

council has been urging that work of a suitable character be found for these young people. A private organization has found 5,000 jobs to Canadian young people in Germany next Summer. I do not think we should have to depend on Germany to find work for our young people.

Programs we should consider ought to include such work as cleaning up pollution. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) has received a letter urging that the National Harbours Board help Vancouver clean up driftwood and other materials from the harbour. Why cannot the young people do this kind of work and get paid for it? Young people would do this kind of thing because they would realize it is useful to the community. Again, there are opportunities in forestry. Only one acre out of seven of our timberland is being reforested. Why cannot we employ our young people on work of this kind, replanting our forests? It will be 75 years before the new growth is ready for cutting.

Here in Ontario the cutting down of diseased elms is a task which might be done by our young people, or we might use them to trim the bushes along our highways instead of using dangerous chemicals. These are some of the things which could be done. It is too important a matter to be left to casual supervision by the young people themselves. We should put our topflight management in charge of such programs, people who are used to working with youth and who can manage these schemes with success. The alternative to such a program is to leave these young people cooped up in idleness, or roaming the streets. They will be sitting ducks for the type of propaganda which led to the disaster existing in one of our eastern provinces.

● (9:40 p.m.)

I have been told that young people will not work. I should like to suggest that a great many of these young people would work if they were offered the chance to take part in such a program. This is an opportunity they should be given. If there are some who will not or cannot work, then other solutions must be found for them, other types of program. But we owe such a program to those who will work.

Like other speakers before me, I know that my time has just about expired and there are many other things I should have liked to say. May I say to the new minister of the environment that we are pleased to see him trying to move in regard to the Skagit River. We hope he can do something to save that valley for the recreational use of the people even at this late date. But the hour is very late, with the timber now cut down and the victim prepared for sacrifice. I hope the minister will act, and quickly.

The other things I should have liked to mention will have to wait for another time. In the meantime, I urge that we save our ecology and eliminate pollution and destruction. At the same time we must save our young people. Federal programs must be initiated and financed at least in part by the federal government in order to put our young people to work and to save our environment.

The Address—Mr. Otto

Saving the environment will save a lot of our young people in the process.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more about the situation in Quebec; more words on my part will not help. A lot has been said with great sincerity by members of the House. But if in the course of my remarks I allude to situations which might have a bearing on the grave situation in Quebec, this is intentional.

I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I was particularly impressed by the remarks of the seconder, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). Since he has come to the House I have been pleased to hear him ask questions during the question period, placing barbs into the government from time to time when dealing with the economic situation in the west. I had a sort of kindred relationship with that gentleman, but suddenly, having read his speech seconding the Address it seems either that all the wheat in western Canada has been sold or he has changed his mind and now regards this as the most wonderful government ever to have existed, though of course there are one or two problems to be dealt with.

Perhaps the explanation is the honour bestowed upon him of seconding the Address. I have never had that honour and in fact I am sure I will never have it. However, though his was still a good speech I would prefer to see the hon. member in his old stripes. I now feel alone in the House, though I am sure the hon. member, now sitting in his seat, will revert to his sharp, controversial but interesting self once again.

My remarks tonight were supposed to be directed to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) but I see that neither he nor his Parliamentary Secretary are here. However, I imagine that somehow the word will get to him, though on the last occasion I had a chance to berate a minister apparently his executive assistant, noticing that I had made a speech about his minister, said to him, "You had better see Otto and say, 'Good speech, Otto'". So when the minister came into the House he said to me "That was a good speech you made". I thought that strange because by rights, in view of what I had said about him, he should have taken an axe to me. In other words, no one had read what I had said. In fact, I did not praise the minister at all.

This will be the context of my speech tonight. A lot of sense has been said and a lot of remarks have been made having great bearing on the situation in Canada today. In summary I would say that our malaise is that we now have two factions in society—the established and the disestablished. All of us in this House represent the established—the small businessman, the big businessman, the union, the organized man, the wealthy, the middle-income group. But who speaks for the disestablished? The disestablished is the man who does not care about income tax on \$30,000 at the rate of 50 per cent because in his whole lifetime he will never make that much money, not even half or a third of that sum. The dises-