

cipality in the country in which the Government happens to own a post office or some other building. The reference obviously would be limited to the Bill before the House, which deals with the agreement between the Government and the City of Ottawa. That would not open up any question of colossal magnitude which would be embarrassing. The study of the committee would be limited to the relations between the Government and the City of Ottawa with respect to the payment by the Federal Government for certain services furnished by the City of Ottawa, and nothing else. For that reason I am not very much impressed by some of the objections which have been made to referring this Bill to committee.

So far as the Federal Government is concerned, the City of Ottawa stands in quite a different position from Moncton or some other place which has been graced by a post office, even though it may be a rather fine one because at some time the sitting member happened to be somewhat influential.

In the City of Ottawa \$60,000,000 worth of real property is owned by the Federal Government, and that situation creates a special problem which does not exist in other places. It is solely to this problem that I for one should like to have the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce direct its attention, and on this problem I should like it to hear evidence which would clarify and explain the attitude and claims of the Corporation of Ottawa and the other taxing authorities within the municipality, such as the Public School Board and the Separate School Board.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I should be glad to second the motion to refer this Bill to the committee, and in so doing I should like to ask why Moncton or Vancouver should be injected into the question. The Bill before us refers to something that has existed for forty years, namely, an annual grant made to the Capital City of Canada for certain services furnished by it. If honourable gentlemen want to bring in some other cities, well and good; I am not sure that I would not be with them. My leader has proved the whole argument, I think. I believe he would agree that if he or I owned the property that is owned by the Federal Government in the City of Ottawa we should be paying taxes very much in excess of \$100,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. COTE: You would be paying \$2,000,000.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I know it would be much more than \$100,000.

Hon. Mr. KING: But there would be no Ottawa, as you know.

Hon. Mr. COTE: There was an Ottawa before you came here.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Possibly, as the honourable senator from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) has suggested, we should leave this alone. But we were complaining a few days ago about having nothing to do. Are we to continue to do just that? Here we have a chance to make an inquiry into something. Are we going to do it, or are we going to say: "We have not done anything yet. Do not let us do anything now. Do not start something that will put us to work"?

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: My disposition has been to support my honourable friend's motion.

Hon. Mr. COPP: If the honourable gentleman would allow the Speaker to put the question, he would be in order. The motion has not been put from the Chair.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I think it opportune that the Senate should know what is going on. The motion for third reading has not been made, but it has been moved that the Bill be referred to committee. I think we should retrace our steps and have a motion for the third reading.

Hon. Mr. COPP: After the motion for second reading was carried, the honourable senator from Ottawa East (Hon. Mr. Coté) moved that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and that is the motion that will be under discussion as soon as it is put from the Chair.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: It is moved by Hon. Mr. Coté, seconded by Hon. Mr. Murdock, that this Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Honourable senators, I have not much to say on this question. My disposition is to support the motion, subject only to one consideration—that referred to by the honourable leader of the House when he said that at the present time negotiations were under way between the Government and the City of Ottawa regarding the proper amount—

Hon. Mr. COPP: Regarding water only.

Hon. Mr. LAMBERT: Well, regarding water. I think we should bear in mind the possibility of any discussion before the committee prejudicing such negotiations, if they are now in progress.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: That has been the argument for ten years.