EVERYWHERE IS SOMEBODY'S BACKYARD

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION IN THE 1980'S

NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY

HUGH L. MACAULAY

AT THE

CALL TO THE BAR

SPECIAL CONVOCATION

LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA

OSGOODE HALL

O'KEEFE CENTRE

TORONTO

APRIL 11, 1980

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

I'VE TITLED MY REMARKS "EVERYWHERE IS SOMEBODY'S BACKYARD." I WANT TO TALK TO YOU TODAY ABOUT THE LAW -- ENVIRONMENTAL LAW, REGULATIONS, INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE FREEDOMS, INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE GOOD. THAT PROMISES A LOT MORE THAN I CAN DELIVER IN THE TIME I'VE GOT. AND I HAVE A SUSPICION THAT TALKING TO PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING OUT INTO THE WORLD TO MAKE A LIVING WRITING, ADMINISTERING, PLEADING, APPLYING, ARGUING, INTERPRETING, AND COMPLICATING THE LAW - THAT THIS MAY NOT BE THE OCCASION TO WARN THAT WE HAVE TOO MUCH LEGISLATION ON THE BOOKS THESE DAYS.

BUT AFTER ALL, WHEN YOU'VE GOT THE CHAIRMAN OF ONTARIO HYDRO GIVING A "CALL-TO-THE-BAR" ADDRESS, YOU PROBABLY THINK YOU'RE IN FOR A LITTLE RIGHTEOUS INDIGNATION. TO SOME EXTENT I'M NOT GOING TO DISAPPOINT YOU.

I'D LIKE TO START BY SHARING THREE SHORT STORIES WITH YOU. THE FIRST CONCERNS AN ENERGY ACTIVIST GROUP, PREOCCUPIED BY AN ANTI-NUCLEAR STANCE. AS YOU KNOW, IT'S ONTARIO HYDRO'S RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE ELECTRIC POWER IN THE PROVINCE. THE WAY HYDRO GOES ABOUT THAT IS TO DEVELOP LARGE-SCALE CENTRALIZED GENERATION STATIONS AND THEN LACE THE PROVINCE WITH A DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM. YOU CAN DISAGREE WITH THAT APPROACH, BUT ULTIMATELY IT COMES DOWN TO A DECISION ON

APPROACHES, AND THE DECISION RESTS WITH THOSE WHO HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE LIGHTS GO ON AND THE MACHINES START UP. NOT SURPRISINGLY, THIS ACTIVIST GROUP DOES ARGUE WITH HYDRO'S APPROACH, AND ESPECIALLY WITH THE NUCLEAR ANGLE. FAIR ENOUGH: I'D AGREE THAT HYDRO MAY GET LOCKED INTO A MIND-SET THAT DOESN'T ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES; AND WHILE A LOT OF ALTERNATIVES DO GET RAISED INSIDE HYDRO, THERE'S GOOD REASON TO HEAR WHAT PEOPLE OUTSIDE ARE SAYING TOO.

SO, IN RECENT TIMES, WE'VE WORKED INCREASINGLY HARDER TO LISTEN TO PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY FROM THIS PARTICULAR GROUP. WE MEET WITH THEM. WE TALK ON THE PHONE. WE TAKE THEIR IDEAS SERIOUSLY AND OUR STAFF CONSIDER THEM SERIOUSLY. WE RECENTLY SUGGESTED THEY MEET WITH MEMBERS OF THE HYDRO BOARD OF DIRECTORS. THEN, A COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO, THEY CORDIALLY SENT ME A COPY OF THEIR NEW FUND-RAISING CAMPAIGN LETTER. TO PUT IT MILDLY, IT IS A SEVEN-PAGE DIATRIBE OF UNSUBSTANTIATED ANTI-HYDRO PROPAGANDA, TRYING TO INFLAME SUPPORT AT HYDRO'S EXPENSE.

ON TO THE SECOND STORY. A FARMER IS APPROACHED BY HYDRO IN THE EARLY 1950s. HYDRO WANTS TO CROSS HIS FARM WITH A POWER LINE. HE AGREES TO THE COMPENSATION OFFERED. LATER, IN THE MID-NINETEEN

SEVENTIES, HYDRO GOES BACK TO HIM AND WANTS TO ENLARGE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY. THE FARMER VEHEMENTLY REFUSES. WHEN ASKED WHY HIS APPROACH CHANGED SO RADICALLY FROM PAST EXPERIENCE, THE FARMER SAID, "BACK IN THE FIFTIES, AFTER THE WAR, I THOUGHT IT WOULD BE UNPATRIOTIC TO GO AGAINST HYDRO. NOW I DON'T THINK THAT'S TRUE."

THE THIRD STORY IS ALSO ABOUT A TRANSMISSION LINE. IT WAS PLANNED BACK IN THE EARLY SEVENTIES, AND IS INTENDED TO JOIN THE BRUCE NUCLEAR POWER STATION ON LAKE HURON TO THE SOUTHERN ONTARIO GRID. NINE YEARS AFTER THE FIRST PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT ON THE LINE, IT STILL ISN'T CARRYING POWER, ALTHOUGH HOPEFULL IT WILL SOON. THE PEOPLE OPPOSING THE LINE SAY THEY ARE DOING SO BECAUSE HYDRO NEVER HAD AN INDEPENDENT STUDY DONE, OR PUBLIC HEARINGS. AS A MATTER OF FACT, A GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONER WITH AN INDEPENDENT CONSULTING FIRM CONDUCTED FOUR SEPARATE HEARINGS INTO THE LOCATION AND NEED FOR THE LINE. THE POWER THAT ONTARIO HYDRO CAN'T GET OUT OF BRUCE AND HAS TO REPLACE WITH MORE EXPENSIVE GENERATION IS COSTING YOU AND ME AND EVERYONE ELSE IN ONTARIO IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OF $2 MILLION A MONTH.

MY THESIS IS SIMPLE: WE HAVE SEEN, IN THE PAST DECADE, A NECESSARY AND BENEFICIAL RAISING OF PUBLIC AND CORPORATE CONSCIOUSNESSES ABOUT CONCERNS OVER THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE WAY INDUSTRY ACTS. LAWS

SHOULD RESPOND TO CHANGING SOCIAL CIRCUMSTANCES. ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION THAT RESULTED FROM THAT CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING WAS THE PROPER LEGAL RESPONSE. BUT I AM GOING TO ARGUE THAT THE NEXT DECADE SHOULD BE A DECADE NOT OF RETRENCHMENT ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES, BUT OF RECOGNITION THAT THERE IS A PRICE TO PAY FOR THIS REGULATION.

I'D LIKE TO POSE TWO RHETORICAL QUESTIONS TO YOU. DOES ANYBODY YIELD IN THE NAME OF THE PUBLIC GOOD ANYMORE? IF NOT, DOES THAT MEAN THAT NO PROJECTS ARE FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD? I DON'T THINK WE'LL EVER SEE A TIME AGAIN WHEN SOMEBODY THINKS KNOCKING HYDRO IS BEING UNPATRIOTIC, AND I'M GLAD OF IT, BECAUSE I'VE INDULGED IN MY SHARE OF THAT, ALONG WITH A LOT OF OTHER PEOPLE. BUT DOES ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION NECESSARILY IMPLY THAT HYDRO MUST PROVE "NEED" FOR EVERY NEW SEGMENT OF EVERY LINE OR EVERY TRANSFORMER STATION? I HOPE IT DOESN'T. BECAUSE THE IMPLICATIONS OF HAVING TO DO IT ARE WORSE THAN DISECONOMIC -- THEY ARE ESSENTIALLY ANTI-GROWTH.

SINCE THE BEGINNING OF TIME MAN HAS DEVELOPED VARIOUS ENERGY SOURCES. THE CHRONOLOGY READS SOMETHING LIKE: MANUAL LABOUR, ANIMAL LABOUR, WIND AND WATER, COAL, AND PETROLEUM, NATURAL GAS AND NUCLEAR FISSION, IN THAT ORDER. THE UNFORESEEN AND UNEXPECTED

CONSEQUENCES OF THE OPEC OIL EMBARGO IN 1973 ARE LIKELY TO REMAIN WITH US UNTIL THE TRANSITION FROM A PETROLEUM-BASED SOCIETY IS COMPLETE. SUBSTITUTION TECHNOLOGIES LIKE ELECTRICITY MUST BE ENCOURAGED: IT WOULD BE VERY DANGEROUS TO STIFLE INNOVATION OR FRUSTRATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE ALTERNATIVES.

KEEP IN MIND THAT TO BUILD A NUCLEAR PLANT IN ONTARIO, ABOUT 30 SEPARATE PIECES OF FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION MUST BE MET, ACCOUNTING FOR A GOOD DEAL OF THE FOURTEEN YEARS IT TAKES TO GET THE PLANT OFF THE DRAWING BOARDS AND GENERATING ELECTRICITY. IN JAPAN, IT TAKES ABOUT SEVEN YEARS. I'M NOT ARGUING THAT 30 PIECES OF LAW ARE TOO MANY OR TOO FEW. MY SUSPICION IS THAT THEY COULD BE STREAMLINED, RATIONALIZED AND GENERALLY SIMPLIFIED. MY APPEAL TO YOU IS TO UNDERSTAND THE RAMIFICATIONS IN TIME, MONEY, GROWTH, AND PHILOSOPHY, OF THOSE 30 PIECES. BECAUSE I THINK THERE MAY BE A FOREST OF "SLOW GROWTH" LURKING BEHIND THOSE INDIVIDUAL LEGAL TREES.

THIS THESIS -- THAT THE EIGHTIES HAD BETTER BE A TIME OF RATIONALIZATION OF PRESENT LEGISLATION AND A FINE TUNING TO COME TO GRIPS WITH OBSTRUCTIONIST LEGISLATION -- IS BASED ON A SIMPLE EQUATION BETWEEN ENERGY GROWTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH. COUNTRIES WITH THE GREATEST INEQUALITY OF INCOME (DEFINED AS THE RATIO OF

INCOME OF THE RICHEST 20 PER CENT TO THE POOREST 20 PER CENT) ALSO HAVE THE LOWEST ENERGY CONSUMPTION PER UNIT OF OUTPUT. IT SEEMS LOGICAL TO CONCLUDE THAT EXPENSIVE ENERGY WILL MOSTLY HURT THE POOR. WE NEED INEXPENSIVE ENERGY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH, TO BETTER THE SITUATION OF OUR UNEMPLOYED AND IMPOVERISHED.

I THINK THE ARGUMENT CAN BE MADE THAT "ENVIRONMENTALISM SOMETIMES FAVOURS PEOPLE WHO ARE WELL-ESTABLISHED IN THE ENVIRONMENT."

YOU WON'T FIND MANY ETHNIC OR POOR OR MINORITY GROUPS AT ANTI-NUCLEAR RALLIES. IN FACT, SUCH GROUPS AS THE NAACP IN THE UNITED STATES ARE VOCAL SUPPORTERS OF NUCLEAR POWER; THEY RECOGNIZE THE EQUATION BETWEEN ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ENERGY GROWTH.

I AM NOT SUGGESTING THAT ENVIRONMENTALISM AS A CONCERN IS MISPLACED OR ILL-PLACED. I'M SAYING THAT NORMAL HUMAN SELF-INTEREST GETS DISGUISED SOMETIMES AS ENVIRONMENTALISM, TO THE DETRIMENT OF THAT WORTHY CAUSE. AND SELF-INTEREST IS NOT AN IMPEACHABLE OFFENCE. WHEN IT COMES TO PROTECTING PROPERTY, THAT FUNDAMENTAL OF WESTERN LAW AND PHILOSOPHY, IT IS UTTERLY HUMAN AND UNDERSTANDABLE. BUT IT COMES DOWN TO A MATTER OF PERCEPTIONS.

IF WE WANT TO BUILD A LINE PAST YOUR FAMILY HOMESTEAD, ONTARIO HYDRO WILL SAY, "THE LINE IS NECESSARY, WE'VE HAD PUBLIC HEARINGS AND INDEPENDENT STUDIES THAT AGREE YOUR BACKYARD IS THE BEST PLACE FOR THE LINE, WE'LL NEGOTIATE WITH YOU AND PAY FOR YOUR APPRAISALS AND YOUR LEGAL FEES IF YOU WANT TO TAKE US TO COURT, BUT WE THINK THIS IS WHERE THE LINE HAS TO GO." YOU'LL SAY, "I RECOGNIZE THE ADVANTAGES OF HAVING MY LIGHTS COME ON WHEN I FLIP THE SWITCH AND THE MACHINES TURN ON WHEN I GO TO WORK, BUT I DON'T WANT THE LINE IN MY BACKYARD. PUT IT IN SOMEBODY ELSE'S."

IF YOU ARE A FARMER YOU'D SAY, "IF I HAVE TO HAVE THE LINE, KEEP IT OFF MY FIELDS AND RUN IT THROUGH MY WOODLOT." IF YOU ARE AN ENVIRONMENTALIST, YOU'D SAY, "IF IT MUST GO IN, KEEP IT ON THOSE ALREADY DOMESTICATED FIELDS AND AWAY FROM THE VIRGIN WOODLOT." IF YOU BELONG TO THE ENERGY ACTIVIST GROUP, YOU WOULD ORGANIZE SOME KIND OF A HAPPENING TO PROMOTE THE IDEA THAT "IF HYDRO WOULD JUST DEVELOP SMALL-SCALE WIND, SOLAR OR HYDRAULIC UNITS, WE WOULDN'T HAVE TO BUILD THE LINE AT ALL." AND SO IT GOES.

I THINK IN YOUR FUTURE LEGAL DELIBERATIONS, IT WOULD BE WISE TO REMEMBER THAT HUMANS ARE A LEGITIMATE PART OF THE ENVIRONMENT TOO.

SPEAKING ABOUT HYDRO SPECIFICALLY, I'D LIKE TO POSE ANOTHER PHILOSOPHICAL DILEMMA. GIVEN THAT HYDRO IS A PUBLIC CORPORATION, WITH ANNUAL RATE REVIEWS AND SEEMINGLY ENDLESS COMMISSIONS AND INQUIRIES INTO ITS AFFAIRS, GIVEN THAT IT IS CONTROLLED BY A BOARD OF DIRECTORS APPOINTED BY THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL AND THUS ACCOUNTABLE TO THE DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM, GIVEN THAT ITS MANDATE IS TO PROVIDE POWER AT COST, THAT IT WORKS ON A NOT-FOR-PROFIT BASIS AND IN THE INTERESTS OF ITS CUSTOMERS COLLECTIVELY, WHAT IS HYDRO'S RESPONSIBILITY TO THE INDIVIDUAL?

I DON'T HAVE THE ANSWER TO THAT. YOU MAY, BUT IT'S MORE A MORAL THAN A LEGAL QUANDRY. MY OWN PERSONAL FEELING, THOUGH, IS THAT HYDRO'S FIRST RESPONSIBILITY IS TO THE COLLECTIVE GOOD OF THE CITIZENS OF THE PROVINCE. I THINK THAT'S THE IMPLICATION OF OUR MANDATE, AND CERTAINLY THAT'S THE WAY I READ OUR MOTTO, "THE RESOURCES OF NATURE ARE GIVEN TO THE PEOPLE." I HOPE NO ONE THINKS I'M SUGGESTING HYDRO CAN BLITHELY STEP ALL OVER INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS OR SHOULD BE ABLE TO. AS AN INDIVIDUAL, IF HYDRO WANTED TO PUT SOME KIND OF AN INSTALLATION IN MY BACKYARD WITH WIRES RUNNING IN AND OUT OF IT, MY FIRST INSTINCT WOULD BE TO SUGGEST THAT MY NEIGHBOUR'S BACKYARD WOULD BE A BETTER, OR THAT THE BEST BET WOULD BE UP NORTH, AWAY FROM EVERYONE, OR NOT HAVE ONE AT

ALL. BUT AS I SAID AT THE START, EVERYWHERE IS SOMEBODY'S BACKYARD. WE CAN'T BLAME HYDRO IF IT INTERPRETS ITS ROLE AS PROVIDING FOR THE COLLECTIVE GOOD.

NEXT YEAR WILL BE HYDRO'S SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY. BACK IN THE EARLY PART OF THIS CENTURY WHEN ADAM BECK WAS PROMOTING THE IDEA OF HYDRO, HE HAD TWO MAIN ARGUMENTS: FIRST, THAT ELECTRIC POWER SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO CITIZENS AT COST BY A PUBLICLY OWNED AND CONTROLLED UTILITY; AND SECOND, THAT BY DEVELOPING INDIGENOUS RESOURCES, ONTARIO SHOULD TRY TO END ITS DEPENDENCE ON IMPORTED FUEL SUPPLIES. DOES THAT SOUND FAMILIAR? BECK WAS TALKING ABOUT THE HYDRAULIC DEVELOPMENT OF ONTARIO'S WATER RESOURCES TO DECREASE OUR DEPENDENCE ON AMERICAN COAL; TODAY WE LOOK TO FURTHER TAP OUR URANIUM TO REDUCE OUR DEPENDENCE ON OIL AND COAL. BUT THE PRINCIPLES ARE THE SAME, AND PROVIDE THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEOLOGICAL CONSISTENCY THAT MAKES ONTARIO HYDRO A GOOD IDEA, AND A DEFENSIBLE ARGUMENT.

IF HYDRO AND ELECTRICITY ARE TO PLAY A PART IN THE TRANSITION OUT OF THE PETROLEUM ERA, THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORE GENERATION CAPACITY IS INEVITABLE, DESPITE OUR CURRENT ENVIABLE BUT TEMPORARY OVER-SUPPLY SITUATION. WE'RE LOOKING FOR THE MOST ENVIRONMENTALLY BENIGN WAYS TO DO IT, GIVEN OUR PREDILECTION FOR

LARGE-SCALE PLANTS AND THE ECONOMIES OF SCALE. DEVELOPING WHAT'S LEFT OF OUR ECONOMIC HYDRAULIC POTENTIAL IS ENVIRONMENTALLY PROBLEMATICAL. EVEN THOUGH HYDRO-POWER IS RENEWABLE AND CLEAN AND WITHOUT FUEL COSTS, THOSE IN THE SOUTH WHO WISH TO BE FREE OF NUCLEAR PLANTS BY HAVING MORE HYDRAULIC GENERATION ON THE GREAT NORTHERN RIVERS, ARE GUILTY OF THE "NOT-IN-MY-BACKYARD" SYNDROME.

I USED TO THINK, BEFORE I GOT INTO THIS LINE OF WORK, THAT EVERYONE, OR NEARLY EVERYONE, LOVED WATER POWER FOR THE ELECTRICITY IT CAN GENERATE. WELL, ALL I CAN SAY ABOUT THAT IS, IF YOU WANT A CRASH COURSE IN PEOPLES RIGHTS, NATIVE OR OTHERWISE, ANIMAL LIFE, INSECT LIFE, PLANTS, TREES, WEEDS, AND OTHER THINGS THAT GROW OUT OF THE GROUND OR EACH OTHER, TO SAY NOTHING OF ANIMAL MIGRATIONS, FISH LIFE CYCLES, BIRD NESTING PATTERNS -- IF YOU WANT A CRASH COURSE IN THOSE SUBJECTS, AND A FEW MORE, GO BUILD YOURSELF A DAM. OR MAKE APPLICATION TO.

THERE CAN BE LITTLE DOUBT THAT NUCLEAR POWER IS MORE ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE. IT PRODUCES MINISCULE AMOUNTS OF WASTE COMPARED TO A COAL PLANT. IT DOESN'T NEED VAST FLOODED STORAGE AREAS LIKE HYDRAULICS. IT'S INDIGENOUS IN TERMS OF FUEL AND TECHNOLOGY. AS FOR FORESEEABLE FUTURE ALTERNATIVES,

WHILE SOLAR POWER IS UNDOUBTEDLY GOOD FOR SPACE AND WATER HEATING, THE CONCEPT OF A SOLAR ELECTRIC GENERATING STATION BOGGLES THE MIND WITH THE ACRES OF LAND THAT WOULD BE BURIED UNDER COLLECTORS. SOLAR ELECTRICITY COULD BE THE ULTIMATE IN HARD TECHNOLOGY.

THAT'S WHY ONE OF HYDRO'S MAIN THRUSTS IS TOWARDS CONSERVATION. CONSERVATION IS THE QUICKEST, EASIEST, CHEAPEST, MOST BENIGN TECHNOLOGY FOR ADDING NEW AVAILABLE CAPABILITY TO THE GENERATION SYSTEM. IT HAS NO TRANSMISSION OR TRANSPORTATION COSTS. IT IS INDIGENOUS AND INFLATION PROOF. BUT I'D LIKE TO EMPHASIZE THAT THE TRUE OBJECT OF CONSERVATION SHOULD BE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, NOT STIFLING OF GROWTH.

A RECENT CANADIAN POLL SHOWED THAT THOSE WITH ANNUAL INCOMES OF $20,000 OR MORE EXPRESSED LEAST CONCERN THAT AN ENERGY CRISIS COULD AFFECT THEIR LIFESTYLES. THERE ARE OTHERS WHOSE LIFESTYLES WILL ALSO REMAIN THE SAME, IF THERE IS AN ENERGY CRUNCH - THE UNEMPLOYED, WHO WILL STAY UNEMPLOYED, AND WHOSE RANKS WILL SWELL.

THE ADVANTAGES OF RETURNING TO A LESS INDUSTRIALIZED SOCIETY ARE ONLY CLEAR TO THOSE WHO HAVE GOT WHAT THEY NEED FROM THAT INDUSTRIALIZED SOCIETY AND ARE NOW PREPARED TO RETIRE INTO A NOSTALGIC, MORE

INNOCENT TIME. THE ADVANTAGE OF TRYING TO LIVE LIKE THE PAST IS THAT THERE ARE NO RISKS IMPLIED. IT'S COMFORTABLE BECAUSE IT'S KNOWN.

WE MUST BE CAREFUL OF THE GROWING SOCIAL TENDENCY TO AVOID RISK-TAKING, IN THE ATTEMPT TO BE FAIL-SAFE. IN SOME CASES, REGULATION IS A KIND OF LEGISLATED TIMIDITY. WE MUST BEWARE OF SITUATIONS WHERE LEGAL DELAYS ARE USED TO DISGUISE A GENERAL IDEOLOGICAL DENIAL OF GROWTH. AND WE MUST ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT FAILURE AND SUCCESS GO TOGETHER. THEY ARE MUTUALLY INCLUSIVE AND NECESSARY. TAKING RISKS IMPLIES FAILURE. A SOCIETY THAT ATTEMPTS TO BE LEGISLATED INTO A SITUATION WHERE IT IS FAIL-SAFE, OR RISK-FREE, IS ALSO A SOCIETY THAT IS LIKELY TO BE FREE FROM CHALLENGE, INNOVATIVE SUCCESSES AND INITIATIVE. AS LEGISLATION TAKES PROTECTIVE CUSTODY OF THE ENVIRONMENT, AND AS WE INSIST THAT THE INDIVIDUAL HAS AN INSTITUTIONALIZED AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DELAY PROJECTS INTENDED FOR THE COLLECTIVE GOOD, LET'S REMEMBER THAT WE NEED SUCCESSES AS WELL AS FAILURES.

WE NEED NOW WHAT THE EIGHTIES PROMISE -- INVENTION, INNOVATION, ACTION. INSTEAD OF PROCLAIMING AND LEGISLATING THE LIMITS, LET'S REMEMBER THIS FAVOURED COUNTRY HAS BEEN BUILT ON INTELLIGENT RISK-TAKING TO ENLARGE AND EXPAND THE LIMITS. YOU AND

I ARE IN A STRATEGIC POSITION TO MAKE SURE THE "LIMITS TO GROWTH" ETHIC OF THE SEVENTIES IS APPLIED IN THE 80s ONLY TO FINITE RESOURCES, AND NOT TO IMAGINATION. IT'S AN EXCITING TIME TO LOOK FORWARD TO.

I'M NOT A MEMBER OF THE BAR, BUT MY FATHER WAS AND MY BROTHER AND SON-IN-LAW ARE, SO I'VE GATHERED QUITE A LOT OF OPINIONS ABOUT THE LAW JUST THROUGH OSMOSIS. TO YOU, WHO ARE ABOUT TO BEGIN PRACTICE, I CAN SAY GOOD LUCK -- YOU DESERVE IT, AND YOU'LL NEED IT. YOUR PROFESSION IS NECESSARILY A PRIVATE ENTERPRISE, AND WHEN THE TIMES ARE DARK AND FEARFUL, LAWYERS FEEL IT TOO. DON'T EXPECT TO START OUT AT THE TOP -- GIVE YOURSELF TIME TO MEET EXPECTATIONS. AND, FROM SOMEONE WHO LIVES IN THE COUNTRY, WILL YOU ACCEPT AN INVITATION TO GIVE A COUNTRY PRACTICE A CHANCE? YOU WON'T DO A LOT OF CORPORATE LAW OUTSIDE THE METROPOLIS -- INSTEAD, YOU'LL DO A LOT OF "PEOPLE" LAW IN RURAL AREAS. AND THE SATISFACTIONS OF THAT KIND OF LIFE ARE, I THINK, INDISPUTABLE. OR SO MY SON-IN-LAW, WHO PRACTICES IN MIDLAND WOULD ARGUE.

NO MATTER WHERE YOU PRACTICE, YOU'LL BE CONTRIBUTING. SOCIETY NOT ONLY REQUIRES YOUR TALENTS TO MAKE IT GO, IT NEEDS YOUR CREATIVITY AND YOUR KINDNESS AND GOODWILL. YOUR PROFESSION IS A GOOD CHECK ON GOVERNMENTAL EXCESSES AND ERRORS. YOUR ASSOCIATIONS

OFFER INVALUABLE COMMENTARIES ON LEGISLATION. YOU WHO PRACTICE THE LAW HAVE AN UNPARALLELED OPPORTUNITY TO KEEP THOSE WHO MAKE THE LAWS IN TUNE WITH SOCIAL REALITIES AND NECESSITIES, AS WELL AS SOCIETY'S HOPES AND DESIRES. COUNSEL IS, AFTER ALL, ADVICE. AND AS ADVISORS TO A SOCIETY IN CHANGING TIMES, YOUR ROLE BECOMES INCREASINGLY THREADED THROUGH ALL ASPECTS OF HUMAN ENDEAVOUR. MY BEST WISHES FOR FRUSTRATING, SATISFYING, RICH AND CONTENTED CAREERS TO YOU ALL.