

for the production of papers and to make the award. It will be the duty of that board to ascertain the causes of the dispute, to make suggestions for its termination and such other recommendations as it in its wisdom may deem proper. That award and the report will then be presented to the Department of Labour and become documents of record. Copies will be given to the parties directly concerned, and to the press and the public, and it will be laid upon the Table for the information of parliament. There the jurisdiction of the machinery proposed by the Bill ends. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition will therefore see that the enforcement of the award is left to such influences as may be brought to bear, backed up of course by the standing of the arbitrators, the manner in which they have conducted the arbitration, and the force of public opinion. As I stated on a former occasion, I know of no other machinery for compelling submission to such awards, except it be the compulsory machinery of the law. There is a wide distinction between the two methods. My own inclination is altogether in favour of the principle involved in this Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. When did the hon. gentleman change his mind?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will tell my hon. friend when I changed my mind. It is true that last session I presented a measure providing different machinery. I was not on that occasion very sanguine in favour of that procedure, but I submitted it to the House and the country in order to get the benefit of the advice of the parties interested and of the public. There are arguments in favour of the enforcement of awards by compulsion, and there are arguments against it. The only law of that kind which has been on trial for any considerable time is the New Zealand Act. That was passed in 1894, and went into operation on the first of January, 1895. It has given more or less satisfaction, perhaps dissatisfaction. Opinion is as yet divided upon it. A year or two ago the state of New South Wales desired to study the labour law of the state of New Zealand, and sent a very distinguished jurist to New Zealand to inquire and report whether or not in his opinion the compulsory law of New Zealand was a desirable measure. That commissioner studied the question pretty thoroughly, and made a report which on its face might be considered an endorsement of that method for the settlement of labour disputes, that is, a method under which the award has the force of a judgment of a court, enforceable just as any legal judgment would be. But he observed that the Act had only been in force in New Zealand during the period of a rising market. During that time, as a rule, the workmen had gained by the awards. The question arises, would they acquiesce in the

awards of the arbitrators in a period of a falling market? It cannot be said, I think, that that law has undergone a complete trial, until the parties have had an opportunity of coming to a conclusion as to its efficiency when there is a falling market. If, after there has been a falling market in New Zealand for a term of years, public opinion should stand by that view, we would be warranted in adopting that method; but up to the present time, I submit, it has not undergone that complete trial that would warrant us in adopting it. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asks me when my views underwent a change. That is putting it rather strongly, because though I did frame the measure of last session, containing some very trifling penalties, they fell very far short of making it one that might be treated as a compulsory mode of settling disputes. The penalties were not very onerous and the methods of enforcement were rather mild. But I will tell my hon. friend with all frankness how this present measure came to be framed. When speaking on the subject last session, I gave what I considered to be a public invitation to all parties interested to assist the government in framing a measure. The invitation was responded to, to a certain extent. I am not at liberty to give the names of the representatives of the railway employees who consulted with me with regard to the framing of this measure, and I am sure no hon. gentleman will ask me to do so.

Mr. INGRAM. Did they approve of it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They did. But I will go so far as to say that I had the advantage of meeting on several occasions a large number of men representing different branches of railway employees, and amongst them their legislative representative, Mr. J. H. Hall. That gentleman, I understand, occupies a very prominent position in the labour world. He is, I understand, the legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Order of Railway Trainmen, and the Order of Railway Telegraphers. He took part in all the negotiations with me, at which the railway employees were present.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Where is his residence, may I ask?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. His residence is in the city of Toronto. He was good enough to convene a meeting of railway employees and introduced to me the deputation, a very numerous one, of men deeply interested in this question. In speaking of the men, I would say that I was prepared to receive advice from both sides—not only prepared, but most solicitous to receive it; and I have had the opinions of some leading railway men in Canada in regard to this measure. Perhaps I would be