

Oral Questions

tions in this regard were strongly supported in the Badgley report. My question is this: why has the government chosen to cut back on funding to these important organizations at a time when over 60,000 abortions were performed in Canada, and what action does the government intend to take to ensure that these vital services, which will reduce the number of abortions in Canada, will be restored at the earliest possible time?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, the hon. member's information is not accurate. Unfortunately I do not have the exact figures of the subsidy to the Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada.

For several years now, discussions with the federation following the federal-provincial conference of social security ministers have been aimed at ensuring that the provinces finance the local family planning services across Canada while limiting our role to the national secretariats of those associations.

As a consequence, the money we contribute to the local family planning services is now channelled through the provinces. If the provinces fail to do what is expected of them and do not subsidize those associations adequately, then it is up to hon. members who know what the federal role and responsibilities are to do everything possible to make sure that the money goes where it should.

* * *

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT**INQUIRY WHETHER DECISION MADE RESPECTING SALE OF NORDAIR**

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport whom I have always found to be friendly, if not too swift to act sometimes. Can the minister tell me whether he is any closer now to a decision on the Nordair question than he was some three months ago?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Yes, Madam Speaker, but there is a question of temperament here. My feeling is that one should not, in the process of attempting to solve difficulties, create others that would be worse than the ones one is trying to solve. That is my philosophy and it is in my temperament to take this approach.

Progress is being made in the Nordair issue and the problem will be solved, but before we get there, there are a number of accommodations that have to come from the potential owners, the potential executives of the merged company and also the labour unions. This is being worked on now and I hope that one of these days before too long I will be in a position to announce success.

[*Translation*]

SALE OF NORDAIR—GUARANTEES OFFERED RESPECTING INTERESTS OF QUEBEC

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Transport. During our short stay in power, several of his Liberal colleagues made representations to me to ensure that the sale of Nordair would at least lead to a majority of shares for Quebec. I suppose that the minister has received similar representations from his colleagues. Can he tell the House today what type of guarantee he can give that a majority of these shares would be reserved for Quebec?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I can assure my friend from Joliette that I have received the same representations, probably in the same form as the ones he got used to. The question he raises is part of the problem, and that is what we are trying hard to settle at the moment.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CONSTITUTION**REPORTED STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER RESPECTING PARLIAMENTARY AND PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEMS OF GOVERNMENT**

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley-Hants): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Yesterday there was quite a discussion in the House about the art of communication, and I should like the right hon. gentleman to communicate to the House, and thus to the country, if the presidential style of government is still his personal preference over the parliamentary form of government we have at present? This is what he told students at the university of Montreal in a most frank and relaxed question and answer period three days after he resigned when he said:—but if I'd said it before resigning people would say, "Oh, now he wants to be President Trudeau,"—

Then he said:

There's no question of that any more.

• (1150)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Madam Speaker, I can confirm that there is no question of that now.

Mr. Nowlan: I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. I will just read from the articles which appeared in several papers on November 24, the day after this very frank discussion the present Prime Minister had. He told the students:

—that a presidential system of government like that of France might be best for Canada.

"I can say that now, but if I'd said it before resigning people would say, Oh, now he wants to be President Trudeau!"—

"There's no question of that any more."

My supplementary question is in a serious vein. We are debating a resolution which gives to a constitution the very heart and soul of the country. In the last election campaign there was no mandate from the Canadian people because the Prime Minister, the then leader of the opposition, was most silent on constitutions or patriation in 1980. This is the people's constitution, not the constitution of the Prime Minister or the premiers.

Since it could fundamentally change the form of government, would the Prime Minister be prepared depending on the form of the resolution finally reported out of the House, to use the referendum procedure in the bill as a dry run to the Canadian people before he goes to London?

Mr. Trudeau: Madam Speaker, I find it somewhat paradoxical that the hon. member and his party seem to be against the referendum procedure in the proposed section 42 which, after all, is a deadlock breaking mechanism on the one hand—

Mr. Clark: No, it is not.

Mr. Trudeau: —and on the other hand—

Mr. Nielsen: It is a hammerlock mechanism.

Mr. Trudeau: —they are now advocating, or this member in particular is advocating, a referendum which obviously is something that—

Mr. Crosbie: Thank you, Mr. President.

An hon. Member: He was not advocating that. He was asking you.

Mr. Trudeau: No, he was advocating that. My answer is that I wish they would get their act together, as usual.

* * *

ENERGY

NATURAL GAS—REPORTED STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF NORCEN ENERGY RESOURCES RESPECTING EXPORTS TO JAPAN

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and I will ask it in Scottish. Yesterday, Mr. Edmund Bovey, the chairman of Norcen Energy Resources, stated that the federal government had authorized him, as energy representative on the Canada-Japan committee, to raise the possibility of liquefied natural gas exports to Japan.

Why is this government, after selling out our natural gas to the United States through the pre-build of the Alaska pipeline, now about to embark upon a policy of further sellouts, that is, of natural gas to Japan? Can the minister confirm or deny the statement made by Mr. Bovey?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, it appears that Scottish is a much easier language to understand than I thought. For a

Oral Questions

moment I thought I would have to refer the question to the Minister of Finance, but I think I can handle this one.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lalonde: As far as the specific question raised by the hon. member is concerned, gas liquefaction is just one other process of handling gas. The question of additional gas exports is purely an academic one at the present time. If there was any project dealing with further gas exports, it would have to be submitted to the National Energy Board in the normal way. However, I would suggest to the hon. member that if we have an opportunity to export more gas, since our reserves are indeed expanding at a very great rate and there is a surplus of natural gas in Canada, I would think Canada should be ready to consider whether it is not more advantageous to our country to have more customers for our gas rather than being dependent on a single customer; and second, whether it would not be good for Canada, and British Columbia in particular, to have further processing of its gas before expediting it abroad.

It seems to me this is a very fair and reasonable question to be raised. If we are to assume that there may be further exports, I think we should examine whether there should not be further processing and more customers for Canada, rather than the single one on which we are dependent, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Waddell: Madam Speaker, it is important that the minister makes the policy very clear because foreign countries are now seeing us as an easy mark for exports.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Waddell: No pun intended. This summer *The Wall Street Journal* reported that Japanese interests had lent Dome Petroleum \$400 million for investment in Beaufort Sea oil and gas exploration in Canada's Arctic. In return they will get 25 per cent of the share of oil and gas production.

Did the minister make it very clear to Dome, which is a company that really survives on Canadian tax breaks—it was built up that way—and did he make it clear to the Japanese that in fact there is no oil for export up there, and that if it is found, that oil will not be exported? Will the minister stand up in the House and make it quite clear that he will not sell out our oil when it is found in the Beaufort Sea and is ready to go to market?

Mr. Lalonde: Madam Speaker, indeed I had the opportunity of meeting several times with spokesmen for Dome Petroleum and also with ministers and senior officials from Japan. In all instances I indicated quite clearly that I could not foresee the day when Canada would have such a surplus of oil that we could export it abroad. This was made quite clear to all the parties concerned, and that is the policy of this government at the present time.

The rule that would have to be applied is that if in decades to come we were to find reserves of the Saudi Arabia style or type, then obviously it is a question Canada would have to