

Interim Supply

ments. One of the expenditures will provide for this committee and other matters in connection with the flag. If I might continue with my remarks, I was referring to an article which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of today's date.

Mr. Fane: The editor is the Prime Minister's nephew.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes; as one hon. member says, the editor of the paper is the nephew of the Prime Minister. It is rather peculiar, Mr. Chairman, but on several other occasions the *Ottawa Citizen* has been able to publish reports concerning various matters and problems which are about to be reported to parliament prior to their actual report in the house.

Miss LaMarsh: Well at least it speaks the truth.

Mr. Woolliams: Now we have the minister of health speaking and we are always interested in what she has to say.

Miss LaMarsh: That is more than we can say of you.

An hon. Member: Remember the truth squad.

Mr. Woolliams: We all know she knows about the truth because she was the one who invented the truth squad during the last election; but the Prime Minister had to dissolve that truth squad because he was losing more votes than she could manufacture. However, I do not intend to be put off the rails by the minister of health. I was saying that it is peculiar that this newspaper is often able to report upon government business which should be disclosed in the house prior to its actual disclosure in the house. This disclosure is far more serious because the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra had given his solemn oath to that committee that he would disclose no facts found by the committee.

The Chairman: Order. I feel that at this stage I might be expected to make a comment as to whether or not the remarks of the hon. member for Bow River are relevant. I realize of course that discussion on interim supply is rather general in nature and is not, according to our practice, very easily restricted. But on the other hand, in the course of this particular debate the Chair has tried to bring to the attention of individual members the fact that speeches and remarks have to stay within the ambit of the administration of the government. That is to say, they must refer to government business. I have

been following the hon. member's remarks to this point and they seem to me to relate to the conduct of an individual member of the house. I have strong reservations about whether at this particular stage of the debate these remarks can be considered relevant and proper to be discussed in committee of supply on the consideration of interim supply. The hon. member for Bow River might wish to keep that in mind.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I appreciate the point you have raised. However, with great respect to the Chair, I would say that this is a serious matter of government business relating to how the government conducts its business. I submit there are past precedents for this. The terms of reference of a debate like this are that hon. members can talk on matters which are relevant to government business; and I am saying this is a matter of government business and I should like to proceed.

As I was saying, this hon. member had given his solemn promise, if not oath, to that particular committee that nothing would be—

The Chairman: Order. It is the feeling of the Chair that the subject matter of the hon. member's remarks deals specifically with the conduct of an individual member, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. It seems to me that this cannot be considered government business any more than the conduct of any other individual member could be considered to be within the ambit of the administration of government. I would strongly urge the hon. member to pass on to other considerations perhaps.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, in addition to referring to government business, there has been an infringement of the rights and privileges of parliament. Only the other day on interim supply we were discussing a problem which affected the Canadian National Railways. During the last two or three days we were discussing a problem concerning the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. On both occasions we were talking about the authority of parliament with respect to crown corporations.

We are now dealing with the authority of parliament with regard to the actions of a member on the government side which infringe on the rights and privileges of parliament itself. So far as we can judge the government has given its approval of this type of action on the part of one of its members. Surely this is a problem which should be discussed at this particular time;