strikes and in which the employees refused to accept the report of the board appointed under the Act, but later settlement was made on the basis of the report. Those cases were as follows: Cumberland Railway and Coal Company, 1907, two strikes; Canadian Pacific railway trades, May, 1908; British Columbia Copper Company, March, 1910, two strikes; Canadian Northern Railway carmen; Alberta Coal Mining Company. In these seven cases the Act was effective, because, while it did not avert a strike at the time, it outlined a settlement, and the settlement adopted was on the lines of the board's report. There were six cases in which the employees refused to accept the report and in which the report was not followed in the ultimate settlement between the employers and employees. These cases were: Dominion Coal Company, strike of 1909; Cumberland Railway and Coal Company, 1909; Winnipeg Electric Railway Company, 1910; Hudson Bay Mining Company, 1911; McEnany Mines, Limited, 1912; Canadian Northern Railway Coal & Ore Dock Company, Limited, 1912. In the following six cases the employers refused to accept the report: Western Coal Operators Association, June, 1909; Grand Trunk Railway Company, June, 1910; Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, October, 1911, Britannia Mining and Smelting Company, September, 1912; St. John Railway Company, July, 1914; Toronto Hydro-Electric Commission, November, 1915. I ran across one case in which the report was not accepted by either employer or employees: The Nicola Valley Coal & Coke Company, May, 1909. I have now accounted for twenty cases out of twenty-one referred to in the telegram. I find that of the strikes in which the men refused to accept the report, there were nine prior to 1911, and four subsequent to 1911, and of the cases in which the reports were not accepted by the employers, there was one before 1911, and five after, including the year 1911. As the men got to understand the Act better, they accepted the reports of the boards, and as the employers got to understand the Act better, they declined to accept the reports of the boards. In the figures which I have given, the minister will find reason for some of the dissatisfaction with which the men regard the administration of the Act. They see that in the early part of the administration of the Act they did make their mistakes, but of late they have been accepting the decisions of the board. The employers, however, have declined to accept the decisions, and that gives rise to a feeling of dissatisfaction on their part which it is desirable that Parliament should seek some means of remedying. We can not judge as to the rights and wrongs of these matters. The virtue of the Act is that it is not compulsory, and because it is not compulsory neither party to an award is bound to accept it. But, as that is the virtue of the Act, it devolves upon each party to the disagreement and upon the department which administers the Act to see that in every possible case the award should be accepted, even though at a loss to an accepting party and even though there may not be complete satisfaction with the award. I am not surprised that a number of men who are engaged as coal miners—most of the trades effected are coal mining trades—should not accept the award of the board of investigation. The mining trade has been very largely recruited from the foreign element which comes into the country and takes that form of labour which is among the most difficult and which our own people do not care to perform. If these men appreciate more than they seem to appreciate the value of the legislation, they would hesitate in rejecting the awards. On the other hand, one wonders that the employers, who are the owners of property which has the protection of law and who ought to be more intelligent than the men whom they employ, do not give the Act more support than they do, and that they put its future in jeopardy by making it a matter of uncertainty to submit controversies between employers and employees to the decision of boards of investigation. I am not suggesting any remedy by way of legislation. I think that the Act goes about as far as it can in showing the way of good-will and common sense between employer and employees. Although amendments could, perhaps, be made which would make the Act more workable, I do not think that the underlying principles of the Act could be improved by legislation. I hesitate very much to say that the Act should be repealed. I want to support the Act, as we support the wider efforts that are made to bring about peace among nations. Strikes and lock-outs are methods of war; we want to bring about methods of peace. The men are not satisfied that in every case the department is acting impartially between themselves and their employers. The Thetford case was discussed here on Friday