

*Motion for Adjournment*

wants to amend any motion referring certain matters to the committee on privileges and elections, the time for him to do that is when the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona has moved his motion stating the question of privilege and his charge and asking that the whole matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections. At that time the minister could move any amendment he wishes and the house could decide whether or not it wanted to accept the amendment. If we are to resolve this matter, the sooner we agree unanimously to revert to the question of privilege to allow the hon. member to make his motion, the sooner we shall have something definite before the house.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Could I ask the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, if he thinks that there is in the motion, as it has been represented to us, a real charge of impropriety? All we are asking on this side of the house is that there be a definite charge of impropriety. If the hon. member will add the words that the Minister of National Defence has suggested or if he will add the word "improperly" or "improperly tampered", either one of those, then we shall grant unanimous consent at once not merely to debate the question but to send it without delay to the committee on privileges and elections.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I understand that the Minister of Transport is now asking a question of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona wants to ask a question of the Minister of Transport. This is getting confusing.

**Mr. Nugent:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Douglas:** I think I asked the first question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam has the floor.

**Mr. Douglas:** I thought that the charges, as made by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona, constituted impropriety. All I know is that Citation 308 says that tampering with a witness is a breach of privilege. If the hon. member can substantiate the fact that there has been tampering with the evidence of a witness, I am prepared to support the motion. But there is no point in discussing this when we have no motion before us. When the hon. member moves the motion, if the house gives him unanimous consent to do

[Mr. Douglas.]

so, I shall be prepared to listen to what evidence he has.

I have no foreknowledge of what the hon. member is going to say. I should like to listen to him and listen to the minister make his explanation. If after listening to both of them I feel that this matter warrants further investigation, the calling of witnesses and the examination of any documents the hon. member may have, then I shall be prepared to vote for the motion. On the other hand, if after listening to both sides I think there is no impropriety I shall be prepared to vote against the motion. Surely we ought to proceed in an orderly way and have something before the house.

**Mr. Nugent:** May I ask the minister whether a specific charge of breach of privilege, consisting of tampering with a witness, is not a direct allegation of improper conduct?

**Mr. Hellyer:** Not the way you defined it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I wonder whether all hon. members want the Chair at this point to express a view?

**Mr. Langlois (Mégantic):** Mr. Speaker, in the argument that has been made there is something that is not quite correct. The minister first of all suggested that this matter be referred to the committee on privileges and elections or to the committee on national defence. The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona seemed to agree to that. Now the minister asks that an amendment to the motion be brought in to indicate to what degree he may have tampered with the evidence in question. With all respect, I say that it is not for the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona to say to what degree the minister did that. That is why we in this party want this matter finished. This is the first time that the Liberals have suggested an amendment which would put them in the soup. I think we are out of order and we ought to get a ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Obviously there can be no unanimous consent to suggestions made by hon. members. Is there unanimous agreement to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** I want to be very fair and give hon. members on both sides an opportunity to express their views as to whether