

organizations work better when they have a deadline. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the party which he supports was here for 22 years. I should like them to point to any great, outstanding accomplishments which they achieved to their credit during that time as far as the Atlantic provinces are concerned.

Mr. Pickersgill: Does the hon. gentleman want me to tell him one right away? I would mention the Canso causeway, a pretty big operation. Then there is Camp Gagetown.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Yes, it is true that for the defence of the country they established a camp at Gagetown. I suppose it was put there for defence purposes. I am not saying anything in criticism of the camp. It is a splendid thing for that part of our country to have the defenders of Canada located there. But I do not think one could put the label of sound economics on it as the reason. My hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis-Kings says "And closed the one in Nova Scotia". Well, I am not standing here to argue the point. I am simply calling attention to the fact that it is nothing short of preposterous to expect this board to accomplish in five and a half years what previous governments—oh, yes, Conservative and Liberal alike; I admit that—have been working on for nearly 100 years. It was only during the period from 1957 to 1963 that we saw definite and great accomplishments as far as the Atlantic provinces are concerned.

So I hope the hon. member will agree on reflection that the clause to which I have referred should be deleted. At any rate I would expect the government to introduce an amendment to that effect, because I am unable to agree in any way that the board should be allowed to die after five and a half years. Indeed, it seems ridiculous to me that anyone could keep a straight face and say the board could possibly accomplish all its objectives within such a length of time. I urge the Secretary of State that when the proper time arrives he should accept an amendment deleting that particular provision.

I also question, if I may have the temerity to do so, our right to say that such a body as this should die at some future date so far ahead, a date beyond the life of this parliament. Who are we to say what conditions will be in January of 1969? Why should we anticipate the future in this way, especially as it appears to me such a provision is likely to do a great deal of damage to one part of our country? What is to be done in January of 1969 will be recommended to parliament by whatever government will be in office at that time. It is something for them to deal with.

I should like to return for a moment to the subject of the personnel of the board.

Atlantic Development Board Act

The minister has stated that they should be strengthened. Well, we have five men named to the board, men whose gifts and qualifications cannot be improved on. I do not say it would not be possible to find five men who would be as good, but they would not be better. I will not be satisfied unless they serve the term for which they were appointed. If the present government, in its wisdom or lack of it, decides it is going to appoint six more people so that they may outvote the five, I think those already appointed should serve out their terms. I think if the government of the day decides that it should appoint people for an equal length of time, possibly, from the point of view of one hon. gentleman opposite, there may be some justification for this idea, though I cannot understand it myself. Their qualifications were examined in detail not long ago. Never in this parliament will the question of ability in this regard be doubted. I hope that an amendment will be prepared and presented accomplishing the continuation of the present board members in office for the period of time for which they have been appointed. I suggest to the Secretary of State that he use his influence to continue in office the present chairman of the board for the period of time for which he was appointed.

I have here a letter written by the Secretary of State to the present chairman. The part to which I wish to draw attention is this:

The effective use of the fund—
That is the fund provided.

—will clearly require a close harmony of view between the government and the board and especially the chairman.

I ask, what is meant by "harmony of view"? I think the Secretary of State owes it to the house to tell us what he means. Does he mean "harmony of political view"? I would not have thought so.

Mr. Robichaud: That is what existed before.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): I might say to the hon. member for Gloucester that he should be an expert on harmony of political views, because he has been working at that for a long time.

Mr. Robichaud: That is true with you.

Mr. Caron: You did also.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): In my opinion, the present chairman of the board will work in harmony with anyone wanting to work toward an improvement in economic conditions. This is what he said in his speech at Amherst, and the Secretary of State quoted him in detail. I will quote Brigadier Wardell also, and from the same speech:

As to the new terms of our appointments, we shall be glad to fall in with the government's