

*Supply*

One of the things that has concerned us with the free trade agreement and the NAFTA agreement has been the fact that we continue to be harassed by American industry. Our farmers, whether they are hog farmers or grain farmers, are harassed just as much as our steel makers and those involved in softwood lumber.

One of the things that the free trade agreement was supposed to end was this harassment. One of the things that NAFTA was supposed to improve on was bringing an end to this harassment. That has not happened. We have more and more cases against Canada being brought forward under the American anti-dumping legislation.

American experts have admitted this is harassment. They have said that 97 per cent of cases brought forward before their commerce department are ruled upon in favour of American industry. American experts have said that the harassment is often the end goal. It is not that the Americans are afraid to lose before some dispute settlement mechanism, because they have achieved their goal through their harassment process.

If you make it difficult for steel, if you make it difficult for softwood lumber producers to go into the American market, it does not matter what the final ruling is by a dispute settlement mechanism body; you have achieved your goals because you have harassed Canadian industry and effectively cut off markets.

In the few minutes I have left, I would like to talk about what we can do to reduce the costs to Canadian farmers. One of the things that is obviously important for me is a decision on the port of Churchill. The port of Churchill provides a shorter, downhill route for getting grain to our sea port. It is a shorter distance to much of our European market.

What the farmers need, especially in the area between the Alberta and Saskatchewan border where most farmers find it cheaper by up to \$30 a tonne to ship through Churchill, is a commitment from this government to make a decision on the port of Churchill. It is the time of year when that decision has to be made for this year. It has to be made this month. However, we also need a long-term commitment to assist farmers.

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Finance and Privatization)):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my hon. friend from Churchill

got on to the subject of agriculture, because he was straying in various directions. He spoke, for example, of the Atlantic fishery as if there had been no response from this government at all to the very grave difficulties which we face in Atlantic Canada.

He dismissed the \$565 million aid package, the Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program, that was brought down two years ago. He dismissed the \$1 billion of special assistance being made available to support the industry in Newfoundland this year. He completely ignores the \$800 million that is annually pumped into Atlantic Canada through the unemployment insurance scheme. Perhaps those bits of assistance are either dismissed by him as irrelevant or they have kind of escaped his notice. I notice he did talk about unemployment insurance and I was intrigued. He is making a mission of this. There is no question there is a difference in philosophy on both sides of the House on this issue. My constituents and others in my province, which is highly dependent on unemployment insurance are saying bang on. When jobs are scarce and times are tough people who quit their jobs without just cause should not have access to unemployment insurance. People are suggesting there are a lot of scams in unemployment insurance and they applaud this government's efforts to come to grips with that.

• (1200)

I want to ask the hon. member a question with respect to what he just said about the free trade agreement because it is most mystifying. It is my understanding that we have had eight panels under the FTA in the area of agriculture—one is being announced today—and every single one has been won by Canada. If we did not have the free trade agreement we would still have protectionists in the United States Congress but we would not have a means to rectify those improper actions.

If we had no FTA as my hon. friend's party advocates, how would he propose to resolve those disputes in the future?

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I thought we were going to speak about agriculture, but I guess the member wants to talk about something else. I referred to agriculture, free trade, unemployment insurance and the farmers to talk about a common problem many Canadians face. Then I