

I submit that the amendment is very broad in its implications and would give us an alternative method of dealing with problems which have been raised and debated in this House. I therefore urge Your Honour to accept it.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, may I add my remarks to those of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. He said the amendment is broad, and I will be the first to admit that. I ask Your Honour to look at Bill C-171 itself. That, too, is broad. One might say it contains few restrictions. Actually, if you appoint a comptroller without imposing any restrictions on him, and say that he must sign all the cheques issued by the company, then, as the hon. member for York South said yesterday when he tried to amend the bill you will be giving the comptroller power to dissolve the company because his power stems from the power of the purse. This amendment really says that instead of giving a comptroller such wide and unrestricted powers to curtail the operations of the CYC, Parliament should give a parliamentary committee that responsibility. The committee should have the power to draw up terms of reference governing the operation of the company and, if it is felt necessary to bring the activities of the company to an end, to phase it out.

We feel it is better for a committee to have such power than to leave it in the hands of a comptroller whose powers may be almost unrestricted. Also, although the amendment may be broad, its scope I submit is no broader than that of the entire bill. At present the comptroller, because he has control of the purse strings, has the effective power to kill the company. We say that it ought to be the responsibility of a parliamentary committee to phase out the operations of the company, and it ought not to be left to the discretion of the comptroller to say whether or not the company is to exist. Of course, if any bill to resurrect the company were to be before the House, my argument would be weak. But there is no such bill on the Order Paper at present, and therefore I submit my argument is not weak. We must look at the Order Paper as it appears today. Because the amendment is simple is no reason for Your Honour not to allow it. The bill itself is simple in concept. It appoints a czar who, in the words of the hon. member for York South, has effective power to kill the company.

As a matter of fact, the other day the hon. member said that he wanted no part of a

Company of Young Canadians Act

company in which the czar could tell volunteers what they were to do and how they were to do it. I submit seriously and sincerely that instead of giving this power, in the interim period, to a czar or comptroller who could kill the company, we should give it to a parliamentary committee which ought to have the responsibility of dissolving the company if that is felt necessary.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the hon. member's amendment suggests that the bill be referred back to a committee of the House and that the committee make provision for the dissolution of the company. I submit that the company was established by statute and if the amendment were accepted we should be giving the committee power to repeal an Act of Parliament. That is absurd. All such questions must be decided in the House by a majority of hon. members; therefore, the committee cannot have power to dissolve the company when that company has been created by statute, by Act of Parliament.

Mr. Nowlan: But the committee must bring back recommendations, surely.

Mr. McIlraith: With respect, I do not think that is correct.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I thank hon. members for their advice in this matter. I have listened carefully to what they said. The first paragraph of the explanatory note relating to the bill reads:

The purpose of this amendment is to provide for the appointment by the Governor in Council of a Comptroller of The Company of Young Canadians whose approval would be required for the payment of any money by the Company and for the entering into of any contract or other arrangement providing for the payment of any money by the Company.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka drew the attention of the House to Citation 415(1) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition which reads in part:

When a bill comes up for third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular.

I suggest to the hon. member that the Chair must interpret the words "any particular" to refer to the particulars of the bill presented to the House.