

Refitting of HMCS "Bonaventure"

ever, when Montreal postal employees request a salary adjustment, a modest expenditure compared to such shameless squandering, they are told they are unreasonable and unco-operative about fighting inflation. They are accused of all the sins of the world.

A plan has even been brought forward for putting straitjackets on union members, asking that they do not demand increases of more than 6 per cent a year. The government is unwilling to pay workers in proportion to work done. That it cannot accept. However, it does not matter if government expenditures reach \$100 million. There is no stinting there. But when it comes to helping workers, they stay up whole nights stubbornly telling union leaders they are unreasonable.

And at the same time, the same government, the same Treasury Board are telling banks and finance companies to increase their interest rates.

For instance, last year, banks were boasting about profits from 20 to 30 per cent higher than before.

Did a government member object to that increase? Of course not, but they object to workers asking for salary increases in excess of 6 per cent a year. Therefore, there is one law for the poor and one law for the rich. That is how the government is acting towards Canadian citizens.

I shall now deal with the cancellation of a project, and I quote:

Cancellation of Northumberland Strait Crossing project.

In 1956 the Province of Prince Edward Island asked the federal government to examine a proposal—

I went there last year.

—for the construction of a causeway across Northumberland Strait as an alternative to the existing ferry system. During the next several years studies were made which resulted in the conclusion that a permanent crossing involving a combination of causeway and bridges was feasible.

Everybody knew it was feasible. This proposal would have been helpful to the citizens of Prince Edward Island. In effect, more tourists would have come to visit that province and New Brunswick as well. I keep on quoting:

Early in 1962 approval in principle was given to the Department of Public Works to proceed with the project, with the stipulation that a combined causeway-tunnel crossing to handle only road traffic be investigated.

After further consideration the project was cancelled officially in February 1969.

[Mr. Caouette.]

So this project was looked into for seven years; the time necessary for studies at a university. Therefore it is beyond doubt that the possibility of building a causeway across Northumberland strait was looked into by university people. I quote further:

In the meantime a substantial number of payments had been made for land required for the approaches to the proposed crossing and work had proceeded under a number of contracts for the construction of the approaches for both highway and railway traffic.

Costs incurred in connection with the project to March 31, 1969 may be summarized as follows:

Consultants—consortium	\$10,817,000
—others	519,000
Construction of approaches—	
—to that famous causeway—	
	4,998,000
Acquisition of land	422,000
Miscellaneous	188,000

This must be for the coffee break in the morning and in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, \$16,944,000 has been spent for the building of a causeway which it has been decided not to build.

Some assistance has been asked of the government for the building of approaches to James Bay, where many new natural resources could be found and developed. But the government is not interested. It is none of its business.

To build a causeway, then not to build it, to undertake a feasibility study, to promise at election time to have it built and then not to build it, all that cost \$17 million. The government can afford to do that. The money is paid to people actively engaged in election campaigns.

This concludes my remarks. I would have many more comments to make about government expenditures, but I will let others have their say. However, I repeat that Canadians are becoming increasingly aware of such things. The friends of the party—political favour seekers, government supporters, contributors to campaign funds—are having a field day, but it will not last forever.

Older members may not be in the House in two, five or six years from now, but younger members will still be here. I ask members of all parties to consider seriously the situation because Canadian youths, not only young Quebecers, will lose faith in us. I visited four