are not accepted by the parties, we have the action of the arbitration board. That board of arbitration would unquestionably be still more expensive. As I read this Bill, the functions of the arbitration board are very much the same as those of the conciliation committee, but their form of procedure is a little different. Instead of saying to the parties we have ascertained the facts and think you should agree on such terms, the arbitration board proceeds with a little more solemnity to ascertain the facts and then makes a report. It does not deliver a sentence of arbitration binding on the parties but reports to the ministers, and that report is published and communicated to the parties. These proceedings might have more weight than the proceedings of the conciliation committee but not much more, because the members of the conciliation committee are qualified and will probably be chosen to form the board of arbitration. We would therefore have two proceedings, held before two bodies, having different names but with very similar attributions, and I venture to say that these proceedings would lead to no binding result. There is the crucial point. The sentence of the arbitrator binds nobody at all, and we are simply making additional unnecessary expense, whereas at present the department has all the powers necessary to ascertain the facts, and the minister himself or those he employs have all the necessary authority and weight required to advise and suggest a remedy. It seems to me therefore that by this Bill we are simply introducing expensive machinery without much result. I listened attentively to what the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) said as to the necessity of these arbitration committees or boards rendering sentences which would be binding on the parties. I understand the hesitation of the hon. Minister of Labour to introduce such legislation. It is something very new and about which a great deal may be said on both sides. I believe with the hon. member for Winnipeg that, harsh as it may appear and as it might sometimes act in certain cases, it will be necessary for us, in view of the great labour troubles upon which we have just merely entered, to adopt some such principle in our legislation, in order to compel a settlement of these labour disputes. I say all this, subject to the doubts I have expressed regarding our jurisdiction, on which we should have the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice. As regards provincial railways I am afraid that we would come into conflict at once with the local jurisdiction. But on general principles, at the stage where conciliation and arbitration would be suggested as a remedy we have no jurisdiction over labour disputes. It is only where the peace, order and good government of Canada are concerned, as for instance in the existing conditions at Montreal, we might intervene.

Mr. MONK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Except with the consent of the House, I have no right to make any further remarks, but as some hon. gentlemen have evidently, by their observations, invited me to reply, I shall try and dispose of their criticisms. In the first place, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seem to think that, under the Conciliation Act of to-day we could proceed as this Bill proposes we should. I endeavoured to make it clear in my opening remarks that the American legislation and incidentally our Conciliation Act have the inherent weakness that they can not be put into force execept with the consent of the parties. Under the Conciliation Act, no committee, no board of arbitration could be appointed except with the consent of the parties. Therefore these hon. gentlemen will see that we have no statute enabling the government to refer a matter of this kind to arbitration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was fully aware of that, and pointed it out in the ccurse of my remarks. But the point I made is this, that in the present Bill, as in the Conciliation Act, you are appointing a tribunal which will not have the power of enforcing the awards it may make.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At all events, if my hon. friend did not refer to the Conciliation Act, his friends beside him did. As regards the contention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that because the two parties are unwilling to come together, therefore it is improbable that any good will come from his measure, I would refer him for his answer to the anthracite coal strike arbitration. You could scarcely find two parties more opposed to conciliation or arbitration, when President Roosevelt undertook to bring them together. If there had been statutory power, it is doubtful if these two could have been brought together, but by virtue of his high office, the President was able to bring pressure upon them and, practically against their consent, bring about arbitration.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a fact that the operatives were always willing to submit their case to arbitration ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be, but I understand that long before the proceedings were given to the public, Carroll Wright, the editor of the 'Labour Gazette' and the 'Bulletin' of Washington, was acting as an emissary on behalf of the United States government, endeavouring by solicitation and argument to induce the parties to come together. What was given to the public was not the commencement of the difficulties by any means. But in the end an arbitration was brought about. There was no power to compel either party to submit to the award except the pressure of