

Mr. Dinsdale, seconded by Mr. Nielsen, proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after the word “that” be left out and the following substituted therefor:

“this House, by reason that the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act, chapter 22 of the 1964-65 statutes, extends and applies, except as therein provided, to every Act of Parliament and every order, rule or regulation thereunder and the Governor in Council has failed to exercise his powers under that statute to issue lists of geographical co-ordinates of points from which baselines may be determined to establish the inner limits of the Arctic portion of the territorial sea of Canada and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has not caused charts to be issued delineating the Arctic portion of the said territorial sea wherefor the Arctic submarine areas adjacent and super-jacent to the coast of Canada, to which the bill applies as mentioned in clause 3 thereof, are not known to and cannot presently be determined by this House, and by reason of the immediate relevancy to the bill and the said statute of the declarations, recommendations and other matter set out and contained in the First Report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, presented to the House on Tuesday, 19 December 1969, relating to the sovereignty of Canada in the Arctic, will not proceed upon this bill until that day next following the day upon which the question is put for concurrence by this House in the said Report, or, if Parliament is not then sitting, then on any day next thereafter that Parliament is sitting.”

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) and the president of the Privy Council in their interventions on this question mentioned the ruling of Mr. Speaker on January 15 last when a reasoned amendment in relation to the bill to amend the Canada Water Act was before the House. I suggest to honourable Members that the ruling on that occasion is relevant and applies in full measure to the amendment now being considered. I should like to quote sections of that ruling. Paragraph 5 on page 312 of *Votes and Proceedings*, which is an excerpt from May's, citation 382, reads: “It is also competent to a Member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of Judges.”

In my view the really operative part of that citation is the following: “a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill”. Farther on, the same ruling refers to section 1 of citation 393 of Beauchesne's 4th edition which reads: “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.”

In my view the amendment moved today by the honourable Member for Brandon-Souris is substantially the same as the one moved by the honourable