

would not want to take the valuable time of this House to respond. Perhaps the Hon. Member can come to the committee when we discuss the program and the computation of the formula, and I will give him all the details. The fact is that the formula applies to every single census area in Canada. It is re-evaluated once a year. If, by the statistics indicated by the Hon. Member, Victoria is in worse shape than all of the other cities, that will affect the formula. Obviously, in that case, the census area of Victoria will change automatically.

APPEAL TO MINISTER TO REVIEW REGULATIONS

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. If the Minister cannot tell me what is fair about the formula, I would like to tell him what is unfair about it. It is based on a ratio of unemployment insurance beneficiaries to the general population of working age. In Victoria, not only are there a large number of unemployed people whose benefits have expired, but there are also many people who have taken early retirement and moved there. Both of these factors distort this ratio. I would like to make a personal appeal to the Minister. Will he himself look into the Victoria situation, will he look at the hardship faced by that community, and determine whether some changes have to be made to the regulations so that people and businesses in Victoria can receive the benefits they need and deserve?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Hon. Member is trying to make some political points. However, I would hope he would go back and read the committee minutes with respect to the development of that formula. As a matter of fact, I believe one of the Hon. Member's own colleagues was applauding my response to the Hon. Member for Victoria last week when I indicated that the formula applies equally to all census areas across the country. It also happens to be, Mr. Speaker, the first time that a formula for regional development incentives to industry and tourism coincides with the job-creation program formulae conducted by the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The formula we use is exactly the same, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

FISHERIES

COD BLOCK INVENTORIES

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The Minister knows that as a result of marketing difficulties there are now high inventories in eastern Canada, especially in Newfoundland, of cod blocks. This will create problems for inshore fishermen as we get into the season. Will the Minister tell the House what steps the Government intends to take to alleviate the situation, either directly or through the Fisheries Prices Support Board?

Oral Questions

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Member, who is a former Minister of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. I am happy to report to him that Cabinet will be making a decision very shortly.

MARKETING SYSTEM

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Time is of the essence, Mr. Speaker, because this situation is creating problems for inshore fishermen in terms of disposing of their fish. Has the Minister taken any steps with regard to single desk marketing, setting up some kind of safe kind of system so that cod blocks as a commodity can be sold through a single desk?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I believe that, first the Hon. Member will not have to wait very long for the announcement of the Government's policy. Second, I will be expecting some initiative from the industry itself which will suggest an orderly marketing organization structure.

* * *

THE CONSTITUTION

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF QUEBEC'S BILL 101—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice I will direct my question to the Prime Minister, who will know that the Supreme Court of Canada has been urged by counsel representing the federal Government to disallow some 4,500 laws passed by the Province of Manitoba since 1890. The issue with respect to the legality or lack of it in connection with the laws of Manitoba was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada by the federal Government, for an opinion of the Court, within six weeks of the decision by the Government of Manitoba to abandon its plan to amend its constitution to extend constitutional language rights to the Franco-Manitobans.

Today a group from the Province of Quebec, representing the Quebec Federation of Home and School Associations, is in Ottawa for the purpose of urging upon the federal Government a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada of the constitutionality of some 31 provisions of Bill 101.

These people have waited some five and a half years to get on the regular Supreme Court docket in Quebec regarding the issues with which they are concerned. Is the Government of the Prime Minister concerned with protecting only certain kinds of minority rights in this country, that is to say, minority rights as they affect French-speaking Canadians? If it is not, why will the Government not take the step of referring the offensive provisions of Bill 101—which offends some 800,000 English-speaking Canadians in the Province of Quebec—to the Supreme Court of Canada?