procedure in a vitally important point, is as to whether or not it is essential to have this motion for the royal assent before the bill is introduced, or whether it can be given at any time before the bill is passed. It seems to me so far as I am able to gather from the precedents that that is the true position and that there is some difference of opinion on this subject.

He concluded that as long as the consent was given before the bill was finally passed, that was all that was essential. As reported on column 599, Lord Hailsham uses these words:

> The practice which has been very fully stated is conveniently summarized in the little book to which we sometimes refer, "The Companion to the Standing Orders," in which it is set out that: "The consent of the crown, as distinguished from its assent, is requisite to every bill or amendment to a bill affecting the royal prerogative or the interests of the crown. It may be given at any time during the progress of the bill, which ought not to be allowed to pass if such consent be not given."

It therefore follows, as I pointed out last session, that there are special circumstances which surround the enactment of legislation that deprives the crown of its prerogative. Those special circumstances are that consent must be given through an address to the crown before the bill passes the house. In this instance it will be observed that all that was done was to ask the crown not to exercise its prerogative, the language being that the crown refrain from conferring any titles. In other words, this was placing a prohibition upon the exercise of the prerogative. I submit to this chamber that that is beyond the competence of this body, and in addition, in the language of Lord Reading, it is in itself an affront to the crown. As the crown possesses the prerogative, and as that prerogative can be taken away only by statute after prior consent has been given, to pass a resolution asking the sovereign to place a prohibition upon his own prerogative is in itself, as Lord Reading says, what should not be contemplated for a moment—an affront to the sovereign himself. But that was what was done by this house.

Last year the matter was raised when a question was asked by the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier), to which an answer was given on May 17. The answer I gave was this:

> The promotion of the Right Honourable Sir George Halsey Perley, K.C.M.G., to be an ordinary member of the first class or Knights Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, was made in conformity with established constitutional practice, it being the considered view of His Majesty's government in Canada that the motion, with respect to honours, adopted on the 22nd day of May, 1919, by a majority vote of the members of the Commons House only of the thirteenth parliament (which was dissolved on the 4th day of October, 1921) is not binding upon His Majesty or His Majesty's government in Canada or the seventeenth parliament of Canada.

There is only one further point to be noted, and that is that later the leader of the opposition asked a question to which I gave the answer that he read yesterday indicating that parliament consists of three estates and that until they combine in action, the prerogative was not affected. This year, recommendations having been made by the Prime Minister for the New Year's honour list, so-called, the names of certain Canadians appeared on that list. That was in the exercise of the prerogative of the sovereign on the recommendation of the Prime Minister. The action is that of the Prime Minister; he must assume the responsibility, and the responsibility too for advising the crown that the resolution passed by the House of Commons was without validity, force or effect with respect to the sovereign's prerogative. That seems to me to be reasonably clear.

I am asked two questions. One is why action of this kind was taken at the time it was in view of the fact that parliament had been called on December 12 for the dispatch of business. I suppose it is unnecessary to say to this house that matters of this kind have, in the nature of things, to be disposed of weeks in advance of the first day of January and long before the 12th day of December had been reached and parliament was called for the dispatch of business, this matter had been acted upon. Everyone who is familiar with the conduct of public business knows that is so. On the second point, namely, as to why, in view of a resolution placed on the order paper, action was taken knowing the matter would be brought up for consideration, I think it is only necessary to point to the resolution itself. The resolution is in these words:

> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty, praying that Your Majesty hereafter may be graciously pleased to refrain from conferring any titles upon your subjects domiciled or living in Canada, it being always understood that this humble prayer has no reference to professional or vocational appellations conferred in respect to commissions issued by Your Majesty to persons in military or naval services of Canada or to persons engaged in the administration of justice of the dominion.

It will be observed that the only two that received titles were chief justices, the one of Canada and the other of the province of