

the Senate, and the voices of the members of the legislatures of the several states, whether their chambers be one or two.

It is well known, of course, that the case with respect to unemployment insurance was not presented to the courts. No one knows that better than the Minister of Labour. It was not, for the simple and obvious reason that admissions, which constituted the basis of the judgment of the court, were made.

I quite agree it is desirable that there should be a national unemployment insurance act. We enacted such a measure, but it fell by the wayside because it was referred to the courts when it should not have been. In a moment or two I propose to make further observations on that point, in connection with another matter. It was referred to the courts, and without the concrete facts being placed before the courts admissions were made which, as I say, constituted the basis of the judgment which declared the legislation bad.

How are we now to proceed? How are we to petition his majesty? On what basis shall we do it? Who is going to give us the authority? We do not require any; can we go ahead on our own. If he so desires, the Prime Minister may introduce a petition. If it passes this house and the Senate, it may go to London and become law. He says he is seeking the support of the provinces to that end, and the reference in the speech from the throne concludes with these words:

My ministers hope the proposal may meet with early approval, in order that unemployment insurance legislation may be enacted during the present session of parliament.

We all share that pious hope, but how is it to be done? One premier has said, "I want to see a copy of the bill, first." We know a bill cannot be introduced, because it has been declared to be ultra vires of this parliament, and therefore no bill which he could see can be introduced. That avenue of escape seems to be cut off.

I direct attention to the matter because it seems to me that we must arrive at some fundamental understanding as to how amendments to our constitution can be made. Until this moment I have not had an opportunity to congratulate the right hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) upon his being made a member of His Majesty's Privy Council. That he deserved it goes beyond question, and that he honours the position he occupies is well known. I do wish him many long years of happiness in which to enjoy his new honour and the new title which goes with it. Strenuously opposed as he is to titles, I shall still insist upon addressing him as the right hon. gentleman. I do suggest to him that

here is an opportunity for sound statesmanship. This constitution of ours cannot continue in its present form; we all know that. We must agree on that point. How are we going to amend it? That is the question we must ask ourselves. Let us get away from the political side of it.

I was greatly interested in reading the story of the constitution of South Africa. Very able men, among whom were General Botha, General Smuts, Mr. Schreiner, and Mr. Merriman had to do with it. They were very careful to go back to their states with the proposals in order that they might be sure that when the constitution was agreed upon it should represent the views of all the people. What are we going to do? Someone has suggested that there must be a majority of the provinces in agreement. Does that mean a majority of the premiers? Would that be a sound principle to follow? On the other hand, if we follow the principle which has been followed in most British dominions there will be an opportunity for the people to express their views with respect to it. How is that to be brought about?

I suggest the right hon. the Minister of Justice might spend some time in devising a method. I know of nothing which would meet with more ready response than a workable plan of dealing with this difficult constitutional question.

What is more, I do not understand how he can hope to give effect to the provisions in the speech from the throne and at the same time attach any importance to the findings of the Rowell commission, because this is sui generis with many matters which have to be dealt with similarly, in view of the judgments of the courts. That being so, how are we going to pick out one, and leave the others alone? Should we not have a comprehensive plan which would be ample to deal with the whole situation?

I come to a point which to me is a very painful feature of the speech from the throne. It deals with two matters, one with reference to the elections and franchise acts, and the other the export of power. I am going to connect the two somewhat closely. I do so with some hesitancy, but I feel I owe a duty to this country and that I must discharge it. In the first place, this country is suffering from electoral corruption.

During the summer I travelled from the Atlantic to the Pacific on more than one occasion. I have discussed the trend of events with many people, people who were not partisans but were calm observers. Never in the history of this country has corruption been so