

S.O. 21

concern that I mention the recent criticism of one of Canada's outstanding high technology products, the Canadair Challenger Executive Jet. It is one of the finest aircraft of its class ever produced. It only requires a chance to work out some of its developmental problems.

Because of Government funding the aerospace industry is always going to come under public questioning. In this regard Canada is no different from any other nation. But, to achieve growth, the marketability of our aerospace products must be maintained and not be undermined by destructive expressions of opinion. As the editor-in-chief of the *Aviation Week & Space Technology* magazine commented editorially, "Canada's aerospace industry has served the national interest better than its critics allow. Canada should look at both sides of the issue and not drift into an anti-aerospace mode that would lose the economic and technical benefits generated by this industry."

* * *

PORTS

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN THROUGH PORT OF CHURCHILL

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a statement on behalf of the New Democratic Party, which is the only Party in this House to support the Port of Churchill consistently. Senator Argue recently offered to give \$50 million to the Port of Churchill if the advisory board to the Canada Wheat Board would guarantee 700,000 tonnes of grain for export through the Churchill Port. Yet the Liberal Government has taken a number of steps to hurt that Port.

The Government has cut off grain sales to Poland, one of the main users of the Port of Churchill, on the basis of less than credible arguments—first of all, that Poland is a bad credit risk, yet we continue to deal with countries which have worse debt records; secondly, that Poland has a poor human rights record, yet we continue to sell grain to Chile and Brazil; thirdly, that we are punishing the U.S.S.R., while the U.S., pushing for a de facto embargo of Poland, recently sold 22,000 tonnes of wheat to Poland.

In the past the Government also failed to make improvements to the railway and port facilities necessary for the Port of Churchill. The Liberal Government has also refused to provide icebreakers to lengthen the shipping season on a regular basis.

However, the major concern of the people in western Canada is that the proposed changes to the Crow rate will kill the Port of Churchill. Once variable rates come in, then no grain will go through that Port. How can Senator Argue ask for—

Madam Speaker: Order.

AGRICULTURE

INCREASES IN FARM INPUT COSTS

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Madam Speaker, Canada is one of the few countries exporting food, and therefore food production must be doubled on available arable land in order to feed the expected world population of about seven billion in the year 2000. Technology exists to double our food production by less summer fallow and applying fertilizers and pesticides. However, this would involve a threefold increase in energy use by farmers. As the price of oil and gas keeps rising, the cost of farm inputs increases.

Recent oil product price hikes will cost our farmers more than \$70 million a year. Last February's increase in the price of natural gas will directly raise the Prairie's fertilizer bill by approximately \$2 million annually. The cost of pesticides and other natural gas based chemicals is also rising.

The federal farm fuel tax accounts for 44 per cent of the cost of fuel paid by farmers. The PC Party has consistently pointed out the need for elimination of taxes on fuel used to produce food. However, the Government continues to turn a blind eye to the plight of farmers already hit by low commodity prices and high interest rates.

● (1410)

If the Government's irresponsible policy toward the cost of energy for agriculture persists, future generations may well find themselves desperately short of food.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE LEADERSHIP CANDIDATE'S REACTION TO CBC NEWSCAST

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, it is interesting to note the reaction of Brian Mulroney to a CBC news item which suggested his organization was making some efforts to rally the non-Clark supporters around Mr. Mulroney. The story so irritated Mr. Mulroney that he is reported to be considering suing both the CBC and Michael Duffy, the CBC's highly respected parliamentary correspondent.

Such a sensitivity and overreaction can only be explained by Mr. Mulroney's lack of political experience. Had Mr. Mulroney run and won in 1979, 1980, or in any of the numerous by elections since the last election, he would long since have become immune to these slings and arrows which those of us who have actually taken the plunge are subjected to regularly.

If this is Mr. Mulroney's reaction to the gentle and even-handed Mike Duffy, I fear he will become apoplectic when the likes of Allan Fotheringham is turned loose on him. Those of us on this side of the House who would welcome his entry into electoral politics, urge him to remain calm and to press steadfastly on to the convention lest this attack of the media jitters turns out to be the big mistake of 1983.