

class of legislation brought here first, and if he does it will help out the present situation a great deal.

I have only one word to say in reply to the senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock). To a very large extent what he said is true, but he and I and every member of this House must remember this: if there is any blame, it is to be attached to me, and to him, and to you. We are all free lances; any one of us has the right at any time to initiate in this Chamber something that will give us work to do. Has the senator from Parkdale exercised that right? Have I?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Stop your kidding.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I am not kidding; I am stating straight facts, and he knows it perfectly well. I say he has the right and the privilege to introduce in this House things that will give us real work. I have that right, and you have, too, but we have not exercised it. That is another reason why we have nothing to do.

Now there is a suggestion from my friend behind me (Hon. Mr. McRae) that we can at least inquire into the problem of post-war planning. I know a little about it. I know the avalanche of work that came upon us when the last war ended, and I was in the very heart of it. I worked nights and days for weeks and months on that job with very little preparation. I had to start from the ground up. With the experience we have of the conditions that existed after the last war there is no reason in the world why there should not be good, sound planning well in advance. There are many civil servants still here to-day who were in the heart of the mess—shall I say?—at that time. Thousands upon thousands of soldiers will come back to this country with all sorts of ideas and demands as to what should be done, and there must be somebody ready to deal with the situation that will then arise. The problem will confront the whole of Canada, for there is no section that will not be affected. If at this time, one year or two years prior to the close of the war, the necessary organization were mapped out, although it might not be finally adopted, at least the ground-work would be done, and it would be exceedingly helpful to those who would have to deal with the problem. There are other fields to explore, and I trust the leader opposite and the leader on this side will do what they can to have work of that character undertaken.

Hon. JOHN T. HAIG: Honourable members, I wish to congratulate the acting leader of the Government on bringing the question up. I also want to congratulate the member from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) on making

concrete suggestions. I think the member from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) forgot that if the member from Vancouver promised that no soldiers should be sent to Europe, some of us in Canada voted on the 27th of April to release him from that promise,—

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: —and quite emphatically we released the Government. I think the member from Parkdale should have told us that all those who promised we would not send soldiers to Europe were released from their commitment on the 27th of April last, and I do not think it now lies in our mouths to remind anybody of that promise. Surely I could not go to the Prime Minister and say, "Mr. Prime Minister, you promised men should not be sent to Europe." "Why," he would say, "my dear Haig, I was released from that promise on the 27th of April." Surely the honourable member from Vancouver was also released at the same time.

Besides the subjects mentioned by preceding members, there are one or two others that will confront this country pressingly as the years go by. The first question I shall mention is not one with respect to which there is unanimity in this House; I quite understand that; but we shall be constantly pressed to deal with divorce reform. Legislation to this end was introduced in the Imperial Parliament and passed. Similar legislation passed this House, but was rejected by the House of Commons. Now we are in a position to investigate and ascertain the results of divorce reform in Great Britain, and we can and ought to deal with it without prejudice. If a senator happens to be a member of a church that does not believe in divorce, it still is part of his duty to get at the facts, to see what are the effects of divorce reform. Whatever church an honourable senator belongs to, I submit he is no useful member of that church unless he is fully informed on all subjects with which that church has to deal. Those of us who are members of the Divorce Committee appreciate the gravity of the problem we have to face in the discharge of our duties. Always there must be considered the legal and the moral side of divorce.

Another question that should be dealt with by a committee of this House is world-trade following the war. I am not talking about Free Trade or Protection. Those controversial points may come up incidentally, and I may believe in Protection while you may believe in Free Trade; but no matter what our fiscal views may be, the situation following the war will for many years be so radically changed that what we talked about in pre-war days will seem piffle.