which must have worked for the weal of the country."

And the learned judge ends a very exhaustive report by saying:—

"Whatever may be the result, the world owes a debt of gratitude to New Zealand for having undertaken the task of demonstrating whether it is possible or not to settle industrial disputes by compulsory arbitration."

Enactments bearing upon this subject were also passed in South Australia in 1894; in Western Australia in 1900, and in New South Wales in 1901, but up to this writing I have been unable to procure copies of those Acts.

In July of last year a bill was introduced in the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, based upon all the Acts mentioned, which however is not yet law. That bill dealt with the matter possibly in a drastic manner, by giving initiative powers in the public interests to the President of the proposed Court of Conciliation, who would be a Justice of the High Court of Australia.

Comment on this bill would not be pertinent at this stage, and I only mention it as showing the importance which is being attached to the problems in the antipodes. I may be pardoned, however, in mentioning the point, which is shown up clearly by that bill, namely,—the existence of a third interest, being that of the public, which is not always borne in mind in the discussions.

In Great Britain, as far as I can ascertain, labor disputes are dealt with by what are termed "Permanent Voluntary Boards," those bodies are organized in any labor district, and can consist of any equal number of representatives elected for a term of years from among the workers and employers interested, who, together, elect a chairman.

Such organizations are not in any way under the Government control, or of the federation of either labor or employers, thus acting entirely independent of both. After the hearing of the case an agreement is drawn up embodying the terms reached, which, if accepted, is signed by the parties interested, and which does not require the consent of unions.

During the year 1902 some 678 industrial disputes were successfully dealt with in Great Britain by this means.

Attempts have been made by the Ontario Legislature to find a remedy, but those attempts have hardly been met in the spirit in which they were passed.

As far back as 1873 "The Trades Arbitration Act" was passed, and again in 1890 "The Trades Dispute Act." Both laws, I understand, are still in force. Why they have not been taken advantage of is hard to say. They are certainly voluntary in their character; and if Voluntary Boards are feasible here as in Great Britain, the suggestion of their foundation is to be found in those Acts. I would point out, besides, that Voluntary Boards were always available, and needed no impulse from the Legislature; yet though that impulse was given, no heed was taken of it. When two parties to a dispute want to agree, then a means of settlement can readily be found; but apparently in nearly every instance within our memories the desire to settle has been absent, attributable, possibly, to outside influences.

In 1902 the "Trades Dispute Act" was amended by giving the Registrar of Labor an opportunity of intervening in disputes upon request; and it is pleasant to notice that in that and the following year some 25 troubles were settled in this way—but none of them in connection with the building trades disputes in Toronto last spring.

A bill to create a Provincial Board of Conciliation and Arbitration was introduced into the Legislature of Ontario last May by the Minister of Labor, but did not get beyond its first reading. The bill is a mild form of the New Zealand Act, and though not far-reaching enough in its scope, would have been a step to successful legislation.

In concluding my remarks on this important subject, I would suggest that our Association make known to the public its views on the matter, as we are considered to be among the best parties to propose a means of settlement, in so far, at all events, as the building trades disputes are concerned; which bodies, I may say, comprise about one-third the membership of the local Unions. The public recognizes that no industrial disputes are so detrimental to trade and commerce, as a whole, as those occurring in the building trades, and we as a body, being brought into such close touch with those trades, can properly advocate some means by which disputes of this character can be avoided or adjusted.

After careful consideration my own opinion favors the adoption of some such Act as that in force in New Zealand, adapted to our conditions, especially as that Act is creating an atmosphere of confidence and trust between the workers and their employers that possibly cannot be found to exist in any other country.

I take it that the system in vogue in Britain cannot be adopted here with success, as members of a Union cannot act independently of the Union; and from the circumstances also, that reference has frequently to be made by the local Unions to higher governing bodies, some of which are in foreign countries—possibly because our workers are more transient than in the old land.

The control of Labor Unions from a neighboring republic (however little or much it may be), especially in the interference of labor bosses and walking delegates, is to be deplored, as it completely blocks the way to the use of independent means of conciliation; creating a spirit of unrest and suspicion amongst workers, and antagonizing the employers at every turn, thus frustrating possible good relations between the disputants that would lead to harmony.

I would particularly refer to the position of the so-called third party in this question—that is the general public. That certain questions of vital importance to the public, for instance where food, fuel, communication and transportation are concerned, should be left in the hands of an organization over which there is no control, is not to be tolerated, but ought to be safeguarded; and however far any future Act may fall short in its power to settle any particular trade dispute, it should give no uncertain sound when such momentous questions are at issue. The Ontario Bill of 1903 proposed to deal with this aspect, but, as I have said, that bill is not yet law.

The great demand for both commercial and residential buildings, consequent upon the prevailing good times, has given us an opportunity to show in a practical manner where we in Canada stand in the realm of modern architectural practice.

Several important buildings have been erected in our larger cities, and they show careful study both in plan and general design; in fact, for the amount of money expended they cannot be surpassed on this continent. I have been repeatedly told by both British and American travellers, whom I personally knew to be capable of judging, that they were surprised to see such results in design and construction for the sums expended.