

No. 3,060—*Mr. Dinsdale*

1. With respect to the Department of Supply and Services tender MPE 0274-2-8322/3/4/5, has the government awarded a contract for item 1(B)AO, parcel sortation systems for the bulk mail facility and letter sorting plants to McInnis Co., of Windsor in association with Arrowjet General of Frederick, Maryland (a) did Feranti-Packard of Toronto in association with Speaker Sortation Systems submit a tender (b) did Speaker Motions of Canada in association with Speaker Motions of Milwaukee submit a tender (c) what was the price of the tender in each case?

2. Did the Canadian Post Office Project Officers report that the McInnis bid did not meet the specifications of a performance type contract and, if so (a) did DSS review the McInnis tender (b) was the tender award increased from \$1,760,211 to \$4,160,436 (c) was a similar review made of the other two tenders?

3. Of the three companies involved, which tender included mechanically assisted loading as specified under the provisions of a performance type contract (a) was the McInnis bid upgraded to include mechanical loading (b) what was the revised cost of this upgrading (c) what is the technical competence and experience of McInnis Co. in this specific area of technology?

4. (a) Which of the three tenders were supported by the Post Office Project Officers from the standpoint of technical competence and actual experience in manufacturing the 1(B)AO parcel sortation systems essential to meeting delivery requirements (b) which tender did the Consultants on the Project, Cole-Sherman Associates of Toronto, support from the standpoint of technical competence and actual experience in manufacturing parcel sortation systems, with the vital delivery date in mind?

5. Was the Canadian Post Office Project Officer on this project withdrawn from the evaluation process at the request of DSS?

6. What is the practical experience of each of the three companies submitting tenders in actually manufacturing and supplying postal sorting equipment?

7. (a) Did the American affiliation of McInnis Co., Arrowjet General, change ownership to the American Chain and Cable Co., since submitting the original tender (b) is the Canadian affiliate of ACCO, the Canadian Mechanical Handling Systems, a competitor of McInnis?

8. What is the Canadian affiliation of the other two companies submitting tenders?

9. Has the project been delayed by the negotiations with the McInnis Co. (a) was the original delivery date October, 1974 (b) has it now been delayed and, if so, until what date?

10. What is the estimated daily cost of slippage on delivery date?

11. Which of the three companies have been involved with other contracts for CPO Mechanization Project

(a) what are these projects (b) has the performance been satisfactory?

12. Is there logistic and training compatibility between the bulk mail facility and the McInnis equipment?

13. (a) Is it the practice of DSS to award contracts on the Canadian Post Office Mechanization Project, without regard to technical competence (b) what are the criteria in making these awards?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/3,060.

Mr. Reid, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-191, An Act to amend the Parole Act, as reported (with an amendment) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs;

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) for Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Broadbent, moved,—That Bill C-191, An Act to amend the Parole Act, be amended in Clause 1 by inserting the following as subsection 4.1(2) immediately after line 13:

“(2) Two of the *ad hoc* members shall be persons of Native Indian origin.”

and by renumbering the subsequent subsections accordingly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) for Mr. Howard, seconded by Mr. Broadbent, moved,—That Bill C-191, An Act to amend the Parole Act, be amended in Clause 1 by inserting the following as subsection 4.1(3) immediately after line 17:

“(3) Two of the *ad hoc* members shall be persons who have served a period of time in a penitentiary under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada whether or not such persons, at the time of their appointment have been granted a parole.”

and by renumbering the subsequent subsections accordingly.

And debate arising thereon;

(*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*)

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question “That this House do now adjourn” was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1).

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

Changes in Committee Membership

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows: