

*Point of Order—Mr. Crosbie*

and that is the right of members on all sides of the House to have access to the proceedings of the House to air grievances that cannot be aired satisfactorily in the question period, at least not always.

It cannot be done satisfactorily under the provisions of Standing Order 43 because there is no response permitted and there is not sufficient time. The adjournment debate is the closest thing we have to it, but it is not satisfactory either. It has a tremendous backlog and in order to get to the adjournment debate one must first have access to the question period. Therefore it is hoped that the House could develop some proceeding at six o'clock, as specifically suggested, I think, by the hon. member for St. John's East. Perhaps we could use that period of time, but I do not know and I certainly would not want to think through the details without an examination by a committee.

It seems to me the following are two possibilities and worth-while suggestions. First, regarding withholding of consent under our present proceeding, that the one withholding consent might have a brief moment to give his reason. Second, that a grievance procedure be established which would replace the attempt now being used under Standing Order 43 to air a grievance in a more adequate and direct way. Both of these suggestions should be examined.

I say in conclusion that these suggestions have my support in principle. The House will know that at this stage of our parliament it would not be timely even to attempt these rather important and substantial changes. In any event, these changes ought not to come from the Chair. They have to be as a result of consensus in the House carefully distilled through committee proceedings which will examine all of the consequences and make recommendations to the House.

I indicate that these are two suggested improvements that ought to be given careful consideration, probably early in the next parliament. A report should be made to the House so the House can draw upon that consensus. I will continue, as I say, with the support of the House to enforce the rules as strictly as I can, bearing in mind the ad hoc nature of the proceeding, the preambles and the content of motions, in order to ensure that we will continue in the balance of this parliament to have this procedure available for those who wish each day to bring important and urgent matters to the attention of this House.

MR. CROSBIE—BROADCASTING—NON-RECOGNITION OF  
SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION

**Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with the question period. Your Honour recognized me so that I could ask a question, which was not unimportant, in connection with the television manufacturing industry of Canada. You did not permit me to ask a supplementary; you went back to my hon. friend from Meadow Lake (Mr. Cadieu) to permit him to ask a supplementary, which I certainly agreed with. But, Mr. Speaker, as you know, the original question is not always the most important one.

[Mr. Speaker.]

I asked a question about the television manufacturing industry. My supplementary was going to be: Why were the government purchasing TV monitors specifying foreign equipment when it calls for tenders? Why do they not assist the industry by giving some preference to purchasing, rather than discriminating against Canadian manufactured equipment? So obviously the important part of my question was the supplementary. Yet for some reason unknown to me, Your Honour did not permit the supplementary. Just because Your Honour wished to permit the hon. member for Meadow Lake to have a supplementary was no reason for Your Honour not to allow me to have a supplementary, unless the question I was asking was completely inconsequential in the first place.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member will realize that he has no point of order. The matter is discretionary. I have to exercise this kind of discretion every day. Regrettably we were coming to the conclusion of the question period and I had some very difficult choices. About three members had supplementary questions and I could not recognize all three of them. Perhaps the next time it will be the hon. member at the expense of one of his colleagues.

[Translation]

MR. MCGRATH—CMHC OFFICIALS—ALLEGATIONS OF  
WRONGDOING—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Public Works and Minister of State for Urban Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) rose on a point of order and asked that I withdraw some of the comments I made in answering one of his questions. I then agreed to check *Hansard*. I must say that indeed the hon. member for St. John's East did not accuse the civil servants of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation but that he merely alluded to allegations of wrongdoing. I therefore take this opportunity to straighten out the record, and correct *Hansard*.

[English]

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I would say that is a demonstration of good parliamentary manners.

● (1520)

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

PRESENTATION OF FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING JOINT  
COMMITTEE

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the fourth report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments