

I have to agree with the hon. member that the reasons for allowing a question of privilege are, to use his own word, narrow. It is true that it is not easy to define what is privilege. The reasons are extremely narrow, and questions of privilege are too often used in the House to disagree with another member, or to express dissatisfaction with the manner in which a question has been answered. There are all sorts of other grievances members might have.

However, the reasons for allowing questions of privilege are indeed extremely narrow. I agree with the hon. member on that point. I can understand the hon. member's frustration over the circumstances in which he raised his question of privilege because the problem was a serious one, and he did want to debate it, but he and other hon. members did have a chance to debate it.

As I say, I agree that the reasons for allowing questions of privilege are narrow. As a matter of fact, I remind the House that the reasons are extremely narrow. In this case, as in many other cases in which questions of privilege have been raised, I must state that I cannot find a *prima facie* case of privilege in the question raised by the hon. member for Crowfoot.

MR. DOMM—PROCEDURE DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My question of privilege flows out of the question period today. I feel that as members of Parliament in this House we should all be treated equally. It is obvious to me, as a result of the business which flowed out of the question period, that all members in this House were offered opportunities for supplementaries. As it will be recorded in *Hansard*, Your Honour asked me to sit down and be quiet in order that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts) might answer the question. If my memory serves me correctly, the exact words Your Honour used were that, if the Minister of the Environment would answer the question, the House might remain more quiet. Your Honour's words were something to that effect. So I sat down. The minister answered "no" and sat down. I was immediately on my feet, noticed by everyone on this side of the House, in an effort to pose my supplementary question.

I suggest that this be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to find out if all hon. members are entitled to supplementaries. If they are not, I would respectfully request that you supply to this House some reason why we are not allowed a supplementary.

● (1510)

**Madam Speaker:** It is true that I did not allow the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm) a supplementary question today. The reason for that is that that precise question had been asked several times of the minister, and answers to it had been given. I cannot make any judgment on the quality of the answer; I can only note that the question was asked several times. All hon. members are equal, but the decision on wheth-

er or not to allow a supplementary question is left to the discretion of the Chair.

Today the question period was very busy. Members on this side of the House wishing to be recognized were extremely numerous. Some hon. members had wished to be recognized for several days, and I was feeling just as frustrated as hon. members might have been that I was not able to recognize them. Therefore, since the question from the hon. member had been asked several times in the House, while many other members were asking to be recognized, I decided to give the chance to another hon. member to ask a question. That is not a question of privilege. Again, the supplementary question is at the discretion of the Chair, and if the hon. member will look up in *Hansard* he will know that he is not the only one who does not always get his supplementary question. In most cases, on the other side of the House, supplementary questions are never allowed; and even on this side of the House, supplementary questions are not always allowed.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

[Translation]

MR. OLIVIER—USE OF BOTH OFFICIAL LANGUAGES WITHIN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

**Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have been a member of Parliament for eight years and as we are aware, this House has made it quite clear that each member could use his mother tongue, or that any person inside the Parliament buildings could also be answered in his or her tongue.

Madam Speaker, I have to inform you that twice last evening, and again this morning, certain persons could not be served in French nor obtain answers in French in the House of Commons, despite all your efforts, Madam Speaker, to change this.

I feel it is most important, at this point in time, that every member in this House realize, whether he speaks French or English, that he must be able to obtain service and answers either in French or in English within the House of Commons. The incident happened outside of this place, inside the Centre Block, and also in the Confederation Building and in the parliamentary restaurant.

Madam Speaker, I would appreciate your diligent attention to this problem to help those who want to be understood, and they understand once and for all that this is everyone's Parliament rather than the Parliament of one culture in Canada.

**Madam Speaker:** I am taking good note of the remarks made by the hon. member, and I must tell him that very precise and constant instructions are given that there be at all times, at both main entrances to the House of Commons at least, persons capable at any time of answering visitors in this country's both official languages. I shall inquire once more, and if today nobody in a position to communicate in French