

Company of Young Canadians Act

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to make a correction to *Hansard*. I think Your Honour would agree with me that such a correction is badly needed. Last night some of Your Honour's constituents came to the House of Commons and at one point in my address as recorded at page 2003 of *Hansard* I am recorded as saying:

Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the Company of Young Canadians I should like to join Your Honour and other Canadians in the warm welcome to the company of old Cornwallian Canadians.

Now, sir, I do not think I used the adjective "old" in referring to those charming and delightful ladies who passed across my vision in the seats directly above me. I am reinforced further in that opinion, sir, by the fact that you, even as an independent member and our Speaker, would have immediately forgotten your impartiality and would have seized the occasion to raise your own question of privilege to say I was mistaken because it simply was not true. I must admit that if I made that statement it was not true. I hope I did not make it and I hope *Hansard* will be corrected so that the awful word "old" will be expunged from the reference to a group of charming, delightful and very young Cornwallian Canadians.

Now, I should like to turn to the subject of the Company of Young Canadians which is becoming one of the old issues in the House of Commons. First, I wish to restate the position advanced privately by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) and publicly by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and myself last night. We think the measure which is before the House, is not appropriate as a long term measure but, as a short-term measure is appropriate. That is, we believe somebody should be in a position to protect the money already voted by this Parliament but not spent as yet by the Company of Young Canadians, if only for the one purpose of choking off those long distance phone calls to Hollywood which seem to be the stock-in-trade of one or two members of the Company of Young Canadians in the city of Toronto. In other words, we have suggested that an amendment to the proposed legislation to set a limit of March 31, 1970, the end of the fiscal year, on the operations of the proposed comptroller is a reasonable one and something that we, as a responsible opposition, can accept. In this way we would be protecting, say, up to \$600,000 from being improvidently spent.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Yesterday the government House leader indicated that such an amendment was acceptable and gave the House his assurance that this would be moved by him when the legislation is dealt with in the committee of the whole. I must say I was surprised that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with all the money it spends on news reporting and services from Parliament, would so completely garble that proposition on its television news last night and on its radio news this morning. If the reporter responsible was wilful in trying to misinterpret the position of members of the opposition he should be fired, and if he was not wilful and did it as a matter of ignorance he should be sent back to the lowest form of work in the CBC until he learns to conduct himself responsibly and to understand what is going on in this chamber. I was furious at such an obvious misinterpretation of such a responsible position.

Then, too, my hon. friend from York South, the deputy House leader of the New Democratic Party, when our proposition was restated by myself very shortly before ten o'clock, stated that he was not inclined to accept it because his party had moved an amendment earlier in the evening. I do not find the two positions incompatible. I do not see why we could not make our decision on the amendment of the New Democratic party and then, that being out of the way, go on to what seems to be the main point.

The point is whether we should forsake the Broadcasting Committee as the instrument to deal with this bill and go to the Committee of the Whole where amendments can be moved. Eventually, when the last clause is reached, the House leader can carry out the proposal which he advanced yesterday. I think that this is really the course that we have to pursue if, as we all agree, the affairs of the CYC are in complete financial chaos at present and we, as the people accountable to the Canadian people, have to deal with that situation. We have to deal with it before whatever is left of the \$600,000 or so goes frittering down various drains before we can lay some kind of restraint upon the operations of the company.

So it seems to me that we are forced to make our own decision on the NDP amendment as quickly as possible, then get into Committee of the Whole where we can make our amendments and our speeches so that, before we rise for Christmas, something will be done about a body that is a thorn in the side of most right thinking Canadians. I do