

*Motion for Adjournment*

I do not think any member would wish to be in the position of only hearing one side of the case or only hearing the accusations made against the minister without giving him a chance to defend himself. Would Your Honour ask for unanimous consent?

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question on a point of clarification? Would the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona explain to the house what he means by "tampering with a witness"?

**Mr. Starr:** Let the minister wait until the matter gets to the committee.

**Mr. Nugent:** I think the minister is perfectly correct in asking that, Mr. Speaker. The word "tampering" may be a trifle technical.

**Mr. Hellyer:** And also a trifle evasive.

**Mr. Nugent:** It includes several things, among others the background of what I have alleged. If the minister wishes me to change the motion to make sure I am not being evasive I would be prepared to do so.

The minister is entitled to know exactly what I allege. I allege that Admiral Landymore had prepared a brief which it was his intention to present to the committee, having been ordered to prepare one and to present it to the committee on his responsibility that the minister caused him to come to the minister's office and present it orally, I believe, to the minister, that the minister is responsible for the fact that the brief was left in his office to be reviewed by him and that it remained there for several hours, that it was returned to Admiral Landymore and a change had been made in it without Admiral Landymore's consent, which change came to his notice only upon examining the brief. I allege that four pages of that brief had been taken out and that two pages were substituted. It is only within the minister's knowledge whether he did that personally. I say it is his responsibility because this brief was in his office and he is responsible for the actions of his officials. Therefore the word "tampering" which the minister wishes defined means in this case the taking of a brief and changing it.

**An hon. Member:** Read it.

**Mr. Nugent:** The pages are long but the house may want to have it read. The minister is right that nebulous terms should not be used in this allegation and I want no misunderstanding of what I mean by the phrase "tampering with a witness".

**Mr. Hellyer:** The hon. member would have to be more precise than that. He would have to charge that I censored testimony or that I was directly responsible for having information changed improperly. Under the law of this country my officials report to me and I report to parliament. I want a specific charge made.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Forrestall:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether Your Honour could refer citation 308 to the Minister of National Defence so he can see that "tamper" is a word which has been used in the British House of Commons since February of 1700 every single year without exception, and has also been used in this house.

**Mr. Knowles:** That is as long ago as medicare.

**Mr. Nugent:** I can only meet the objections of the minister and then wait for the house to give unanimous consent to this motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Of course the house is the master of its own rules and procedures. All members can agree to whatever they wish to agree concerning the running of the business of the day. It is up to hon. members to give unanimous consent. The Chair, of course, is in the hands of the house. What the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is now suggesting is, I assume, that we abandon the motion which he made under standing order 26 and that we revert to the question of privilege which he raised earlier this afternoon and obtain the unanimous consent of the house to proceed with that question. Is my understanding correct?

**Mr. Nugent:** I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that unanimous consent to revert to the question of privilege would afford full opportunity to debate the matter and to hear the minister's answer. I suggested that I would amend the motion if that is the only way left, but if you allow us to proceed with the motion then only half the case will be presented and I do not think it would be fair to anyone. That is why I asked you Honour whether we could first try to get the unanimous consent of the house to revert to the question of privilege which I raised at the beginning of this session.

**Mr. Churchill:** May I ask a question, Mr. Speaker? If the suggestion to revert to the question of privilege is not accepted because