

Order Paper Questions

6. Canadians were not employed at the construction site. As stated above, Mr. Veitch supervised the work of the contractors. Only Canadian citizens or landed immigrants may be employed on CIDA projects under normal circumstances. There is, however, no record of the number employed, as this information is not required for purposes of payment. Payments are made relative to the specific performance within the scope of work and the payment budget or, according to approved rates by discipline and total time worked, depending on the contract. The actual number of individuals employed is the prerogative of the consultant or contractor.

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE DE THIÈS PROJECT IN SENEGAL

Question No. 3,220—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What criteria were used to award the contracts for consulting services and construction for the École Polytechnique de Thiès Project in Senegal in 1973?

2. (a) Who were the (i) consultants invited to submit a proposal (ii) contractors invited to submit a bid (b) who was the successful bidder?

3. Was the low bidder awarded the contract for the project and, if not, for what reason?

4. Did the cost of construction exceed the contracted amount and, if so, for what reason?

5. Which members from CIDA and/or the Department of External Affairs visited the job site and were their trips charged to the project?

6. How many Canadians were employed on the project?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. There was no construction or consulting services contract awarded for this project in 1973. However, a technical assistance contract was awarded to la Corporation de l'École polytechnique de Montréal to take over the educational responsibility and administration of the school. L'École polytechnique de Montréal, as a technically-oriented university was particularly competent in this field. It also carried out the feasibility study on this project and was therefore the logical choice for the major contract. This is normal practice in selecting a university to fulfil a contract since we do not invite competitive bids in the case of universities.

2. (a) (i) (ii) No proposals or bids were invited. (b) As mentioned, bids have not been called.

3. As mentioned, bids have not been called.

4. As mentioned, no contract for construction has been awarded.

5. Records of visits or travel by CIDA and/or Department of External Affairs members are not maintained by project as travel is related to overall programs involving several specific areas of interest, and records are normally kept on this basis. Travel costs by CIDA and/or Department of External Affairs members are not charged to project funds.

6. Only Canadian citizens or landed immigrants may be employed on CIDA projects under normal circumstances. There is, however, no record of the number employed, as this information is not required for purposes of payment. Payments are made relative to the specific performance within the scope of work and the payment budget or, according to approved rates by discipline and total time worked, depending on the contract. The actual number of individuals employed is the prerogative of the consultant or contractor.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

FIELD TRAINING AND DEMONSTRATION CENTRE PROJECT IN VIETNAM

Question No. 3,221—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What criteria were used to award the contracts for consulting services and construction for the Field Training and Demonstration Centre Project in Vietnam in 1972?

2. (a) Who were the (i) consultants invited to submit a proposal (ii) contractors invited to submit a bid (b) who was the successful bidder?

3. Was the low bidder awarded the contract for the project and, if not, for what reason?

4. Did the cost of construction exceed the contracted amount and, if so, for what reason?

5. Which members from CIDA and/or the Department of External Affairs visited the job site and were their trips charged to the project?

6. How many Canadians were employed on the project?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. No consultant contract was awarded for this project. The criterion used to award the contract for construction was the lowest bid received.

2. (a) (i) No consultant contract was awarded; therefore, there was no proposal call for consulting services. (ii) Victoria Builders International AJN Construction Limited. (b) Victoria Builders International.

3. Yes.

4. Because additional work was required and carried out under CIDA financing, eventual costs of construction were \$286,000 as versus an original contract amount of \$250,140.

5. Records of visits or travel by CIDA and/or Department of External Affairs members are not maintained by project as travel is related to overall programs involving several specific areas of interest, and records are normally kept on this basis. Travel costs by CIDA and/or Department of External Affairs members are not charged to project funds.

6. Under normal circumstances only Canadian citizens, landed immigrants or nationals of the recipient country would be employed on CIDA projects. To the best of our knowledge the only Canadians employed directly on this project was the Site Manager, and two engineers who carried out site inspections. There is, however, no record of the number employed, as this information is not required for purposes of payment. Payments are made relative to the specific performance within the scope of work and the payment budget or, according to approved rates by discipline and total time worked, depending on the contract. The actual number of individuals employed is the prerogative of the consultant or contractor.

ÉCOLE NATIONALE DE PÊCHE PROJECT IN ALGERIA

Question No. 3,222—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What criteria were used to award the contracts for consulting services and construction for the École Nationale de Pêche Project in Algeria in 1973?

2. (a) Who were the (i) consultants invited to submit a proposal (ii) contractors invited to submit a bid (b) who was the successful bidder?

3. Was the low bidder awarded the contract for the project and, if not, for what reason?

4. Did the cost of construction exceed the contracted amount and, if so, for what reason?