

*Oral Questions*

However, if I am to exercise some restraint on the length of questions which ought to be put, I equally have to exercise some restraint on the length of answers during the question period. I ask the minister to conclude his answer very briefly.

**Mr. Richardson:** I will be brief and read only one short paragraph from the letter as follows:

If Lockheed were to finance the shortfall as suggested in item (c), it is estimated that the financial impact would be approximately \$800,000. Such an arrangement would, however, be contingent upon Lockheed's ability to secure approval for additional financing with lending banks and would further be subject to approval by the Emergency Loan Guarantee Board.

I ask members of the opposition to listen to the next sentence. This is from a Lockheed vice president.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**An hon. Member:** We are listening.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the letter is important enough to be quoted at length in this House, it is equally important that it be tabled in total.

**Some hon. Members:** Right now.

**Mr. Speaker:** The minister has indicated his willingness to table the letter.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Then let's not ruin the question period.

**Mr. Clark:** The question period will be over before he finishes reading.

**Mr. Richardson:** The letter went on to say the following:  
We believe this approach . . .

That is, the approach to the banks and to the emergency loan guarantee board.

. . . has merit and after due consideration would receive a positive response.

In fairness to the Lockheed company I think I should say that this letter was related to a financing shortfall in the summer which was not of the proportions which we discussed in December. I want to underline that and make it clear. However, in fairness to my personnel and to my officials I also think that this letter is a very clear indication of the willingness of the Lockheed company to assist us with the financing.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE OF CABINET DECISION ON SIGNING

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** The minister has given no indication that he will make a statement on motions. I wonder if he could indicate to the House, in a general sense, when the cabinet will make a final decision on this contentious problem and decide either to sign the contract or not to sign it.

[Mr. Speaker.]

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence):** Surely, the hon. member has heard that the government now has an option which is good until the end of April, so that presumably before that date or on that date a decision will be reached.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Minister of National Defence, during the course of his answer to the second last question, made reference to a letter which he is prepared to table. Under the circumstances he is at liberty, I think, without the leave of the House, to table it either now or during tabling of documents. Perhaps it might be more orderly for the minister to table the document forthwith.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—AUTHORITY FOR SPENDING THE MONEY WHICH HAS BEEN SPENT

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, in light of what we have just heard, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Supply and Services. It has to do with the money which has been spent up to this point by Lockheed in the development of engineering work ups and design—to accommodate other user departments' requirements, I might add. On what authority has money been expended up to this point in time? What parliamentary authority, what governor in council authority or under what aspect of the Financial Administration Act has the \$10 million or \$12 million been spent up to this point in time?

[Translation]

**Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that we have indicated to Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Ltd. our intention to enter into a contract with them which is nothing but normal if we are to preserve the advantages I stated to this House; it is normal, for the time being that we pay Lockheed for the works done so far, and also to protect the government's interest that we place a limit to the amount to be spent from now to April 30. I believe that it is a good business deal.

[English]

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBLE RECOVERY FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS OF A SHARE OF THE COST OF THE "ORION"

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** The minister has not answered the question at all. We can only assume that there has been no authorization other than a requisition from the Department of Supply and Services for the expenditure of funds or a telephone call or some conversation, in the absence of a contract. Because of the substantial proportions of this \$59 million or probably up to \$70 million we are going to pay per aircraft, could the minister indicate whether the cabinet committee responsible sought from the other user departments their share or pro rated share of the capital cost of this equipment? I am referring to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Department of Fisheries and other govern-