

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read a third time?

**Mr. E. Nasserden (Rosthern):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is that this bill involves one of the prerogatives of the crown and therefore requires the consent of the crown before it can be given a third reading in the House of Commons. May I refer you to citation 283 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, page 231 of the fourth edition:

The royal consent cannot be communicated in committee, is generally given at the third reading, and its omission, when it is required, renders the proceedings on the passage of a bill null and void—

The procedure with respect of signifying the "consent" is different from that in giving the recommendation of the crown. The recommendation precedes every grant of money the consent may be given at any stage before final passage, and is always necessary in matters involving the rights of the crown, its patronage, its property or its prerogatives.

I should also like to quote from Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, fourth edition, page 413, where we find the following:

A misapprehension has sometimes arisen as to the time when the "consent" of the crown should be given to a bill. The procedure with respect to signifying the consent is different from that in giving the recommendation of the crown. The recommendation precedes every grant of money; the consent may be given at any stage before final passage, and is always necessary in matters involving the rights of the crown, its patronage, its property, or its prerogatives.

Then on page 414 we find the following:

If the royal assent is not given at the last stage, the speaker will refuse to put the question. If a bill, requiring the royal assent, should be permitted to pass all its stages through some inadvertence, attention will be called immediately to the "fact in the house, and the proceedings declared null and void".

I should like to draw your attention to what is said in this regard in May's sixteenth edition, page 825, as follows:

The fact that a bill affecting the interests of the crown has been mentioned in the speech from the throne does not exempt it from the need for the royal consent.

Where a bill affecting the interests of the crown has been suffered, through inadvertence to be read the third time and passed without the royal consent being signified, the proceedings have been declared null and void.

The English translation of Faucher De Saint Maurice's parliamentary procedure, dealing with the matter on page 657, reads as follows:

I am of the opinion that the consent may be given at any time before the final question, "That the bill do pass", and that in the absence of such consent, this final question is the only one which the speaker is prohibited by the law of parliament, and by constitutional usages, from putting to the house.

All of these authorities are agreed on the necessity of the crown's consent. They are

*Municipal Development and Loan Board* also emphatic that without that consent a bill is declared null and void. This is a very commendable piece of legislation and my purpose in bringing this matter—

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Could I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Has he by any chance a copy of the statement he is making? It is a little difficult to follow for anyone who would like to comment upon it.

**Mr. Nasserden:** I will let the hon. gentleman have it when I have completed my remarks, if he would like it.

**Mr. Knowles:** So would I.

**Mr. Nasserden:** I have only one copy here; I wish I had more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very commendable piece of legislation which is before us. My purpose in bringing this matter up at this time is not to try to destroy the bill. I am not trying to delay the proceedings.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Nasserden:** Well, hon. gentlemen opposite can raise all they want here today, but I spent the better part of a couple of weeks going through the rule books on this question and I should like an answer today for my own satisfaction, and I believe for the satisfaction of others as well.

In the British House of Commons the procedure followed has been in conformity with the views expressed by the authorities I have mentioned. There are a great many citations to which reference might be made and which might be brought to the attention of the house in support of these views. The practice in Great Britain, as evidenced by the journals of their house of commons, might be interesting to the members of this house. I refer to volume 107, page 157, where we find this:

The house was moved, that the entry in the votes of yesterday of the proceedings of the house on the third reading of the Rhyd Improvement Bill might be read, and the same being read;

And notice being taken that Her Majesty's interest is concerned therein, and that Her consent had not been signified thereto;

Ordered that the proceedings on the third reading of the said bill be null and void.

The situation was the same with regard to another bill which had been dealt with by the British House of Commons.

This matter became the subject of an interesting debate in the Canadian House of Commons on May 29, 1951, at which time the distinguished leader of my party, the then member for Lake Centre, questioned the procedure which was being followed. The minister of justice of that day was piloting a bill through the house regarding the Petition of Right Act and by his statement as reported in *Hansard*, 1951, at page 3505, he confirmed