

*Government Orders*

with a number of questions of privilege, but there was an incident in the House today and I do not think I can let it go unnoticed. I am referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton East who, unfortunately, is not in the House as I speak. First, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I do not expect you to rule on my question of privilege today, for I think the hon. member should be given the opportunity to respond.

Unless I am mistaken, Mr. Speaker, when the Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council was addressing the House the hon. member for Hamilton East, from her seat in the House, criticized him for not speaking in French. Other members will confirm this. Indeed, the hon. member for Shefford indicates that he too heard the same remarks. I would not want to put words in her mouth, Mr. Speaker, so perhaps we might wait until we get *Hansard* to find out exactly what she said. But I want to raise the issue for the following reason: in Canada, unless the rules have been changed recently, as far as I know members of this House have the right to speak English or French, and nobody is allowed to criticize them for their choice of language.

I raise the point today, Mr. Speaker, not only as a member of this House but also as a French-speaking citizen because as such I reject this approach and I would not want anybody here or elsewhere in my country to criticize me for speaking French or to request that I speak English when I have every right to speak French. Mr. Speaker, nor would I want my children to be criticized for the same thing some day. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to review *Hansard* or what we call the "blues" and to give us a ruling on this matter.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps after the hon. member has seen *Hansard* it may or may not be necessary to pursue the matter any further. In any event, I would ask hon. members not to pursue it any further, especially because the hon. member for Hamilton East is not here. If the matter should be pursued further, I will of course receive a notice of a question of privilege and it will be heard some time tomorrow.

Orders of the day.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**FISHERIES ACT****MEASURE TO AMEND**

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Valcourt that Bill C-74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Before I recognize the hon. member for South West Nova, it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Restigouche—Chaleur—Forestry; the hon. member for Mackenzie—Agriculture.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate on this bill. The amendments introduced last June by the Minister of Fisheries increase the penalties for fishermen who are caught in certain violations of the act.

I realize that matters other than the debate may be most interesting down in that end, but there are other people in Canada who want to get on with the debate on this particular bill.

This bill shows the Canadian people just how bad this government has failed in its fishery policy. The minister, when he spoke on the bill last June, told us of the clear measures that will be taken by the government. He said:

— unless the government takes clear measures to show its intention to conserve and rebuild these stocks, they will be out.

In other words, knowing that these measures will come about, this would be a reason to conserve and restore the stocks. I will get back to that in a minute. He goes on to say:

We are going to be the country which will have the more stringent fines for fishing violations. It just shows how important we see this issue to be.

In other words, he does not talk about this being a country that has a great resource, or that we have to develop this resource within Canada and have incentives that apply to all sectors of the fishery. He says that no,