

either the member for Fraser Valley of the opportunity to ask a few questions, or the hon. member for Carleton of the right to give the answers. I have already given an answer to my good friend. Long before you were even nominated, years before you were elected, I was speaking in this house and opposing the principle of divorce bills. So far as I am concerned, I have given an assurance of what I will do, if this ever comes to a vote.

If the house will just let me alone for a little while, I will return to a discussion of the point raised by the hon. member for Carleton. If my good friend had been elected when I was—and I have been here for years and years and years—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; the hon. member should address himself to the Chair. I would ask him to confine his remarks to the bills before the house.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I rise to a point of order, and ask for a ruling on my question. If an hon. member in the house is permitted deliberately to obstruct the business of the house, as the hon. member is now doing—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not given proof that the hon. member speaking has been trying to obstruct the business of the house. The fact that the hon. member said that he had twenty or twenty-five minutes ahead of him is no indication that he is trying to obstruct. But I would say to the hon. member for Fraser Valley that it is his duty to discuss the bill, and only that.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I apologise, again. What I meant when I referred to twenty minutes, when I made that observation, through you, sir, to some of the uninformed members, was that private bills go on only until nine o'clock. I am sorry, but Your Honour has probably not had experience enough to understand me.

However, I should like to address the Chair, and the hon. member for Carleton, through you, sir. How many children are there in this family? How old are they? Has proper provision been made for their care in the future? Are they boys and girls?

An hon. MEMBER: Boys "and" girls?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Are there any immediate relatives? That is all I have to say.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it is customary when a member sponsors a bill of this kind for him, before doing so, to verify the propriety of the bill and the regularity of the procedure.

As the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) may know, it is customary to have divorce bills introduced in the senate and to have them reviewed by a committee of the senate. Evidence is taken by that committee, and it is available to any member of the House of Commons who wishes to look at it. After a divorce bill has been passed by the Senate, it comes to the House of Commons, at which time a member of the house on behalf of the solicitor or the applicant, is asked to sponsor the bill.

When the hon. member for Fraser Valley was speaking, perhaps he had in mind those fine-looking girls from the Fraser Valley, and was confusing them with the peaches concealed behind the red veils on peach baskets. Perhaps he got lost behind the veil, when he has been thinking of those good-looking girls from the Fraser Valley. It will be noted that the hon. member used the expression "came from", and because of that I would judge he has not been able to see any other good-looking girls who have remained in the Fraser Valley.

I do not think it would be wise at this time to discuss the principle of divorce bills. Rather, I would refer the hon. member to evidence taken in the senate. I do not think we would be enhancing the prestige of parliament if we were to discuss the impropriety of bringing divorce bills before the house in this fashion. The fact of the matter is that Quebec does not have divorce courts, although I believe if they wanted to they could have them. Further, I believe it is the wish of Quebec that this parliament, not the local legislature, should handle their divorce bills. I believe, too, that if divorce is possible in some communities we should not make it impossible in others. To those hon. members who object to the procedure in this chamber, a procedure which they may wish to describe as slipshod, let me say that the facts of these cases have already been considered thoroughly by the senate committee, a committee composed of competent members of that house, who have recommended certain action to the House of Commons.

Each year since I have come to the house, and I believe for many years before that, the same argument has been raised by way of criticism of the manner in which we pass divorce bills. Those very members who are loudest in their criticism are the ones who are most guilty of delay; neither have they brought before the house any constructive or acceptable suggestion as to a better method of proceeding. I would recommend, therefore, that in future those members who wish to criticize procedure in connection with