

*Supply*

went on to talk about specific problems faced by people in agriculture.

With regard to free trade, I have said the government has failed to meet its own objectives. In 1987 it was the Conservative Prime Minister who said—I must admit I am only paraphrasing because I do not have the direct quote in front of me—the reason we are going into free trade is to end the harassment. I will get that quote for those members who do not seem to remember those words, but the harassment has not ended.

**Mr. McCreath:** Why will you not answer my question.

**Mr. Murphy:** The member asks me to answer his question but he wants to continue heckling. We did not end the harassment. It is continuing and continuing. Instead of the Prime Minister and the minister of trade going on Friday and Monday respectively to make the Canadian position, they were more concerned with protecting their own political backsides and protecting the NAFTA rather than saying: "Stop the harassment". That is what we need.

We had trade with the United States before we had the free trade agreement. We all know that. We also settled our disputes before we had the free trade agreement.

**An hon. member:** They harassed us then.

**Mr. Murphy:** We had harassment before and we have harassment now. Under NAFTA we will have more harassment because we have taken out the one clause that had some potential under the free trade agreement. It was the requirement that both Canada and the United States sit down and come up with a final definition of a subsidy. That was a requirement under the free trade agreement and over a five-year period it was supposed to resolve a lot of the problems we face. Under NAFTA that is no longer required. Under NAFTA we will continue to be harassed because none of the parties to the agreement will have a clear definition of what a subsidy is and is not.

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this motion today brought forward by my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, calling on the federal government to fulfil its responsibilities to agriculture that have been forsaken by this government since it was elected. This actually fits within the plans outlined by this government some time ago for agriculture when the now finance minister was

Minister of Agriculture and with the white paper of the government called, "Growing Together" which was actually based on the assumption we already operate under a free market in agriculture. There was no recognition at all in the "Growing Together" paper that all of the marketing institutions we have operate under an oligopolistic situation. The only remnant of the free market in agriculture exists at the local level.

At the time of the release of the "Growing Together" paper, the National Farmers Union and others were able to analyse the paper and comment on it. The then president of the National Farmers Union, Wayne Easter, called the paper an acceptance of the negative international trends and a positive wave for the future. He used them to justify further cuts in domestic farm programs. Since that time we have seen that is exactly what has been happening.

Today's motion indicates a continuing commitment of the New Democratic Party members of Parliament to fight on behalf of agricultural producers. This continuing commitment has been shown virtually every day in this House since this sitting began. A farm rally in Saskatchewan during Parliament's recess attracted 13,000 producers and interested and concerned Saskatchewan residents. They called upon Ottawa and the Government of Canada to respect the financial responsibilities the government has to the producers on the land.

The New Democrats have been questioning government since Parliament sat. There have been speeches under the Borrowing Authority Act including my own. Today is the first opportunity New Democrats have had to raise any issue of significance in this House. Their commitment is to agriculture and the producers of Saskatchewan.

There are many other very important issues today that have been raised in Question Period and appear on the front pages of the newspapers, but New Democrats today have made agriculture the number one priority of our caucus and the debate in this Chamber today.

There is a crisis in agriculture and it must be addressed. On February 2, I rose in this House to speak about my reaction to the farm rally. At that time I talked about the need for an immediate injection of cash as discussed in our motion today. I also talked about other matters that were raised at the farm rally which included support for the Canadian Wheat Board, maintenance of the Crow benefit and the need for the development of a long-term agriculture program based on the cost of