

*National Capital of Canada*

Ottawa, the city of Hull and the neighbouring townships, included in the national capital region, legally it is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that a legal argument which the hon. member could have used has been allowed to appear in the bill. Unfortunately, I do not agree with Judge Cartright who used to feel that the Queen and Parliament have the right to determine the location of the federal Parliament. The provinces are clearly involved in the matter and their consent would be required.

We could actually legislate that the national capital would from now on be called Ottawa-Hull. Since such is not the view of the province of Quebec because that would seem to lessen its influence over its territories, the Quebec government could immediately introduce a bill rather longer than this one, as the result of which the name of Hull would be totally eliminated because the Quebec government is responsible for setting the limits of the city of Hull. That does not take time. It is only a matter of dividing the whole into two, three or four parts and to assign them to neighbouring communities. This way Hull would become part of history. I suggest therefore that the bill introduced by the federal government would be altogether worthless. No!

[English]

I now want to turn to the desires expressed by many of the people I represent in Edmonton. Many if not all of my colleagues from other parts of the country, whether the east, centre or west, will say that the determination of what shall be the capital of their country belongs as much to them as to the people of Ontario or Quebec where the actual site is located.

If a plan were submitted with the consent of Ontario and Quebec, and with the general approbation of the country, that the capital be expanded to include the new area, I am sure most people would agree. I think there is a certain attraction to it. The proposer of this bill took us through the history of this matter. I am sure that when the matter was first considered 100 years ago, as indicated by the hon. member, there were certain arguments in favour of it. Some are still in existence today. I do not disagree with them. However, legally this House does not have the power to change the name and the location of the capital of Canada by passage of a bill in this House and the other place and then have it sent on for royal assent. That would be the greatest nullity ever perpetrated in this House.

In the province of Ontario there is the city of Ottawa, the city of Vanier, the village of Rockcliffe, the city of Nepean, the city of Kanata, the township of Gloucester—

**Mr. Simmons:** The city of Gloucester.

**Mr. Lambert:** All of these are on the Ontario side. If the impatient young member from Newfoundland will listen—

**Mr. Simmons:** I was trying to help. It is the city of Gloucester.

**Mr. Lambert:** The hon. member is correct. I apologize. As of the first of January, it became the city of Gloucester.

**Mr. Simmons:** He learns after a while.

**Mr. Lambert:** That's right. And I am willing to admit it, unlike some other people. There are other municipalities on the Ontario side which are included in the area the proposer of this bill asks to be included in the area of the national capital. Those represent the boundaries; that is only as to name. Everything else that is south of the Ottawa River is under the control of the province of Ontario.

I need not go into all the municipalities, whether of a regional nature or otherwise, which exist on the Quebec side of the river. They are entirely under the dependence of the government of the province of Quebec. The people within those regions may be moved to amalgamate, something that has happened before. They may be moved to upgrade their status, as we have seen on the Ontario side with the growth of population in the cities of Nepean, Kanata and Gloucester. However, the boundaries are fixed by provincial legislation.

• (1730)

In his amendment the hon. member says it is hereby declared that the national capital of Canada and the seat of the federal government of Canada shall consist of the city of Ottawa and the city of Hull. If we adopt that, we will then be saying by act of Parliament that part of the national capital of this country shall be under the jurisdiction of yet another government within Canada so far as its location is concerned, and that to me is a nullity.

I think there is a very logical reason for suggesting that in this national capital region we have unity of assessment, the same type of health services, police protection, fire protection and transportation for the residents here and those citizens living on the other side of the river whose jobs are on this side. I suggest there are scores of thousands—perhaps hundreds of thousands—of people on both sides of the river who consider their lives totally interchangeable on either side. They will go to a supermarket in Ottawa one day, and the next they will go to a similar supermarket in Hull or in one of the other municipalities on that side of the river. They live in this region, and they are part of the region. There are intermarriages and all sorts of interrelationships between people on both sides.

I would not accept the example of Air Canada in this regard, which shows Ottawa-Hull in its timetable. That should not be a justification. After all, one used to be able to look at Air Canada's timetable and see Toronto and Hamilton joined together, and there is certainly a great deal of difference between Toronto and Hamilton, just as there is between Ottawa and Hull.

**An hon. Member:** Vive la différence.

**Mr. Lambert:** That is not a reason for advancing this idea in the House. The hon. member might, by way of resolution, suggest that the government set up another study, perhaps the ultimate study this time. Perhaps people have progressed far