

dition in which some of these men are placed. It would appear to be almost a reflection upon our honour and sense of fair play, but that I may not speak altogether in the abstract, let me cite one or two cases. I happen to know, Sir, that there are men in the employ of the Government engaged as mail carriers who are in receipt of the—I cannot find an adjective to describe it, and so will say, in receipt of the wage of from fifty cents to one dollar per day for the support of themselves and their families. In other words, the whole of the income they receive from the Government, with the exception of this small pittance, is required for the upkeep of their outfit. No wonder they ask, and beg, and plead, for consideration. I have drawn the attention of the Postmaster General to this matter, and the answer I received was regular, of course, and quite correct. He stated that it was not within the power of the department to grant increases during the continuance of a contract. Of course, that is true. But, Sir, it is within the power of the department, I suppose, to make the necessary recommendation which will ensure to these men ordinary common justice and fair play, and I do sincerely hope that such measures will be taken at an early date as will give to these men who are doing their duty faithfully and well, proper remuneration. True it is that a contract is a contract. But let me say by way of explanation that this particular contract was undertaken two or three years ago when the cost not only of living but of all supplies was very much lower than it is to-day. The increased cost of supplies for the upkeep of their team and outfit has resulted in leaving only the small pittance I have mentioned for the support of these men and their families.

I listened with a very great deal of interest the other day to the address of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). If I understood him correctly, and I would not willingly misrepresent or misinterpret anything he said, he said in substance, when speaking of some amendments to the British North America Act, that as that Act was agreed to by the four original provinces individually, it would remain for the said four provinces to bring about any amendment to the Act. I may be wrong in my interpretation, and I sincerely hope I am, for I cannot believe that that position is correct. The hon. gentleman is learned in the law, while I am but a workman, but I cannot help feeling that that

position is unjust. It is not morally right, and how can it ultimately be legally right? Has not this House something to say regarding the amendments which may later be placed before the country for consideration? Is it not impossible to suppose that the provinces which were not then born should be ignored when we come to consider amendments to that Act? It is well known that there is a growing and ever deepening conviction throughout this country that the time is not far distant when certain amendments to that Act must be brought before the people for consideration. We all know, for instance, that there is a growing feeling in the minds of Canadian citizens that all legislation should be passed by a responsible chamber. We cannot shut our eyes to that fact, and when an irresponsible chamber delivers itself in the manner in which our friends did towards the close of last session, rendering inoperative what I considered to be some of the most important items of legislation passed by this House affecting the moral and social welfare of our citizens, that does not tend to deepen the affection in which it is held by the people of Canada. And so, when the question of amendments is considered, and I hope it soon will be considered, I trust that my hon. friend will be found to be wrong, or, rather, I would hope that I have misunderstood him and that he also will admit that this House, which represents provinces not then in existence, will have something to say regarding the said amendments.

Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have referred, during the course of this debate, to the question of national unity. Indeed, some had the temerity to introduce that phrase during the stormy times of last session. That, Sir, is a great idea. It is so great, in my opinion, that it requires some special consideration. You cannot mention the phrase without the question arising in every earnest and thoughtful mind: What does national unity mean, and how can it be brought about? What are the successive steps by which such a goal may be approached and ultimately reached? This opens up a very inviting field which I shall not presume to enter at the present time, but I do make bold to say that by a process of elimination we may at least approach an answer to our question. It goes without saying that national unity cannot be a unity of race; that need not be argued. Nor can it be a unity of religion, for all Protestants are not agreed in their religious views, and I am told that even all Roman Catholics are not agreed in their religious concep-