

the amendment I announced last night that I would move. But going still further, the member for Fraser Valley used those same persuasive powers which the member for Humboldt speaks of to win to his side—that is, to win to the side of the member for Fraser Valley—not only the leader of the official opposition but the Acting Prime Minister, who has stated this morning that he will accept the amendment suggested by the member for Fraser Valley.

I am doing rather good work for the city of Ottawa, and if I stayed here long enough I might be able to fix that death trap at Confederation square that has been spoken of. I do not know who is to blame for it.

Mr. BOUCHER: We should be glad to have you.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I am sure I could be elected in Carleton if I ran there.

Mr. BOUCHER: At least I admire the hon. member's courage.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I had an amendment which I intended to move in connection with section 2, because I want the people of Manitoba and of all Canada to know that the leader of the opposition was right at least in this instance, because he is prepared, I understand, to second my motion, which will be to the effect that of the members appointed by the governor in council one shall ordinarily be a resident of each of the nine provinces.

In conclusion, may I suggest to the member for Humboldt that the most constructive speech made in this debate was delivered by the member for New Westminster, who said it would be an excellent thing if each province had the privilege of taking part in the beautification of one particular section of the capital. The only thing the member for New Westminster forgot to mention was that ninety per cent of the shrubs, flowers, and ornaments would come from Fraser valley, British Columbia.

Mr. BOUCHER: I am pleased to see the committee in such a happy mood when discussing the beautification of the federal area. One point I mentioned last night I would impress upon the minister who is piloting the bill. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is necessary for me to urge it upon him because in the course of his remarks this morning he mentioned the same thing several times. What I mean is that the word "area" is far more appropriate than the word "district". While it is true that this body was first incorporated as the Ottawa improvement commission, it had a title that more fittingly represented its activity than that of dis-

trict commission. For a number of years in this house and in the country at large a great deal of confusion, as well as some antagonism to the aims and objects of the government in the improvement of the federal capital area, has arisen because of the use of the terms "federal district" and "federal district commission."

I do not think the people of Canada are in favour of creating a federal district to be run by a commission with the probable loss of local autonomy. I do not think the people of Canada want to have established a federal area similar to that in Washington, run by commission government. I do not think it makes for harmony or the welfare of the community or of the project itself, when we bear in mind that we are taking in portions of two provinces with different municipalities, two provinces with different types of law, different educational desires, different municipal management and all the rest of it. Under these circumstances I do not think there should be any doubt about our intentions. There should be no loss to the community or to the province of local autonomy.

The commission that has been appointed has acted well as an advisory coordinating committee rather than as a legislative and enacting body. I feel therefore that the word "area" should be substituted for that of "district", and the word "committee" for that of "commission". The minister who is piloting the bill might consider adopting this suggestion, which would assist greatly in furthering the objects we have in view. I think we should change the name from "federal district commission" to "federal area committee". If such a change were made the people of Canada generally and in the area locally would look much more favourably upon this undertaking, and from a more realistic point of view. I am pleased to notice that the minister himself, whether intentionally or accidentally, used the words "federal area" three times in his speech this morning. Other speakers yesterday and to-day have done the same. It would be a great improvement and would make for better advertising and understanding if the change were made.

As a means of bringing the suggestion before the house for discussion—I will not insist on the exact wording—I propose at the appropriate time to introduce an amendment to that effect.

Some discussion has arisen to-day in regard to Confederation square. I do not think any of us wish to attribute blame to anyone in particular for the location of Confederation