

full of all kinds of offenders, but so far as I have heard not a single profiteer has yet seen the inside of a jail in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: They have all been knighted.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: They are all at large and flourishing, and I understand that nearly every one of them is a supporter of Union Government.

Now, Sir, in the United States, in England and in France profiteering has been punished, but Canada is probably the only country in the world engaged in the war where profiteers have had a free hand to fleece the people. Here is an extract from a Boston paper:

Massachusetts Fish Men Sentenced.

Boston, July 9.—Judge Sanderson, of the Superior Criminal Court, imposed heavy jail sentences and fines on seventeen wholesale fish dealers convicted in the so-called "fish trust" trial.

The five men were sentenced to one year in jail and a fine of \$1,000 each.

The men had been found guilty of conspiring to raise the price of fish in war times, and of creating a monopoly.

F. Monroe Dyer, of New York, president; Ernest A. James, treasurer; John Burns, jr., manager, and Joshua Paine and Joseph A. Rich, directors of the Bay State Fishing Company, of Maine, were sentenced to serve one year each, and to pay fines of \$1,000. Twelve other men connected with subsidiary or associated firms of fish dealers, were given sentences of six months each with \$500 fines.

While these profiteers were conspiring to advance prices in Boston, the Boston fishermen were compelled to strike to get enough money to keep body and soul together.

In the United States they not only enacted laws against profiteering, as we did, but they voted a million dollars to pay the expense of prosecuting the profiteers. Here is an extract from a report of the House Appropriation Committee of the United States Congress:

It is believed by the committee that "widespread civil and criminal prosecutions of the profiteers will accomplish more toward reducing prices than all the investigations and other activities the departments might undertake." Therefore the committee has decided to give Attorney General Palmer and his assistants all the money they ask for, and, in the language of Chairman Good, "pin our faith on him to start immediate action in the courts."

It is not the Attorney General of Massachusetts or the Attorney General of New York, it is not the clerk of any municipality, it is the law officer of the United States who is conducting these prosecutions. My right hon. friend spoke of prosecutions being thrown upon the municipalities. Just

[Mr. Sinclair.]

think of that, Mr. Speaker. He expects a big expenditure like this to be undertaken by the small municipalities throughout this country which have not any funds available for prosecuting profiteers. Mr. Speaker, you can see the difference. The Government at Washington have instructed their Attorney General to conduct these prosecutions and have appropriated one million dollars to that purpose. I see by the Order Paper that we are voting \$26,000 at this session to pay the salaries of the Board of Commerce Commissioners, but not one dollar for the purpose of prosecuting the profiteers. The Government has repeated the same mistake that was made in the case of the Food Board. They refused to accept responsibility for prosecutions, they shirked that all-important duty, and they shouldered it on the Provincial Governments and the municipalities. The Provincial Governments have not voted any money to pay for these prosecutions, and they cannot do so until they meet next winter; and we all know that our municipalities have no funds that would justify them in embarking in these prosecutions. The profiteers are well aware of these facts. They know that the Board of Commerce is helpless until the sinews of war are provided, and the refusal of the Justice Department to undertake these prosecutions is the main reason why so many people suspect that the Government is standing in the shadow behind the profiteers.

The public are tired of investigations. Everybody knows that profiteering is widespread. It is common knowledge that there is a sugar trust, and a steampipe trust, and a cotton trust, and a cannery trust. You might as well appoint a Royal Commission to ascertain if there was anything wrong about the kiss of Judas or the judgment of Pilate. What we all want in this country is a Department of Justice that will undertake,—not to investigate, but to punish offenders.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Will my hon. friend allow me a question? From what authority is he reading?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: He is stating facts.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If my hon. friend will refer to the New Testament he will find the story of the kiss of Judas. That is my authority on that question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I understood my hon. friend was making a quotation.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does my hon. friend object to my using notes? If he does