

convenient opportunity on subsequent question periods for ministers to rise and, perhaps, in the course of answering one question to one member, direct another answer to another member. That tends to pre-empt any priorities which I may have been trying to set in recognizing members. In any case, it is not a very satisfactory resolution of the problem. The fact of the matter is that there really is no easy resolution of this particular problem except perhaps to facilitate this kind of thing in the first instance by notice, as has been referred to by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), or in the alternative, after a period has elapsed for the hon. member who put the question originally to seek the floor a second time, to put the minister on the spot, as it were, and say, "having given the undertaking a few days ago to answer the question, does the minister have the information and would he bring it forward?" Up to this time there does not seem to have been any better resolution than that, and after reflection on occasions on which the point has been raised, frankly I cannot say I am aware of anything I could suggest. If hon. members have any suggestions for improving that procedure, I would be pleased to receive them.

**Mr. Breau:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to draw to the attention of the House an error in the proceedings as printed in yesterday's *Hansard* in respect of the vote of members on division No. 91. I am not shown as having voted on that division. I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention the fact that I voted for the motion. It seems that the Table has made an error between myself and my seatmate, the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia). I should like the record to show that I voted yea on the division on motion No. 91.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to embarrass the hon. member, but I listened to his point of order with great care because it is so unusual. My attention was drawn to the location of the hon. member in the House. If the Chair made a mistake, it was because the hon. member was moving in his seat, or doing something, because I had the distinct impression that the hon. member was on his feet. Perhaps the hon. member was moving, but I did see him. He may have been squirming, or doing something. This was observed by some of my colleagues around me.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) has raised a legitimate point of order. I recall very distinctly that he not only was on his feet to cast his vote in favour of this particular motion but, furthermore, the vote was duly noted by the officials at the Table. If a mistake was made in *Hansard*, it was simply a technical error which I am sure will be corrected.

[Translation]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Eleventh and twelfth reports of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, in both official languages—Mr. Comtois.

[Editor's note: For text of above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.]

Order Paper Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[English]

(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: 3,219, 3,220, 3,221, 3,222, 3,223, 3,224, 3,225, 3,226, 3,227, 3,228, 3,293, 3,329, 3,503, 3,601, 3,628, 3,630, 3,634 and 3,678.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[Text]

REFUGEE HOUSING PROJECT IN VIETNAM

Question No. 3,219—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. What criteria were used to award the contracts for consulting services and construction for the Refugee Housing Project in Vietnam in 1968 and 1969?

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. A contract for consulting services was not awarded. The criterion used to select the company for the construction contract for this project was the ability to construct facilities for displaced Vietnamese on an emergency basis, at the best possible price. This was financed under grant, to the Government of South Vietnam. The selection of the company was made by the SSEA, on advice from CIDA who maintained a permanent engineering adviser in Vietnam at the time.

2. a) (i) Not applicable as there was no consultant involved in this project and, therefore, no proposal call. (ii) The contract was awarded to Engbuild Builders International (later Victoria Builders International).

3. To the best of our knowledge, the lowest bidder was successful. To confirm this would require searching many documents at inordinate cost and length of time.

4. CIDA believes the costs were within the estimates. To confirm this would require searching many documents at inordinate cost and length of time.

5. Mr. D. Veitch who was CIDA's engineering representative in Vietnam at the time, was concerned with this project among others. He was present at the job site on continuous inspection. 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.