

have been no prosecutions. I think there have been demands for prosecutions made just lately. If my information is correct, boards of trade in British Columbia and other places have been bombarding the minister with requests that certain combines should be prosecuted. One of these combines is known as Nash or Mutual combine. What has the minister done about it? I hold in my hand a report which has been presented by a commissioner who was appointed. This report contains sufficient information and sufficient material to justify prosecutions being started. Nothing has been done. The minister says: We have put it up to the provinces; let the attorneys general of the provinces deal with this question. Well, the attorneys general of the provinces are considering what action they can take, but nothing is being done. Is that the proper course for the minister to have taken? I submit, it is not. I have authority for that statement, my authority being no less a person than a Supreme court judge in the province of Nova Scotia, Hon. D. D. McKenzie, who was at one time leader of the opposition and afterwards Solicitor-General in this administration, and who has now been elevated to the bench. He took part in the debate of 1921, and at page 3293 of Hansard, he said:

I do not look to the municipal councils, or to the local governments, for the administration of the law governing matters of this kind. We have a federal law dealing with trusts and combines.

He went on to refer to the suggestion which had been made, or which he alleged had been made, that private individuals might lay informations, and then he said:

Could anything be more absurd than to imagine that any man is going to bear the burden of carrying through the various courts a case against a combine, with the support of all the other combines in the land behind it, and nothing on the other side but an ordinary man who found that he was charged too much for a pair of boots, a keg of nails, or something else he bought from that combine. The best legal talent of the land would be arrayed against him, and counsel's fees would be running up—

And so on. And then he proceeds:

I thank my good friend from York (Mr. Maclean)—pardon me for mentioning his name, but I wish to show him my appreciation—for standing up in this House and stating that there should be a public prosecutor to deal with these cases. I agree with him. Until that is done and the government have a secret service from one end of the country to the other, and the combines realize that there is power behind the prosecutor, we will have the governing of prices just to suit these combines and trusts.

I wonder if any such prosecutor has been appointed. If so, who is he? So far as I am aware no such appointment has been made. Mr. McKenzie goes on to say:

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

And the government says to its darling: "Don't be concerned; we knew it would die. Now be happy and contented, for we have carried out our promise to you. We were always behind you, and we will continue to be behind you, and you will have things absolutely your own way, except of course that, for appearance sake, we must ask the attorneys general in some of the provinces to do something, but we know there is nothing they can do."

That is exactly what the minister is doing now—asking the attorneys general of the provinces to do something. That is the minister's record as to combines, trusts and mergers. He did not say a word about that subject in his address.

Then we come to the second function, to provide a cure for unemployment. The minister's cure for unemployment is to say that there is practically no unemployment in the country. I wonder how many people in Toronto, in Montreal, in Hamilton and in other places will agree with him. I wonder what the provincial premiers will say when they hear of his statement that there is no unemployment in the country. Certainly this government has decided this question, to this extent—it has decided that it will do nothing to assist in relieving unemployment.

We come now to the third function of the Labour department, to settle labour disputes. We did not hear from the minister a word about the coal strike in Nova Scotia. You would think there was no strike down there. You would think there were not thousands of people starving in that province. You would think there was no trouble of any kind there. I suppose in his mind sunshine pervades that province just as it does other provinces in this Dominion and there is no cause for trouble there at all. It seems to me that, instead of being in this House at this very instant, the Minister of Labour should be in the coal fields of Nova Scotia trying to see if it is not possible to settle that strike. The minister is not down there and perhaps there is a reason for that. I am informed that there is a reason and that that reason is that some years ago, when the minister was an official of an international union, he visited Nova Scotia and assisted in a strike on the railway of the coal company, and that, as a result, as regards the coal mine and steel workers, he is the most unpopular man in Canada. I think it is a standing disgrace that the Minister and the Department of Labour are not trying to ameliorate conditions in Nova Scotia. It is true it might be injudicious for the government to take sides in this dispute; but when women and children are starving in those coal fields, the government should do something. We cannot disbelieve the statements which appear in