

National Capital

to work and has tackled the problems, it will look at this issue, among many others, and that those who sit on the committee will be proud of what they have done and those who look at that work will be equally proud.

I hope the committee will deal with the subjects of jurisdiction, property ownership, who owes what to whom, and so on. When the committee gets to the jurisdictional problems, which are very important, I hope among the accomplishments will be listed, at least in small measure, a success which demonstrates that the national capital has become to westerners not a symbol of something foreign or divisive but, rather, a symbol of our strength in all parts of Canada, a symbol of which they can be proud in the knowledge that this place is their capital, too, and that they want it to be so.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, rising as a representative from even farther west than my predecessor in this debate, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale), I wish to express my general agreement with the scheme put forward by the minister to establish a parliamentary committee to examine the current situation within the capital region and to make recommendations concerning the future of this area. We have already expressed our agreement with this course of action but have done so, let me clearly state here and now, on the understanding that it will be the committee that will make the recommendations and there is not already lurking in the wings a bill or a set of plans ready to be brought out and presented to parliament no matter what the committee says or recommends.

Unfortunately, this has happened in the past. It has been brought to our attention that this government does proceed in this fashion, going through the motions of consultation but all the while having made up its mind exactly how it plans to proceed. We must, therefore, be on the look-out for all possible signs of a predisposition on the part of the government to move this way or that way despite the findings and proposals of the committee.

In this connection I am reminded of a procedure practised in the British House in respect of their select committees, which correspond more or less to our standing committees. The select committees at Westminster are empowered to investigate and report with recommendations. The important words here are "with recommendations". At Westminster, the government within a specified length of time is obliged either to accede to or implement each recommendation or provide reasons for not doing so. This is a good committee system. The committee is empowered to recommend, after proper inquiry of course, and the government either implements the recommendations or provides reasoned argument why this or that recommendation cannot be or ought not to be implemented. That is real participatory government—something that I, for one, would like to see developed a bit more around here.

I agree that the capital should reflect—we have heard this from all speakers—the dual nature of our society, our culture and our linguistic inclinations.

[*Translation*]

But in this regard, one word of caution is indicated. To my mind, we must preserve the authenticity of our names,

[Mr. Goodale.]

thus encouraging wholesome reflection on the duality if not the multiplicity of our origins.

The most flagrant example of a lack of authenticity, from my point of view, is that of the "trans-phonetizing" of some names, for instance the name "Outaouais" which does not exist. That is an Indian name, and we see it everywhere. The name is "Ottawa", and that is a sure thing. We must keep it in its original form. For instance, we do not speak of "coque" in the case of Hull, which would really be an exaggeration, nor of "basketmaker" when speaking of Vanier. We should not therefore speak of "Outaouais". Does anyone claim that Rockcliffe, in the suburbs of Ottawa should be called "falaise rocheuse"? or that Deschênes should be called Oak Woods, or again of Pont Chaudière "Teakettle Bridge" or "Cooking pot Bridge"? Really it is the Chaudière Bridge. We ought to keep that name. And the Rideau River, is it the laughing water or is it "Curtain River"? No, it is the Rideau River. We must keep that name. The result of such procedure is a ridiculous situation, even nonsense. If we keep on like that, for instance, we will have site and place names borrowed from every aspect of our history. Let us keep them in their original state, whatever the language they come from.

[*English*]

I simply make a plea, therefore, for good, ordinary, down to earth, common Canadian horse sense in this area. We have drifted too far away from some original designations. I am at a complete loss to understand why Nova Scotia, for example, a pure Latin term if ever I ran into one, should have to be translated into one or other of the official languages. The word "exit"—a means of getting out from somewhere—has been translated into another word. We all know what those words mean. Nova Scotia is Nova Scotia. I believe we should stick with the name the people who arrived there gave to a particular part of the country. I say that one of the working rules of the committee that is to be set up should be to examine the nomenclature of the sites, the mountains, the lakes, the rivers, the woods, the regions and the banlieues of the cities, and let us stay with those original names.

● (1730)

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words on the motion to establish a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to study the various aspects of the National Capital Commission. I think that such a committee is badly needed. There have been many studies carried out in the past, such as the Fullerton report, and it is just and right that the elected representatives of the people should take all these studies to heart and decide what should be done for the future of our capital.

It has been said that this must be a non-partisan committee, and I hope that members will remember that in the committee. I do not know whether or not I shall be a member of it—I hope that I shall be. I will certainly want to encourage the non-partisan aspect. Our capital is of interest to all Canadians, and it has nothing to do with political parties. I think that we should approach it in that way. In fact I would even like to see members of the