

as is true of every divorce case, which one does not like, but there seems to be no alternative but to grant this divorce. This is another of these Scotch tape cases.

Mr. Murray (Cariboo): I object to the word "Scotch" being used in that connection.

Mr. Knowles: I can only quote from the evidence, at the middle of page 11:

Q. Was the Scotch tape still in place?

A. It had not been touched.

This is the modern type of investigation, done with Scotch tape instead of match sticks. This is an unhappy case; the couple had not been living together for quite a time. For the reasons set out in the evidence the Senate has agreed to the divorce, and I must confess that they had no alternative. While I am on my feet I should like to say just a word in reply—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think the debate on the question of procedure on the previous bill was not strictly in order. I permitted it at that time, but I doubt if we should continue that debate now.

Mr. Knowles: Then I would like to say with respect to this bill that it is a private bill and therefore subject to the provisions of citation 769 in Beauchesne's third edition, which says that agreement to the second reading of a private bill is a conditional agreement, subject to proof being produced in the committee. Then the citation goes on to say:

Where, irrespective of such facts, the principle is objectionable, the house will not consent to the second reading . . .

Further on the citation says:

This is the first occasion on which the bill is before the house otherwise than pro forma or in connection with the standing orders; and if the bill be opposed, upon its principle, it is the proper time for attempting its defeat.

I do not wish to attempt the defeat of this bill.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Knowles: Because I have looked over the evidence and think it is one that can be granted. But I believe the point needs to be made and repeated, for the benefit of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Applewhaite) and others, that if an hon. member is opposed to the principle of one of these bills the time to express that opposition is on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion for second reading?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: On division?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Those in favour will say yea.

Private Bills—Divorce

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: Those opposed will say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and referred to the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

EDNA GIBSON SMITH SCHILLER

Mr. H. W. Winkler (Lisgar) moved the second reading of Bill No. 31, for the relief of Edna Gibson Smith Schiller.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This is another of the bills in connection with which the evidence has not been distributed. Therefore, for the reasons we have advanced previously, which were well put by my leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell), again tonight, I do not think the house should be asked to proceed with this bill. I could move the motion I have moved on other bills but perhaps hon. members would be satisfied to have you call it nine o'clock.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggarr): We do not want to delay the real business of the house, which is the motion to go into supply and the debate on defence. If the house will not agree to call it nine o'clock now I want to say I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that we should not deal with this bill. We do not wish to waste the time of the house with a vote on the motion, so I suggest that it is nine o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It being nine o'clock, the house will revert to the business under consideration at six o'clock.

SUPPLY

NATIONAL DEFENCE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Claxton for committee of supply.

Mr. Drew: Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was discussing what the subject before us means in terms of taxes upon our people, and I had sought to emphasize the fact that at this time we are very strongly of the opinion that not only the members of this house but the people of Canada are entitled to detailed information as to how the billions of dollars already spent have actually been employed,