

Constitution Act, 1867

ment are being contributed by all Canadian taxpayers. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to adequately reflect the feeling of pride and belonging, the vision and wishes of all our countrymen.

Thus, if we were to promote this vision which seems to me to be quite narrow, and simply include the City of Hull in the National Capital which is Ottawa, without its outskirts where the actual population really feels that it is already part of the national capital—

If we fail to enlarge our vision, then we would not fulfill the expectations of the Canadian people. I therefore believe that as the National Capital Commission which is responsible for enhancing the buildings, the parks and the life of our national capital, under the Department of Public Works, is currently very seriously addressing the issue, we are in fact considering projects which could truly reflect a true vision of our national capital, we should go beyond this Bill.

Not only that but this plan of Mrs. Jean Pigott, the present chairman of the National Capital Commission, and of the Department of Public Works, whose Minister is Mr. Roch La Salle tells us for instance about administrative sectors of the Government which would be scattered throughout the Capital area, a much larger area which reflects at last what has happened to the National Capital in the last ten years. For instance, in my constituency, there are 17,000 civil servants who work either in Hull or in Ottawa, the main city; in the constituency of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Ottawa West (Mr. Daubney), there are also many civil servants who work in the heart of the capital, some of them may even have the chance to work a little closer to home, in federal Government facilities. We see that this need for administrative sectors to be scattered throughout the National Capital area is really, in its wide vision, an objective to be pursued now. When we consider the legislation introduced by Dr Isabelle, the Hon. Member for Hull-Aylmer, we see that it may not have been brought up to date for . . . I think it is the sixth year he has brought back this Bill; if he had a look at that enlarged vision of a National Capital which should reflect the aspirations of all the population of that area, I might say of the region

defined as the area of the National Capital Commission, which extends to Buckingham—

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, on a point of Order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier has the floor.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) is repeating the speech she made on last December 7. She rose on the main motion and now she is speaking on the amendment, that is the motion I moved to refer the whole matter to a committee for consideration. The Hon. Member for Gatineau should know that a speech is made only once in the House, not twice. The one she is making now is a repetition of the one she made on December 7.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my comprehension of the Hon. Member's speech, I find there is a difference. I went through it with the Table Officers, I read the Hon. Member's speech, and I find it to have been relevant, as were her remarks today. They were not quite the same. I think I will allow the Hon. Member to carry on.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maily: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleague objects and says I am repeating the same speech, but it is not the same speech at all, because we have things to say now we did not have the last time we discussed the matter, in December 1985, I think. Mrs. Pigott now has devised an overall plan for the National Capital territory. So I fail to see why we should refer such a narrow issue that is not relevant to the present situation, which represents a narrow point of view and does not convey a sense of fairness to a committee. When we have—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order, please. The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

It being five o'clock, the House stands adjourned until next Monday, at 11 o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 5 p.m.