

will be realized by Canadians, for Canadians, in the interests of all Canadians, not only here in Canada, but also in foreign countries? Will we be a people forever dependent on other people's interests? Canadian money will—

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I have just listened to the lovely rhetoric of the new leader of the Bloc Quebecois. Perhaps I am mistaken, but it seems to me that when he was Minister of Environment in the Conservative government he supported the Hibernia project.

Mr. Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the environment, everybody knows but nobody mentioned it except the hon. member a moment ago, that no other project has ever undergone as many environmental studies before being brought forward. When I was Minister of Environment and a very strict minister as that because many criticisms were levelled at me in economic circles, I have attested, and I can reaffirm it now that in that project everything has been done to protect the environment.

We do not criticize the legislation from the environmental point of view. What we criticize and find unacceptable are the conditions under which the project is to be economically and technologically realized. Certainly, Mr. Speaker— I would like to conclude my remarks, with your permission.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): On the same point of order, perhaps, Mr. Speaker. I find it a bit confusing because at the time he was a minister, he was unconditionally for the project. Is he mixed up or what?

Mr. Bouchard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, although we are close to adjournment time, I would like to make another point.

Essentially, in the battle to be recognized we in the Bloc Quebecois are fighting a very important battle for parliamentary democracy, for the interests we represent in Quebec and for the future of Quebec. We know quite well that the right we claim must be won little by little. We will patiently fight day after day. We will patiently bring the House toward full recognition of the Bloc Quebecois. That being said, we will not accept any attempt at muzzling members one at a time, we will condemn it, contest it and immediately repudiate it. And

that is what was done today. An attempt to muzzle one by one—

Adjournment Debate

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES

Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the Bloc Quebecois just now on what needed to go to Quebec. It seems to me the deal that was signed helps Quebec immensely. It helps less so the maritime provinces, such as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and P.E.I. who would be looking for the work.

• (1900)

However, last May 8 I rose in the House and, just after he had tabled his amendments to the Fisheries Act, I asked the minister about the penalties that he was planning to bring in at that time. The question was about the fines up to \$1 million for harmful alteration, destruction or disruption of fish habitat.

I asked on that day in particular because I knew there were 42 foreign boats fishing in what was called the silver hake box, while our own fishermen were not able to fish in that area at that time because of the spawning ground rules. The odd part is that they were fishing right beside the spawning grounds. They are allowed a by-catch of the traditional fish in the spawning grounds.

It just seems that the government—and I am looking forward to hearing more about these amendments as they come into play—was hitting at the people who are least able to pay the penalties, our own Canadians, when we have foreigners out there fishing and overfishing, yet we cannot impose the same type of penalties on them.

I know the Minister for International Trade signed an agreement with the Americans whereby they would look to have a uniform system as a guide to prosecuting Americans in our waters. I know the American system and I have seen how it works. That agreement is only worth the ink on that paper, because I cannot see the eastern seaboard American states agreeing very rapidly