

used by the same company and subject to recapture, it costs the government nothing directly.

The same rule of thumb could apply to our inshore fishermen on the Atlantic coast and the British Columbia coast who also require new ships in the 45-foot to 65-foot class. Since these ships are generally built of wood, an inshore fleet development plan would spark a chain reaction in the production of jobs throughout the whole of Atlantic Canada and, indeed, in all parts of Canada. Since the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, through the banks, does not seem to be working, there should also be set up a central mortgage and shipping corporation to provide fisheries development funds at special rates to fishermen desirous of upgrading their boats and equipment.

The same lack of planning is seriously affecting the development of agriculture in my province. Due to mismanagement of the entire economy, approximately 35 cents out of the average Nova Scotian's food dollar finds its way back to the farmer. The rest is gobbled up by freight charges, shipping charges, processing and packing charges between the time commodities leave the farm and are purchased by consumers. Even though agriculture in Nova Scotia is one of our oldest basic primary industries, after centuries of farming there is still no vehicle available to producers which provides them with a suitable income for an honest day's work.

Canada has always had a cheap food policy, but what the farmer receives today for his labours and what the consumer pays for his products bears no relationship one to the other. As a result of this situation, the ratio of farmers to the population is declining. While they are producing more food than ever, we have to ask ourselves whether or not we want the agricultural industry in Nova Scotia to continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will only be another minute. The capital investment in the average farm for land, equipment, buildings, feed and other expenditures is massive, and some form of stabilization program has to be worked out to enable our farmers to remain in business.

In closing, I say to this House that if the economic problems of Canadians are resolved, there will be an easing of the political and social difficulties throughout Canada. However, if our economic problems are not resolved, our social and political problems will compound. The longer the delay, the more severe will be the adverse consequences of that delay. For all these reasons I intend to support the amendment moved by my leader, which clearly states that we no longer have any confidence in this government.

The Address—Mr. Francis

● (1452)

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address for their contribution to our proceedings, one which, I am sure, augurs well for both of them.

I should like to deal with two major areas: first, bill 101 and the tactics of the government of Canada with respect to it, and then with some of the problems of the national capital region.

[*Translation*]

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal). I have read and reread the speech he delivered in this House on October 19, 1976. He discussed minority rights and everything that happened in the province of Manitoba in the 1890's.

[*English*]

A year ago in this House my hon. friend from Maisonneuve-Rosemont (Mr. Joyal) dealt most eloquently with the injustices which were perpetrated on a minority language group in the province of Manitoba. His words today reflect a sincerity and conviction which for me carried just as much weight now as they did then. I differ from my hon. friend in my views respecting many areas of his speech, particularly with regard to the treatment of public servants, but I stand with him on the question of minority language rights, along with other members of the House. I welcomed the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that bilingualism is to be the very cornerstone of our approach to national unity and that it will have to be written into the Constitution of Canada in some way so as to guarantee absolutely the equality of the two official language groups from coast to coast. There is no question in my mind that this must be the ultimate objective.

It is perhaps worth while reviewing the events which took place in Manitoba in the years following the action of that province in 1890. When my hon. friend from Maisonneuve-Rosemont first spoke on this matter, my reaction was to think, "This was a long time ago, and I cannot atone for the sins of my forefathers. Nevertheless, I am quite prepared to admit that an injustice was done and to do all I can to correct it." Someone has said that a nation which cannot learn from the past is doomed to repeat it. In 1890, the government of Manitoba abolished, by resolution, the use of the French language in the legislature. It then proceeded to enact legislation abolishing separate schools. Both the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada and then went to the Privy Council, where lay the ultimate decision as to the constitutionality of the legislation. The bulk of the legislation was held to be valid and constitutional. Then the minority group in Manitoba appealed to the federal cabinet under section 22(2) of the Manitoba Act of 1870. That section is parallel to section 93 of the BNA Act under which a similar appeal would still lie. The cabinet of the day listened to the minority appeal, but Sir John A. Macdonald died in 1891 and in the five years following his death four ill-remembered