

*Oral Questions*

we will be arguing for and what we will be making representations for at Geneva, on behalf of the sugar producers in Canada.

**Mr. Murta:** Mr. Speaker, the minister's answer is entirely too vague. He is too secretive. The United States plan for an international sugar agreement sets a minimum price of ten cents a pound and a maximum price of 20 cents a pound. This information is readily available in a good many United States agricultural publications. Will the minister outline the Canadian position vis-à-vis a minimum and maximum price? If the Americans can make their prices public, surely Canada can do the same. The minister should not be so defensive and secretive.

**Mr. Whelan:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Americans have not made all of their program with regard to a sugar policy public. I imagine when they negotiate they keep some of it to themselves before they go into negotiations. As I said, I will check with my colleagues in government to see whether I have the right to make my position public and will do so at the first of the week if I am permitted to do that.

\* \* \*

**ENERGY****MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—POSSIBILITY OF REQUEST BY ARCTIC GAS FOR GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE TO RAISE CAPITAL**

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It concerns the Mackenzie Valley pipeline. The Arctic Gas consortium has indicated several times in evidence before the National Energy Board that it would require government guarantees in order to raise the capital required for the Mackenzie Valley. On December 13 at the National Energy Board, the chairman and president of Arctic Gas told the board that as soon as the preliminary decision, which was the Judge Litt decision, was released from the Federal Power Commission in Washington that they would contact the United States and Canadian governments and negotiate vigorously on the question of guarantees, and that they hoped to be in a position to report back to the National Energy Board with details of those negotiations by the end of the hearings. It has been three months since the preliminary decision was released. Since the National Energy Board hearings will probably end next week, will the minister tell the House whether his department or any other to his knowledge has received formal or informal representations from Arctic Gas on this question and, if so, what is the state of those negotiations that are taking place on government guarantees?

**Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I indicated in the House on other occasions that there have been indications that the particular CAGPL application might require government guarantees. Those indications have been given to us by the officers of the corporation. To the best of my knowledge, there has not been

[Mr. Whelan.]

any formal request by the CAGPL consortium for government guarantees. As to the state of any negotiations between them and the National Energy Board, I am not in a position to provide any information at this time. However, I will be pleased to try to find out.

**MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—ALLEGED PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT BY ARCTIC GAS AND PREPARATION OF LEGISLATION BY GOVERNMENT**

**Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster):** Mr. Speaker, in the last two weeks Arctic Gas has confirmed that it has started giving firm orders for major pieces of equipment, for example such things as steel and an Arctic ditcher. At the same time, there are indications that the government is preparing legislation with regard to the pipeline and to a pipeline authority. Can the minister indicate whether anyone is in the process of preparing legislation with regard to the Mackenzie Valley. Also, can he advise whether the consortium is now in the process of purchasing equipment for the Mackenzie Valley?

**Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** On the last point with respect to purchasing equipment, I have no knowledge of any plans or any contracts issued by the Mackenzie Valley CAGPL consortium. As to the second question whether anyone is doing any work on the preparation of legislation with respect to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline authority, it is fair to say that there may well be people who are trying to assess what kind of legislation might be necessary in the event that the government takes a decision in favour of either the Mackenzie Valley pipeline authority or the Alcan route. I am sure the hon. member understands that in the event a decision were made to go either route, there would likely be a number of matters upon which this parliament would have to legislate. In that sense, there may be some contingency work being done at the present time. Quite frankly, I have asked that it be done because I think it important that we do not become faced with a situation where a heck of a lot of work has to be done in a very short space of time. On a contingency basis, I would expect that work to go forward.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**HEALTH****MINISTER'S POSITION ON ABORTION**

**Mr. Armand Caouette (Villeneuve):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Members of the Pro-Life movement now being in the national capital to assert their arguments in favour of greater respect for life, I would like to know if the minister expects to make any statement during the week in support of respect for life to show Canadians that his government is prepared to act to safeguard human life, particularly unborn children who have a special need for legal protection?