

I invite my hon. friend to look at the facts and see that programs are being implemented at the present time to come to the rescue of those unemployed in the country, and I invite him to show real concern and attention to the problems of these people by beginning to get Parliament working to pass the legislation that these people need.

\* \* \*

### TRADE

#### PURCHASE OF F-18 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT—MANUFACTURE OF COMPONENTS IN CANADA

**Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. When Canada ordered its \$5 billion fleet of F-18 fighter aircraft, we were to get approximately \$3 billion in industrial offsets. This was to create 24,000 aerospace jobs based on the United States production run of 1,366 planes. Is it not true, if the U.S. production total is lowered, that the contractors' obligation to buy F-18 components and assemblies in Canada, and their over-all industrial benefits obligations, will be proportionately lowered? Would the Minister comment on the present status of that proposed \$3 billion offset package and if the expected creation of 24,000 jobs is assured?

**Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Madam Speaker, I believe my colleagues, the Minister of Supply and Services and the Minister of National Defence, indicated in a press conference several weeks ago that, with respect to industrial offset benefits as a result of the purchase of the F-18 aircraft, we already were ahead of our initial forecast and it is fully expected that we will meet the guidelines that we set down for ourselves before we purchased the aircraft.

#### POSSIBLE REDUCTION IN SIZE OF PURCHASE BY UNITED STATES NAVY

**Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same Minister, or for the Minister of National Defence. In a press interview last week, the U.S. Chief of Naval Operations said that the American production target was now unrealistic and that the number would likely be reduced to a total of 700. What impact will this reduction have on the Canadian industrial offset package and on the \$5 billion contract that we offered the United States on a controversial airplane? Why did the Government agree to accept an offset package based on a specific production total, and why did the Government not negotiate for a firm and fixed amount? How many jobs will be lost now?

**Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion):** Madam Speaker, I am not aware of the alleged statement of the officer of the U.S. Naval Operations cited by the Hon. Member. I will check that statement and get back to him.

### Oral Questions

### IMMIGRATION

#### GOVERNMENT POSITION ON AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

**Mr. D. M. Collenette (York East):** Madam Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Last week my colleague from Sarnia-Lambton asked the Minister whether or not he would accept the recommendation made by the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council for a limited amnesty with respect to illegal immigrants resident in Canada. In view of the concern which this recommendation has generated in the country, especially in Metropolitan Toronto, can he assure the House that the Government will not accept this recommendation?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, let me first indicate that, in response to that particular report, I have appointed a special adviser who will undertake consultation with a number of groups since the report contained a number of recommendations concerning enforcement actions, and others related to the control of illegal immigration. I would underline that at the present time the Government has no plans for amnesty. It was simply a recommendation from the Advisory Council. We would not take any kind of action until the special adviser reports back to me in April.

\* \* \*

### GARRISON DIVERSION

#### RESTORATION OF UNITED STATES FUNDING—REQUEST THAT MINISTER TAKE ACTION

**Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Since the bi-level government delegation to Washington, headed by the Minister of Employment and Immigration and the Manitoba NDP Minister of Natural Resources, to oppose continued development of the Garrison Diversion Project has obviously failed, due to the fact that the U.S. Senate has just reinstated \$4 million of interim funding to proceed with the project, will the Minister tell the House what he will do about this failure, and what his immediate plans are to try to get the message across to the U.S. Senate?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, as the Hon. Member has mentioned, it is true that the funds which have been removed in Congress have now been restored by a joint meeting of the Senate and the House. But I think the Hon. Member can draw some comfort from the fact that there is an explicit assurance in the provision of those funds that none of the money will be used in a way that will affect the flow of waters into Canada, affect Manitoba waters or the Manitoba fisheries. That seems to me to be the important objective that has been sought by the Minister of Employment and Immigration and by his counterpart in Manitoba. That has been the aim of the Government of Canada for many years