

*Company of Young Canadians Act*

The CYC legislation was conceived in a great rush. It was never very carefully thought out. The company's greatest contribution was its service to the Liberal Party's campaign strategy in convincing young people that there was a role for them to play and that dissent was not only tolerated but was welcomed within that party. We had a recent demonstration of this at Harrison Hot Springs where a token number of unconventional dissenters were imported and paraded around as window-dressing.

**An hon. Member:** Why did you vote for it?

**Mr. Rose:** Some of them had difficulty getting in because the RCMP set up barriers.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Rose:** Let me say to my hon. friend that I do not intend to speak for the whole 40 minutes. I would welcome questions at the conclusion of my time. The fact remains that through the approximately three years of the government-appointed council there have been many incidents of tension and difficulty within the council not only in Ottawa but in the field. This difficulty has been present under various ministers who by and large chose to ignore the various contentions put forward. Never during the tenure of the provisional council was any government amendment presented to the House of Commons designed to overcome any of the obvious flaws in the structure of the organization. The organization and its accountability—which, incidentally was well known to all government appointees who sat on the council—was never changed by amendment.

● (9:20 p.m.)

They were not the kind of people who were going to be out-manœuvred by the so-called radicals who formed a large part of the volunteers. Far from it. Some of these men enjoy high prestige and high office in government circles today. In the Privy Council office today are such Scrooge-like men as Mr. Lalonde and Mr. R. J. Phillips. One wonders why such men who exercise influence or direction in respect of government policy did not see at the time some of the shortcomings of the company and immediately advise the appropriate people. They obviously had the peers at the right place; they were prominent on the CYC council, but for all we know they remained silent. Whether they did or not, the results were the same—no government

amendment altering the CYC administration was made until the one which is before us today.

It is true that the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) felt obliged occasionally to go beyond the book when important matters were at stake. We heard him admit before the committee that a few days before the June 1968 election he was so concerned with the situation in Montreal—one can imagine how sensitive anything like that would be a few days before an election—that he personally interviewed and supplied the executive director with certain information at the minister's home, which caused the executive director to ask for the resignation of Mr. Martin Beliveau. Then because Mr. Clarke, the executive director, felt he was pressured, he resigned a short time later.

I do not raise this matter because I think the minister did something he did not need to do, or because I think he was interfering. Far from it. The minister himself said Mr. Clarke had a perfect right to tell him to go to hell. That is in the evidence. But he did not do it. Nor do I believe that an accountant-comptroller—nowhere, incidentally described in the act which set up the CYC which was enacted a short time later—was not needed. I think in introducing this bill today the minister is suggesting that a comptroller was so limited by the act that he really had no power, and that in spite of his being placed in the council's offices in Ottawa he was not able to do the job he was intended to do.

From what we learned in the committee I believe the government has for a long time been acutely conscious of the various problems within the Company of Young Canadians, but has been singularly silent until now about introducing legislation that might have overcome some of these problems. It is a long time—about three years. Behold, now they come in with a bill that anticipates a virtual **Czar over the company; in other words a one-man trusteeship, not a three-man trusteeship.** He is not to be appointed for one year, as the committee recommended, but as the bill says "who shall hold office during pleasure". This might be forever, for all we know.

The Minister without Portfolio, in charge of citizenship, has since told us he does not believe it will be in perpetuity, but that the period will end possibly as soon as March 31, 1970, or the end of the fiscal year. We were all extremely pleased to hear this. I think our words have reached the government; we have communicated. I learned a long time ago