

Telephone and travel costs were restricted. This does not mean much in an urban centre but in an area such as the north coast it is essential to be able to contact people by telephone or travel. The Vancouver office, serving three projects, was limited to \$25 per month for office costs. They could not even run their duplicator, which could have been a good thing for some projects. However, I do not think we experienced irresponsibility in the Vancouver project. In spite of people resigning and leaving the various projects, no vacancies have been filled; therefore some projects are necessarily understaffed. Efficiency is great. Like planning, like preparation and like motherhood, everybody approves of it. But what is the good of streamlining procedures and inviting budget control if, in the process, you choke off active work at the community level? I realize it will not persist forever but in a situation like this do we not want to run the risk of being left with a streamlined top-level management team in a non-functioning series of field projects.

To close, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if this bill is passed unamended we will have a strictly conventional organization with the standard, staff line arrangement. There will be nothing to distinguish it from other Crown corporations, in spite of the CYC's unique role and the job for which it had been established. It is my opinion that the reason it was established was to respond positively to the failure of conventional organizations in other areas of our society. It seems, however, that we are creating another very conventional and inflexible organization and if such structures could not meet the needs of society four years ago, there is little possibility they can now.

I hope the minister will consider the words of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) and myself and re-examine this particular clause, because we put forward our views with sincerity. Perhaps we do not have the high level of indignation that would make for an emotional speech but we have thought about it a good deal, as I am sure the minister has, and I would like him to consider it.

● (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member sits down, will he permit a question? I have listened to him and looked at the evidence taken before the committee with regard to this whole question. Having listened to the hon. member, examined remarks made before the committee and looked at his

Company of Young Canadians Act

amendment, I am not certain whether he is in favour of a majority of the council being volunteer members or appointees. I believe the minutes of the committee suggest that he wants the majority of the council to be volunteer members; yet his amendment really suggests that three council members out of seven or eight ought to be volunteers, which is somewhat less than a majority. It seems to me that the hon. member, in his amendment, takes a position slightly different from the one he adopted in committee. Perhaps he could explain this discrepancy before he sits down.

An hon. Member: That is a good question.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Crowfoot for his question. The amendment speaks for itself. I am not aware of any discrepancy in my position; nor did the hon. member bring to my attention any part of the committee minutes which suggest that I may have changed my mind.

Mr. Horner: But it appears that the hon. member has changed his mind.

Mr. Rose: I will say that the committee did not recommend a completely appointed council. It recommended that the minister should look at the structure of the council, and I think the minister did. Nowhere in the committee report is it indicated that the committee is in favour of a completely appointed council.

[Translation]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, nothing would please me more than to agree with the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) and the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose). Unfortunately, I do not share their views and I would like to give briefly the reasons why the bill before the House was introduced in its present form.

First, the argument of the member for Halifax-East Hants has surprised me somewhat. It could be summarized as follows: the Company of Young Canadians is a very sick child; it therefore should be killed. It is an awkward solution in the treatment of a sick child. But what followed is even more astonishing as the member stated implicitly: "If we don't kill it, let's see to it that it remains alive but not well."

I confess again that this kind of reasoning is beyond me. The hon. member concludes his remarks by accusing us of over reaction, that