

City of Ottawa Agreement

under consideration by the provincial government. We have given to them the report of our federal parks officials who have examined several different sites.

Mr. BARRY: Will the minister assure me that the selection of this site is within the purview of the powers of the provincial government?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not think there is any doubt of that, if they have the money to get it.

Mr. BENNETT: The minister need not take what they offer; that is all.

Mr. CRERAR: No, not necessarily.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Crerar thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 75 respecting the establishment of a national park and to amend the Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island National Parks Act, 1936.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

APPOINTMENT OF GEORGE A. TOUCHE AND
COMPANY AS AUDITORS

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. 56, respecting the appointment of auditors for National Railways.

Motion agreed, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Sanderson in the chair.

On section 1—Appointment of auditors.

Mr. STEWART: Could the minister tell us for how many years this firm has been acting as auditors for the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. HOWE: Since the formation of the railways in 1919, I think, except for an interlude of one year when it was replaced by another company.

Mr. STEWART: And how are the auditors selected? Are they chosen from a panel of eligible auditors?

Mr. HOWE: This is highly technical work, and familiarity with railway accounting is the prime requisite. Because of the fact that Touche and Company have had such special experience in this particular work it is felt by the government that they are the logical people to carry it on.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.
[Mr. Crerar.]

CITY OF OTTAWA AGREEMENT

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Public Works) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to authorize the Minister of Public Works on behalf of His Majesty to enter into an agreement to pay to the corporation of the city of Ottawa the sum of \$100,000 for the year ending July 1, 1937.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Sanderson in the chair.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Chairman, this resolution contemplates the introduction of a bill to permit the government to enter into an agreement with the city of Ottawa, continuing an agreement which was entered into several years ago. At that time, if I remember correctly, the agreement was made for five years, and for the last three or four years it has been continued year by year. This agreement with the city of Ottawa was entered into in settlement of a claim made by the city for compensation in lieu of taxes, and so on. The claim, as I explained last year, was for a very large amount, and after some negotiation the Department of Public Works came to an agreement with the city under which the government agreed to pay \$100,000 a year for a period of five years. That agreement lapsed several years ago, but has been continued by legislation each year since.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Cardin thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 76 to authorize an agreement between His Majesty the King and the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bill be read a second time?

Hon. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house I do not see any reason why the bill should not be put through all its stages tonight. The minister has explained its purpose, which is simply to continue an existing arrangement which I think is favourable to the dominion. I know that for several years, as the minister will confirm, the city of Ottawa has been claiming a larger amount than that specified in the bill, as compensation for certain services which they render. I am convinced that since there is nothing new in this bill as compared with the arrangement that has existed for many years, no valid objection can be taken to it. I believe it is in the