

exceedingly able architects of our own in Canada. Why we should go outside of Canada and get somebody else to come in here and do this job is beyond my comprehension.

So far as the bill itself is concerned, I think it is a good thing to have a federal district, but we should go slow in this matter in the next two or three years and remember that we are spending the taxpayers' money.

Hon. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am quite interested in this bill because I happen to represent the riding right across the river, which has a representative on the federal district commission. I have listened attentively to what has been said up until now. On the second reading we are to decide on the principle of the bill. That is not difficult to do because that principle has been agreed upon for the last fifty years. If I remember aright, the first Ottawa improvement commission was created by statute in the year 1899. There were modifications made under every government, and now this bill is to amend the Federal District Commission Act which dates from 1927. The object is to try to plan a capital of which Canadians will be proud.

This bill is based on the recommendations of the joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons which was set up in 1944. This committee, chosen from both houses of parliament, was set up to try to find a better plan for the capital and to devise plans which would be executed by governments in the future.

The first recommendation of that committee was to enlarge the federal district commission from ten to fifteen members, and if hon. members will read the bill they will see that that is what the bill proposes, to meet the wishes of the joint committee set up in 1944.

Even the title of this bill is another of the joint committee's recommendations. Instead of calling it the federal district commission, the committee favoured the title of national capital district commission. Those two recommendations of the committee are implemented in this bill.

Then there follows a clause by which the commission and the operation of this bill will come under the president of the privy council instead of under the Minister of Finance. I think we can all agree on that. So that there should be no difficulty in our agreeing upon the enlargement of the commission, the new name of the commission, and the minister who will have charge of the act.

[Mr. D. G. Ross.]

There are other sections of the bill which deal with expenditures. It is proposed to increase from \$200,000 to \$300,000, an increase of \$100,000 a year, the annual grant to the commission for the maintenance of the grounds belonging to the federal district commission on both sides of the river. That is understandable because, since the act was passed in 1927, the government has acquired a good many other properties and put up many buildings and even extended the government driveways.

Another section provides for the expenditure of \$3,000,000 to be spent as the years go by, over, I think, the next ten or fifteen years. Parliament in 1927 voted the sum of \$2,000,000 for the commission to acquire property and develop parks, gardens, driveways, roadways and sidewalks. The commission was authorized to spend the \$2,000,000 at the rate of \$200,000 a year during ten years. That amount has been completely expended. During the war the government did not see its way clear to voting any further amount for that purpose. Now this additional sum of \$3,000,000 is for the enlargement of the plan during the next ten years.

For many years in this house I have listened to members on both sides telling us what we should do in the city of Ottawa. Everybody wants to have a national capital which they would be proud to show to visitors and to speak about. If you travel in other countries you will notice how proud the people are to show you their capital city, their public buildings and parks, and the souvenirs of their past history. In this country we are trying to build up the same mentality. The only difference I see is that, as regards Canada's national capital, we have flowing between Ottawa and the city on the other side one of the most beautiful rivers we have in Canada. On one side of the river you find sumptuous buildings, splendid driveways and parks. If you look on the other side of the river you will find the industrial part of this district. That dates back to a long time ago. The city of Hull was built as an industrial city and it has developed the natural resources that were close to that city at that time. But I believe that now, in view of the development of the city on this side of the river, it is time to develop the other side of the Ottawa river. Why should we deprive the Canadian people of the beauties we have on the other side of the river? Why should we develop driveways and parks and put up fine buildings just on one side of the river and ignore the other side? I have heard a member on the other side of the house speak of the slums across the river. They are poor people but proud