

Benefits

The proposed Victory highway route would:

(a) Facilitate the movement of agricultural produce to and from the prairies, Grand Forks district, Okanagan, and coast points.

(b) Stimulate tourist traffic in this district. At the present time travel through this district is severely curtailed due to the fear of traversing the treacherous Cascade highway.

(c) Provide year-round bus and freight traffic service between the Kootenay and Grand Forks district, and a highly important link in the southern B.C. trans-provincial highway.

International Aspects

During the winter months the only road link between Rossland and Grand Forks is by a roundabout route through the United States, the Cascade highway being closed due to heavy snow conditions; freight carriers are compelled to travel under bond and seal.

The following means of overcoming international complications that would arise in connection with building the proposed highway are suggested:

(a) That an area extending approximately from Patterson to Danville and from 5 to 6 miles each side of the boundary, be set aside as an international memorial park, and that travel within this area be as free as possible of customs and immigration formalities.

(b) That the Canadian government either lease, or purchase from the United States, a strip of land 300 feet wide. Most of the land is in a forest reserve in which there are few settlers.

Conclusions

The present road link (Cascade highway) between the Trail-Rossland district and the Grand Forks area is inadequate, and it would be extremely expensive to make it a first-class highway. Alternate routes through Canada are not attractive.

We feel that a first-class road link between the above-mentioned areas is vital to the continued prosperity of southeastern B.C., and suggest the Victory highway project be given very serious consideration.

Submitted by:

The Rossland Junior Board of Trade

Endorsed by:

The Rossland Board of Trade (Senior)

The Trail Board of Trade

The Trail Junior Chamber of Commerce

I brought up this matter in the provincial legislature, and the Premier of British Columbia stated that it would be brought to the attention of the proper authorities in Ottawa. Some time ago the Rossland junior board of trade and other organizations wrote to the premier of British Columbia, and he replied to the effect that the matter was being taken up with Ottawa and that they were waiting to hear from the east. Then I wrote the Department of External Affairs, but nobody there knew anything about it. Then I asked for the production of all papers and correspondence between the government of British Columbia or any official of the government of British Columbia and the government of the Dominion of Canada or any official of the dominion government, but again I was told that no one

[Mr. Herridge.]

knows anything about it. So that I do not know what has happened to date, and I should certainly like to know what is being done in connection with these proposals for this new diversion into United States territory.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that my time is slipping away very quickly. I am not going on at greater length, except to again emphasize my belief—and it is not my belief only but that of many other people in this country—that the budget should have contained evidences of the government's approach to the reconstruction period, that it should have provided for a programme of public investment for the future, for a housing erection project, for doing away with level crossings, and for a great development of the trans-Canada highway system. I trust that, while this government has not seen fit at this time to give effect to these proposals, when the next budget comes before this house we shall see that the government has reacted favourably to these proposals and is doing the things which I know all of us realize the Canadian people wish to see it do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. BENTLEY: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, may I call it eleven o'clock?

Mr. BENTLEY: May I move the adjournment of this debate?

On motion of Mr. Ross (Souris) the debate was adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before adjourning the house, it is my duty to call the attention of hon. members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, third edition, page 102, article 239, in which they may read:

Besides the prohibitions contained in this standing order, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not:

(a) read from a written, previously prepared speech.

Many times since the beginning of this session I thought I should call the attention of hon. members to this rule; but I hesitated to do so. However, I feel that it is my duty now, particularly to-night, to draw the attention of hon. members on both sides of the house to this rule, and to tell them that I feel I should call to order in future members whenever they read their speeches.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.