

*Adjournment Motion*

**Mr. Allmand:** And the territories. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to deal with some of the objections which have been raised by hon. member with respect to parts of the peace and security program, in particular the provisions respecting dangerous offenders. However, I do not wish to take advantage of the courtesy the House has shown, so I shall end my remarks at this point. I simply wish to confirm that the Minister of Justice and myself are already preparing amendments which have been suggested to us during the course of this debate. We have already agreed to incorporate certain amendments which appear to us to be reasonable, and we shall be pleased to hear further representations in the committee. We expect representatives of all the national associations involved in hunting, shooting, antique collecting, and so on, to appear before the committee, and I am sure that with the co-operation of all honourable members we can bring in legislation which will better protect the Canadian public and bring them the peace and security they deserve.

**Mr. Wally Firth (Northwest Territories):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on Bill C-83 which I see as yet another piece of legislation which is taking away certain rights from native people across Canada and will be causing hardship to hunters, trappers and prospectors in the Northwest Territories.

I notice that the time available this afternoon for debating this subject is running out, so may I call it five o'clock and resume this evening?

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It being five o'clock, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Social Security; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—Air Transport; the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert)—Floods.

The House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions. It is my understanding that there is agreement to proceed with motion No. 97, in the name of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon).

**Mr. Paproski:** Agreed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Does the House agree to stand all the other motions which appear on the Order Paper ahead of motion No. 97?

**Mr. Paproski:** That is also agreed, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[English]

### CONTRACT BETWEEN LOCKHEED CORPORATION AND GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria)** moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the proposed contract between Lockheed Corporation of Burbank, California, and the Government of Canada for the purchase by Canada of eighteen long-range patrol aircraft, including the agreed formula as outlined at page 11617 of *Hansard* dated March 9, 1976.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise with a certain amount of hesitation, bearing in mind that the speech of the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth) on the peace and security legislation had to be interrupted.

● (1700)

I suppose the story of the LRPA should be divided into three eras, and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson) has always been talking of new eras of defence financing. The story of Lockheed could almost be prehistoric, historic and modern. Perhaps you will forgive me if I start in with the historic period of the Lockheed program. The Lockheed story first came to the knowledge of the House of Commons on March 17, 1969 in reply to a question by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall). The then minister of national defence, Mr. Cadieux, said they were going to replace the Argus. That is something over seven years ago.

The next five years in the history was a study of the problem. They looked at three or four aircraft companies, narrowed it down to three, and then dropped the British product, the Nimrod, two years ago. The government then announced, with a great deal of fanfare, that they were down to two companies, Boeing and Lockheed, and were then entering the final definition phase. There was to be a bill of \$11 million for that final definition stage, to be split approximately 50-50 between the two companies. The two companies duly completed the final definition phase. The culmination date of that was August 1 of last year, at which time a contract was supposed to be signed. Then we started into the modern era of delay.

I would ask you to note that in the humble address I particularly ask that they not only provide the contract but include the agreed formula as outlined on page 11617 of *Hansard*. The part of *Hansard* on that page I want to draw to the attention of the House and the minister is where the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) said:

As for the terms of payment of this eventual contract with Lockheed, we are not required to make a downpayment. According to the agreed formula, we pay as the production goes on.

It would be very interesting for the House to be informed whether the Minister of Supply and Services had seen this agreed formula, because we find that the Minister of National Defence said at page 11402 of *Hansard* for March 2, when speaking about the government:

At the time it agreed to purchase the Lockheed, the government made agreements for full payment when the aircraft were delivered—