

off. I looked at the figures this morning. The Liberals sold more than 1,700 million barrels of Canadian oil in the early 1970s.

When Tommy Douglas, our energy critic at the time, pointed out that it was a mistake, he was laughed at by the Liberals. They said, "They are the gloom and doom boys". Well, Tommy Douglas happened to know what he was talking about.

Mr. Kempling: Good old Husky.

Mr. Broadbent: The Liberals sold our oil in the early 1970s and, as a result, we are now importing oil. What they did with oil in the seventies they are about to do with gas in the eighties. That is exactly what they are doing. The Liberals are the masters of the short-run, quick-buck solution, which always ignores the long-range interests of the people of Canada. Just to turn around a phrase used by the colourful, if incompetent, former minister of finance, the Liberals really do believe in short-term gain for long-term pain for the people of Canada. That is what this sell-out amounts to.

I want to conclude by saying that if there is one party which can accurately be described as a collection of phony nationalists, it is the Liberal Party of Canada. They suddenly discovered in the latter days of the last election campaign that Canadians were concerned about resources, wanted an industrial strategy, and wanted a Canada that in the long run we owned and controlled. We got the nationalist rhetoric. That is the nationalism of the Liberal party in essence, nothing more than rhetoric. The time has come, and the people want this above all in the energy field, to replace rhetoric with substance. The people of Canada want something entirely different from what they get from that cynical crowd across the chamber. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper):

That the motion be amended by deleting the words "on the day that this order is adopted", and by substituting therefor the following words:

"after it has voted on a government motion providing that the building of the pre-build portion of the northern gas pipeline will not commence until complete financial guarantees for the whole pipeline have been obtained and that an agreement has been reached between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States that the Canadian gas exported through the southern portion of the proposed pipeline will be replaced by Alaska gas at an equivalent price".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair would like to reserve judgment on the amendment. It certainly has some substantive aspects to it. If, however, there is a disposition on the part of the House to accept such an amendment unanimously, that might be considered. Is there any indication that there is unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is unanimous consent of the House to accept the amendment as proposed for debate.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I had presumed that the reservations which the Chair had put were reservations as to the propriety of the amendment under the

Summer Recess

Standing Orders. The Chair has nodded yes. It is in agreement. I presume the Chair, with those reservations, will have to take its own counsel. I further suppose that every member of this House is in exactly the same position. We will be looking at the amendment from that point of view.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair would invite further comment. Does the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) care to comment on the propriety of the amendment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, we have absolutely no objection to this amendment being moved by the hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party. We do not support it, but we have nothing against the amendment being accepted for debate in the coming speeches.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the motion be accepted for debate?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is unanimous consent. In that case—

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I do not know whether that question really arises because, as I understand the practice, it has always been that if the Chair had some reservations about a motion, which reservations it has now indicated it has, debate could continue while the Chair considered those reservations. If that is the normal practice, and I believe it is, we have no objection to that practice being followed. However, when the Chair expressed reservations about the substance of the motion, I was reserving the right of the House to do what the Chair is doing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will reserve judgment on the motion, and debate will continue.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): That's better.

Mr. Waddell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this matter, I would simply ask that you consider this, Mr. Speaker. I distinctly heard the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the House the other day propose or agree with a motion in this line. I would ask the Chair to note that, and to note there is no one in the House objecting to the motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, last Friday the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) suggested that the New Democratic Party propose an amendment along the lines of this one, provided the debate be terminated last Friday, but that was not the case. However, I am certain that the Prime Minister will not object to such an amendment being moved. We object to the merits of the amendment but not to its acceptability, if it meets with the approval of the Chair.