

located in eastern Canada. I am not so sure that is bad. I believe my friend, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy), mentioned the Maritimes and beer. Obviously he is not aware that Moosehead beer out of the Maritimes is sold all over North America and extremely successfully. That company knows what it is doing. It has good business people. If you are running an inefficient brewery, if you do not know what you are doing, why are you in the brewery business? We have breweries in British Columbia that can compete with any in the world and should be allowed the same right across this country.

Again, so many of these things have built up over the years. There is such a patchwork of regulation that it will be a terrible job to get back to where the efficient survive and do well and the marginal producers who really do not know what they are doing are forced out of business. Market forces will do that. More than that, I believe the role of Government is to ensure safety and health standards, but when you have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars in order to obtain a quota for some product, that is where the problem begins. The simple fact is that it is the consumer who is paying that money and it is about time someone spoke up in favour of consumer protection as opposed to inefficient producer protection.

Mr. Sid Fraleigh (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I first want to express the view that I am glad eastern Canada did not get blamed for the number of breweries we have in the country. Second, I want to tell the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) how pleased I am to be able to participate in this debate.

At the outset I want to say that Governments at both levels have been paying lip service to a reduction in interprovincial trade barriers for as long as I can remember. For those of us who come here from industry and who happened to be involved in industries which are vitally dependent upon interprovincial trade, this has been an almost insurmountable road-block. We as Canadians are being urged to become more competitive so that we can take our rightful place in the world in bilateral and multilateral trade with the U.S. and the rest of the world. Yet we have all these road-blocks thrown in our way in our own country. In a nation as large as ours, regional disparity is a fact of life. It is a problem we have to address and there is no doubt about that. Unfortunately, the way we have chosen to attack that particular problem in many cases impacts on the way we do business across the country.

• (1800)

I see you signalling, Mr. Speaker, just as I was getting started.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 42(1), this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

Adjournment Debate

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE—PAYMENT OF BENEFITS IN ATLANTIC REGION. (B) REGIONAL DISPARITY

Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, on October 14, 1986, I put a series of questions to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) regarding the recommendations of the Forget Commission, recommendations which would see the Government of Canada cutting the sum of \$3 billion from the Unemployment Insurance Commission fund, with some \$727 million coming out of the Atlantic Canada economy. I asked the Prime Minister to give the House and Canadians the position of the Government of Canada to the report of the Forget Commission. At that time the Prime Minister said that the report had not been tabled, that it was not formalized, and that therefore he could not speculate on what indeed would be the response of the Government of Canada.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Forget Commission report has been tabled for some months, since the end of November. The House and the people of Canada have still not received from the Government of Canada a response to the recommendation to cut some \$3 billion from the UIC fund and, more specifically, to cut three-quarters of a billion dollars out of the economy of Atlantic Canada alone.

The Government has now had a matter of months to study the report. I would like its formal response to what I would call Draconian recommendations.

The other matter I raised was the whole question of a government strategy or policy to deal with regional disparity in the country. On October 14 the Prime Minister indicated that he was going to Charlottetown to meet the provincial Premiers and hoped to initiate a new day of consultation, co-operation, and discussion to ensure that a regional development policy was forthcoming soon. That was in October; much water has gone under the bridge since then, and we still see no regional development policy. We certainly have not seen the dawning of a new day of consultation and co-operation.

The fact of the matter is that even today in Question Period there were some very strong and angry questions being asked about the actions of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) who proposes to sign an agreement or a protocol with France on fish stocks off Saint Pierre and Miquelon, which will have the effect of denying to Newfoundlanders their traditional and historic right to catch fish in Canadian waters.

That agreement was signed without consulting any Atlantic Premiers, the unions of Atlantic fishermen, Members of Parliament from Atlantic Canada, or even, we have been told today, cabinet members from Atlantic Canada. If that is the