

Privilege

farmerse and the right to maintain marketing boards in Canada. That is Quebec's position, but we do not know the Bloc's position on what I said just now.

• (1500)

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of State for Agriculture has spent the last two years making a big show of saying there was no risk at all and that he was ready to put his seat on the line. Is the minister prepared to repeat today that he is ready to put his seat on the line if article XI is not reinforced?

Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, and I say this for the benefit of farm producers who may be listening, I think the issue is far too important for us to get into this kind of debate.

The important thing is for people on all sides of the House, including the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party, if they are willing and the government, to rally behind Quebec and Canadian farmers, defend their interests at GATT at this vital moment in the talks and ignore these diversions that might expose farmers to far greater risks.

[*English*]

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into this present constitutional fight but thank you for allowing me to ask a supplementary question of the Prime Minister as a result of the question of the hon. member for Lambton—Middlesex.

A week ago the Prime Minister, in answer to a question on supply management said at page 6369 of *Hansard*, in answer to the same type of question, that Premier Bourassa has full confidence in the Minister for International Trade to negotiate the new GATT agreements, and he thinks that Quebec is better protected by the plan on which we are now working than with the present formula.

My supplementary question is this: In view of the answers from the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of State for Agriculture that there has been no change and they are going to defend the present system, could the Prime Minister please

explain the answer he gave a week ago, when he said that "Quebec and Canada is going to be better protected by the plan on which we are now working than with the present formula."

Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the explanation is very simple. As I remember, it was a statement in *le journal La Presse* and that it was a direct quote from Premier Bourassa.

Mr. Speaker: I will take a point of order but I want to tell the House that I have a question of privilege which I have to get to.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, I would like to designate tomorrow, Wednesday, February 12, an allotted day.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSIBILITY OF QUESTION DURING ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I am astonished and rather shocked that I was unable to put my question to the government or at least to the minister responsible for the CBC.

I may refer the Chair to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, citation 359, which reads as follows:

359. The Speaker expressed some general principles in order to clarify the regulations—

In other words, the guidelines to be used in asking oral questions in the House.

"A brief question seeking information about an important matter of some urgency which falls within the administrative responsibility of the government or of the specific Minister to whom it is addressed, is in order".

Further on, at 359 (6), we read:

(6) A question must be within the administrative competence of the Government. The Minister to whom the question is directed is responsible to the House for his present Ministry and not for any decisions taken in a previous portfolio.

My question concerned an appointment made by this government, I imagine by the minister, to the Board of Governors of the CBC.