

Supply

It was our Minister of Justice who sold this program to the government of Canada which provided the western farmers with this large sum of money.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, so that the record will be accurate, I would ask that justice should prevail in this committee of the whole and that the hon. member should name the member who was the first member of the House to advocate the sale of wheat from the area on which the hon. member seems to be concentrating tonight.

Mr. Whicher: I did not catch exactly what the hon. member said; but if he said what I thought he did, I would imagine that his party would drop him like a bad habit.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member rises on a point of order.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, when the question I pose is called into question in the manner in which it was, I think I should have the right to correct the hon. member. This is within the rules as I understand them. The question I posed to the hon. member was to implore him to include in his remarks to the House the name of the hon. member who was the first person in the House of Commons to advocate the sale of Canadian wheat abroad.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member knows that he is raising a point of debate, not a point of order.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I really could not understand what the hon. member said. I tried to be fair about the hon. member. I think he did a wonderful job in selling wheat to Russia, but he sold only half as much as did our minister.

Mr. Forrestall: Why don't you mention Gordon Churchill?

Mr. Whicher: The hon. member did not do half the job in getting the two-price system for western farmers that the present minister did, and he did not do half the job in supplying the much needed railway cars to western Canada that were supplied in the last few months. My friends say that the railway tracks will not take the cars. Quite frankly, it does not matter how much we give, not to western Canada but to Members of Parliament from western Canada; they will ask for more. In any event, I do not want to say anything more on this subject. I heard my hon. friend, the agricultural expert from the New Democratic Party whom I respect greatly—

Mr. Forrestall: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whicher: My hon. friend is a perfect example of why we should have birth control in this country.

An hon. Member: The Tories are split on that issue.

Mr. Forrestall: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Whicher.]

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I am not giving up the floor. If my hon. friend says anything further, even members of his own party will admit that so far as birth control in his instance is concerned, we should make the legislation retroactive.

Mr. Forrestall: You are the best example of it.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Bruce.

• (2140)

Mr. Whicher: If you say any more, my friend, you had better call out the defence forces whom you try to represent for your party.

My hon. friend in the NDP who represents the farmers asked tonight, "What is your policy for the farmers of western Canada?" Just tonight the Minister of Agriculture spoke, and the Minister of Justice spoke earlier in this debate. Here I refer to our grains policy in western Canada. Our policy is simply this: we are going to sell all the grain we possibly can, for as much as we can, for the farmers of western Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to speak on this vote dealing with the production and marketing of grains. I feel fortunate in being able to pass on to hon. members opposite some solutions to the grain marketing problems that they have been agonizing over for quite some time. I am particularly happy that some of the members on this side of the House have also suggested one solution to the marketing problem, namely, the utilization of the port of Churchill to its full capacity and potential.

Hon. members know that the port of Churchill has been in existence for a long time. It was one of the main entry routes through Hudson Bay for the early settlers in the Province of Manitoba. Unfortunately, the potential of the area has still not been realized, but it seems the only impediment to the development of the port has been of a political rather than an economic nature.

This evening I am pleased to pass on to hon. members opposite, particularly to the Minister of Agriculture and to the minister responsible for the Wheat Board, some suggestions on how the port might be better utilized. I am not suggesting that the problem is a recent one; it has been in existence for a considerable time. Here I refer to a report made following an expedition in 1904, which says, "Ships will go wherever cargoes can be found. All that is needed to open Hudson Bay for ordinary commercial navigation is a line of rail to carry freight to the port. With the use of iron steamships, the shipping season can extend from July 20 to November 1, and this period might be increased without much risk by a week in the beginning of the season, and perhaps by two weeks at the close." That is another report that has been buried somewhere and no one has paid much attention to it.

The port of Churchill has a storage capacity of some 5 million bushels. That capacity is almost as great as the capacity of the western seaports. However, the capacity is not used adequately, and in order to realize the full poten-