

When that bill or resolution is brought down I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will vote against it.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to say a word on this matter and to make myself understood by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Irvine). One of the things the people of my riding cannot understand is how I take advice from him. Another thing they cannot understand is why we have no time to discuss such vital things as subsidies on milk and—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): The price of strawberries.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Yes, and such vital things as—

Mr. BOUCHER: The red curtain over peaches.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We can take time in and out—but I have only twenty minutes to fill in—to discuss divorce bills. I am getting a lot of assistance around here. We can take all this time to discuss divorce bills but we cannot find time to discuss other vital matters. I want the hon. member for Cariboo to know that I was not elected to come here and discuss divorce bills. I am neither competent nor have I the time to do that.

An hon. MEMBER: You are not competent.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: My hon. friend here says I am not competent. Probably the reason I am not competent is that I come from the most beautiful spot in the Dominion of Canada. Hon. members may have heard of Atlantic City; they also may have heard that once a year a competition is held to discover Miss America. I wish to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and, through you to the House of Commons, that each and every fair girl in the Fraser Valley is a Miss Fraser Valley far surpassing any Miss America in Atlantic City. We do not have to worry about anything like that.

Some time ago this government, of which I am a supporter, brought in legislation not to encourage divorce but to discourage it. They did everything they could to promote family life. Of course I am speaking of family allowances. Why should we have divorces? May I say that at any time I will vote to prevent divorce bills from being brought before the House of Commons.

Having had some experience with lawyers, which always cost me money because they generally lost my cases, I can understand their point of view. I can understand the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher) because I sympathize with anyone who has to live in

Carleton. I was coming down town on the street-car this morning. As hon. members know, the street-cars are crowded in Ottawa. I left around half-past seven o'clock to get down to my office at eight o'clock. The street-cars are old. What I have to say has some connection with these divorce cases. As I entered the car I noticed a dear old lady with grey hair sitting in a comfortable seat. She saw me get on and that I had no seat, so she got up and gave me hers. It was one of the old cars they got from Toronto; and any time you get anything given you from Toronto you can be sure it is old. Any hon. members who travel on the Bank street-cars know they are old; this particular seat was worn out, and there was a hollow in the middle. When this very dear old grey-haired lady got up to give me the seat I noticed that in the other half of the seat there was a very pretty girl; and I had to slide into the seat. According to the evidence I read in one of these cases from Montreal, that could have been grounds for divorce. That is why I think every one of these cases should be explained, because they are not all the same.

What I started to say was this. I can understand lawyers doing a lot of things, because if I were a lawyer I would do them myself. If you are a lawyer you get \$50 for the first hour; after that there is a discount and the client is charged only \$37.50 for the next half-hour. But I cannot understand the names of hon. members appearing on the order paper in this connection. I see after bill No. 37 the name "Mr. Boucher" and the initials "E. F."; I do not know what that means. I understand the hon. member for Carleton sponsored this bill. I can never understand why a member should sponsor a divorce bill in this house, because to me it is a very serious thing to sponsor anything. For instance, I am sponsoring higher prices for everything the farmer produces, but I do not get a chance to say so here; I am called out of order if I say we should increase the subsidies on milk and strawberries and peaches, and so on. This is very much in connection with divorce, because at the time I happened to mention peaches I had a letter from a farmer in Ontario. In this province they put a little gauze over the peaches, and this producer in writing to me said that this gauze reminded me of much of the evidence in these divorce bills.

That reminds me that I came through Alberta the other day. I have often wondered as to the grounds for divorce. I have been to Toronto; I have even been through Saskatchewan, so that I can understand why there should be divorces in some parts of