

Atlantic Development Board Act

the estimates for that year. What we are doing in this particular case in effect is passing estimates for the next six years.

I have no objection, nor has any member of this party, to the amount that is proposed. We think it may not be enough. It is not that we have any objection to the present government initiating the expenditure of \$100 million for this purpose over the next six years, but rather the manner in which the money is going to be provided. The Secretary of State has said that we are going to enact this provision in legislation and then nobody can renege on it later. That brings up a point. I am not sure that this is good parliamentary practice because, if what he says is true, in effect we are binding future sessions of parliament in the next six years. If that is not so, then it means that what he has said has no validity because any future session of parliament could reduce the amount just as easily as changing the amount of an estimate. There is nothing sacrosanct about the fact that this figure is in the bill.

I may be somewhat out of order, but perhaps the chairman will be lenient I just wanted to clear up one misconception on the part of an hon. member on my left. We have no guilty conscience about the appointments we have made to the board; we think they are fine appointments. But the Secretary of State has argued—and I have forgotten his phrase—that he thought the government had a right to have a board which was a congenial one.

Mr. Pickersgill: In harmony.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): That is the word. The implication there is that the government is going to do the same sort of thing with every other board, because there are boards in existence to which they have not appointed the members. In my view this is not a very valid argument. I am not going to say any more, but I was interested in the Secretary of State exposing to the committee what his chief reference book is with regard to his logic. I could never understand it before. Now I find it is Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. Monteith: In all his actions.

Mr. Churchill: There is just one thing I should like to say. The statement of the Secretary of State that if more money is required he will fight for it is completely meaningless. There is such a thing as collective responsibility on the part of government, and all that he has said is that within the cabinet he will put forward a case for more money for the Atlantic provinces. Earlier today my friend to my left talked about the blind faith that people may have in the statements of the Secretary of State.

I hope they will not exhibit blind faith in that statement, because it is completely meaningless except as an expression of opinion as to what he might do at some future date.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 agreed to.

On clause 8—*Duration*.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word on clause 8. There has been a good deal of exception taken to clause 8. A good deal of exception was taken again today to clause 8 in that it was suggested that we should not have a terminal date on the board. I am not entirely convinced by the arguments that have been made but I think there is a lot in them. I also think there is some likelihood that there might be some misunderstanding among many ordinary people that we were not serious about this matter. I had thought it would be a useful incentive to the board but it certainly is not essential to the legislation. Therefore I am going to ask my colleague, the Solicitor General, to move an amendment along the lines suggested to us by the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton to take clause 8 out of the bill and to renumber clause 9 as clause 8.

Mr. MacNaught: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That clause 8 of Bill C-80 be deleted and that clause 9 be renumbered clause 8.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Title agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the bill carry?

Mr. Pickersgill: Just before you leave the chair, Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton for his courtesy in making his amendments available ahead of time so that there would be an opportunity to consider them. It was a great convenience and I think it helped us to get the bill through more quickly.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, may I simply comment that I appreciate the courtesy of the Secretary of State in the statement he has just made. I should also like to say how much I appreciate the action of the committee in allowing the legislation to continue beyond January 24, 1969.

Mr. Bell: I hope there is the same harmony on the board as there has been in the house this afternoon.

Bill reported.