

is here to try to divide one part of Canada from the other. It is here to try to divide the producing parts of the country from those in need of energy. It was designed as a pre-election issue. That was the claim of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce when he spoke in 1973 before the 1974 election. Today we have simply a repeat of style, not a repeat of need. The government knew that for seven years OPEC nations were made up of unstable governments. It has known for a long time that there was a need for increasing the supply of resources to the far side of Canada.

In conclusion, let me say that today the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources tried to leave the illusion that somehow my party filibustered this particular bill. In truth government members spoke virtually as much, in terms of combined opposition or other parties, as our party did. The Liberal party used as much as 75 per cent of the combined speaking time used by the other parties in the House. Is ten minutes of a Liberal member's time any longer or shorter than ten minutes of a Conservative member's time? Time is an absolute factor which does not change. The only difference between Liberal speeches and ours is that theirs makes one numb on both ends.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should like to deal with the question of privilege I mentioned. The hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) made a statement a few moments ago that I lied in giving a quotation. I ask him to withdraw that statement for the goodness of some parliamentary conduct. I hope the hon. member at least has the decency to recognize that, when we speak in the House, we do not need people on the other side acting like chickadees in fermented chokecherries. I hope the hon. member comes forward with a complete and absolute withdrawal.

[Translation]

Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, I have here the *Harrap's* English-French dictionary. At the English word "lie", we find "mensonge" in French. When I said "lie" in English, I wanted to say to the hon. member that he was telling a white lie, that what he said was without any malice. You said that it was a minister who made a certain statement in 1974. At that time, he was not a minister, but a member of the Progressive Conservative opposition. I am not therefore accusing the hon. member of being a liar; I am simply saying that he made a white lie or that he misinterpreted the facts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not believe that the explanation given by the hon. member is acceptable according to the rules of the House, whatever interpretation he wants to give to the word "lie" or "mensonge" or "liar". These words are not parliamentary and should be withdrawn.

[English]

I agree completely with the request of the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone). The words "lie" and "liar" are unparliamentary and should not be used. If the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) wishes to withdraw, it would be

appreciated. Even his explanation is not acceptable in the manner he has made it.

[Translation]

I think that the hon. member should recognize—order, please. I think that the hon. member for Mercier is able to speak for himself and does not need the help of all his colleagues. I am trying to be serious. Certain members may find this funny, but I believe that the procedure of the House and the decorum that must be maintained in this institution apply to both sides, whether the member involved is a friend or simply another parliamentarian. The hon. member for Mercier.

[English]

Mr. Boulanger: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As a typical and honest parliamentarian and as a typical Canadian, proudly and with great pleasure I take the word "lie" off the record. As a true Canadian and a true parliamentarian, I apologize as well.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, the exchange between the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) and the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Malone) ended quite properly as Your Honour requested, although it reminded me of the classic story of the hon. member who asked Mr. Speaker if it would be all right if he called an hon. member across the way an s.o.b. Mr. Speaker assured the hon. member that he would be out of order. So the hon. member said, "I won't say that then. I just hope when the hon. member gets home tonight his mother comes out from under the porch and bites him!"

The New Democratic Party supports this legislation as inadequate as it is. I want to assure you and the House of that. However, the more I listen to the minister the more I worry about whether he is going to support it.

● (2110)

If you have ever seen a reluctant dragon, surely it is the minister and this government. They feel very sensitive about being called socialists, or of being accused of instituting socialist measures, particularly when all they have really done, sir, is implement a measure they were trying to implement back in 1973 and 1974, and which they did implement in a minority parliament. However, they had to do it most reluctantly. I suspect that the majority of the Liberal caucus have had to be dragged kicking and screaming in on this one. They are sensitive about Conservatives accusing them of being socialists. If that makes them socialists, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it makes us. If that is socialism it is a disgrace to real socialism, that is, democratic socialism.

The minister has gone through a lot of exercises on this legislation, and I have come to the conclusion that the hurrier he goes the behinder he gets. He accused the Conservatives of conducting a filibuster, and then he took an hour to make his third reading speech. We thought he had made his points on