

expect to get relief with such a law as we have to-day, it must be strengthened, and we must look at what they are doing in the United States. I am not going into a lot of detail about the matter, but I want to draw a contrast in this House as I have drawn a contrast out of it, and I am gradually getting the people to listen to me. It is a new view perhaps of our politics in this country, but the new view is this: the great power, and the only power, for progress in this country is the federal power, with federal machinery and federal money, and that those who are at the head of our Government and who take the responsibility of governing Canada, must also undertake the responsibility of passing laws and providing machinery for the enforcement of these laws.

Reference has been made to the high cost of rents in this country. I do not know whether that is quite a federal question or how it can be brought into public consideration, but it will have to be dealt with. The high cost of rents, and a great many other things, were dealt with by Great Britain during the war, and they got results. In Great Britain they fixed prices and they compelled people to respect those prices. They regulated profits and they brought people in and made them show their cost sheets, and that is what the federal Board of Commerce of Canada ought to be doing to-day. In respect of all these prices which are alleged to be overcharges the people responsible ought to be compelled to go into some public office, or to some public official, show their profits, and have it determined whether their charges are reasonable. If they are not reasonable give the offenders twenty-four hours to change them, and if they do not, then fine them or put them in jail. They are getting results in the United States, as the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) pointed out here—any one can see it who reads the papers—they are getting results by fining the men who are making these exorbitant charges; they are putting them in jail, and they are threatening to put them out of business.

I venture to say that if the packers of Chicago do not pretty soon go a step further and make other reductions, the President will take over their plants in the public interest. I go further and predict that the United States Government will before very long take over the whole of the Standard Oil business and make it a national proposition; and it is not at all unlikely that if they find the Steel Trust is acting un-

fairly towards its men, or is charging exorbitant prices, they will take it over too.

But to my mind the only cure for these great economic evils that have come to the front in these war times is to enact a Federal law and have summary enforcement of that law. You cannot hang up these questions and leave them to somebody else to deal with; you cannot, in other words, leave the provinces to take action. Profiteers must be prosecuted by a federal official in a federal court, and, if found guilty, they must be punished immediately if we want to get results. We have, in fact, got to change our whole system, and follow the example set by the United States. It won't do to tell me—and I think I have some appreciation of the fact—that there are great differences between the Constitution of the United States and our Constitution. The criminal law is under Dominion jurisdiction, and it would fairly follow that we ought to enforce it. The argument has been advanced in this House that as the provinces enforce part of the law we ought to leave them to enforce the remainder. That is not logical at all. While there may be difficulties to overcome, we must adapt our Constitution so that we can obtain the same results as are being obtained in the United States. I can understand that some of the provinces might take objection to the course I am suggesting. But that is not the question. It is not a matter of constitutional interpretation. It is a matter of the protection of the people and bringing them relief from the evils under which they are suffering, and if the Constitution does not admit of federal action, then let us have the Constitution changed.

If any lawyer tells me that our Constitution cannot be changed as against provincial rights I want him—and I am no lawyer myself—to stand up and tell me how it was done in the United States. It was done by gradual changes in the interpretation of the law by the federal courts. They did not

even change the law, but they

5 p.m. evolved the practice gradually, until now the great power over there is the federal law. That law can redress almost any grievance. Do you know how they got after the men who caused those frightful dynamite explosions in the United States a few years ago? There were state laws against such crimes, but they were ineffective, and the federal authorities dealt with the trouble through the jurisdiction they have over transportation and commerce. They simply passed a little statute,