exhibited by officials and politicians at the international and the national level over frequently inconsequential issues tends to promote feelings of cynicism and demoralization amongst the general public.

● (2030)

There seem, then, to be several factors mitigating against our chances of anticipating and successfully overcoming the fundamental and rapidly worsening problems of world society. One is the unwillingness of both government and individuals to look beyond immediate term interests. Another is the feeling of cynicism or perhaps helplessness engendered in the individual in witnessing the failure of man's institutions to deal with the complex social problems of today. The individual tends to be overwhelmed by, or indifferent to, problems which seem completely beyond his capability of either understanding or solving.

It is, then, to a considerable extent the responsibility of government and parliament to overcome this indifference