

thing under any circumstance; it is the sort of thing that would be very valuable.

I do not have very much time before the hour of five o'clock comes upon us.

Mr. Baker: Take it all.

Mr. Macquarrie: I have been urged by my colleague to go all out and use the whole five minutes, so I think I will do that. I always like to hear the minister, even when he is partisan, though he was not today. However, I am a little unhappy—indeed, I am profoundly disturbed—that at a time when the country faces an economic crisis of pressing gravity the response of the government time after time is to throw out another welfare measure. In the emergency session in August and September it was the minister who came through with measures. There was a little change to old age security, an alteration here, another there, adopting policies that the opposition had suggested long ago. In face of this grave and terrible situation of galloping inflation, this modicum of relief is not sufficient to meet the mountain of need of the Canadian people.

We have a government that is clearly, obviously and tragically without an economic strategy. Without such strategy it relies on tactics. In face of inflation, a chronic case of unemployment and a continuum of economic stagnation, the government has but one response: Send in the welfare minister, who must gallop to the relief of the whole group. Where are the mighty economic ministers of this government? Cannot they take up arms in the fight against inflation? All that the Canadian people have to do today to reach a judgment on the fighting capacity of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) in economic matters is to read the answer that he gave the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies) just a few hours ago. Where is the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Gillespie)? He has not been in Russia the whole time; where are his moves in this important area? And what is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Gray) doing? At this point I am running out of giants in the field of economics!

Mr. McGrath: Not difficult to do with the government over there.

Mr. Macquarrie: Why are these ministers so silent, so supine, so superlatively recumbent in face of the cost of living volcano that is shaking Canada's economic structure to its very roots? Is nothing forthcoming to strengthen the economy of this country and to halt the advance of grievous inflation? Certainly the minister, despite his best intentions—and he is not always at his best—cannot cope with this problem. We cannot welfare ourselves into a sound economic society. We cannot capsulize palliatives enough to overcome the economic agony of the Dominion of Canada.

While we support this bill—because it does provide some measure of relief—we ask for, indeed we cry out for meaningful action on a forward front of economic strategy. As far as I and my colleagues are concerned, we do not think this measure requires a long debate in this chamber. But it does require very serious study in committee because this bill, unlike the one which was passed in September, has a good deal of complexity which needs

Damage to Shoreline by Passing Ships

examination, scrutiny and further elucidation by the minister.

There are provisions that please me. Those relating to school attendance are certainly an improvement. There is no reason for the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) to become the giant truant officer for the whole of Canada. So the proposal is a great improvement. I am also glad that Canadian citizens who serve abroad will derive benefit from this bill.

May I call it five o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs—Disability pensions, action to eliminate backlog of applications; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Provision of educational films to school boards—government position; the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker)—Public Service—Appeal against decision condemning red circling—Request for review of practice and appropriate legislation.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

TRANSPORT

SUGGESTED ACTION TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO SHORELINE BY PASSAGE OF SHIPS

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of taking action, wherever necessary in the inland navigable waters of Canada, to prevent damage to shorelines, dykes, homes, lands and other public and private property caused by the passage and manoeuvring of ships and boats and other vessels.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the motion before the House is to encourage the government to take a look at the provisions of the law as they now stand which govern damage done to shorelines by boats in our inland navigable waters. When the present law was first brought before parliament and passed, the situation was far different from what it is today. The law as enacted at that time