

The Address—Mr. Greene

venture of this kind it ensures that it does not contribute to any further misunderstanding between the young and the old; that it does not contribute to the building-up of a bad reputation for what is essentially a very fine group of young people. I do not care how a man wears his hair, whether as long as Einstein, as short as Jack Benny, or as in my own case where 75 per cent of the question is academic. But when a youth hostel is established it should be well run. It should be run by people whose reputation is reasonably impeccable.

This reminds me of the old Scottish Presbyterian who told his preacher that humanly speaking, he was perfect. None of us is that. However, it would be wise to avoid those who have had recurrent problems with the taking and trafficking of drugs, and so on. Indeed, I think we should err on the side of caution. It would not hurt occasionally to appoint an out-and-out "square". I think these youth programs could do some good. It is a terrible thing in any community to create the kind of situation where it is easier for people who are hostile to youth to continue to express themselves in such a way as to say "I told you so". The Company of Young Canadians let down a great many of us who believed it was worthy of support. I do not want the same thing to happen with the youth hostel program.

I hope that next year, if the program is implemented, we will not have a recurrence of what took place last year. I hope the Secretary of State will pay heed to some of us who are very concerned about these matters and are very anxious to see that all young people in Canada are given opportunities. I have been in youth work for many years. I hope the minister will avoid some of the pitfalls into which he fell with great rapidity last year.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take part in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. First of all, I should like to make a comment on the speech yesterday of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) in respect of the question of pollution. In his speech he alluded to the fact that in his opinion long-term, low-interest loans would be the way to most effective abatement of water pollution.

I would point out that this idea is completely contrary to the tenor of the Canada Water Act which the government has indicated is one of its major weapons in the fight against water pollution. The philosophy behind that act is one of "the polluter must pay"; that the cost of cleaning up water must be an integral part of the cost of production. Just as with municipal taxes or labour costs, so must the cost of cleaning up water to be used in production be a cost of that production. Only thus will we have the economic motivation whereby in each area of our manufacturing industry we will achieve the optimum results with respect to water usage.

If, on the other hand, we say that we will have the government look after polluters by extending to them long-term loans or otherwise, this of course is a disincentive to a polluter to clean up his own house. The polluter who knew that somewhere downstream the non-polluters,

the taxpayers of Canada, would in some wise have to pay for the cleaning up of his pollution would be very foolish indeed to build in anti-pollution measures as a cost of his production and so pay for them himself.

Therefore, may I point out that the two philosophies are opposite and opposing and in our view the principle of the Canada Water Act is superior. I would refer my hon. friend to the evidence given by Professor Juby to the House of Commons committee on this score. I think he put the case for "the polluter must pay" proposition, that the cost of cleaning up pollution should be an integral part of the cost of production, far better than I could hope to put it today in the short time at my disposal.

I want this afternoon chiefly to speak to the dual questions of nationalism and natural gas which in speeches from the opposite side of the House were referred to by more than one member including, I believe, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). The two do, in fact, in some way go hand in glove and I think can be effectively dealt with together. First of all, on the question of nationalism itself, if I may be permitted to mix a metaphor I would say that nationalism is, in any age and in any country, at once a tender flower and an unruly horse which must on the one hand be carefully nurtured and on the other hand be ridden with care; because if it runs away, then indeed the problems of a surfeit nationalism can be greater than those of not having a strong nationalism in a country.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I think we have seen of recent days actions by the FLQ, in the name of nationalism, to which none of us would subscribe. I think over the years probably more harm has been done and more wars have been waged in the name of nationalism than any other cause. I believe a great deal of harm can be done by irresponsible nationalism, by nationalism which seeks to incite popular acclaim in the short term, which seeks to gain short-term political advantage, over the long-term best interests of positive nationalism. Nationalism in a positive sense is indeed one of the most wholesome attributes of any country. It enables the people of any land to work together toward common objectives, to enhance the lot and the opportunity of the entire people of a country. It points out the road and the direction in which a nation must move and can ennoble the very purposes of nationhood.

I have said, and I say again this afternoon, that I think there is in Canada today a very real influence toward a positive Canadian nationalism, a very real nationalism, a nationalism which is not against anyone, but which is determined to build in Canada a unique Canadian society; not a pale imitation of any other society, not merely a second-hand view of some other land or of society in some other land but something that is peculiarly and essentially Canadian. This philosophy is particularly evident among our young people. All of us should indeed welcome it because in this direction of thinking there is the source of the very unity which Canada has sought so long.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]