

Ways and Means

ending March 31, 1964, the sum of \$990,623,771.47, be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Sharp (for Mr. Gordon) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-132, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending March 31, 1964.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1.

Mr. Herridge: Is the bill in the usual terms?

Mr. Pickersgill: Well, I think the Acting Minister of Finance would be able to say the bill was in the usual terms.

Mr. Sharp: Yes, I can give the house the assurance the bill is in the ordinary form.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules A to E inclusive agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported and read the third time and passed.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State): I wonder if I might have what I believe will have to be unanimous consent to revert to government notices of motion? Perhaps, if I get unanimous consent, the motion that stands on the order paper in the name of the Minister of Justice could be dealt with. In doing so, I would, of course, be asking for unanimous consent to have this measure dealt with in all its stages. I think perhaps I should not ask, though there has been a great deal of consultation about this, without informing some hon. members who may not be aware of the contents of the bill. The measure to be dealt with would be one establishing an additional judge of the exchequer court who would be available, if it were desired, and would have authority of an act of parliament to be founded upon this resolution, to have leave of absence to serve as an officer of the other place for the purpose of dealing with divorce petitions, as provided for in the legislation that was adopted last August. That is all, I may say, that is in the measure itself.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Sharp.]

JUDGES ACT

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR
EXCHEQUER COURT

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Judges Act and the Exchequer Court Act to authorize the appointment of, and the provision of salary for, one additional judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Pickersgill (for Mr. Chevrier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. C-133, for the appointment of an additional judge to the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Secretary of State): I believe that the house would be disposed, from such consultations as I have had, to give unanimous consent to take certain private bills that are on the order paper, with the exception of one about which I believe another position is to be taken a little later, in a single motion, and that the house would also unanimously agree to dispense with sending the bills to the miscellaneous private bills committee. Then, we could go into committee on all the bills in a single motion and deal with all of them at each stage in a single motion. If I correctly interpret the will of the house, could that be ordered?

Mr. Aiken: In this connection, I would consent to reverting to private bills, but there has been no other agreement with regard to the final private bill reached. I would consent, therefore, to reverting to private bills, but not otherwise.

Mr. Pickersgill: Pardon?

Mr. Aiken: There has been no agreement reached in respect of the Good News Broadcasting bill, and therefore if we revert to private bills I merely want to revert to private bills, because this would bring on that bill.

Mr. Pickersgill: Is the hon. gentleman willing to have the divorce bills dealt with first?

Mr. Aiken: I have no objection to that. I merely indicate the Secretary of State said this would refer only to the divorce bills and not the last bill. I say that if we are to revert