

Company of Young Canadians Act

doubt he would have welcomed the existence of the CYC at that time and used its facilities to the limit.

The question I ask, Mr. Speaker, is this: why is the minister seemingly so intent on keeping this revolutionary machine alive, albeit perhaps under somewhat better control? It seems that the government's attitude is the same toward the CYC as it is toward inflation—do not stop it, just control it. My belief is that the people of Canada want young people to participate in the affairs of this country with a view to assisting the poor and disadvantaged but that such participation must be within the framework of the system upon which this country is based. There is no support for activities, whether they be government financed or not, aimed at making fundamental changes in our system by the methods of revolution—that is, violence, intimidation and confrontation.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the government to face up to its responsibility and wind up this misconceived and mischievous body without delay and without wasting Parliament's time by trying to rejuvenate something around which so much ill will has collected and whose reputation will not be soon forgotten.

Therefore, with a view to arriving at the proper conclusion without the necessity for the production of another bill, which would require to go through all stages of the legislative process, I move:

That this bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to make provision for the dissolution of the Company of Young Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have had a chance to review the amendment and to consult with counsel on this matter. I must say that I do have some grave doubts about the admissibility of the amendment and I would certainly be prepared to have further advice from members of the House. It does seem to me that it goes beyond what is a normally allowable amendment at third reading. I would suggest it goes even beyond the scope of the bill.

As I say, my inclination would be not to allow it but I would prefer to have advice from members of the House on whether this amendment, as presented, is admissible.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We have not got a copy of the amendment and some of us have not heard it.

[Mr. Schumacher.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: While copies are being made available, I might just read it to the House:

That this bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to make provision for the dissolution of the Company of Young Canadians.

I might point out that it is the latter part of the amendment about which I have misgivings.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, the amendment that we have before us purports to refer this bill back to the Committee of the Whole for a specific purpose. I refer to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, page 287, citation 415.

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. The motion for third reading is debatable—

Now, the purpose of this amendment is to have the bill referred back to the Committee of the Whole House to amend it in one particular and that is, to dissolve the Company of Young Canadians. This, I would submit, is an alternative method of dealing with the problem which has been raised and debated on this bill for the last two days. There has been a very wide ranging debate on the CYC. This debate has included various alternatives and proposals from many members on all sides of the House on the method that should be used to deal with the CYC.

● (3:40 p.m.)

I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the bill and the amendment refer in general to the means of dealing with this problem. The means outlined in the bill, in general, is that there should be a comptroller; the proposal in the amendment is that the company should be dissolved. These are alternative proposals and do not constitute an expanded negative. Since this is an amendment to third reading the question of an expanded negative does not enter into the picture. May I refer to a ruling made on July 7 in connection with the official languages bill. The reasoned amendment on third reading was that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be resolved to refer the bill to the Supreme Court of Canada. In that instance, that motion constituted an alternative method of dealing with the situation then existing, and in those circumstances the amendment was accepted.