

recognized—the incestuous relationship that exists between Liberals, Tories, and the corporate sector of this country.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave):** Order. The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin) is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Corbin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has the floor used a word in the English language that has not been interpreted and I should like to know its meaning. I wonder whether the interpretation service could give it to us. I think the word used was “flunkey”.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave):** The hon. member asks for an opinion or a direction from the Chair. I have had the opportunity to consult and it seems to me that the word “flunkey”, though it has some definite connotations, is not a term ordinarily considered to be unparliamentary.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Mr. Speaker, I will use a term that hon. members may better understand. The parliamentary term would probably be “bumbo” instead of “flunkey”. This bill is excellent when it comes to showing—

**Mr. Raines:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave):** The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Raines) is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Raines:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would wish to withdraw his expression “bumbo”. However, if he wishes to stay with it I suggest he is stuck with it. I do not think it is a matter of great importance, but on another point of order I would suggest that hon. members should not become too preoccupied with the sex life of parliamentarians since we have had reference to the word “incestuous”, and a few other connotations, which may be of interest to some people outside the Chamber though I think we have other business to do. Since we have had reference specifically to the expression “bumbo”, perhaps we could get a definition. Otherwise we might waste a great deal of time, and so I will await Your Honour's ruling on that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McCleave):** Whatever happens I will not count the time taken against the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez). The attention of the Chair has been directed to the “Concise Oxford Dictionary” which is upon the Table of this Chamber. I cannot see the word “bumbo” but I do see the word “bumbo”, which is a cold rum punch. That seems to be a very commendable suggestion.

I think the hon. member has a certain knack with words. Frankly, the Chair had more difficulty with his use of the word “incestuous” than the word “flunkey” or the word “bumbo”. When the debate becomes a little warm in here we do try to respond in kind. I do not think it holds up operations in a way that the Chair should intervene. Therefore I recognize the hon. member for Nickel Belt, and the time taken will not be held against him.

*Continental Bank of Canada*

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Thank you for your kindness, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that when it comes to showing that Canada's financial and political systems are one and the same thing, no course in any school or business administration could be more effective in showing that relationship than simply coming to this place and observing the progress of Bill S-30 through the House and the other place. Every time one looks at this bill or at the companies behind it one cannot help but stumble over the names of Canada's big business, the guys who clearly run both our country and our finances, and that includes this House and the other place. As the profitability of IAC goes up, there are a lot of people who stand to benefit greatly. I am not talking about the little shareholders benefiting. They will still have to go to the banks feeling very apologetic about asking for a loan. But the big boys and their friends will see plenty of profit, and this is the kind of thing that we in this party question.

Why should we make an exception under the Bank Act to facilitate this particular arrangement for IAC to become a bank? We have argued that IAC ought to go through the normal processes stipulated in the Bank Act if they want to become a bank. Parliament ought to be making exceptions for small groups in this country, yet never does. For example, widows should be able to get their widow's pension and the guaranteed income supplement. Why not put a special bill through parliament to enable such people to get those benefits? Why not sponsor a private member's bill to do this? We on this side would let it go through almost without debate so that the poor people of this country would get some benefit.

This is why we in this party cannot vote for privilege. That is what this is all about, Mr. Speaker—privilege. We as a party have stood against privilege and will stand against privilege, and we do so as it comes before this House in the form of Bill S-30.

The hon. member for Timiskaming made reference to the name Bronfman. That name has come up time and time again during this debate. The Bronfmans are the friends of the health minister. He travels in their jets to Israel and all over the place. It seems to me there are a lot of other people like that, MP's and Senators, members of both houses, who are involved either directly or indirectly in IAC.

Since this is a Senate bill let me see how that body is involved in interlocking directorships in IAC and other companies. I have a list of Senators before me and the companies on which they sit as directors, on the boards of other companies as well as IAC. I should like to show how corporate interlocking meshes with memberships of this parliament. Since we are dealing with interlocking directorships it is only fair to put on the record the names of those in the other place who have an interest in this particular bill.

Why should the people of this country put up with this kind of nonsense? These are individuals who are supposed to be passing laws. They are passing laws for themselves. They are the ones who will get the biggest benefits out of IAC becoming a bank quickly through circumventing the regulation that provides that you cannot be a member of the boards of directors of two banks at the same time. Who are going to get any benefit from that, Mr. Speaker? It is certainly not the people of my riding or the people in the