

other park areas, from the point of view of the maximum use the public could make of those facilities.

The third committee would be the railways committee. It was felt that there again there must be this general master plan as a thing to work to in the future before the railway committee could do any valuable or effective work toward the solution of that part of the problem. After the national planning committee have determined the extent of the changes which would ultimately be required in the railway lines in and around Ottawa, in order to conform with the requirements of a much larger capital city and development this committee would work out the details and the cost of such changes. I anticipate that would be something which it would be very important to have carefully gone into.

We have heard the old saying that Rome was not built in a day. I do not think the capital of Canada is going to be built in a day. I do believe that no matter how desirable certain things might appear to be, they will have to wait until the opportune time—until they can be undertaken without putting any undue burden upon the economy of the nation.

This railways committee will be appointed by the federal district commission and will consist of the chosen representatives of the railway companies, representatives of Ottawa and Hull and also of the board of transport commissioners.

Before concluding these remarks I wish to say a word about the interesting and useful suggestion by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) and the remarks and comments made upon it by other hon. members. I think everyone is in agreement that this federal area should be regarded as a thing of interest not only to the citizens of Ottawa and Hull but to the citizens of Canada generally.

The bill does propose that of a commission of fifteen members, at least five—and the number has not been limited to five—would be chosen as representing not the residents of the capital area but the residents of the rest of Canada. It would be possible, even with a commission of fifteen, to have a representative from each of the nine provinces. The object the government had in view in submitting the bill as it now stands was to have the Canadian public generally represented in this body.

If it is the feeling of the house that there should be a legislative requirement that at least one member of the commission would be ordinarily resident in each of the nine provinces, it does make the commission a little more unwieldy, inasmuch as there would be a commission of nineteen instead of the fifteen

as set out in the bill. But that is not a serious objection. I am sure that if there were a commission of nineteen there would be occasions when routine meetings would be held, at which times the whole nineteen would not feel they had to attend. But when there was anything of major importance they would feel it their duty to respond.

Of course hon. members realize that as in the past this is going to be asked of them as a labour of love. They are going to be asked to serve without remuneration because they would be chosen by reason of their vision, outlook and public-spiritedness. We felt we might achieve that object by having regional representation. However, if hon. members feel it is preferable to have the nine provinces, as provincial units, separately represented, there will be no objection to accepting an amendment along those lines.

Having made these remarks I suggest that the committee might now be prepared to consider the terms of the legislation proposed. There may be other points which during the course of the discussion hon. members may wish to urge. They may feel sure that there is no desire to force anything upon the country. There is a desire to do what the predecessors of this government, to whatever party they belonged, have been doing for the last half-century, and to which I feel sure all future governments, composed of no matter which of the political parties, will also wish to add their respective contributions.

Mr. BRACKEN: Mr. Chairman, with the general objectives of this measure I am sure a large proportion of hon. members will be in accord. Certainly this party is.

I should like to thank the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) for the historical background he has given the committee respecting this project over a period of time stretching back for almost half a century. He has shown that this project has had the support of every government in power since 1899. He has shown, too, that during that time \$13 million has been put into it. He has pointed out further that the development, which began by costing the state \$60,000 a year, had recently cost more than \$300,000 a year and, when this measure passes, is likely to cost \$600,000 a year. I mention this only as a fact, and not necessarily as a criticism.

During the course of his remarks the minister said that there is nothing in the bill which states that the present plan is to make of this project a national war memorial. I was glad to hear the minister say that, because if it had been the idea of the government to change the original conception and plan a national war