

made, which necessitates certain changes in this boundary as described in the original Act to meet local conditions. It will be necessary to add certain areas, authority for which was provided in the original Act, and also to withdraw certain areas which the detailed survey discloses are not now necessary from a park point of view.

The provision herewith is to authorize the Governor in Council to withdraw from the park any areas which the official plan of the survey of the boundaries, which has not yet been issued, shows as lying outside the boundaries as finally selected and surveyed.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Honourable members, I would ask whether the Governor in Council, when land is taken out of a park, as contemplated by this Bill in respect of the Cape Breton Island Park, can convey it to whomsoever he wishes. I should think he must convey it back to the province which gave it.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I should surmise as much, as it is the province that gives the land.

Hon. Mr. COPP: The Bill provides for re-vesting in the province.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Can I get any information as to where the park in New Brunswick is likely to be? All of New Brunswick that I ever saw is admirably suited for a national park.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My right honourable friend's leader in the other House asked whether it would not be in his old county, and in reply the Minister said:

I suggest that my right honourable friend may still live in hope. The difficulty in New Brunswick is that there are several sites under consideration. Under the Parks Act the Provincial Government has to give to the federal authority with clear title the area set aside for a park. In the older settled provinces this involves the acquisition of the site. I had hoped to be in a position to state to the committee when this measure was brought down that a particular site had been selected, and what its boundaries would be, but unfortunately I am not in that position. We desire to get a start made on the park in New Brunswick, and we are asking in the Bill for authority to define the area by Order in Council.

So we are not much further advanced. The Minister has not stated the nature of the difficulties in the way of the New Brunswick Government offering a certain area.

The Minister added:

There have been some changes in Nova Scotia in the boundaries of the park as defined a year ago, the Provincial Government having discovered that it would be put to considerable expense to acquire some of the area included in the boundaries as defined at that time.

There are certain problems of mineral rights which they had not considered before, which might lead to an uncertain financial liability.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

But we are adding an area to the park which, in the opinion of the parks officials who have examined it, will add to the usefulness and attractiveness of the park.

Sites are examined first by officials from the Parks Branch of the Federal Government, but my honourable friend must remember that the area has to be given to the Federal Government by the Provincial Government free of charge, with a clear title. That means that the Provincial Government has to be a consenting party to the area set aside.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: With the leave of the House, I move the third reading of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

OTTAWA AGREEMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the second reading of Bill 76, an Act to authorize an agreement between His Majesty the King and the Corporation of the City of Ottawa.

He said: Honourable senators, the object of this Bill is to extend the agreement between His Majesty the King and the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, under which the federal treasury pays \$100,000 annually to the city.

Hon. Mr. COTE: Honourable senators, I do not wish to oppose the passing of this Bill, which provides for payment of \$100—

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: \$100,000.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps \$100 is what my honourable friend thought it ought to be.

Hon. Mr. COTE: The Bill could not be much more unjust, I suppose, if it provided for payment of only \$100. I am rising to say that although the city is grateful for the \$100,000, that amount is a mere pittance in comparison with the value of municipal services which the Government enjoys with respect to its properties, which are immune from taxation. This sum is but a small fraction of what the Government would have to pay if all the property it owns in Ottawa were assessed and taxed as other property is. As stated in the explanatory notes accompanying the Bill, the agreement originally provided for an annual payment of \$75,000. It was obviously a one-sided agreement, because the Government was under no legal obligation