

Point of Order—Mrs. Finestone

On June 4 the Speaker received a reply which he kindly circulated. In effect it said that the National Capital Commission management committee decided not to spray this spring with 2-4,D and to reassess its position later this year. It was signed by Madam Pigott.

What we see happening here is that both you, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps even the Chairman of the National Capital Commission, have been ignored by this management committee, or Madam Pigott has forgotten her commitment, or the matter has simply drifted so badly that we see this silly development whereby a commitment made only three months ago is now not even worth the paper on which it is written.

You have our fullest confidence and support, Mr. Speaker, in pursuing this matter. I am sure you are as upset as we are, because we do want to demonstrate that we can have grass, lawns and soil managed in a proper manner on the Hill without having to utilize chemical fertilizers.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair wants to thank the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill, the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) and the Hon. Minister. It is quite clear, and it should be clear to everyone watching or listening, that what we have just heard in this Chamber is a very strong expression of the will of all three parties. I will carefully take into account what has been said here and will be meeting with Members in order to make an appropriate response. I thank Hon. Members for taking the position they have, and I thank the Hon. Minister for supporting both the Hon. Member for Winnipeg—Birds Hill and the Hon. Member for Davenport.

ALLEGED FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH PROVISIONS OF S. O. 99(2)

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I am rising on this point of order because it relates to the tabling of the Government's response to the interim report on the "Recommendations of the Task Force on Broadcast Policy, Speciality Programming Services", and some proposed legislative amendments. That was called our fifth report.

The point of order also relates to the response to the sixth report called "The Recommendations for a new Broadcasting Act, a Review of the Legislative Recommendations made by the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy". I think Hon. Members have noted the size of the *Hansards* which were required to bring our reports to the attention of this House. There were 150 pages of carefully considered documents and analysis which included 107 recommendations. Members of the committee, members of our staff and members of the Library of Parliament worked extremely hard to bring—

• (1220)

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member for Mount Royal (Mrs. Finestone) but the Minister rises on a point of order. I will hear the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I in turn do not wish to be seen to be interrupting anyone's argument. In view of the fact that this argument with respect to the tabling of a report is both substantive as to the contents, and procedural, will the Hon. Member for Mount Royal agree to stand down her argument on her point of order until such time as we are able to get the Minister of Communications (Miss MacDonald) in the House in order to respond to the substantive part of the argument.

As I said, I am prepared to deal with the procedural part of the argument. I do not wish to be seen to be delaying the Hon. Member. We are perfectly prepared to deal with this at any time. However, I wonder if it would not be more appropriate for Your Honour to hear both the substantive and procedural parts of the argument at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: I am wondering if perhaps the Chair can be of help. First, I want to say to the Hon. Member for Mount Royal that the Chair has heard not just one but several complaints of this type in connection with the rule that, after a committee reports, the Minister is to give a comprehensive response under the rules. The Chair has been reluctant to get into the position of defining what is a comprehensive response. However, if I may say to the Hon. Member for Mount Royal, I think the Hon. Minister has made a very helpful suggestion. It is difficult under this particular rule to find a clear line between the substance and the procedure. The Minister has suggested that the Hon. Member for Mount Royal adjourn her point of order to a day soon when the Minister responsible can be here, I say to the Hon. Member for Mount Royal that that, frankly, would help the Chair.

I would invite the Hon. Member for Mount Royal to agree to the suggestion of the Minister that this matter be adjourned to a day, which can be arranged through myself, when the Hon. member can pursue her argument and the Minister can be here. I want to assure the Hon. Member that this is a matter that the Chair takes very seriously. If the Hon. Member would agree, then I think that would be the most expeditious way of dealing with the matter.

Mrs. Finestone: Mr. Speaker, with your many years of experience in the House I will certainly accept your guidance, in the hope that when the Minister hears the argument she will have had an opportunity to rethink the grievous way in which she has injured the committee with her snide four and one-half page response. Thus, I hope that the Minister, whose staff is watching, will prepare the kind of responsible report that she should have prepared in the first place. I look forward to that argument taking place at that time.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Mount Royal for her intervention, and the subject that has been raised. Arrangements will be made to continue this discussion further. I know that the Minister will convey to his colleague the proceedings so far so that when we bring this matter back to the House it can be dealt with in an appropriate way.