

one sample per brand was taken that really brings into question the reliability of the study. In the intervening time I really have been on the horns of a dilemma.

In view of the fact that a partial list has been published, although I have not seen that partial list I am still persuaded to proceed. My own personal feeling is that since this was paid for out of public funds, public disclosure should be made, in keeping with the freedom of information and the open government of my Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) and my colleagues on this side. I have made the decision that we should go forward and make the study public, attaching the brand names to the 95 brands. But we should also, in making a press statement, point out that this study was simply based on only one sample per brand and, therefore, this brings into question the reliability of that study.

Subsequent to that my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Crombie), has asked officials in his department to set up a special group within the Department of National Health and Welfare to look specifically at the matter of fatty acids in relation to the health of Canadians.

[Translation]

MR. LAMBERT (BELLECHASSE)—REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF POULTRY IMPORTATION PERMITS

**Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, and in accordance with your recommendations, I will be very brief. I would not want to upset the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) because I know he has rather heavy responsibilities.

In question period today, I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he would care to tell the House whether he would be prepared to recommend that the national chicken marketing agreement should be amended so as to make the agricultural products marketing agency the first receiver for all chicken imports. Perhaps the minister misunderstood my question because he answered that no new poultry import permits had been granted since October 22, the date of the Canada-U.S. agreement. There will be a substantial increase in exports as of January 1, 1980, and to reassure Ontario and particularly Quebec poultry producers, I believe it is my privilege and the privilege of the House to get an answer from the minister assuring us that any additional permits for the importation of poultry would be granted through the Canadian marketing agency so as to protect Canadian producer quotas and maintain stabilization of the farming industry. The minister should have told the House that it was a result of insufficient production and the incapacity of Canadian producers that Canada has to resort to poultry imports.

And in concluding my question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be allowed one more comment so we know exactly where we stand. We had enough difficulty in having Bill C-76 passed to allow poultry producers across Canada to set up marketing agencies at the provincial level in order to

*Point of Order—Mr. MacEachen*

establish a national agency. It has given excellent results so far and I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the danger that might exist in granting import permits without prior consultation with the chicken marketing agency.

● (1510)

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** Once again, I have severe reservations as to whether or not we are in a procedural area, but the minister seems to wish to participate again.

**Hon. John Wise (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's raising the point of privilege but, again, like the matter raised by his colleague in the NDP, I question whether it is a point of privilege. It is true that I did misunderstand the first part of his question, which was to the effect, was I considering providing the first receivership for the importation of U.S. chicken into Canada by the national chicken marketing agency. The answer is no. I have answered the other questions raised by the hon. member.

\* \* \*

POINT OF ORDER

MR. MACEachEN—INCORRECT DESIGNATION IN OFFICIAL REPORT

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Cape Breton Highlands-Canso):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On reading yesterday's *Hansard* I noticed at page 1481, during the adjournment debate, that the question put by the member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) on the subject of external affairs was answered by the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Reimer), who was standing in for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Roche). I find that the member for Kitchener is not a parliamentary secretary. It may be that this is a printing error, but if it is not I would draw to the attention of the government that having persons who are not parliamentary secretaries answering for ministers is a very undesirable practice to which we would object strenuously.

**Hon. Walter Baker (President of Privy Council and Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his intervention. I give him the undertaking that I will look into the matter and report to him directly. I agree with the view that he has expressed with respect to the parliamentary practice.

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I merely suggest that when the government House leader is looking into the matter, he might ascertain whether the mistake was *Hansard's*. I think it was the Parliamentary Secretary to the Postmaster General (Mr. Reid) who answered last night. All Tories do not look alike, but—