Atlantic Development Board Act

Production, who I have no doubt will be the new minister of industry, would be one of the first to say he does not favour any unnecessary duplication. It is my opinion that if this board were constituted and had the information which is desired, it would be unnecessary duplication in many phases and respects to set up another body simply to duplicate what had already been done. I am one of those who feel that resource development of the Atlantic provinces has not been carried out to the extent it should. We have in the constituency of my hon. friend from Charlotte, I am told, a tremendous deposit of tin. This will undoubtedly receive a great deal of investigation by the board also. Incidentally, I believe it is also a commodity imported into this country, and so our balance of payments position again comes into the picture.

Mr. Pickersgill: I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to interrupt for a second to see whether it might be the sense of the committee to sit for a little longer this evening to deal with the non-contentious sections and to hear any amendments which might be suggested by others, so that we might make a little more progress tomorrow. I put that forward as a suggestion. Since most of the hon. members from the Atlantic provinces are here perhaps the committee would not mind going on for a little longer.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fleming (Victoria-Carleton): I have no special objection, but at the moment we have a request from a very distinguished maritimer that he would like to see clause 1 left open.

Mr. Pickersgill: Then we could have it stand and go on with some of the others. I have no thought that we could complete this work tonight, because I know that one or two clauses will have to be held over for tomorrow; but if we could make progress by getting through the non-contentious clauses it would be of help.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): If I can complete my remarks about what the hon. member calls the non-contentious sections then, perhaps I am at this point the most disagreeable person in the chamber as far as the bill is concerned, and if he got rid of me perhaps he would be satisfied that tomorrow the going would be quite smooth. I was referring

to the question of area development under the new department of industry. I am wandering around a bit.

My colleague the hon. member for Royal might not care for this, but I am one of those who feels that the department of industry can perform a function. However, I am a little worried that they are going to usurp the functions of private business. I believe that private business should be co-operated with rather than that the government enter into competition with them. Having said that I will leave it, because I have got by with the chairman pretty well on that one.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): There is just one other point I wish to make.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman, I had understood there was agreement a few moments ago.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, apparently it was a misunderstanding. I am sorry, sir.

Clause 1 stands.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader to let us know the business for tomorrow and perhaps Thursday. I realize there are consultations going on and he will not want to go beyond those two days.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member is quite correct. We had some consultations today and I do not want to project the business beyond tomorrow and Thursday at the moment. Tomorrow we would hope we could get through the committee stage of this bill and if possible make a start on the second reading of the economic council bill, which would be continued on Thursday. If it should be completed on Thursday we would then make a start on the resolution preceding the Department of Agriculture bill. I do not think it is realistic to suggest more than that at this stage.

It being four minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

2018