

annum has been derived from the International Railway Company by way of taxes, and having further in mind that all municipalities are being faced with higher tax rates in 1938 by reason of increased responsibility for relief, I took the stand that the corporation of Niagara Falls, Ontario, should be supplied with every possible information and were fully satisfied before any steps were taken which might in future deprive them of taxes which are so urgently needed. It was my opinion and conclusion that the meeting to be held on March 26 would possibly clear away any difficulties in the minds of your council, as all the interested parties were to be in attendance.

May I, in further explanation, state that it was argued by the chairman, and supported by some members of the committee, that as the presentation of this bill to parliament had been properly advertised, and as the council of Niagara Falls, Ontario, had taken no steps to register any objection to the bill; and further, that a resolution passed by the council in February supported the erection of a toll-free bridge, there should be no further delay in presenting the bill to the House of Commons.

With this argument I could not concur, in view of all the information as contained in the foregoing part of this letter.

That there may be no misunderstanding, let me make my position clear. Either all the press reports were erroneous, or there must be some misunderstanding as to the purpose of the meeting that is to be held on March 26. My one desire is that the citizens of Niagara Falls, Ontario, through their council body, have every possible opportunity to express their views before any proposed bill was presented to parliament. The bill in its amended form will now come before the House of Commons in due course, and later before the Senate. If the rights of the citizens, in your opinion, are being protected in every way and their expressed views are being complied with, I cannot see that any good purpose can be served by further discussion of the bill now before the house.

I would appreciate knowing whether your council endorses the stand I took in committee on the bill. I would also appreciate advice as to what final decision is arrived at following the meeting on March 26.

It is my one desire to protect the rights of all citizens, who are after all, the people who are required to assume any increased burden of taxation.

It has been said that a resolution was introduced in the council and was defeated. That resolution was placed on Hansard before. That resolution was defeated four to three. It will be found on page 2050 of Hansard. It contains a statement that I said that the condition of the city of Niagara Falls is one of virtual insolvency. I hesitated to take up the time of the committee in reading the whole of this letter, but I felt it was necessary to do so in view of the statements that have been made. In this house inferences have been drawn and statements made which I hope are now conceded to be incorrect. This

is another question from the verbatim report of the council meeting of April 4, Alderman McAninch speaking:

I believe they owe that loyalty to this municipality. They would see that we have something in writing about taxes on the bridge. You remember when I told Mr. Stewart Lyons we should have a new agreement regarding hydro taxes for this municipality, he said to me, "Niagara Falls sold themselves out when the former city council dealing with the former hydro commission didn't see there was a clause in the contract to protect the city of Niagara Falls." I have no axe to grind with who builds the bridge. I am not arguing that point, but after Mr. Lyons' "talk" I want to see to it the solicitor and the city council sees there is a clause put in the bill requiring the company to pay taxes on any property they take over, and their successors be obligated to carry out that agreement.

I could read passage after passage from the verbatim reports that have appeared in the press of Niagara Falls, and I could read many extracts from letters I have received, but perhaps what I have quoted will be sufficient. When anyone talks about there being an Ethiopian in the woodpile, I can only repeat what I said before, that "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones." I have the evidence; I had the letters—

An hon. MEMBER: One minute to go.

Mr. LOCKHART: I can go for much longer than that. I quote again from the verbatim report:

Alderman McAninch asked Mayor Carl D. Hanniwell if he had any assurance, in writing from either Honourable E. L. Houck, A. B. Damude, M.P., or anyone, that taxes would be paid to the city.

Progress reported.

## PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS

### PROPOSED ABOLITION OF APPEALS TO HIS MAJESTY IN COUNCIL

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Cahan for the second reading of Bill No. 19, respecting appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps this field of discussion may be regarded as a preserve for legal gentlemen, but the consequences of the existing arrangements are of such a serious nature that even a layman must seek to understand the principles involved. My own interest in this question of appeals to the privy council was quickened years ago by some informal gatherings that a few of us were privileged to attend in the