

Privilege—Mr. Wagner

question. In any case, the minister, as he said today, chose not to answer.

I hope I can reassure the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton. I said that when the hon. member for Lisgar sought a supplementary to a question which had not been answered—and I used the language of the original question—by the very basis of its definition, a supplementary question must be one which arises out of the response to the original question. I think the words that are causing the hon. member trouble are “original question”. What “original” in that context was designed to convey was the question which the supplementary was following. In other words, if a supplementary question is to be permitted it must flow from the response to the question to which it is supplementary, not to the original question, as the case may be.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton seemed to be concerned that unless the question is supplementary to the first question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, it falls. That is not the case. The supplementary, if it is to stand, must flow from the response to the question which had previously been put by the same questioner or by another questioner. In the circumstances, if a minister exercises his legitimate option not to answer, I fail to see how the Chair can allow a supplementary question flowing from a response which does not exist. The response is not the response to the original question, but the response to the question in this context, to the original question put by the hon. member for Lisgar, not the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

It seems to me it does not follow that if a minister refuses to answer one question and thereby stops supplementary questions on that occasion, there is any prohibition against other members seeking the floor during the same question period and continuing to put related questions on the same subject to the same minister.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I realize the difficulty the Chair has, but this is a very confusing matter.

An hon. Member: Only you are confused.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): It is a confusing matter and it is very important to the operation of the question period, even if the hon. member opposite does not understand that. Mr. Speaker, I take it from your statement that if the hon. member had said, “A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition,” Your Honour’s judgment might have been different, given the fact that there was no partisans or some other reason to put it down.

In other words, I am asking if it is now to be the rule of this House that an hon. member who is second in a series of questions on a particular subject can only have a supplementary question relating to his own original question, or is it still within the ambit of supplementary questions that a member, second in a series on the same subject matter, can ask a question supplementary to a question asked by the first questioner in the series.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member seeks clarification. Surely the individual circumstances would govern. Perhaps if the hon. member for Lisgar had said yesterday, “I see the minister does not want to pursue that subject further. Therefore, I have a supplementary to another minister on the subject raised,” that may have been permitted, in the circumstances. I do not think I can go any further than that.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE RIGHT OF APPEAL WHERE COMMISSION ERRS IN LAW

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-423, to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (appeals).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to correct an apparent anomaly in the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act. My colleague, the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), discovered that through an oversight there is no appeal to the Federal Court or the Supreme Court on matters of fact or law of decisions or procedures of the various electoral boundaries commissions appointed under the act. This bill would provide an appeal to the Federal Court, thus bringing this regulatory agency under the same rules as other regulatory agencies.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

● (1530)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

DESIGNATION OF ALLOTTED DAY

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to designate tomorrow as an allotted day. My understanding is that following tomorrow we will be discussing the motion in the name of the financial critic of the official opposition on the anti-inflation program. If the assigned days under the law are used, we would have a division on that on Monday next.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was in fact rising to ask the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) if he would designate tomorrow as an allotted day. Now that he has done so, I wonder if I may indicate to the House that the motion for tomorrow will be put down by the New Democratic Party. It will be in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggett) and it will read as follows: