

Canadian Wheat Board Act

Mr. P. E. Wright (Melfort): I must say that I think the answers of the minister are rather weak. His whole case is predicated on the fact that the bill does not provide for the handling of the 40 million bushels of wheat that might be grown in the favourable freight rate area adjacent to Churchill. I think that argument may be wrong. With very little expansion the facilities at the port could be made to handle 40 million bushels of wheat. On the average, I do not think there are 40 million bushels of wheat produced in that area of the grades that can be marketed through Churchill. I think probably 25 million or 30 million would be closer to the amount that could be marketed from that area via the port of Churchill. Therefore I do not think his argument is sound.

His other argument is that if the freight rates were paid on the basis of all we produce in that area the growers in the area would not be interested in whether their wheat went to the port of Churchill because they would get the advantage even if it went to Port Arthur or Fort William. I should like to point out as to that argument that at the present time the wheat board—and I am not criticizing them because I think they have done a good job in many respects—have not put forth every effort to use the port of Churchill because it did not matter to the wheat board whether or not the wheat went there. They paid for it on the basis of the Fort William-Port Arthur price. If they had been paying for it on the basis of the Churchill price they would have been more interested in seeing that as much of that wheat as possible was delivered through the port of Churchill, either under the British contract or otherwise.

As for the minister's argument that wheat going to Churchill would remain in storage there until it had accumulated considerable storage charges against it, I should like to point out that in my memory there has not been a crop year in western Canada when there was not a carryover of wheat of anywhere from 40 million to as high as 400 or 500 million bushels. Therefore the two and a half million bushels of wheat that might be carried over at the port of Churchill would be a very small portion at any time of the total carryover of wheat in Canada. Carrying charges must be paid on that wheat whether it is at Churchill, Saskatoon, Fort William or Montreal. Carrying charges are accumulating just the same. I do not think the argument is sound that it is going to cost the wheat growers of the west a lot of money for carrying charges at the port of Churchill. As for its costing the wheat growers of western Canada more money because of the favourable freight rate to Churchill being

paid to the growers in the Churchill area, that depends entirely on whether we make full use of the port. I think that we can make full use of the port to the extent of the wheat that is grown in that area of the grades that can be marketed through Churchill.

The minister did not answer my inquiry as to what the possible price might be at Churchill under the world wheat contract. Possibly he cannot do so at the present time, but if a favourable price is obtained for wheat at the port of Churchill under the world contract, a price in excess of the price at Port Arthur or Fort William, then I think it is doubly necessary that the people adjacent to that port should get some advantage from that price.

Mr. Howe: I would agree.

Mr. Wright: Under those circumstances I think the bill should have the consideration of the government.

Mr. Howe: Now that we have discussed this matter, perhaps the hon. member will not press the bill to a vote and will withdraw it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Beaudoin): Is the hon. member withdrawing the bill?

Mr. Wright: No; put it to a vote.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Beaudoin): Those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Beaudoin): Those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Beaudoin): In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion (Mr. Wright) negatived on division.

SOCIAL SECURITY**ALLOWANCES TO PERSONS SUFFERING INJURY, ACCIDENT OR CONGENITAL INFIRMITY**

Mr. Lionel Bertrand (Terrebonne) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should during the present session take into consideration the advisability of including in their social security program a system of allowances to every person, without any sufficient income or means of support, who, by reason of an injury, accident, congenital infirmity or incurable disease, is at a disadvantage in seeking or obtaining employment, or incapable of providing for his subsistence, and whose age prevents him from benefiting by the social security legislation now in force.

He said: This motion was discussed in 1946 but was not adopted. It barely needs comment. My remarks will be very brief, because I should like to know the opinion of the house on this question. In 1946 no less than 15 hon. members, representing all parties in the house, supported the motion.