

opportunity to speak on this bill, which affects our major fishing resources on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

We must not forget the fishing areas of our Great Lakes. Indeed, Lake Erie is well known for Olmstead Fisheries, which is the largest inland freshwater fishery in the world. Mr. LaVerne Kelly is just one person keenly interested in this bill. He is a fisheries inspector. As well, I am no stranger to fishing, Madam Speaker. The St. Clair River, the Chenal Ecarte, Mitchell's Bay, and Lake St. Clair are excellent areas for fishing, in fact the finest fishing in North America. I have been on the water many, many times.

In dealing with Bill C-74, as my Liberal colleagues from the maritimes have noted, we generally support the principle of the new penalties contained in the new legislation. But there are areas of concern. For example, most of the current surveillance effort is concentrated on the inshore sector. And the new resources provided for in the adjustment program are geared toward the inshore sector as well.

It stands to reason that those who will be caught will be overwhelmingly from the inshore sector. Let us look at the penalties. For a general fisheries offence and obstruction of a fishery officer, there is a fine of up to \$100,000 on summary conviction and up to \$500,000 on indictment, with options of jail terms for one and two years. The alteration of a fish habitat and pollution of a fish habitat are liable to a \$300,000 fine, and up to \$1 million on indictment, with options of imprisonment for six months to three years.

As well, Madam Speaker, the failure to provide habitat information could mean up to a \$200,000 fine on summary conviction, and a court option of six months in jail for a second and for later offences.

These fines and penalties are important. Everyone would agree. Both the Harris and Haché reports recommended amendments to the Fisheries Act to increase fines and penalties for such violations.

These proposals were also part of the Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program released on May 7, 1990.

Those documents stated in part: "all the surveillance and enforcement in the world will not contribute to

rebuilding the fish stocks, if those who break the law face fines that are considered the cost of doing business."

That says it in a nutshell. There must be a deterrence factor involved here. These higher fines and penalties will bring the Fisheries Act in line with deterrents contained in the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

As an aside, I could go on for hours about the Tories' Environmental Protection Act and how weak and feeble and gutless it is.

As we have seen from the minister when he presented his green plan to the House, the only thing good about it is that it is recyclable.

As we have seen, because I raised it in the House with the former Minister of the Environment, only 3 per cent of polluters were charged last year, and there is only one lonely Environment Canada inspector for all of Ontario.

Meanwhile, the government opposite will hire 4,000 new bureaucrats for the GST to make sure that ordinary Canadians comply with the tax rules.

And yet our environmental rules are not being enforced. It is my sincere hope that the new Fisheries Act does not follow the poor lead of this government's Environmental Protection Act. It is all words and no action. Let us hope that the legislation is followed to the letter.

Indeed, during committee hearings on this bill, Mr. Jim Rushton, of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union stated: "There has been a consistent cutback over the last 10 years in the percentage of the budget for enforcement. That needs to be strengthened. A fine will not deter someone who believes they will not get caught."

I have stated how most of the surveillance effort will be concentrated on the inshore fisheries. What about offshore?

We saw the embarrassing example last year of an American trawler ramming one of our navy ships in the Atlantic, and then hightailing it back to the east coast of the U.S.

Let us hope that never happens again. I know that my colleague from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception has very strong views on that particular matter.