

Canada, but I can never understand why there should be any suggestion of divorce in Alberta. Next to the Fraser valley Alberta is one of the finest districts you could ever see, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will visit it some time. Out in Alberta you are right under the foothills.

I wish to speak about the McGregor case; perhaps I should go into the details of it. It was always my understanding that bills coming before this house were supposed to be studied and read by all hon. members. For instance, I am perfectly well aware of the fact that the hon. member for Vancouver East and the Secretary of State never read that section of the bill we were discussing this afternoon before it was brought in here. If they had read it before they would have realized that something was wrong, and could have come to me to have it fixed up. In my opinion, every bill that comes into this house should be studied and read. I have not had a chance to study this bill No. 37 introduced by the hon. member for Carleton, but I did have time to read the McGregor case, and I want to suggest that this case should be read by every hon. member. The McGregor case, or maybe it is the Montgomery case—I know it was a Scotch name—was a wonderful case. I have read all these bills, for the reason that I am interested in this matter. For two years I represented the riding of Vancouver North, in addition to my own riding, while my good friend and room-mate was overseas. Those hon. members who have been overseas, particularly those who have been in Sicily or in Africa, know how desolate it is out there in the desert, with nothing to do but watch the sand drift by. In order to keep my hon. friend well informed I would send him copies of *Hansard*, so that he might have something to read to his fellow members of the air force. But I knew *Hansard* was not very interesting, because so often it contained the remarks of the C.C.F. members, so that I used to send him these divorce bills. On them I always marked, "With the compliments of George Cruickshank", and my name became so familiar overseas that when these men returned home they automatically voted for me.

Speaking particularly to bill No. 37, I should like to ask the hon. member for Carleton a few questions. Are there any children in this case? If so, how many? How old are they? Are they under proper supervision and care if this divorce should be granted? How long has the hon. member known them?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have allowed the hon. gentleman a great deal of latitude

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

to make his point and discuss the divorce bills which are before the house, but I think he is pretty far away from them now.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I was just coming to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BENTLEY: If I may ask the hon. gentleman a question, I was just wondering if in the few minutes left at his disposal he would be disposed to make a recommendation that a divorce be arranged between the Canadian wheat board and the Winnipeg grain exchange.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: That question is out of order, but I will answer it when I am through asking these questions. Perhaps, however, after the hon. member for Carleton has given me this information, it will be possible for the hon. member who asked me the question to tell me when there will be a divorce between the Labour Progressives and the C.C.F. party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Well, I should like to ask the hon. member this question in connection with this divorce.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): I should like to ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is to be permitted deliberately to obstruct the business of the house. Some time ago he admitted that he had only twenty minutes to speak, to waste. I wish to speak on this divorce matter, not in the foolish manner we are now listening to but seriously, and I find I am not going to be able to take a few moments to express myself.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I object to the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Through you, Mr. Speaker, I am asking if an hon. member is to be permitted deliberately to obstruct the business of the house, as the hon. member is doing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: On a point of privilege, I am accused of deliberately doing something.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Has the hon. member finished stating his point of order?

Mr. MATTHEWS (Kootenay East): Yes.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The hon. gentleman is a very good friend; as a matter of fact he belongs to the same faith that I do, and I forgive him a lot. He imputes things to me which I know he will regret to-morrow. I am sure he would not want to deprive