

*Point of Order—Mr. Lewis*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Hon. Member indicated the page and I am listening to his point of order. I do agree that he should come to his point of order quickly. I believe he claims that it was on page 11558.

**Mr. Lewis:** I believe I began my remarks by saying that it was on page 11558. If I did not, I am sorry, but I—

**Mr. Deans:** You did.

**Mr. Lewis:** I think so.

**Ms. Copps:** Apologize, that's what you should do.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Resign.

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

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, we are naturally in your hands as to whether or not the remarks are parliamentary. I would suggest that to say: "No one in the political history of our country can equal the Prime Minister's expertise in back-stabbing" is unparliamentary.

**Ms. Copps:** Ask Joe Clark.

**Mr. Lewis:** I suggest that using the comparison to Judas Iscariot is also unparliamentary. Mind you, if you find the remarks to be parliamentary, then it would be open to those of us who want to use that kind of language to use it. I would ask the Chair to rule now or later at the Chair's leisure as to whether or not that kind of language is parliamentary.

**Mr. Deans:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point. I certainly would be fascinated to hear your ruling, but I had thought that perhaps the Hon. Member was rising to complain about the fact that the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) was making reference to Members by their names as opposed to by their constituencies or titles.

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** That's an additional point of order.

**Mr. Deans:** That clearly is out of order. I would be interested, and in fact fascinated, to hear just whether or not those kinds of references are considered to be out of order. They may not be kind or pleasant, but I was wondering if they were out of order.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. There has been a representation made with respect to whether or not the statement made by the Hon. Member for Bourassa (Mr. Rossi) was unparliamentary. It would have been nice had the Government Member had the courage to wait until the Hon. Member for Bourassa was in the House but—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order. I would be glad to hear the Hon. Member on the point of order. Perhaps the Chair should explain that the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary indicated that he wanted to raise a point of order with regard to language. The Chair advised the Hon. Member that the proper procedure is to do this as early as he is aware of the situation.

Therefore, there is only one time that it could be raised, I must say to the Hon. Member.

**Ms. Copps:** That is exactly my point, Mr. Speaker. I understand the Standing Orders to read that an Hon. Member is to raise the matter as soon as he or she is aware of it, unless I am misreading the new rules. The statement was made some time early in the day yesterday in French and unfortunately if the Hon. Member did not avail himself of simultaneous translation that is his problem. It seems to me that he should have raised the issue when it was stated yesterday and not today in some political sham to try to take away their own blame on the issue of slighting Italian Canadians.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I take it there are two points of order. One is with regard to referring to Hon. Members by name and not by constituency. There are two practices toward which we are moving and that is regrettable. One is the practice of calling Hon. Members by name. I must remind Hon. Members that that is contrary to our traditions and rules. I might take the opportunity to say at the same time that we are beginning to move closer toward referring to people as "you". This is a good time for me to remind Hon. Members that questions and answers should be put through the Chair.

Our practices with regard to complaints about language arising out of Question Period, whether they are in English or French, is that they are supposed to be raised at the end of the Question Period. Notwithstanding the representations made by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, I therefore would have to find that the reason we have the translation is so that Hon. Members will be able to do that and will be able to know what is going on. I must therefore find that the point was not raised at the time when it should have been raised which was at three o'clock yesterday. I am afraid that is all the Chair can do with that.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, am I then to understand that the official translation of the House is when I hear it or when I read it?

**Mr. Speaker:** No, no. The issue of unparliamentary language or of disorder that is caused by unparliamentary language, in order to be dealt with by the Chair, has to be raised at the time. The issue of language, aside from what one thinks, and I have said some things about that, is whether a disorder is caused by that language at that time. That is the issue the Chair has to resolve. It is for that reason, in order that it be fresh in the mind of the Chair, that the matter should be raised as close as possible to the time it occurs. Otherwise, it is difficult to argue that a disorder occurred, if I may put that to the Hon. Member, because a disorder is not caused in print; a disorder is caused at the time, if there is a disorder.

● (1120)

**Mr. Lewis:** If you condone it, that is fine.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member is asking the Chair to condone the language. The Chair would never condone unparliamentary language whenever it was used. However, the