

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

inside the house without any question of parliamentary immunity or privilege whatsoever. I think that if I tried to ask for parliamentary privilege for what I was repeating outside the house it could not be extended to me, but I made it plain I was not reading from *Hansard*. I left Ottawa Wednesday morning before *Hansard* was available. Out west I was trying to use the exact words I had used in the house so that there would be no suggestion that I backed down on what I said. But the truth has not bothered the editor of the *Ottawa Citizen* whatsoever. He writes this editorial to cover up the facts with a smoke-screen. It is perfect example of one technique used to perpetrate the big lie. We are used to that in the *Ottawa Citizen*, and I hope tomorrow I can continue with a few other illustrations of the classic use of the big lie in this debate.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of getting on with the business of the house and of the country, since there are some other things we would want to do later this session and next session after this bill has passed, if the committee would agree to extend the sitting beyond ten o'clock tonight?

**Mr. Nugent:** We have received little cooperation from the Minister of National Defence in this debate. I can understand his tender susceptibilities about time but I believe the minister had his tongue in his cheek when he said he was making that suggestion in the interests of getting along with the other business of the country.

It is ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Progress reported.

● (10:00 p.m.)

#### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

[Translation]

PUBLIC BUILDINGS—OTTAWA—INQUIRY AS TO CONTRACTS FOR DEMOLITION

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, I come back to a matter I raised a few weeks ago, the tearing-down of public government buildings, namely the old printing bureau and the Roxborough building in Ottawa.

23033—950½

Mr. Speaker, the point is to decide whether a serious investigation is necessary to unveil the truth about the adjudication of demolition contracts to companies that seem to be in collusion. In fact, a comparison of the tenders submitted to the Department of Public Works on two occasions, first for the old printing bureau and second, for the Roxborough building, reveals that the same contractors who missed out on the Roxborough demolition job, had all the chances to recoup themselves with the old printing bureau demolition job.

When the time came for the demolition of the old printing bureau, which is under way at present, the department chose to call on some contractors. Instead of calling for public tenders, where everyone would have had a chance to tender for this contract, where all contractors would have competed, they preferred to call six companies: Cohen & Cohen, Hugh M. Grant, Teperman & Sons, Green-spoon Bros.—who had not done any demolition in Ottawa for many years—Palmer-Levitan Ltd., in Hull and Hurdman Bros. in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the first call for tenders to wreck the Roxborough building, in October 1966, Cohen & Cohen tendered for the job with Teperman & Sons—another company, which was supposed to be a rival, but they joined forces—for a total sum of \$138,000, while Beaver Demolition tendered for \$143,600, Panzini Ltd. for \$164,000 and Palmer-Levitan Ltd. for \$169,000.

Now, honest officials of the department stated that the cost of such demolition could not go beyond \$25,000 or \$30,000. Tenders were called for and then, Panzini Ltd., for instance, having first tendered for \$164,000, now tendered for \$57,000, a difference of 107,000. On the other hand, Palmer-Levitan Ltd. of Hull tendered for \$68,000 or a difference of \$101,000 between the two tenders.

I understand that high officials of the department, having taken a position, the companies were slightly embarrassed not to tender again at a price lower than previously quoted. But when the small difference is noted between the first tenders, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe there was collusion between the companies. The same situation occurred in connection with the demolition contract for the old printing bureau, when the two same contractors again tendered, but this time, in order that other people may not tender at a lower price, public tenders were not called for.