

it would be in the interests of my grandchildren, I believe, that the parents should be separated. I love my children very much, but I am sure that my grandchildren would fare better in a household which was not divided by the behavior of their parents. As a lawyer I find as I grow older that the number of women who consult me on these domestic matters is increasing, because most women prefer to talk with elderly lawyers. One thing that troubles them is the cost of proceedings. As a rule the husband is the wage earner, and it is difficult not to feel sympathy with a woman who finds it almost impossible to finance her suit. On many occasions I have had to advise a divorce, because the effects upon the children were such that I could not conscientiously advise the wife to carry on. So, while I do not favour divorce, I admit its necessity; there seems to be no alternative. But I will not argue the question.

On a matter of procedure, I suggest that this house should lay down a rule that cases which are not ready for hearing by the 1st of March, or at least by the 1st of April, should be held over until the following session. If this were done our members would have a reasonable chance to deal with other matters, and we should hear less criticism to the effect that this house is a glorified divorce court. I do not like that. I do not appreciate anyone saying to me, "Well, I suppose you are going down to Ottawa now to help get the Senate divorce mill running". It was certainly never the intention of the Fathers of Confederation that the Senate should find itself open to such criticism. It was intended that men and women experienced in public life should help to formulate better legislation for Canada by serving in the Senate.

I do not know what I would do without the services of the honourable and distinguished senator from Rosetown (Hon. Mr. Aseltine). When I go wrong he puts me right. You ought to hear him lecture me sometimes. In any event, I believe my honourable friend served on the Divorce Committee for some fifteen years.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** Twenty-one years.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** That is worse than I thought. Finally, one day I said to him, "Well, Walter, you can continue to serve on the Divorce Committee if you want, but I can tell you that you are not helping either the Conservative party or myself by working on that committee all day." I added, "You owe it to the people of Saskatchewan, particularly Rosetown, to devote more of your time to other legislation." I would say

such a thing to any honourable senator who has served on the Divorce Committee for a long period of time.

In conclusion I would again urge that the Chairman of the Divorce Committee take steps to see that no divorce cases are heard in the Senate this session after April 1.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, may I have the indulgence—

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I would draw your attention to the fact that if the honourable gentleman from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) speaks now he will close the debate.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** I have just a few comments to make in reply to the very kind remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig). I wish to thank him for his sympathetic attitude towards the Divorce Committee and particularly towards its chairman. I would like to associate myself with his remarks about the honourable senator from Rosetown (Hon. Mr. Aseltine), who gave many long years of patient and excellent service both as a member and Chairman of the Divorce Committee. However, there was one remark which I believe was inadvertently made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition. In speaking about the criticism made in the House of Commons he intimated that on one or two occasions a Senate divorce committee had been a little lax. He used the words "a little lax". Now there was no occasion last session—and I speak from personal knowledge—when any divorce committee was lax to any degree whatsoever.

**Hon. Mr. Howard:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I should like to thank the honourable gentleman from Toronto-Trinity for correcting me. I used those words intentionally because I thought that was the case.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** That was not the case. There was no laxity at any time, and there was no case in connection with which any chairman or committee member should apologize. The case that was most criticized last year was one which we had heard with care and devotion for no less than seven hours. At the end of that time we adjourned to think the matter over for the evening, and on resuming next morning we were unanimous in our decision. That decision was criticized in the House of Commons, and a number of outrageous mis-statements were made with regard to the facts. We were also criticized because the evidence had not been sent to the House of Commons, and as a result a committee of that house approved of our