

*National Capital Commission*

the Quebec side, have indulged in what I consider unseemly criticism. I propose to deal with this matter later on, in some other debate.

A moment ago, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) speaking of buildings, stated—and rightly so—that due regard must be had for aesthetics. Nobody will quarrel with this, but aesthetics in architecture can vary according to people's tastes.

At salons or art exhibitions, for instance, you will see people raving over a Picasso who are quite unmoved by a Millet. It only shows that tastes vary and that different people see beauty in entirely different things. Just the same, I agree with the hon. member for Carleton, and I think we could preserve in the area some of the architectural style found in the parliament buildings, or the Confederation and Justice buildings. They give Ottawa its particular cachet. I also think that we should think of Hull as the possible site for other buildings in this sector of the national capital. It should be remembered that while the Quebec side covers a larger part of the area of the national capital than does the Ontario side, Hull gets only a small portion of the favours granted in this field.

As for representation on the commission—this is a point I wish to emphasize—it will be noted that the Hull or Quebec side representation was made up of only two members, namely, the mayor of the city of Hull and Mrs. Fontaine who, for a number of years, had been representing the Quebec side. On the other hand, the Ottawa side had eight representatives on the commission. There was the chairman, Major General Kennedy, an Ottawa resident, Mr. Charles Camsell of Ottawa, Mr. Ewart of Ottawa, Colonel Fraser of Ottawa, Mr. Lawrence Freiman of Ottawa, Mr. A. J. Major of Ottawa and Dr. R. A. Valin of Ottawa. Moreover, there was the then mayoress of Ottawa, the present mayor of Ottawa, whereas Hull had only two representatives, namely the mayor and Mrs. Fontaine.

I think that, considering the area of the national capital which is on the Quebec side, the Hull representation on the commission should include at least three Hull citizens, namely one for the rural part of the Hull constituency, one for the Gatineau part and one for the Pontiac part.

If the appointment of these individuals should create difficulties, we could always fall back on the metropolitan council which comprises about all the municipalities on the Quebec side interested in the national capital. We have, for example, East Templeton, the

municipality of Templeton, the village of Templeton, North Templeton, West Templeton, the town of Gatineau, the city of Hull, the village of Pointe-Gatineau, the municipalities of East Hull, West Hull and South Hull, Wakefield, the township of Wakefield, the municipality of East Wakefield, St. Cecile de Masham, North Masham, Eardley, the village of Deschene, the town of Aylmer, South Onslow and North Onslow as well as the village of Quyon. These municipalities on the Quebec side are all members of the metropolitan council and council officials could be asked to name representatives of the different sections, that is one for the rural parts of the constituency of Hull, one for the Gatineau section and one for the Pontiac section; I am sure that the people who would be appointed by that council could not be accused of intending to introduce politics in the commission since we do not know in advance what representatives the metropolitan council could appoint. Contrary to what the hon. member for Carleton said a moment ago, not only the cities of Hull and Aylmer are interested in a national capital; in fact, a good number of other municipalities are just as much interested if not more.

Another remark I wish to make has to do with bilingualism. I congratulate the federal district commission on that score. During the two years when I was a member of the commission, I advocated bilingualism. For a number of years, they had forgotten to put up bilingual signs even on the Quebec side.

I am quite prepared to believe it was not intentional; it was merely an oversight; and you know how easily human nature can cause people to forget certain things. At all events, I think I repeated my objections when we appeared before the committee which examined the federal district act in 1956. I asked the committee to refer the matter to the federal district commission, and urged them to have proper regard for bilingualism in the federal field. In this connection, I am heartened by the words of the Prime Minister this morning when he revealed to us the bilingual policy of the federal government.

Now, the federal district commission is part of the federal government. Also, I want to congratulate its members, inasmuch as for some time past they have agreed to use bilingual notices. This simplifies things, and it shows foreigners coming here that, on a federal plane, we are a fully bilingual country.