

5. For each month in the past year, by how much has the purchasing value of the dollar decreased over each preceding month as a result of an increase in the money supply?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/2,818.

Mr. Reid, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Resolved,—That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents between the Government of Canada and the Government of Prince Edward Island and/or other persons or agencies, with respect to the transfer of Province House in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island to the Government of Canada, together with the land on which such building stands and any additional land or buildings related to that transfer.—(Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 258—Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)).

Bill C-176, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, was again considered at the report stage.

Whereupon, the House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. Sharp,—That Bill C-176, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be amended by

(a) adding immediately after line 29 at page 9 the following:

“Judge may rule evidence admissible (2) Where in any proceedings the judge is of the opinion that any private communication or any other evidence that is inadmissible pursuant to subsection (1) is relevant and that to exclude it as evidence may result in justice not being done in the matter to which the proceedings relate, he may notwithstanding subsection (1), admit such private communication or evidence as evidence in such proceedings.”

(b) by striking out line 30 at page 9 and substituting the following:

“Application to Sub-section (1) (3) Subsection (1) applies to all”.

And on the motion of Mr. Atkey, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, in amendment thereto,—That motion numbered 13 be amended by deleting therefrom the words “is relevant and that to exclude it as evidence may result in justice not being done in the matter to which the proceedings relate,” and substituting therefor the following:

“(a) is relevant,

(b) is inadmissible by reason only of a defect of form or an irregularity in procedure, not being a substantive defect or irregularity, in the application for or the giving of the authorization under which such private communication was intercepted or by means of which such evidence was obtained, and

(c) that to exclude it as evidence may result in justice not being done.”.

After further debate, a point of order having been raised as to the acceptability of an amendment to the proposed amendment to motion numbered 13;

#### RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I thank honourable Members for their advice and I thank the honourable Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) for raising this very important point of order which has worried the Chair for some time. I appreciate that there can be only one amendment and a subamendment before the House at the same time. If the subamendment is defeated, then a different subamendment can be brought forth for the purpose of amending the amendment. The question is whether we have before us now three amendments, or only two.

I have always felt, in thinking about the possibility that this objection might be brought forward for the consideration of the House, that the interpretation of Standing Order 75(5) should be that this is a substantive motion with notice. That probably makes the difference, in that the Standing Order provides that we will have on the Order Paper a substantive motion with notice, which puts it in the category of a question subject to amendment and subamendment.

I must confess that I still have some doubts about the matter and, because I have had these doubts, I have been thinking about the problem for some time, wondering when it might come up. This is the first time that this point has been made.

I would think that honourable Members might be entitled to the benefit of the doubt and that the Standing Order might be interpreted in this way: what we have before us is a substantive motion subject to amendment and subamendment.

Motion numbered 16, standing in the name of Mr. Leggatt, as follows:—That Bill C-176, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Official Secrets Act, be amended in Clause 2 by deleting lines 9 to 14 inclusive at page 15 and substituting therefor:

“the Official Secrets Act,”

was withdrawn.

Consideration was resumed at the report stage of Bill C-176, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Crown