

bers to May's Seventeenth Edition at page 528, subparagraph (2), on this point.

Perhaps an even more important point is whether this amendment opposes the principle of the bill. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that the consequence of the adoption of the amendment would be that the bill could not be proceeded with if the amendment were carried. I do not disagree with that, but the amendment in these words, taken as such, does not oppose the principle of the bill. I believe that this is one of the essential aspects of a reasoned amendment, that it should first oppose the principle of the bill and indicate reasons why the second reading should not be proceeded with.

I refer hon. members to citation 393 (1) of Beauchesne:

An amendment purporting to approve the principle of a Bill and at the same time enunciating a declaration of policy cannot be moved to the second reading. It must oppose the principle of the Bill.

I think this is fundamental. I have always felt that hon. members who wished to propose a reasoned amendment can do so fairly easily with a bit of imagination, providing they find some way which does oppose the principle of the bill and indicates in general terms why the mover of the amendment does not think that the bill should be proceeded with further. That is why I have not been entirely reluctant to rule a reasoned amendment out of order because I feel that hon. members are not penalized very seriously. With some imagination, they can always rectify or remedy what the Chair thinks is a defect in the amendment which has been proposed.

This having been said, I have no alternative but to make a ruling in conformity with the British precedents relating to reasoned amendments and to tell the hon. member that I do not think that the amendment as proposed is acceptable. I do so with regret, because I appreciate the importance of the matter and the willingness and anxiety of hon. members to discuss, in relation to the second reading of the bill now before us, that aspect of the matter raised by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris. My conclusion must be that the amendment cannot be put.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

• (2.00 p.m.)

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, when Bill C-187 was introduced in the House last November, and during the brief time in which it was debated during March, it had been my intention to speak briefly on the subject, not so much in respect of what the bill contains but rather in relation to some glaring omissions which I felt I should bring to the attention of the House.

The bill is a comprehensive one. It is a complicated measure, and generally speaking hon. members feel it represents the government's plan for the operation of Yukon mining resources in the future. When we consider the legislation in this light we find, as has been men-

Yukon Minerals Act

tioned by previous speakers, that it runs somewhat contrary to the views expressed by several ministers sitting on the other side of the House.

A great deal of interest has been shown in this subject over the last few years, especially in the question of foreign control of Canadian industry and natural resources. At the present time, a large group in Canada is recruiting support in favour of what it terms an independent Canada. I said a few moments ago that the bill, in many respects, runs contrary to statements made by Ministers of the Crown. Yesterday in the House the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie) referred to the remarks of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) in the course of the symposium on petroleum economics and evaluation which was held in Dallas in March. I know the minister may say we are misinterpreting his words, but it appears to me the minister indicated that foreign investment would certainly be welcomed by Canada. I can tell him I appreciate his interest in this respect.

An hon. Member: The minister of energy does not want it, though.

Mr. Simpson: My hon. friend is right. He has spoken out against it on many occasions. However, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development at that time stated to this group that foreign capital need not fear because Canada would remain an open country seeking positive, not negative, answers to questions relating to foreign investment.

• (2:10 p.m.)

A close look at this bill reveals that it introduces, unlike the existing act, Canadian ownership requirements which in effect provide that a lease of mineral rights can be granted only to a Canadian citizen or Canadian corporation incorporated in Canada; that 50 per cent of the outstanding shares of such corporation must be issued and beneficially owned by Canadian citizens or other Canadian corporations. It is easy for one to say that there should be not too much quarrel with that proposition, and generally I have no quarrel with it, though I for one do welcome foreign investment in Canada. The one reason that I wish to speak on Bill C-187 is that I learn from the bill that there are certain requirements governing foreign investment in minerals in the Yukon.

Ministers have been going across the country offering their own suggestions as to what the Canadian government should require in respect to foreign capital in Canada, and this brings me to the point I should like to make. Although I have said that this is not a good bill, I feel that in many places it is an exceptionally bad bill because of several important omissions in its provisions.

For example, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) mentioned briefly that nowhere in the bill is there any spelling out of the rights that native peoples may have in regard to the future sale or development of natural resources in the Yukon. The hon. member went so far as to move an amendment, which I was disappointed to see ruled out of order because the main objection that I and many others have to this bill is that the rights