

wear would have to pay for it at the rate of \$3 per pound. I mentioned that while oats were selling at seven cents a bushel, oatmeal sold at five cents per pound; hides were selling at 25 cents each and shoes at from \$7 to \$10 per pair. To-day the Canadian people are not so much concerned about the method by which we propose to stop competition, but they do want to know how we propose to ensure them a reasonable return, and thereby bring about an equality between the amount they receive for their products and the amount they have to pay for supplies.

In the month of April I received a return from one of my constituents. This return purports to be a statement from the Saskatchewan Cooperative Creameries. This gentleman in the month of March sent 30 dozen eggs to the company's plant at Regina, and the return he received indicated that the eggs were graded in classes A, B and C according to quality. His total receipt for the 30 dozen eggs amounted to only \$1.67. In the note which he sent to me he stated that on March 11 the eggs were sold for 5½ cents a dozen, but that on April 8, the date of writing, they could not be sold for enough to pay for transportation.

After putting this country to an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars in carrying on an investigation I believe the Prime Minister is not fair in stating, as he did yesterday, that we have gone as far as we can under the constitution. If that is so I say he should not have appointed the commission, and should have followed the suggestion I made in February of 1933, more than two years ago. This work could have been done by the research council without cost to the country, and I have no doubt that in the final analysis some means could have been found whereby to a certain extent at least we could have been relieved from the conditions which still exist.

In my view the inquiry has certainly fallen short of what was expected. What advantage will it be to my constituents if I have to tell them that one result of this expensive inquiry is that if they allow a man to work for half an hour over the allotted time they will be liable to a fine or imprisonment. Sometimes a man comes along—I have had this experience—wanting a job at any wage. If in that circumstance you have not very much work to do but consent to give him a dollar a day you will be liable to a fine or imprisonment for accepting the services of the man in question, and for giving him a home but paying him less than standard wages. That is about the only result we have had from the investigation.

[Mr. R. McKenzie.]

The Prime Minister spoke about the constitution. In view of his knowledge of the inquiry held in 1919 I contend that since February of 1933 he has had plenty of time to amend the constitution so as to make it possible to do something for these distressed people who are suffering for want of legislation along those lines. I ask the government: Why did you not do it?

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (East Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to give a silent vote on this bill. I think the government deserves the utmost credit for being the first government since confederation to endeavour to do something through the regulation of trade and commerce, for the workers of this country. This particular bill to create a federal trade board will create a new industrial magna charta for the workers of this country. The Conservative party has done itself proud in the mass buying commission. It originated with the Conservative party, and all along the Conservative party has been the friend of labour and of the consumer.

We have had this session in my opinion too much law and too little common sense. We should forget that we are lawyers and endeavour to carry out as far as possible the very important recommendations which have been made by the mass buying commission. The purpose of this bill is to give a new deal to the masses of our people and it should not be approached by quoting law cases and decisions based on separate facts, because we are faced with a completely different set of facts now, owing to changed conditions, from those facing the fathers of confederation when the British North America Act was framed.

Ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, I advocated a federal trade commission, much of what is proposed in this particular bill, No. 86. Fortunately one of the cardinal principles of the British constitution and of our own constitution, which is part and parcel of it, is that the courts are subservient to the legislature. It was a great mistake in 1867 in so framing the British North America Act that we had any provincial legislatures at all. They were created by the fathers of confederation for political and not for economic purposes. The result has been that this government, which has done more for the working people than any other government since confederation has been very much hampered in framing this relief act or new deal, by stated cases and decisions of the courts on sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act.

The British North America Act is a relic of the past, and in my opinion confederation cannot last much longer unless we grapple