

expressed by this House a few weeks ago when a member of the Liberal caucus moved a motion in this House, which was unanimously supported, indicating the concern of the Canadian government and people regarding events in Poland. I think any further comment must be made while keeping in mind the single most important enjoiner which we are getting from Polish leaders of various sorts, that as this time the West would be wise to show restraint in its political and military posturing.

\* \* \*

### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

#### INQUIRY RESPECTING FUTURE FUNDING OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

**Mr. Gordon Gilchrist (Scarborough East):** Madam Speaker, I should have liked to address my question to the Minister of State for Science and Technology but in his absence I will address it to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. It is a serious question involving, not patchwork payments today for the unemployed and for people below the normal income standards, but rather a long-range approach to job creation through science and technology research spending.

The National Research Council has made a clear point of having every dollar spent on research into true job creation being returned 20 times. I wonder if the Prime Minister would tell us what plans he and his ministers have after almost a year in office for research spending of a specific nature into such things as rail transportation and the other things at which we are good, which will result in true job creation for young Canadians on whose behalf I ask this question.

● (1440)

**Mr. Roger Simmons (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, the government has already made known its intention to encourage the increase in spending on research and development to 1.5 per cent of the GNP by the mid-1980s. I am pleased to report to the House that it is the intention of the Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment to indicate early in the new year a more comprehensive framework policy which will guide our actions in that particular direction.

#### SUGGESTED CHANGE IN RESPONSIBILITIES OF MINISTER

**Mr. Gordon Gilchrist (Scarborough East):** Madam Speaker, I guess we are reassured by that, but the future seems to be put off from week to week and from month to month, and we will be waiting anxiously to hear the specifics of this policy early in the new year.

Would the Prime Minister recognize that after only four months the last government realized the need to separate the two hats of the minister so as to give full attention to research and development, the most important matter to which we can address our minds in the country today? Would the Prime

### Oral Questions

Minister consider changing the responsibilities of this minister, to give him full-time responsibilities rather than diluting his efforts in other areas like the environment, which is important, but also in some lesser roles, such as running to Her Majesty with rather less important things like constitutional matters?

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

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I will consider the representations of the hon. member, but I hardly think that the success of the previous government is an encouragement for me to organize my ministers in the way they did.

\* \* \*

### SUPPLY AND SERVICES

#### F-18A FIGHTER AIRCRAFT—TOTAL COST OF PROGRAM TO CANADA—COMMITMENTS RESPECTING OFFSET PROGRAM

**Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Supply and Services. Last Friday in the House I tried to learn from the government how recent events had affected the cost of Canada's fighter procurement program. Two days ago the minister told the House that he had no intention of renegotiating the contract with McDonnell Douglas. In light of this, could the minister confirm that, using per aircraft costs supplied by the United States navy, the total cost of the Canadian program now exceeds \$5 billion? Further, will the minister confirm, if the United States purchase of F-18s is reduced to 1,044, which is very likely, that the Canadian program costs will then exceed \$6 billion?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of Supply and Services):** Madam Speaker, I should like to indicate to the hon. member that his figures are completely askew; they are completely inaccurate. In effect, the number of aircraft which will be purchased by the Americans in the 1981 fiscal year has been increased from 48 to 60 aircraft, and every indication is that the aircraft which will be ordered by the American navy for the 1982 fiscal year will be superior to that initially envisaged. There is no difficulty in the American McDonnell Douglas company meeting its obligations under the contract. I point out to the hon. member as well that a ceiling is contained within the signed contract, and that ceiling will be met.

**Mr. Sargeant:** Madam Speaker, I wish I shared the minister's optimism. Last week I also tried unsuccessfully to determine whether McDonnell Douglas was living up to its obligations as set out in article 34 of the contract between Canada and that company. In the last couple of months, over 500 workers have been laid off at McDonnell Douglas in Toronto because there is no demand for DC-10s and DC-9s. Could the minister tell the House if McDonnell Douglas is living up to its commitment of \$83 million worth of work on these aircraft in 1980 and a similar amount of benefits in 1981? Further, could he tell us in what other areas McDonnell Douglas might be falling short of its offset promises?