

Oral Questions

are continuing. As I said on earlier occasions, until these discussions are complete I do not intend to discuss the details.

● (1420)

Mr. Leggatt: Mr. Speaker, since the time of the premature announcement of the minister on November 27 concerning the agreement in principle to make this purchase, it is my understanding that some \$20 million has been expended on the contract. Will the minister advise the House whether he has received a legal opinion from any source on the government's present legal status as a result of the November 27 announcement in order that the government can make a proper assessment of its position on the Lockheed matter, namely, to get out clean, to cut our losses and get out, or do we have to stay in because our commitment is so high we have no choice but to stay in? Will you answer regarding those three options?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, the legal aspects of the contract are the responsibility of the Minister of Supply and Services.

Mr. Alkenbrack: He's the one who bought the oil and lost \$14 million.

Mr. Richardson: As I have indicated, he and his department have done an excellent job of protecting the interests of the government. The figure of \$20 million that was mentioned is too high, but the details of the legal aspects should be left to my colleague.

* * *

SUPPLY AND SERVICES**LOCKHEED CONTRACT—EXTENT OF COMMITMENT AS A FACTOR IN DECISION TO CONTINUE NEGOTIATIONS**

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could turn to the minister's colleague, the Minister of Supply and Services, and ask him whether his department now, in terms of the negotiations he is continuing with the Lockheed Corporation, has a legal opinion from any source, whether the Department of Justice or private, about the legal commitment of the government in terms of the expenditure that Lockheed has already made? Is that a factor in the decision of the government to continue in the negotiations; that is, is the \$20 million lost now and therefore we have to stay in because we cannot stand to take that loss? Would the minister answer that?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, it is true that Lockheed Aircraft Corporation Ltd. did some work before the contract signature. It is also true that Lockheed gave us a first delay until March 31 without any change in prices and in the economic advantages for Canada. This is in fact a provision of the letter of agreement we signed yesterday at midnight, to the effect that we are going to pay Lockheed for work done between January 5 and April 30, with a view to preserving the price we negotiated last December, preserving the production schedule which is advantageous for Canada, and preserving the economic impact which is evident for

[Mr. Richardson.]

this country since we sign a \$614 million contract with Lockheed and we are going to have economic repercussions of about \$580 million in Canada.

In consideration of all these advantages, we agreed with Lockheed to pay a maximum of \$16 million in case we put an end to our negotiations between now and April 30. This being said, we do intend to sign the contract if possible, because these are the best conditions we can get for Canada to fulfill its role in NATO.

* * *

BILINGUALISM**TEACHING OF BOTH OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN ALL SCHOOLS—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

A while ago he said with regard to bilingualism that it was left to the discretion of the provinces to have the second official language taught in the schools. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe told us that handing over the teaching of both languages to the provinces was a new suggestion.

I should like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that for at least 10 years now I have been suggesting the teaching of both official languages in all Canadian schools, and I request the co-operation of the federal government in helping the provinces to do the job properly.

Now, Mr. Spicer said yesterday that teaching a second language to people of 50 or 60 was a waste of time and money. To force someone to learn a second language at 50 does not make sense, whereas by teaching it to children of five, six, seven and eight we would have a perfectly bilingual Canada, from the Pacific to the Atlantic, within five years.

If the provinces were to decide to do so, would the federal government be willing to spend as much money in helping them as it spent, for nothing, or almost, teaching both languages to the civil servants?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the hon. member has advocated for years the teaching of the second language in the schools. That is an opinion we all share. Naturally, we hope it can be done. However, the question is whether we can wait 25 years for results. That is the figure the hon. member mentioned—

An hon. Member: Five years.

Mr. Trudeau: Indeed 25 years is a little too long after 100 years of waiting—

An hon. Member: No, he did say 5 years!

Mr. Trudeau: No, the hon. member said 25 years. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Chrétien: He did say five years.

Mr. Trudeau: He did? I am sorry, then. He said five years. It seems strange to me that if the two official