

approach to language training that was effective and which was, secondly, available to all children who wanted it. That would obviously reinforce what we are trying to do here in the government of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. One of the things the minister said which I think has gained general acceptance on all sides of the House, as we can see from this demonstration today, has to do with the federal commitment. One of the criticisms to the minister by the commissioner of official languages is that the commitment thus far seems to be rather short term. Would the minister indicate to the House whether he would consider studying very carefully, and if possible adopting, the provision suggested by Mr. Spicer, that the commitment of the federal government be an eight or ten year commitment, something in the long term rather than the presently existing short-term commitment even in the national capital area?

● (1430)

Mr. Faulkner: Mr. Speaker, I am rather puzzled by the question because it was only last year that, on behalf of the government of Canada, I renewed the language arrangements with the provinces. In discussions I had with them there was no complaint registered about the 5-year formula. They generally agreed that was a reasonable time span. They also agreed that the situation was changing and five years would probably be enough, because beyond five years the needs would be quite different.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

INQUIRY WHETHER SALES AGENTS' COMMISSION PAID ON EQUIPMENT PURCHASED FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. Peter Stollery (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on Friday the Pentagon told a Senate subcommittee that United States manufacturers of military equipment paid more than \$200 million to sales agents in foreign countries over the last two and a half years, and in view of the fact the *New York Times* included in its reports on those sales references to military equipment sold to Canada, can the Minister of National Defence assure the House that none of those sales agents' commissions were paid to agents dealing with the Canadian government?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the Department of National Defence is not in itself directly involved in the sale or purchase of equipment. This is handled through the Department of Supply and Services.

An hon. Member: Speak up Goyer.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Oral Questions

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SALE OF CANDU REACTOR TO SOUTH KOREA—SUGGESTED RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION IN VIEW OF THREATENED OUTBREAK OF WAR

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister regarding press reports that the government of South Korea has placed its forces on a special alert, an order which a government spokesman states "is issued when there are signs that a war might break out". In addition, President Park is quoted as seeing a "heightened" possibility of another war with North Korea. In view of this critically dangerous situation I should like to ask whether the government will reconsider its decision to sell a nuclear reactor to South Korea?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would have to refer to the quotation the hon. member has alluded to, but it would seem rather preposterous to me, I might say, in light of the circumstances. As to his precise question, I must remind the hon. gentleman that South Korea already has two reactors from the United States. I do not know if they are safeguarded as Canada safeguards ours, or if those safeguards are as high as Canada's safeguards, but in our case the position is the one I stated to the hon. member last week.

PROPOSED SALE OF PLUTONIUM SEPARATION PLANT BY FRANCE TO SOUTH KOREA—SUGGESTED DELAY IN SALE OF REACTOR PENDING VERIFICATION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is now almost 10 days since fairly authentic reports indicated that the government of South Korea was negotiating with France for the purchase of a plutonium separation plant which could be used solely for the purpose of making nuclear bombs. I would ask the Prime Minister whether the government has made inquiries to ascertain whether these reports are accurate and, if it has not made such inquiries, is it prepared to hold up such a sale until the government has satisfied itself that such plutonium separation plants are not going to be used in conjunction with the Canadian nuclear reactor?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under our type of safeguards we intend to safeguard the material and the technology through the entire life cycle of the supplied fissionable material. Therefore, there is no possibility that the Canadian material would serve in the way the hon. member apprehends.

An hon. Member: Like in India.

Mr. Trudeau: Unless, of course, other countries want to help Korea break its own undertakings, and the hon. member has sensed here the difficulty of the situation. It is not sufficient for Canada to have the highest safeguards in the world, it is also important that we get other countries with nuclear knowledge to adopt the same type of safeguards. Otherwise I agree with what the hon. member suggests, that there is a danger to world stability. That is what we are working at, and that has been the subject of my talks with other countries with nuclear capability, to