

has come to stop pussyfooting and to tackle these great organizations that are subsidized and legalized by the state and directed mostly by great financiers and politicians. I speak of those trusts and combines trusts and restraints of trade which are nothing but an application of the communist principle. The average thinking man back home in this country thinks this particular bill is the most important bill that has ever come before parliament since confederation. The common people are demanding a policy that will help pull Canada out of the mire and get our workmen off the dole. They want to see planning by all governments, federal, provincial and municipal, to put half a million workers back to work by the end of the year. The country is ripe for just such leadership; it is waiting for a sign post showing which way we are going to go. This demand comes from the Conservative element in the Canadian nation, and we as a party must go forward to greater objectives. We want a new national policy such as this board is going to create. We must build our prosperity on a new and enduring basis. As the late Lord Salisbury said, the commonest error in politics is sticking to the carcasses of dead policies. Now is the time to do something. There are in my opinion too many Woodrow Wilsons in the legislatures of this country who are too proud to fight for legislation such as this. We should have had an act like this ten or twelve years ago. The field should have been explored then, and this country would not then have been in the economic turmoil it is in to-day.

I am sorry that some of the clauses in this bill have not been written into the criminal code, particularly those which deal with sweatshops. Notwithstanding what has been said about the criminal law of this country, the law courts have never had before them this vast field of trade and commerce which is placed exclusively under the jurisdiction of this parliament by section 91 of the British North America Act. Precedents have not been built up in the courts to deal with that particular section and because lawyers both in and out of the house say that a certain thing is so, does not make it so. No court of law has said that this sweatshop legislation cannot be written into the criminal law. Similar legislation has been written into the criminal law of the United States and the mother country and it can be done here as well. We have practically no regulation of trade and commerce except in connection with our external trade. As I said in a previous debate, we have not been spending enough time on our domestic problems

[Mr. Church.]

and perhaps too much time upon our international problems. Certain infringements, along social and economic lines could be made crimes by enactments of this legislature. Certain sections of the Clayton act and the Sherman anti-trust act could be written into our criminal code.

I believe Canada wants this trade commission to be up and doing. We want a trade commission with a kick in it. This commission should be under someone like the late Mr. Justice Mabee, a previous chairman of the railway board. That learned gentleman built up a number of rules and regulations. I regret that a judge has been chosen as head of this commission because if there is one board which should be under a layman, it is this particular one. The mass buying and price spreads had two good chairmen. One of them, the other day, a very brilliant young lawyer gave an address on this question in the house. What this country needs at the present time is a great public rights lawyer; then this parliament would not have to call in corporation lawyers. I have had considerable experience and I say that once a corporation lawyer, always a corporation lawyer, especially when interpreting the British North America Act. They see things in just one way. The Toronto street railway agreement, and the British North America Act have led to more litigation and references to the law courts than any other acts in history or that have come up in recent years. I am sorry this country has not produced a great public rights lawyer like Ferdinand Pecora of Washington. He straightened out things down there and showed up the abuses of big businessmen and Wall Street; many of these men had not paid a cent in income tax. We need a similar public rights lawyer in Canada to deal with the chisellers in this country. What has happened in connection with this matter happened in 1928 when the water power versus navigation matter was before the house. The Supreme Court of Canada was asked to answer certain abstract questions in connection with water and navigation rights on the St. Lawrence river but those questions were so abstract that neither the supreme court nor the privy council could give a proper answer, and they returned them as unanswered in part owing to their not being concrete.

The enforcement of federal laws is placed upon the provincial attorneys general. Why should not this government have law officers of its own to enforce all federal statutes in connection with all our acts and trade and commerce? We know the type of enforcement of our acts which will be carried out by the