

Damage to Shoreline by Passing Ships

undertook additional studies to attempt to determine as closely as possible the effects of ship waves along the shores of the St. Clair River and the Detroit River. The report of this study provides relatively precise figures and procedures covering the wave energy transmitted to the shore from ships and waves. A report on the St. Clair, Detroit and St. Lawrence Rivers was prepared in March, 1970, by Marine Engineering and the Department of Public Works. The information contained in this report would be an asset in connection with the references being made at the present time.

I stated there had been some expenditures. In addition to actual expenditures for protection works in the province of Quebec, in Ontario—specifically on the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers—the expenditures have been as follows: 1966-67, \$110,000; 1967-68, \$700. I imagine that is all that was requested that year. In 1968-69 the figure was \$110,000, and in 1969-70 it was \$100,000. This makes a total of \$320,700 over the four-year period.

With regard to the Fraser River in British Columbia, the funding for bank protection works is provided by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. This is principally because the major benefit is in the protection of dykes and in reducing the threat of flooding.

There should be a concern by all governments and the public in their commitment to environmental protection. The relationship of shore erosion to environment can be viewed as a loss of value to property, sedimentary pollution of rivers, harbours and lakes, real property loss, possible depletion of tax bases of local governments, loss of recreational benefits, decline of general area values, increasing importance of recreation manifesting itself in increased pleasure craft population and indicating a proportional increase in shore damage attributable to waves generated therefrom, legal aspects of ownership as related to the responsibility to maintain and repair the protection works when built, consideration of eventual expropriation or purchase of privately-owned shoreline by the Crown for public use and the relationship to provincial and national parks and playgrounds.

There is no doubt that all levels of government face many problems in this regard. Initial schemes are being developed in coastal waters. As an example, the Chedabucto Bay vessel traffic management system incorporates regulation, traffic separation, aids to navigation, communications, shore surveillance and pilotage which, obviously, are directed toward vessel safety which have as an ancillary benefit features which serve to reduce shore erosion. The same can be said for systems being developed at Chebucto head at the entrance to Halifax harbour and for the Strait of Juan de Fuca off Vancouver Island. Obviously, such schemes will be developed in restricted or congested waters. Consequently, when we move to the inland waters of Canada, shore erosion as a result of vessel movement will in all likelihood be reduced.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[Mr. Guay (St. Boniface).]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT, 1973**MEASURES TO PROVIDE FOR PAYMENT OF FAMILY AND SPECIAL ALLOWANCES**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-211, to provide for the payment of family allowances in respect of children to supplement the income of Canadian families and for the payment of special allowances to provide for the care and maintenance of other children, and to amend the Income Tax Act in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, in the four and a half minutes vouchsafed to me before five o'clock I was endeavouring, with my usual sweet reasonableness and modulated tones, to discuss the bill which the minister was good enough to bring before us earlier in the afternoon. I was referring with great concern to the inadequacy of the government's response to the present overwhelming crisis. I referred also to the importance of a measure such as this coping effectively with the broad spectrum and the heavy burden of our nation's economic ills.

The lack of a concerted attack on poverty and the failure of the present government to alleviate the hardship suffered by too many Canadians has gone on for far too long. The elimination of poverty must be one of Canada's most important goals. Support for children is only one part of any anti-poverty strategy; a comprehensive approach to social problems brought about by poverty requires that income protection be given to adults both with and without children. Family allowances are an immediate and short-term response to the solution of large-family problems.

In terms of aiding those in poverty, family allowances must be considered against the background of the rise in the cost of living. The increase from an average of \$7.21 to \$20 barely compensates for the rise in the cost of living since 1945 when the late Mackenzie King introduced family allowances to members of parliament of that day and to the people of this country. Had family allowances been tied to the cost of living from the outset, the figure today would be \$19.35 per month. So \$20 a month is not an overwhelming advance. I am not here to criticize that 65 cents; I am going to fight for it. But let no one try to throw over his shoulders the cloak of munificence and generosity on account of those 65 cents. We are in favour of it; but let us not, for God's sake, try to turn it into a gold mine for the Canadian people.

Increases in family allowances are but another example of the government's ad hoc approach to inflation. I don't want to quote Larry Zolf, because the press does not quote