

Inquiries of the Ministry

not as serious as might be indicated by the wording of the question put to me by the hon. member. I think it would be unwise, in my view, to anticipate the findings of these conciliation boards, where the chairman of which has been agreed upon by both sides.

DEFENCE PRODUCTION**CONTRACT FOR REPAIR AND REFIT OF H.M.C.S. "BONAVENTURE"**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Saint John-Albert (Mr. Bell) as to when an announcement would be made regarding the awarding of the contract for the refitting of the *Bonaventure*. That announcement has been made today.

A contract has been awarded to the value of \$4,913,541 to Davie Shipbuilding Ltd. at Lauzon, Que. I should point out, lest there be any misunderstanding, that there are three elements of cost in the overhaul of the *Bonaventure*. One involves a firm price contract in the amount of some \$4,900,000 for the work, for which specifications have been prepared in advance. There is another element of work on which competitive bids were submitted on a unit price basis for unknown work which will arise in the course of the inspection which is being carried out. This amount of work has been estimated to cost approximately \$855,000, and I want to make it clear that that is only an estimate.

The third element of cost relates to stores and equipment in the nature of radar, electronic gear, air conditioning equipment, evaporators, oil purifiers, mechanical stores and related items to be purchased by the Department of Defence Production on behalf of the navy, to be furnished directly to the shipyards for installation. The amount of these purchases is estimated at approximately \$2,230,000.

The sum of these individual items amounts to a total estimated cost for refitting the *Bonaventure* of something in the order of \$8 million—and not \$4,900,000 as announced as the firm price contract to Davie Shipbuilding Ltd.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Do any of these contracts have any contingency clauses such as those often contained in building contracts, as a result of

[Mr. Nicholson.]

which padding can take place often to the extent of 10 per cent? If so, to what percentage do they exist?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, these contracts do not contain contingency clauses.

HOUSE OF COMMONS**FAILURE TO LIST MEMBERS IN NEW TELEPHONE DIRECTORY**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a brief question to the Secretary of State, asking the hon. lady why it was deemed necessary or advisable to drop the names of all hon. members of this house, except those who are heads of departments or parliamentary secretaries, from the alphabetical section of the new government telephone book just issued?

Hon. Judy V. LaMarsh (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have not had occasion recently to use a telephone book; therefore I am not in a position to give my hon. friend an answer. I realize that hon. members want to have their names and numbers available for constituents, at least, and I would be happy to obtain an answer for the hon. member.

• (3:40 p.m.)

REDISTRIBUTION**CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS TO COMMISSION REPORTS**

Mr. Speaker: On January 24 last a notice of objection in the form of a motion was filed with me in the following terms, namely:

That, pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Chapter 31, Statutes of Canada 1964-65), consideration be given by this house to the matter of an objection to the provisions of the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the province of Quebec, laid before this house by Mr. Speaker on Wednesday, January 19, 1966, for the reasons hereinafter specified.

(1) Historical connotation of the present name of the constituency of Quebec East.

(2) Possible confusion with the boundaries of a provincial constituency and city limits.

[Translation]

Mr. Valade: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I should like an explanation about the procedure referred to earlier this afternoon, namely whether the specific points included in a general notice of objection can be discussed during this afternoon's debate, whether you have to hear motions from members