

million from the people of Canada by way of subsidies, should now object to \$300,000 being spent in the capital city. Perhaps it is because it is not for Saskatchewan, but for the Dominion of Canada. And might I remind the hon. member for Humboldt that on that committee was a member of his own party. The report made to the house in 1944 was unanimous, and the \$300,000 which is proposed in this bill was the amount recommended in 1944 by that committee. I do not suppose that the people of Humboldt will hear about the \$96,757,000 that has been given to the people of Saskatchewan by all the taxpayers of Canada. They will probably hear about some cement, and someone not sleeping, and the lack of this and the lack of something else.

However, I did not rise particularly to try to enlighten the people of Humboldt as to the actual expenditure of this money, but I think the record should be kept straight, that the money which is to be spent under this bill is not altogether for the beautification of Ottawa. If anyone would care to read the report he would find that over \$55,000 is spent annually around the parliament buildings and other public buildings by the federal district commission, and I could give the items on which these expenditures are made. There is a water-sprinkling system which costs the city of Ottawa \$23,500 annually; there is a lighting system for the various driveways which costs \$5,000; there is also the collection of garbage and a scavenger service in respect to the various buildings, including the parliament buildings here; and there is the removal of snow and clearing of the walks around parliament hill which, as everyone knows, are kept fairly clean throughout the early part of the year when we are here. I think that in fairness those facts should be placed on record so that the matter may be put more clearly before the members of this house.

I want to make one comment regarding the proposal of the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) that the commission should be enlarged to more than thirteen. With that I am in hearty accord, because the recommendation of the committee on page 172 of the report reads:

In order that such development may be co-ordinated in general with what has been already laid down, we suggest that the powers of the federal district commission be increased and its personnel be enlarged to include not only representation from the Ottawa area but from the people of Canada as a whole.

I cannot see how the people of Canada as a whole can be represented if you have representation from seven or eight provinces and then appoint only one to represent the

[Mr. Reid.]

three provinces of the maritimes; and I would suggest to the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), who is piloting the bill through, that representation be given to every one of the maritime provinces, in compliance with the report of the commission.

Mention has been made of the architect from France, Mr. Greber. I was on the committee, and I will repeat what I said then when the federal commission came before that committee. One of the objections I had to Mr. Greber was this: France and Great Britain and the other countries of Europe are old countries. They have historic buildings dating back a thousand years and more, and the architecture which is suitable for those countries is not suitable for modern countries like Canada or the United States. Regarding Confederation square, I used to wonder as a boy about the sentence in the good old book which spoke of "the quick and the dead", but it was not until I tried to get around Confederation square that I realized that the "quick" is if you get across, and the "dead" if you don't, for you are no more, so that the scriptural reference to the quick and the dead is being fulfilled down on Confederation square.

To me it is most unfortunate that the parliament of Canada, in keeping company with the city of Ottawa, did not start earlier with their plans. They have developed Elgin street right up to the great war memorial. I am not a town planner, but I think everyone will agree with me that Metcalfe is the street that should have been widened, and it should have been widened up to the museum. It should have been made a wide and spacious street right from the parliament buildings down, and in the course of conversations with persons born in Ottawa, when I suggested this they have said to me, "Well, Mr. Reid, you don't know just how this council of ours works. Many of these things might have been done, but there was real estate to sell on Elgin and other streets and so we were not too keen about making this the capital." But even at this late date the beautification of Ottawa, and the undertaking to make it the real capital city of Canada, of which everyone could be proud, should be further considered, and to this end we should widen Metcalfe street from the front gate of parliament straight to the museum. That, I think, would be a far better approach to the parliament buildings. It would be better than further developments of Elgin street.

The committee in their report made some recommendations which have not yet been dealt with by the government, and one of them was to have the railroads coming into Ottawa routed under a subway, or in some way have