

Petitions

left wide open so that farmers, producing any product and who wanted to enter into a national scheme, would be able to do so.

* * *

PENITENTIARIES**ROLE OF PAROLEE IN RECAPTURE OF ESCAPED SEX MURDERER**

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. I believe the allegations made in Montreal today have been brought to his attention regarding Strangler Bill Boden, who was arrested the other night in a bar solely and simply because of information given to the police that Boden was there, by an ex-convict. Earlier, that ex-convict had been approached in the bar to determine whether a gun could be obtained for Boden. That particular ex-convict was out on parole. Apparently, he has now been detained and his parole is in jeopardy.

My question to the Solicitor General is: has he investigated the matter? Does he think it fair that a convicted sex killer can treat his art instructor at an expensive restaurant and almost manage to escape, whereas an ex-convict, who believes in attempting to prevent bloodshed, is now in danger because of his actions in bringing information to the attention of the police?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Hon. Member was unable to take the trouble to attend the Justice Committee meeting last night because a lot of the information which he requested was covered at that meeting. I certainly expressed my opposition to Boden being out on an escorted temporary absence, and indicated the steps that would be taken in that regard.

As far as the source of information leading to Boden's apprehension is concerned, according to newspaper articles and the information that I have, it was an anonymous tip. I can assure the Hon. Member that I do not consider it proper to suspend someone's parole solely because they co-operated with the police. If that is his allegation, I agree with him. I have requested a report on it. I would want to know if his parole was suspended, and whether there were valid reasons for doing so, other than the reasons which the Hon. Member has suggested.

* * *

PETITION**MR. BRADLEY—TAXATION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS**

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Bradley) on Tuesday, May 8, 1984, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

POINTS OF ORDER**MR. BLAIKIE—SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION OF MR. KEEPER**

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to the question asked by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper) and your ruling that his supplementary question was out of order. As you, Mr. Speaker, know, it has been quite acceptable in the past for Members to ask supplementary questions of a Minister other than the Minister to whom they asked their first question.

Some Hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Blaikie: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that if you intend to change that practice you owe it to the House to give Members some notice. When Members rise to ask a supplementary question—and they have traditionally done so without any interference by the Chair—they should have some expectation of what your ruling will be. Mr. Speaker, if you have changed the rules with regard to Question Period and now regard it differently from what has been the practice in this House, would you kindly enlighten us as to what you have in mind?

Mr. Speaker: In quoting from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition—

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) has raised a point of order on which the Chair will rule. Subsequently, other Members will be recognized.

The point raised by the Hon. Member relates to supplementary questions. In Beauchesne's, Citation 371 reads in part:

The extent to which supplementary questions may be asked is in the discretion of the Speaker.

That has been established for some time. The Chair is concerned with the growing practice in the House of raising questions which are not supplementary and which are directed to another Minister. In some situations it is very difficult for the Chair to make a decision, especially as the Chair must do so on the spot.

However, as a general rule, a supplementary question should be asked of the Minister to whom the original question was put. There are exceptional circumstances where there is a shared responsibility, or where perhaps the Minister indicates that it is not his responsibility but some other Minister's responsibility. There are circumstances in which the Chair will respect that practice. The Chair is attempting in Question Period to discourage the practice of asking different questions of different Ministers.

In this particular situation the Chair will review *Hansard* carefully. If there are grounds, with respect to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-St. James, for recognizing that the two Ministers had a shared responsibility, then the Chair will review the situation. It is not the intention of the Chair to discourage supplementary questions, but the Chair will dis-