

Trans-Canada Highway Act

the construction cost of the major highway bridges that are required in order to be able to get in and out of that great city.

Mr. Green: If I may interrupt the hon. member for a moment, the route of the trans-Canada highway is designated by the provincial government, and in the case of British Columbia that province designated a route which more or less cuts across the northeastern corner of Vancouver in order to get to the new Second Narrows bridge. We do not designate the route at all. The provincial government does that.

Mr. Winch: I know that is what was decided at one time but my hon. friend knows the situation in Vancouver at the present time with regard to getting in and out of the city. The traffic cannot be handled just over the Pattullo bridge. There has got to be another bridge and I understand that is now in the process of planning. It is ridiculous at the present time to speak in terms of four-lane bridges. They must be at least six-lane bridges. So far as the cities of Vancouver and New Westminster are concerned it would be completely stupid to think about four-lane bridges over the Second Narrows or the Fraser river.

I should like to know what part the federal government can play under the trans-Canada highway program by way of making a financial contribution toward the construction of six-lane bridges, not four-lane bridges. I have noticed in the newspapers on more than one occasion that contributions would only be made on the basis of four-lane bridges, and I think that is completely wrong. The minister knows that it is impossible to handle the traffic going from Vancouver to the interior of the province or elsewhere in Canada on the Pattullo bridge. If people wish to go south, to the interior of the province or north they have to cross the Fraser river and I maintain that because traffic must all cross the Fraser river it should all come under the trans-Canada highway program and the most earnest consideration should be given under the program to making use of other roads that will lead to the trans-Canada highway, whether people are going south, north or to the interior of the province. All the millions that have been spent already on the Marpole bridge, on the Deas island tunnel, the new Second Narrows bridge and that will have to be spent on the new bridge that will cross around Port Moody, I believe—

Mr. Green: Port Mann.

Mr. Winch: Port Mann—have to be spent because of the geographical location of Vancouver. All these major bridges have one

[Mr. Winch.]

purpose, egress and ingress so far as Vancouver is concerned and should be considered as being basically on the main route and part and parcel of the trans-Canada highway. There should be a federal contribution toward the building of all these bridges and the roads leading thereto.

Mr. Green: Does the hon. member suggest that the federal government should be responsible for all ingress and egress to and from every city in Canada that happens to be on or near the trans-Canada highway?

Mr. Winch: I am certain that my hon. friend, with his knowledge of Vancouver, knows that its geographical location is peculiar and that as the terminus of the trans-Canada highway it is in a different position from a city on the prairies, for example, which can be by-passed by a road and which is not surrounded by water, be it an inlet, river or ocean, as is the city of Vancouver. I think it is this peculiar and particular situation which most certainly merits every consideration from the minister of the type of assistance I have been suggesting.

Mr. Lamberg: I should like to add my support, in a few brief words, to those who have been advocating a second trans-Canada highway in western Canada. I spoke about this in 1957 as did the hon. member for Jasper-Edson and several others. I would commend this to the attention of the minister for immediate consideration, and I do not believe he should wait until the whole of the trans-Canada highway is built before entering into negotiations with the provinces with respect to this particular section of the highway.

There has been recently held in Edmonton the annual meeting of the Yellowhead route association, and I would commend its proceedings to the attention of the minister. I know that the people who live in the northern part of Alberta, where the big bulk of the population of that province is now located, find it extraordinarily difficult to understand why they must go through the southern part of the province or even the United States, at present, to reach Vancouver. I know the Minister of Public Works would like to see people from northern Alberta out in Vancouver, and we would like to go there. Frankly, we must travel about 1,100 miles at the present time, but if we had a more direct route through Jasper national park and connecting with the highway system of British Columbia the distance would be much shorter.

Most of the highway system in Alberta is almost up to trans-Canada standards at the