

tion in other wars—and they have become very much united, having built up a strong federal power; and all improvements that have been made in the United States since the Civil War, improvements especially on economic and social questions, have largely been effected through the employment of federal law and making these great issues matters affecting the welfare and interest of all the people, to be settled by the Congress of the nation. Here in Canada, on the contrary, we have largely taken the ground—certainly I have not taken it—that these questions are mainly questions that pertain to the provinces and can be settled in that way, and for quite a while I have had arguments in this House with every Minister of Justice, or, as I prefer to designate him, Attorney General, and there has not been an Attorney General in this country, while I have been in the House, who has not set up the argument that these questions are not federal questions, but provincial questions that ought to be settled by provincial laws and provincial administration of them. We have not made any headway in that connection.

Many years ago we heard a great deal about certain laws that were proposed in this House, amongst them, the Election Act and things of that kind. We passed laws which, when they came to be tried out, were brought up in the Provincial Courts, but nothing was really done to establish the authority of our federal jurisdiction or to vindicate these laws in connection with the conduct of elections. We had eminent men in this House, lawyers who have left a greater reputation than probably some of our lawyers are making to-day; they were all afraid of these questions and they said these laws should be left to the Legislatures and that they should not be enacted by the Federal Parliament. It has gone on and we have had recommendations in this House that these questions ought to be dealt with by the Federal power. Some headway has been made. We have got so far that this Parliament last session passed a law to deal with the question of the high cost of living and it created a federal board of commerce. But there is a great deal of difference between the methods prescribed for our federal board of commerce and the way in which the people of the United States have dealt with this question of the high cost of living. Let me point out some of the differences that exist. In the United States, when they pass a law to bring relief to the people,

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

they invariably put into that law a provision imposing the duty on some responsible member of the Administration to enforce it. If you analyse these laws that have brought relief to the people of the United States in a great many respects, even in connection with railways, interstate commerce and all those things, you will find in every one of them something of this kind:

It shall be the duty of the Attorney General of the United States to enforce this law.

For the purpose of the enforcement of the law a certain sum of money is appropriated. Not only do they give the Attorney General of the United States money to employ attorneys and special agents, to obtain advice, to collect evidence and to do everything of that kind, but they place at his disposal the services of every district attorney in the United States to assist him in enforcing the law. That is what is being done there in connection with the high cost of living. Not only has the President of the United States entered upon this crusade against the high cost of living, but the Attorney General of the United States is discharging the responsibility placed upon him in connection with this matter, and he is at the head of all the prosecutions. Every district attorney in the United States is assisting him and working up evidence. They have unlimited means at their disposal for this purpose.

In the United States they have tackled this question of the high cost of living, they have created a Board of Commerce, they have created other boards, they have put them all at work, and they have voted unlimited sums of money. I forget what the last grant to Congress was, but it was a large sum, practically a blank cheque, for the President and the Attorney General to use for this purpose. The result is that the President, the Attorney General and the Board of Commerce are all working on this question of the high cost of living. Every district attorney is at it and every district attorney can bring an action in the United States courts. We do not seem to desire to have courts in Canada for the enforcement of our laws, and we do not seem to desire to have prosecuting attorneys representing the federal power.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does the hon. gentleman understand that the district attorneys in the United States are federal officials?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Yes, certainly I do, and we ought to have them here. Does