

to the people of Ontario. Why those hon. members who represent constituencies in Ontario adjacent to Niagara Falls are holding up this bill is beyond my conception.

An hon. MEMBER: What are you doing now?

Mr. DUFFUS: I have not spoken several times as some hon. members have. Further, let me say that the bridge should be adequate to accommodate increasing tourist traffic for the next seventy-five years. The city of Niagara Falls seems to be quite satisfied with the proposed bridge, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Welland when he read to the committee a resolution passed by the city council to this effect. In addition, the proposed new bridge will be built over what is known as River street; it will not end on River street where there is bisecting traffic and where there have been traffic jams not only on holidays but from week to week at both ends of the bridge for considerable distances. When we build a bridge we should have regard to the requirements of the future.

Inasmuch as the Ontario government, and not this parliament, will be responsible for the construction of this bridge, and that it will be built with funds provided by the people of the United States and the people of Canada and elsewhere who use the bridge, through the tolls they will pay, I can see no good reason why it should be held up in this committee at this time. As a matter of fact, the province of Ontario is simply asking this parliament to sanction the project. It then becomes the responsibility of the government of Ontario to provide adequate facilities for those desiring to cross at this point. Surely, we as citizens of Canada should have some regard for our United States friends whose trade is so valuable to us. Hence we should see to it that this project is carried out with the least possible delay, and that a structure that will give ample accommodation to those who wish to pass back and forth over the border between the United States and Canada is provided.

Mr. POULIOT: To put the matter in a nutshell, it is generally agreed that the old Niagara bridge is a frozen asset, flooded with a tremendous quantity of watered stock.

Mr. LOCKHART: Since this bill, and more particularly section 8, entitled "power to construct bridge" came before this committee on April 5, I have refrained from making any further comments, as I was of the opinion that I had fully expressed my views on that section, as well as voiced the sentiments and

protests of a number of home owners in Niagara Falls. These home owners have written me expressing their fear of increased taxation in case the provincial government should take over the five acres of river front property as suggested by the sponsors of this bill. In the light of what took place at the city council meeting of Niagara Falls on Monday last, and following the statements made and inferences suggested in this chamber during the discussion of section 8 on April 5, I find myself in direct conflict with many of the statements that were made both in the city council of Niagara Falls, Ontario, and in this committee.

I wish to direct attention to the remarks I made during the previous debate. I want to make my position quite clear, because I have some pointed references to make before I finish.

When this bill was first discussed my attitude was stated when I said, as reported on page 1831 of Hansard:

I do not question the motives of the hon. member for Welland, because I have known him too well and too long to do that.

I also said that I did not want the hon. member to feel that any of my remarks were in any way personal, because I know that he presented the bill in the form in which it was given to him to present. I made that statement advisedly, because I had an interview with the hon. member in my own office in this building, and I questioned him as to the motives of those promoting the measure and the purport of this bill. His reply was that he was not familiar with the details of the bill, but that he had been asked to sponsor it; and he did not or could not impart any information to me. This lack of the information which I desired to obtain before making any further comments convinced me that the bill required looking into. I have now made my attitude quite clear as far as the hon. member for Welland is concerned. Turning to page 2049 of Hansard, we have some references which the hon. member made at that time. He said:

Further, in connection with this matter the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart), addressed a letter, dated March 24, to the Mayor of Niagara Falls—and I may say it was a very fine letter, taking up eighty-three lines of foolscap paper and consisting of 1,079 words—asking the city of Niagara Falls to say whether it appreciated his efforts on their behalf.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to a statement made by Alderman Donald which