

*Company of Young Canadians Act*

never to beat people on the head for doing things I wanted them to do in the first place.

Nevertheless, I wonder whether this measure really goes far enough. I think the comptroller-trustee, according to clauses 2 and 3, makes completely irrelevant the committee's concept of reform from within. Remember that the committee sat for about five weeks and heard a great many witnesses. I think the committee's concept of reform from within by the permanent council and the executive director, putting their own house in order and continuing to function toward this end, is rather irrelevant if we impose a one-man comptroller-trustee upon them immediately. Perhaps the government is out to kill the company. I hope it is not. I hope if it is to be killed, it will be killed outright and not left to survive in name only, like a de-fanged tiger that marches around the jungles of our large cities and Indian reserves but is completely unable to cope with the problems it might meet.

Perhaps the poorly drawn act has finally motivated the cabinet to blow the whistle. At the present time, two signing officers out of four may sign cheques up to a maximum of \$100,000. I know anything untoward in this regard is far from the minds of some of the people who are signing officers, but I think the government sincerely believes it can no longer tolerate this situation in view of the record of the company and some of the testimony that was given before the committee. It can no longer tolerate the risk of two signing officers being able to write a cheque for \$100,000 and then disappearing to some unextraditable country.

**An hon. Member:** Cuba.

**Mr. Rose:** I do not know what our diplomatic relations are with countries in the Caribbean and elsewhere, but I do not think that is the point. There must be some kind of financial accountability. I agree with the minister on this point. The minister expressed in the committee the desire to have a panic-button. He wants some kind of legislative device that will allow him to take charge in a crisis situation. I ask the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, why he waited so long to bring in this amendment. Surely the need was apparent long ago. My view is that the Company of Young Canadians is neither a strictly financial problem nor a legislative one. The company is primarily a political problem now that its activities are losing more votes for the government than they are gaining for it among the youth. Now is the time for the axe.

[Mr. Rose.]

There is no doubt that the representations of Mr. Saulnier of Montreal have had a profound effect on the government. This is why we had a prolonged investigation before the committee. Because it was prolonged, there was not sufficient time to go into a number of things which should have been gone into. No one in this party will sponsor government-financed support for subversive political strife. No one will be unduly influenced by the evidence that the Montreal council brought before the committee. The evidence was largely circumstantial, and so far as I am concerned most of it does not wash.

This committee member for one—and there were others on the other side of the House—does not deny that the civic administration in Montreal is being challenged; nor do I deny that seditious and terrorist tactics should form no part of the CYC activities. But when the city of Montreal attempts to come before us and in a scarcely concealed manner lays the responsibility for all the troubles of the CYC and all the troubles of Montreal squarely at the feet of the CYC, I for one cannot accept it. When the city of Montreal was defenceless last November, it was not because of the five or six infiltrators in the CYC but because the city failed to come to terms with its policemen who had gone on strike.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The internal problems of Montreal are very serious and no one here would attempt to minimize them, least of all me, but that is not the point. The issue appears to be that the government is prepared to abandon all pretence at giving approval to a pluralistic society because, after two months, the permanently elected council has failed to deal with the problems that a government appointed council could not resolve after three years.

What we are really saying to the youth of this country is, "We do not approve of your outlook. Why can't you be more responsible, like us, for instance? We are responsible. We tolerate the arms race, war, pollution, alienation, and discrimination. We have done it for years. Why can't you be more like us? Go ahead with your little patchwork community-chest type of projects if you like, but do not, for heaven's sake, threaten the power structure". Regardless of the ineffectiveness of its \$1.9 million annual budget with which to wage war on poverty, it is rather like fighting an elephant with a peashooter. I think that members of the government, when asked by committee members what happened to the