Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): Surely, we can deal with virtually any of these clauses on the first clause, by custom. Is that not correct? I would prefer to make the observations which I have to make at this stage because I have prepared an amendment which I would like to send over to the Secretary of State in case, after consideration he should decide it merited adoption. With that in mind I would prefer to make these somewhat rambling remarks at this time. I suppose we all have peculiarities. I would be the first to acknowledge that I have my full share.

I think the delegation of authority to spend public money in large amounts is a step which merits a tremendous amount of caution. Even though, as the Secretary of State has pointed out, we have the protection of treasury board—and I can say from experience that sometimes I felt this protection was a little too strong for my liking—I feel we should exercise a great deal of care before delegating the spending of \$100 million without further reference to parliament. After all, this is money which is raised through taxation of one kind or another, and it seems to me this is a point which merits serious consideration as far as the principle is concerned.

Opinions have been freely expressed in connection with this \$100 million. As I said this afternoon, I do not want to misquote anybody. I did not say the Secretary of State had ever said the \$100 million was only a minimum amount. I think he said he would not be presumptuous enough to bind further parliaments regarding what they might do when the question arose, if it ever arose. However, I think some of his colleagues have been more careless and said right off the bat that the \$100 million was merely a token amount and that after it had gone there would, presumably, be another \$100 million placed at the disposal of the board. I do not think the Secretary of State will tell us he subscribes to that view at the moment.

I do not know how it is contemplated that the board will function with respect to guarantees. I can see a situation arising where a guarantee for a large development might be necessary. But that would not be contemplated. It would actually not cost the board or the government a five cent piece.

I do not mind saying that in the constituency I have the honour to represent there exists near Woodstock a large deposit of manganese, unfortunately of quite low grade. The gentleman who was head of the corporation there had a personal interest in it and an urge to do something, but unfortunately passed away within the last six or eight months. I have been told that one of the reasons this has not been given more examination is because it is only by disposing of the

Atlantic Development Board Act

equity shares, which means the control, that the proper financing may be arranged. The people who have studied the situation are reluctant to do anything in that connection, and I am sure we are very pleased they have that hesitation. I can see the board stepping in here. The Minister of Finance will be very much interested because the finished product which would be produced is a product which is being imported at the present time. I am sure all hon. members would agree this is a matter deserving of a good deal of attention. not only because of its location-which I hope would be one reason because it happens to be in my own constituency-but because it would be for the general good of the country as a whole. I do not think anyone would want to see the board hamstrung or circumscribed in any way.

I will send this little piece of paper which I hold in my hand over to the Secretary of State for his perusal. All it does is to add before the amount of \$100 million the words "not less than". It puts the \$100 million as the minimum amount. I assure the Secretary of State that he has full authority to delete my name and insert his own if, in his judgment, he feels that that is a wise course to take.

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not think the rules would permit that, but I can probably insert the name of my hon. friend from Gloucester.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): That would be quite acceptable. My main interest in the matter is that strength will be lent to the instrument so that it may be possible to secure for the Atlantic provinces an additional opportunity for development of resources which hitherto have remained undeveloped. That is my complete interest. I think that is all I have to say along that line. While I would be the first to agree that perhaps clause 16 might have been the more appropriate place to make these remarks, I am sure that under the circumstances—

Mr. Pickersgill: As a matter of fact I am very grateful to have this notice.

Mr. Flemming (Victoria-Carleton): In case the memory of hon. gentlemen, especially the Secretary of State, is not too clear on what I have said in expressing the opinion that the government might consider some other amendments, I suggested the complete deletion of the expiry date of January 24, 1969. I share the view expressed by the Secretary of State with regard to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Pictou this evening in connection with the part the Atlantic development board can play in the newly-created department of industry as far as area development is concerned. I am sure that the Minister of Defence