Interim Supply

The Chairman: Order. I would suggest that we might allow the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra to state his question of privilege very briefly, and I will allow the hon. member for Bow River to state his point of order briefly.

Mr. Deachman: I am accused by the honmember of being a front for other people, of having been in connivance and collusion with other people in connection with the story. I want to repeat again what I said to Mr. Speaker in the house today, that I wrote the story myself, that I did so without getting in touch with any other members of the committee at any time and at no time did I have anything to do with anyone connected with the committee, with parliament or with the Prime Minister's office in connection with the story.

An hon. Member: How much did you get paid for it?

The Chairman: Order. In my opinion there is no question of privilege, but a denial of a statement by the hon. member for Bow River. To my mind both the denial and the statement are out of order because they involve a discussion of the private conduct of an hon. member which should not be a subject of discussion in committee of supply at this stage.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I never made any charge against the hon. member. I asked a question of the government and that is what makes my remarks relevant and within the terms of your ruling. I will proceed to ask the question again. Was the hon. member a front? Was he in communication with cabinet ministers while the committee was sitting? Was the hon. member getting his inspiration from the government in this regard?

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member said he is not making a charge, and I cannot deny that, but he is certainly making an insinuation. The Chair tries to stay out of the debate if at all possible, but certainly the hon. member would seem to be going against the spirit of the ruling of the Chair by using those words.

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe the answer to the whole question I have raised can be found by looking closely at the article itself, which deals with what was discussed in the flag committee. At the beginning of the article it says:

20220—605

The Commons flag committee has completed its six-weeks task and this afternoon submitted its findings to the house.

One of its Liberal members, Grant Deachman, reveals in this frank report how the committee worked and arrived at its final decision.

Without any reservations whatsoever we know the hon. member disclosed the facts of the committee, the evidence of the committee, the report of the committee before the chairman of that committee could disclose those facts by a report filed in the House of Commons.

There were leaks throughout the time this flag committee was operating. Where did they come from? Did they come from the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, or from other members that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra talked to—and I am talking about Liberal members? We have just to take a look at what he said is the inside story. He said he wrote this a little time after the committee had made out its report. It is a strange thing. He may be speedy on a typewriter, or he may be a speedy writer, but he whirled out practically everything the committee had done a few minutes after the committee made its decision—

The Chairman: I suggest the hon, member is discussing the very matters which the Chair has ruled are not relevant in the discussion on interim supply.

Mr. Woolliams: I take it you are ruling the facts I have been setting out in this debate are out of order, and I would like to appeal your ruling.

The Chairman: I am sure the hon, member realizes the position of the Chair. The Chair has suggested to the hon, member that he cannot discuss the personal conduct of another hon, member, and I am sure the hon, member for Bow River recognizes this ruling. Any comments that he makes which seem to infringe against that rule cannot be allowed to pass without the hon, member being called to order.

Mr. Woolliams: Sir, with the greatest respect to you, I have been in this house since 1958 and I have never asked to appeal any chairman's or Speaker's ruling, but this afternoon I ask to appeal your ruling in this regard so that I can continue my remarks.

[Translation]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Chairman-