

please hon. members from time to time; it is bound to. The fact is there is common ground among us all. The refusal from time to time to recognize a given member on a supplementary does not constitute either a question of privilege or a point of order. It is a matter that hon. members have to accept from time to time. In this case, the hon. member put a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs about the backlog of the board with regard to veterans' pensions. Some, he said, had built up over three years' duration. That precise question was put to the minister only a few days ago, and answered.

If the Chair had wanted to take a very hard line against the hon. member, it could have refused to permit him to put the question at all. However, the minister was permitted to give an answer, which was the same answer that he gave a few days ago, namely that they are trying to clear up the backlog. If there are any specific cases, the hon. member should bring them to the minister's attention. That goes beyond the ground granted to the hon. member. He can bring specific cases to the minister.

We face a continuing problem. Every member wants to ask supplementaries. I do not, and will not, recognize every member on a supplementary. There is one thing about which we can be absolutely clear. If every time that a member is not recognized on a supplementary he proposes to take it as a personal gesture of prejudice or discrimination against his particular line of questioning, we will have to face this matter every day at three o'clock. There are times every day in the question period when I have to exercise discretion either to allow or not allow supplementary questions.

Mr. Korchinski: With all due respect—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Korchinski: I do have a case of three years' duration.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Korchinski: I do have a letter from the minister indicating that he will take this up on a priority basis. This dates back two years. I still have not got any answer. Since we are continually told by the commission that we should not—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Korchinski: It would lose its priority.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Yesterday I indicated that at three o'clock today I would invite discussion on the question I deferred on two occasions, namely, a tax matter that was sub judice. I wonder if before launching into that discussion today we might complete routine proceedings.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Order Paper Questions

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ELECTIONS

TABLING OF REPORT ON WAYS OF REDUCING ELECTION PERIODS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of a report by the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada, dated December, 1975, entitled "An examination of possible ways of reducing the election period".

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

TABLING OF VANTOUR REPORT ON DISSOCIATION

Hon. Warren Allmand (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 41(2) I wish to table, in both official languages, the report of the Study Group on Dissociation or, as it is known, the Vantour report.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 3,171, 3,651, 3,708, 3,723, 3,773, 3,775, 3,823, 3,824, 3,826, 3,827, 3,867, 3,899 and 3,963.

[*Text*]

PLACE DU PORTAGE, HULL—CONSTRUCTION PHASES I TO IV

Question No. 3,171—Mr. Paposki:

1. Are general contractors constructing the buildings in Hull, Quebec known as Place du Portage Phases I to V and the underground parking garage and, if so, who are they?
2. (a) Which of the buildings are being constructed under contract with the government (b) what is the contract price (c) what are the estimated costs?
3. Are there any extras in addition to the contract or estimated price and, if so, what are they?
4. Does the government plan a contribution to any scheme for the eventual use of any building not being constructed by the government and, if so, what is it?
5. What was the cost of land acquisition by the government or any agency of the government for the Place du Portage sites?
6. Is any person or corporation participating with the government either as partners in construction or under any agreement as to the leasing of space in the completed building by the government and, if so, what are the terms of the agreement.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Public Works): 1. (a) (i) Phase I, Yes. (ii) Phase II, Stage "A", Yes; Phase II, Stage "B", Yes; Phase II, Stage "C", Yes. (iii) Parking Garage Former City Hall Site: Excavation, Yes; Footings, Yes; Structure, Yes. (iv) Maisonneuve Parking Garage, Yes. (v) Phase III, No. (vi) Phase IV, No. (vii) Phase V, not available. 1. (b) (i) Phase I, Thomas Fuller Construction Co.