

had been owned by Mr. Rosenberg, and suggested that now an individual is able singly to own a trust company. As a result of the report made public by the Government today, and if the report were to result in legislation, it would allow that same individual to be the sole owner of a chartered bank of Canada. I called that into question and referred to it as the Rosenberg bank because that was the individual who had some difficulties as head of a trust company in the Province of Ontario some months back. I could have referred to the Thacker bank or given it just about any other name. However, the Hon. Member for Lethbridge-Foothills (Mr. Thacker) called out during Question Period that I was making a racist comment. The point, I suppose, was my referring to an individual, and if that is a racist comment, then I suppose we cannot refer to any individual. However, Mr. Rosenberg was chosen for that reason; it could just as easily have been, as I say, the Thacker bank of Canada or the Smith bank of Canada.

**Mr. Speaker:** We have a difficulty. That is not a question of privilege. The Member is raising a point of order with regard to the use of proper language.

**Mr. Thacker:** Mr. Speaker, I did not realize that the *Hansard* reporter would have picked it up, but to the extent the Hon. Member has explained the point he raised, and I know him personally, and he has no intention of making those types of comments, then if it is on the *Hansard* record I would withdraw it unconditionally.

**Mr. Speaker:** I take it that will deal with the matter. On a point of order, the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid).

\* \* \*

#### POINT OF ORDER

MR. McDERMID—ALLEGED PARLIAMENTARY COMMENT OF MR. WADDELL

**Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown):** Mr. Speaker, I found out that I gave you incorrectly notice of a question of privilege when it is a point of order. In the debate on Wednesday, April 3, 1985, as we were concluding the sitting for the day, the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) said, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) is deservedly acquiring a reputation for being one of the thickest and dumbest Members of the House of Commons.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. McDermid:** I know opposition Members will applaud that. Although I have been called a lot worse by a lot better, I am asking that the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway withdraw those remarks as they are unparliamentary.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown gave me notice of his intention to raise this matter which he thought in the beginning was a question of privilege. He is complaining that certain language used by the Hon. Member

for Vancouver-Kingsway was unparliamentary. The language in question was used on Wednesday, April 3, 1985, the last sitting day prior to the Easter recess. The Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown was in the House at the time. In the view of the Chair, the point of order should have been raised at the time the language complained of was used. The Chair is of the opinion that complaints of unparliamentary language or alleged unparliamentary language should not be pursued unless they are raised at the time the offending words are used. If I may take one moment to explain the reason for that, it is because it is only at the time the disorder results, which is why it is called a point of order, that the question of whether disorder has been created can be determined. I refer specifically to the point of order just raised by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis).

However, I should like to add in general terms that the Chair deplores the use of the kind of language complained of. Hon. Members should observe the normal courtesies in the course of debate. Offensive language, whether or not it is particularly unparliamentary, should always be avoided in the interests of good taste and the preservation of the dignity of our proceedings.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate that we are making progress today. I had understood that Bill C-19 might take some time. I had an indication from the NDP it was going to take a long time, so we are very pleased that we were able to deal with it this morning.

As Your Honour will know, we therefore move to consideration of Bill C-33. I wanted to advise the House that if we are able to conclude that Bill today, and I am hoping we will, we will then move to Bill C-36 relating to the Aeronautics Act.

I would also like to advise the House at this time that I would like to designate tomorrow as the second allotted day in the Supply period in this trimester, and, therefore, the business for tomorrow will be debate on a motion from the Opposition.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, even though technically the Government House Leader can designate tomorrow as the second allotted day, generally there is more notice given of this type of thing so that the opposition Parties can consult among themselves as to whose day it should be and have sufficient time to prepare the debate on the Opposition Day. I just wanted to signal to you, Sir, and to the House, my concern as to the manner in which the Government House Leader has designated tomorrow as an Opposition Day. I regret that in doing it in this way he is not showing due respect for the importance our rules have given to the concept of Opposition Days, and I hope he will do better in future. If he does not, then the next report card he gets from the press will be a lot worse than the one he got last weekend.