

the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) argued in his presentation, and it seemed to me that maybe there was something I wanted to look at further to see if there was a distinction there that I might bring out for the benefit of honourable Members.

The honourable Member for Peace River argued that the consent of the Crown is required before the right can be given to waive the penalty which is referred to in clause 108(11) of the bill, and that penalty is imposed by subclause (10) of the particular clause, and whether or not without the consent of the Sovereign, given before the bill is finally passed, and that the bill should not accordingly provide for that right of waiver.

I won't take much more time of the House in making this decision but I want to thank the honourable Member for Peace River and the Minister of Agriculture for their presentations, because it does seem to me that it was a new point, certainly to me with my very limited experience in the Chair, and there might be a distinction I wanted to make before rendering a decision—that the recommendation which is required for all bills, which we generally call money bills, and this was the argument of the Minister of Agriculture, that the recommendation of His Excellency did in fact cover the point that the honourable Member for Peace River raised with respect to consent.

And it seems to me that we have to go somewhat further, to look at the argument made by the honourable Member for Peace River, that in this particular case where the right to waive the penalty was given in the bill, that there would have to be the consent of the Sovereign. The matter has been dealt with by Mr. Speaker, and I want to refer just very briefly to his decision on that occasion. But before doing so I might say that generally speaking one might say that consent, as argued by the honourable Member for Peace River, is required only where the personal property of the Sovereign is affected, as distinguished from property that the Sovereign may hold for the Sovereign's subjects.

I would just refer honourable Members to the ruling of Mr. Speaker, in the 1963 session, volume 3. The matter was raised at page 2980 during consideration of the Municipal Development and Loan Board Bill, and in circumstances which did not affect the personal property of the Sovereign. And Mr. Speaker, then Mr. Deputy Speaker, made this distinction, and if I might read it very briefly: "I should like to turn to the citation which has been quoted by the honourable Member, that is citation 283. It is obvious that his whole argument, as has been suggested by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. Favreau, is based on the premise that certain rights and privileges of the Crown are affected. It says:"

And here Mr. Speaker, quotes: "The consent of the King or Queen, as the case may be (to be distinguished from the Royal Assent of bills) is given by a Privy Councillor to bills (and occasionally amendments) affecting local and personal interests which concern the royal

prerogative, the hereditary revenue or personal property or interests of the Crown or Duchy of Cornwall."

I might just mention without reading them, the two other citations on which Mr. Speaker based his decision, Campion at page 329, and Beausiesne, citation 283.

And so, in view of the distinction that was then drawn, and as I have tried to do, in the cases where Royal Consent is required, it seems to me that while the argument of the honourable Member was a learned one, it should not prevail in these circumstances.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Olson, seconded by Mr. Basford,—That Bill C-175, An Act respecting grain, be now read a third time and do pass.

After further debate, the question being put on the said motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the said bill was read the third time and passed.

The Order being read for the second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill S-2, An Act respecting statistics of Canada;

Mr. Olson for Mr. Pepin, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That the said bill be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

*(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)*

At 10.00 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate, the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

*Changes in Committee Membership*

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Benjamin for Mr. Brewin on the Special Committee on Election Expenses.

Mr. Nystrom for Mr. Peters on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Messrs. Rochon, Roy (Laval) and Howe for Messrs. Crossman, Smith (Saint-Jean) and McCleave on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.