

minister's department and other departments of about \$14 million.

In view of that fact, how can the minister justify our suing a friendly nation such as Great Britain, or a company associated with Great Britain—without any apparent negotiation—while not suing Russia for a multimillion dollar bill which is only half the real cost? Can the minister explain to the House why his government is so intimidated by the Russians and so anxious to appear friendly that they are prepared to write off millions of dollars without using the same tactics that they use on their supposed friends and allies?

Mr. Pepin: Madam Speaker, I thought I mentioned everything on the subject of the ship which is my responsibility. I even have the names of the lawyers who will be acting for us on the matter. However, with regard to the Cosmos and our relationship with the Soviet Union, I will have to bring that matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice.

* * *

NORTHERN PIPELINES

ALASKA GAS PIPELINE—FINANCIAL GUARANTEES BEFORE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister and it is with regard to the northern pipeline. I am sure he is aware that the section Caroline south to the American border is, in fact, the cheapest section of the line. In meetings which I had recently with Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska, he indicated that the Americans are actively considering moving their gas from Alaska down to the continental United States by tanker, which brings me to the real point. Would the Prime Minister tell the House what sort of guarantees, or what does he expect to be in place for the Americans to construct their connecting line if we are, in fact, going ahead with the construction of the Caroline south section?

● (1450)

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, our most recent meeting with Senator Ted Stevens was to the effect that he was in full and complete support of the Alaska gas pipeline route. He was one of the leaders of the Republican minority who pushed the resolution through the Senate, and he voted for it, expressing total and unanimous support of the American Senate for the construction of the Alaska gas pipeline before 1985.

Mr. Fulton: My supplementary is to the Prime Minister. I appreciate what the Minister of Energy has told us; however, it is a sort of conflicting view. They are looking at tankers to move it, and yet they are supporting the line. Obviously, there is a contradiction there without some kind of guarantee. What are we to expect, the tankers or the line?

My question to the Prime Minister goes back to the Northern Pipeline Act, schedule 1(2), under the subtitle Expeditious

Oral Questions

Construction Timetable. The agreement between the two governments was that the Alaska section would start one year prior to the Canadian section. I wonder why the Prime Minister and the government are moving so quickly to change that, so that the pre-build section will come first, in light of the tanker section, instead of what was agreed between the two governments—that the Alaskan section would come first, guaranteeing it to Canada.

An hon. Member: That was amended.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, one of the reasons we would be moving, if that is the decision we take, is because it would mean a lot of jobs for Canadian workers and a lot of revenue for Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: That is one argument that I must say is very strong, at least from the point of view of our party. When you get telegrams from steelworkers all across the country saying that they favour the pre-build, it is obviously something we must put in the balance.

In so far as what the act says, I repeat my earlier answer: section 20(4) indicates that condition 12 can be amended: in fact, it has been amended by the National Energy Board. That section, as amended, says that we have to have the assurance that the pre-build will be financed and we have to have the assurance that the whole thing can be financed.

An hon. Member: Will be built?

Mr. Trudeau: I am sorry; the hon. member has not read the section as amended.

An hon. Member: You cannot change the whole.

Mr. Trudeau: As amended, condition 12 requires that the minister and the board be satisfied, first, that financing for the pre-build has been obtained; and, second, that financing for the remainder of the pipeline can be obtained.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: That is what the amended section says.

An hon. Member: By the National Energy Board?

An hon. Member: Have you approved of that?

Mr. Trudeau: That is what we are in the process of looking at, Madam Speaker. The opinion of hundreds of thousands of workers across Canada has some weight with us, if not for the New Democratic Party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Madam Speaker: The hon. member for Northumberland.