

other measures which the hon. member is proposing, I do not know if he is referring to possible unilateral action. I am surprised that he, as a representative of a west coast constituency, would be advocating this before we have absolute guarantees that we can protect the salmon.

PROPOSED UNILATERAL DECLARATION OF JURISDICTION  
OVER MARINE RESOURCES TO 200 MILES OFFSHORE

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** In view of the fact that Mr. L. R. Day, Executive Secretary of the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, has pointed out that they have no evidence of the Russians over-fishing and he says it is not surprising because those countries which follow the ICNAF regulations do not, of course, report them, and since this matter is left entirely to the discretion of nations involved, I ask the minister whether it is not now time to do what Canada did with regard to the outmoded three mile limit and take unilateral action or join with the United States in taking bilateral action in order to extend our jurisdiction to the 200 mile limit or to the continental shelf in order that we may be able to police the situation which ICNAF has shown it cannot police?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of State (Fisheries)):** Before the hon. member and the hon. lady across from me applaud, they might question whether Mr. Day has been properly quoted. I cannot believe that a person who is the secretary of ICNAF would not know that the charges of violation made by Canada followed many hundreds of boardings over the past months with our inspectors having access to foreign ships fishing off our coasts in the ICNAF area.

● (1520)

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** The Minister speaks of impatience. I should like to remind him of a speech he himself made to ICNAF in Edinburgh on June 6, 1975 in which the minister began by saying: "We have had enough"? I remind him also of his words to the delegates at that conference:

Either the distant water fishing nations will co-operate with Canada or other coastal states in the orderly development of new coastal management regimes . . . or else Canada and the other states . . . will be obliged to consider other means of protecting their legitimate interests.

I am asking the minister what other measures he proposes to take to protect the legitimate interests of Canadian fishermen.

**Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent):** I rejoice that the hon. member has been reading my speeches, too. I said then that we were impatient, and we still are. I also said we would take certain measures, and six weeks ago—it was not because of Mr. Moores' visit to Ottawa two days ago—I indicated that we would be closing ports if violations continued. In one case, violations were flagrant and continued, and we closed the ports. As for the other measures contemplated, I indicated earlier that we are talking to those nations which share our concern; we are

*Oral Questions*

examining our options, and one lively option is that of a unilateral declaration.

\* \* \*

**ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AUTHORITY**

REASON FOR CHANGE OF CONTRACTORS FOR DEMOLITION OF  
BRIDGE AT PORT ROBINSON—POSSIBILITY OF  
COMPENSATION

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct two questions to the Minister of Transport of which I have given him notice. They have to do with the circumstances surrounding the awarding of contracts by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority calling for the demolition of bridge 12 at Port Robinson after a boat had hit the bridge—the peculiar circumstances surrounding the awarding of contracts. In the first instance, Bridge and Tank Company of Canada was awarded a contract to do the job but this was subsequently cancelled in favour of a contract awarded to McAllister Marine subject to some compensation for Bridge and Tank by way of salvage and scrap. What was the reason for the change in contractors and what form of compensation, if any, was paid to Bridge and Tank, of Hamilton, for loss of the contract and on what basis?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport):** As far as the figures are concerned, I would have to check them because I do not have them with me. The reason no tenders were called was that the canal had to be cleared as quickly as possible. Under the arrangements which were made it took about 14 days before the canal was open. Otherwise, it would have taken two months or so. The Authority awarded the contract to a local firm to destroy the two towers and the span in the middle. The company could not do it, so they had to give the work to another firm. The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority even sent its own crane from Montreal to help in getting the span out of the way. After 14 days it was possible to open the canal. But for these measures it would have been necessary to wait for a couple of months.

**Mr. Alexander:** I want to thank the minister for his answer, subject to information which may be revealed to me subsequently. May I ask him, now, why it was necessary for the Seaway Authority to seek any contract for the demolition of the bridge when it is alleged it had the equipment, the personnel and the capability to do the job itself by means of the Hercules floating crane?

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** They came with the crane only to help the contractor. I am not sure that the Authority does have all the equipment necessary to do this job. The reason given me by the Seaway management is that they wanted to proceed as quickly as possible in order to free the canal for navigation. This is why they asked a firm which was already there to try to clean up the destroyed bridge. I will reply to any parts of the question which have been left unanswered after I get in touch with the Seaway Authority.