

Mr. Stanbury: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If hon. members will permit I shall comply with the rules and move to my own seat.

An hon. Member: I thought he was in his own seat.

Mr. Baldwin: The minister will sound much better there.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, one could say that I have been put in my place. I certainly would not pretend to be the government House leader.

Mr. Stanfield: I hope not.

Mr. Stanbury: Mr. Speaker, the government might have waited until a full package of proposals in response to the committee's report could be presented to the House. However, I hope that hon. members consider, as we do on this side of the House, that we are bringing before the House today a matter of some urgency. We do not want to ask this House to rush through proposals which would perhaps have the effect of destroying what has been built up over the past years or would change fundamentally the statutory framework of an organization which has performed good work.

• (8:50 p.m.)

If that is the opinion of some hon. members, there should be sufficient time in which to consider such proposals. But the government feels that in the interim there is a requirement for action to protect public funds; it feels there has been an indication from the hearings before the Parliamentary Standing Committee that Parliament should act promptly to protect public funds in this situation.

The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) has stated, and I am pleased to reiterate, that the government does intend to present detailed proposals in a more fundamental response to the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee before the House adjourns for the Christmas recess. We would hope that these proposals in the form of another bill would go to the standing committee for consideration and possible amendment; and that by the time the bill comes back to this House we shall have carried out a carefully considered review of the legislation.

The bill now before the House is acknowledged to be an interim measure. We can appreciate the difficulties expressed by hon. members in dealing with the bill in isolation,

Company of Young Canadians Act

but I hope they will appreciate the good faith of the government in wishing to put this forward as an urgent matter while awaiting the due process of the amendment of the law in a more fundamental way.

Hon. members have expressed varying views about this bill. Amendments have been suggested, and perhaps there will be more. One point which I thought was valid was that there could perhaps be a time limit imposed on the mandate of the comptroller. The committee suggested a time limit of one year. I do not think this would be an unreasonable limit although I hope a comptroller will not be necessary for nearly that long. I hope the new legislation will supersede this arrangement very quickly. In any event, such amendments would be seriously considered by the government. I hope hon. members will put them forward and allow them to be dealt with tonight so that in the House and in Committee of the Whole we can come to a decision on the details of the bill and thus meet our responsibility for protecting the public funds which are in the hands of the Company of Young Canadians. This is the nub of the measure which is before us now, and I trust that whatever may be the views of hon. members they will agree with this objective and proceed promptly to resolve the issues put forward by speakers who have preceded me.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to hear the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Stanbury) make what I might refer to as his maiden speech in the House since his elevation to such high rank. Our party is agreeable to the suggestion which was made by the hon. gentleman, to the effect that this measure should go to the Committee of the Whole in order that we might deal with it as expeditiously as possible. We would like the government and our friends in the NDP to know that we can be responsible in this regard.

We must also note what the minister stated with respect to the recommendations of the committee, indicating that trustees should be appointed for no longer than one year. We take the same view with respect to the comptroller, except that we think the time limit should be even shorter. We must, of course, be responsible for this organization and for seeing that the \$900,000 which is still available is administered properly and to the satisfaction of those to whom we have to report.

We suggest that the time limit be set at March 31, 1970, which is, of course, the end of the company's fiscal year. I hope that the