

Hon. Mr. KING: No.

Hon. Mr. ROBINSON: In the first place, I want to congratulate the leader of the House on initiating what I think is a worthwhile debate. At the same time I should like to congratulate the honourable gentleman and the honourable leader on the other side of the House upon being elevated to the positions which they now occupy. I am sure they will fill those positions to the satisfaction of everybody. We shall discover, perhaps, that it is not the intellectual giant who makes the best leader, but the real, worth-while, all-round man.

There is just one point brought up here to-day that I want to discuss, and that is post-war rehabilitation. There seems to be an impression that the public may not have a proper appreciation of the work of the Senate. I want to say that only this week a prominent citizen of Montreal, after writing to me, came up and had lunch with me in order to tell me that post-war rehabilitation afforded a splendid opportunity to the Senate to appoint a committee and investigate the matter. He said he knew the public would place much more reliance in work done by a committee of the Senate than in that done by any committee elsewhere. I mention this so that honourable members may know that there are prominent people who look to the Senate to take action. Although I have not asked permission to do so, I think it would do no harm to mention this gentleman's name. It is Mr. Sherrard. I told him he was wasting his eloquence on me, but if he would come again I might be able to get a group of senators to listen to him.

I rose at this time because I did not want to miss the opportunity to tell of this little incident, so that honourable members might realize that there are people who have considerable respect for the activities of the Senate.

Hon. CREELMAN MacARTHUR: Honourable senators, in the first place we started out with a constructive suggestion by the new leader of the Senate, who received a promise of hearty co-operation from the leader on the other side. That was splendid; but we got away from that into a somewhat contentious argument. I think the honourable senator from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) was a little hard on the honourable senator from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae), and that the honourable senator from Saltcoats (Hon. Mr. Calder) was a little hard on the honourable member from Leeds (Hon. Mr. Hardy).

The honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) said that in a moment of weakness it might be difficult for him to forget that he had been a Conservative.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Louder!

Hon. Mr. MacARTHUR: I was thinking about the leader on the other side, and his views of a few years ago. I do not want to get into any controversy with the honourable senator from Saltcoats about caucuses, but I may say that our leader would never allow us to have a caucus before we voted. It is quite probable, therefore, that I often voted wrongly. I cannot be accused of political bias, because I have been called down not only by the late leader on the other side, but also by my own leader and other gentlemen on this side, particularly the honourable senator from Parkdale.

There are two or three minor matters that I think we should mend. I have no criticism of the honourable senator from Westmorland (Hon. Mr. Copp), who is Chairman of the Committee of Selection, except that he followed the line of least resistance, proposing the same number and kinds of committees, as before, with only a few changes in the personnel. I have been here for sixteen years, during which I have been on the Finance Committee, but as yet I have never known of anything being referred to that committee by the House. That committee may have brought in a report naming a quorum, but that is the only thing it has ever done. Reference has been made also to the Committee on External Affairs. And I might ask what the Tourist Committee is going to do this year. Its appropriation, which was \$500,000 last year, has now been cut down to \$100,000; and conditions, as you know, are not favourable. Some of our committees should be reorganized. We have new members coming in from time to time, but all that is done in the formation of committees is to change the names around a little, and now and again to take off a name or put one on. I think there could be an improvement there.

Some two or three years ago I made a remark in this House about going home, and spoke of the expense of travelling to and from Ottawa, and of the disruption of family life and business by reason of adjournments. I also offered certain suggestions.

The other day reference was made to the trade agreements with Chile, the Argentine Republic and Brazil. If you turn to page 79 of Hansard of March 10 you will find that I wanted these treaties discussed in Committee of the Whole. If that had been done the Minister of Trade and Commerce could have come here and sat in, and we could have had the details on Hansard; but the treaty went to a standing committee and in a few minutes it was accepted. It was said, "You can do nothing else." The committee