

*Oral Questions*

fact that the evidence in the Morgentaler trial was that he had performed 5,000 abortions most of which had been referred by qualified doctors, and in view of the unusual and unique legal procedure that prevailed in Dr. Morgentaler's case, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes):

That the Minister of Justice immediately intercede with the Minister of Justice in Quebec with regard to the treatment of Dr. Morgentaler while in prison; with regard to the decision of the Quebec Minister of Justice to continue the prosecution of Dr. Morgentaler on further counts arising at the same time; and with regard to the reasons why other doctors have not been charged despite the overwhelming evidence now available.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

**INDIAN AFFAIRS****REQUEST FOR EXPLANATION OF WORKABILITY OF PROGRAM CIRCULAR D-1—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Battle River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to raise a motion of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the fact that it is extremely unlikely that native peoples in communities such as Fort Chipewyan or any other remote community can be expected to even receive responses from companies on tenders for amounts as small as \$100, and since requiring tenders on all items that cost in excess of \$100 imposes an extreme rigidity on the native people, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith):

That the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development make a statement to this House to explain the workability of Program Circular D-1.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion proposed pursuant to Standing Order 43 cannot be presented without the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**TRANSPORT****DREDGING CONTRACT FOR NORTH TRAVERSE—REASON GOVERNMENT IS NOW CHARGING SUCCESSFUL BIDDER WITH COLLUSION**

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport arising out of his statement in the committee of the

[Mr. Leggatt.]

whole on May 13 as reported at page 5749 of *Hansard* where he said he could give no explanation for the successful dredging bid in connection with the so-called north traverse, this bid being the same as the estimate made by his own department as to what the cost should be. I quote the minister. He said:

But how can I explain it if the RCMP and the courts cannot explain it? . . . They searched everywhere.

● (1410)

Would the minister indicate to the House why the government is now claiming that there was collusion and that the successful dredging company had prior knowledge of the estimate made for the contract by the minister's department? What has happened since May 13?

**Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that this case is before the court now.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Oh, yes.

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** Yes, it is. I think that the government estimate was about \$18 million and the contract was awarded for \$20 million. I think I have a letter ready to be sent to the hon. member for South Shore. The hon. member can read it, and if he has another question I can answer it.

**Mr. Stanfield:** I have another question right now, Mr. Speaker. The successful bid was, I believe, \$20,860,000, which was exactly the estimate made by the minister's department as to what the cost should be. I should like to ask the minister why the government is now claiming, in a counterclaim against the dredging company that is suing for payment, that the successful bidder on that contract knew at the time he bid what the departmental estimate was. What has happened since the thirteenth day of May? The minister said that there has been no indication that a civil servant was involved in this. Who was involved? Was a politician involved? How did the successful dredging company find out, as the government now claims what the department's own estimate was?

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** I think that the answer will come from the courts. I do not see how the court, which is aware of all this, is not going to try to clarify the situation.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, the minister having said in the committee of the whole House that nobody knew whether or not there was collusion and the government having now asserted in a public document that there was collusion, I suggest with all respect that the House is entitled to some information, statement or indication from the minister as to what has happened since the minister made his statement on May 13 and why the government is now claiming that in fact there was collusion and is defending itself against this dredging company by making that assertion.

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

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** I do not see why it is so complicated. The inquiry was started in Hamilton after a charge was made by the city of Hamilton and after the