

the other hand, if the minister admits that his department built a dyke on a road, they must see to it that that road is replaced by a similar one. They took a road thirty-six feet wide and reduced it to eighteen feet, just cut it in half. They simply laid the bed of the road, if I might say so; they did not finish it. They laid large stones, then smaller ones; then they put a coat of smaller stones on top of that, and they left the road in that condition. The Department of Roads of Quebec refused to accept the road as it was laid, first, because it was not wide enough and, second, because it was not according to their requirements; it was not built in a proper manner so that they could finish it. The result is that the road is left in that dangerous condition. The Department of Public Works, when the dyke was finished, closed the road, putting at each end of it a notice that it was prohibited to pass there. I believe they were not entitled to close that road. It was their duty to build a road, if not of the same width, at least of a width sufficient that two rigs or two automobiles could pass without danger. Moreover, the department should have put a fence on the south side of the road to protect the public, because some parts of the road are from twelve to fourteen feet high. It is a very dangerous place to travel, and the town of Laprairie is threatened with damage suits for leaving the road as it is by other municipalities on the south shore, for example, Hemmingford, Sherrington, St. Edouard, St. Constant, St. Emile and all the places on the way to Valleyfield, Chateauguay and Beauharnois, the people of which are interested in passing along the road because it is a shorter route. Some time ago I wrote to the Department of Public Works and to the Department of Roads of Quebec and I did not receive a very proper answer from either. Recently I received the following letter from the divisional engineer, Mr. Leclerc:

(Translation):

In reply to your letter of March 11, as regards the petition signed by the ratepayers of Laprairie requesting the completion of the parish road, please find attached a copy of a letter from Mr. Vincent Dupuis, dated May 11, 1932 . . .

This letter was sent to Mr. Gosselin, chief engineer of the district of Montreal.

(Translation):

. . . and a copy of a report which I made in reply to that letter.

As you will note by this report, the road over which improvement is requested has a length of 4,105 feet, and to improve it in the way the petition requests, the work would cost as follows:

To widen the road-shoulders—	
3,800 cubic yards. borrowed material,	
\$1.30	\$ 4,940
Protective cable fence—	
3,350 feet at 60 cents.	2,010
Laying of pavement—	
342 cubic yards at \$4.	1,368
(including the screenings and rolling)	
A layer of macurban and macasphalt	
3 inches—	
8,210 cubic yards at \$1.50	12,315
	<u>\$20,633</u>

In a letter from the same district engineer there appears one paragraph which I will try offhand to translate as well as I can. He says: "This road cannot be accepted by the public roads department of Quebec because the foundation is everywhere in bad condition and is not suitable for making a road. As it stands, the road is not in such a condition as to be completed. It would have to be widened and rebuilt." The Department of Roads in Quebec has reported that it would cost \$20,633 to build the road, and I presume, although I am not authorized to speak for that department, that if the Department of Public Works in Ottawa were prepared to contribute half the cost of the road the Department of Roads of Quebec would pay its share. My reason for asking the federal department to contribute to this work is that the question of obligation arises here. The work done by the federal department in building the dyke resulted in the destruction of the original road, which it left in the present state of disrepair. I submit, therefore, that there is a principle of justice involved and the Department of Public Works is under obligation to restore the road to a proper state of repair.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): This work was undertaken some years ago—

Mr. DUPUIS: In 1930.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Some work was done earlier than that, before the present government came into office. I am told that the object was not the construction of a road—

Mr. DUPUIS: No.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —but the construction of a dyke for protection, and that the road as it existed before was very imperfect. It was in bad condition a great part of the time through flooding, so much so that it could not be used at all. There is another road on the shore, almost parallel and not far removed, which was used. My information is that there was no agreement on the part of the Dominion government to leave the work in such a condition as would make it available