

languages can be taught in elementary schools, within five years bilingual children will qualify as deputy ministers. That does not seem logical.

As for expenses, Mr. Speaker, the answer is that we already spend around \$80 million a year—

**Mr. Chrétien:** \$125 million.

**Mr. Trudeau:**—\$125 million, as the President of the Treasury Board has just mentioned, so that the provinces may teach the other official language within their jurisdictions. It is important for us and for all hon. members to ensure that those moneys are well spent. We now have a Social Credit government in British Columbia. I do hope it will heed the Socred leader and start teaching French in all the schools of that province.

GOVERNMENT INTENTION TO ACHIEVE NATIONAL UNITY BY  
TEACHING BOTH LANGUAGES

**Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

The Prime Minister can be sure that in many areas it will be easier for him to convince the Socred premier from British Columbia than Mr. Bourassa from Quebec.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the possibility of financially assisting the provinces. I did not speak of a 25-year period, I said that if our youngsters were taught French or English or both from the first school years, in less than five years our young Canadians, both French and English speaking, would use the second language with a surprising flexibility, whereas our civil servants still cannot do so. We cannot blame them, for it is much easier to learn at age five or six than at sixty.

So is the federal government ready to spend, not \$60 or \$125 million, but the millions necessary to build up national unity through bilingualism?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned \$80 or \$125 million earlier. Those sums are considerable. I do not know if the hon. member is suggesting that we should make more money available to the provinces and thereby deprive the official language program of the federal government of that money. I am prepared to consider specific proposals during the forthcoming discussions, but when the hon. member says that it will go faster in British Columbia, only the future will tell if he has succeeded in three days.

\* \* \*

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF DECISIONS  
MADE AT RECENT MEETING WITH COMPANY

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister make a statement on motions today concerning LRPA and any decisions made by Canada and, if not, would he inform the House about the decisions reached with Mr. Wilson of Lockheed last night. Other than the decision which the minister made to give himself 30 days

Oral Questions

grace on making a decision on the contract and deciding to pay our just debts, what decisions were made?

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I think that in view of the fact that I have always believed that the hon. member for Victoria was a supporter of the Canadian armed forces, I will confine my statement to reading his words, as recorded on October 24. He said this problem has plagued the department for many years, that is, too low a percentage of the defence budget being used for capital equipment. He has been an advocate of new equipment for the Canadian armed forces, and that is what we have been achieving in these negotiations.

● (1430)

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

**Mr. McKinnon:** The minister leaves me almost speechless with his attack.

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

**Mr. McKinnon:** I have been a supporter of equipment while this government has been procrastinating for eight years on this matter, and I still am,—but not at any price.

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

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF LETTER  
FROM MR. HEPPE—REASON FOR FAILURE TO CHECK  
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

**Mr. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Perhaps since the minister is unwilling to answer the question I put to him he will answer this supplementary. Yesterday the minister showed the press a letter from Mr. R. R. Heppe of Lockheed indicating that there was a financing problem which arose last summer. Would the minister table the letter from Mr. Heppe, and would he explain to the House why, given the implied warning in Mr. Heppe's letter, he did not check the financial arrangements again until late December? Why was he aware of a minor problem in midsummer and unaware of the enormous problem in November?

**Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence):** The letter in question has not been discussed in the House and therefore does not need to be tabled.

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

**An hon. Member:** Just give it to the press.

**Mr. Richardson:** The department was fully aware of the problems of financing early in the year and toward the completion of the contract. I have explained many times that we were given a very clear impression that Lockheed could assist. I think I will read from that letter, and therefore I will be obliged to table it. I think this will answer once and for all whether the Lockheed company was in fact—

**An hon. Member:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I am sure the House appreciates the willingness of the minister to table the letter.