

Standing order 72 applies to the introduction and prior to first reading. It says:

No bill may be introduced either in blank or in an imperfect shape.

Therefore at that moment the hon. member cannot raise that point of order because he does not have a copy of the bill. The bill has not been printed. It is my duty, however, to satisfy myself. My satisfaction must be made on a very summary basis because hon. members cannot expect the Speaker to study every bill in an effort to find out whether or not something has been omitted. Hon. members have taken care of that situation themselves by insisting in their procedure that after second reading all bills be referred or committed either to one of their standing committees or to the committee of the whole and even if a bill goes to a standing committee it must be committed to the committee of the whole.

In the committee of the whole proper amendments may be moved, new clauses may be inserted and schedules may be inserted and that is the manner in which it is being done. To raise a point of order and say the second reading of this bill cannot be put because there is an omission in it is not correct. I think the hon. member will admit his point as to explanatory notes is not a good one and I do not think he would insist on that point.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, in order to clear the ground for the more important objection, I will withdraw the first objection. But I press the second one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's main objection is this. It is his contention that, because this bill refers to an agreement and the terms of the agreement not being a part of the bill and not being printed *in extenso* in the bill, the control of the house over the expenditures which may be involved therein is being denied. That is the way I would summarize the point the hon. member has made.

Control of parliament over expenditures is exercised through the financial initiative of the crown. The crown must recommend any expenditures which have to be passed through the house. The way the crown signifies its recommendation is through the Speaker now announcing that a royal recommendation has been given to a resolution that outlines the expenditures involved. When we are not dealing with a money bill, the case does not obtain. In this instance we are dealing with a money bill. The

Northern Ontario Pipe Line Corporation

exigencies of the control of the house over expenditures have been met, in my view, by the fact that a resolution has preceded this bill, a resolution which was accompanied by the royal recommendation. These are the requirements of the British North America Act. These are the requirements of standing order 61.

We have done exactly what must be done in relation both to the section of the British North America Act and to standing order 61. We have gone into committee of the whole. We have examined the resolution, which does not contain any details of the various sections of the bill but just gives an outline of the expenditures contemplated later in the bill. At this moment the bill has received its first reading, and it was ordered to be printed. Now it is up for second reading. If the hon. member's point was right, a new resolution would have to be introduced, because that is the only way to correct something missing in a bill in which the financial initiative of the Crown is involved. If that is not the point, then it can be corrected by the proper amendments being moved when the bill is in committee of the whole being studied, clause by clause.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart): May I just say one word in support of my hon. friend? As far as the amendment of the bill in committee is concerned, that is problematical because often amendments moved in committee are rejected by the committee and therefore are not reported to the house.

Mr. Speaker: May I just say to the hon. member that surely he cannot expect the Speaker to rule on the probability that amendments may not be adopted.

Mr. Coldwell: I did not ask you to rule on that. I simply made the remark, which I think is perfectly correct, in regard to what happens in this house. This particular bill refers to an agreement—an agreement, moreover, made with the approval of the government of Canada before or after the coming into effect of this particular measure. We have no knowledge of that agreement other than that it was tabled and circulated through the house by request of members. This agreement is one of the most important agreements coming before the house in my time. In my opinion, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, this house should not only be apprized of what is in this particular agreement but this house should approve of the agreement when this bill is before the house on the second reading. We should be given that chance on the second reading.