

without a suitable framework of law to rest upon, but that framework cannot be built until the conditions are thoroughly understood. A lawyer's powers of analysis and his tendency towards accomplishing some practical result make this the ideal work for members of this body. Let me suggest some illustrations.

The most pressing problem consists in the relation between capital and labor and the prevention of strikes. Canadian legislation upon this subject is looked upon as the most successful experiment yet evolved, and I think we have with us to-night its author, Mr. Mackenzie King—but it does not yet accomplish two necessary things. It does not secure a full and intelligent survey for the benefit of the public—who suffer most—of the real matters in issue, and the exact conditions which have given rise to the difficulty—nor has it yet constituted a really impartial conciliation tribunal, since each side appoints a member, who is committed in advance to one or other view, leaving only one in an independent position.

It would, we are sure, be of the greatest value to this country if the ablest legal minds in it were to meet together and after thorough inquiry and getting into touch with leading men on both sides, endeavour to work out some improvement in the machinery of conciliation, and to ascertain how far outsiders are responsible for its frequent breakdown.

There are plenty of other spheres of usefulness. The enlargement of the scope of the Workmen's Compensation Acts, to include the rehabilitation of the injured workman and his re-education so as to fit him to be again a self-supporting unit; the complete reform of criminal justice by introducing into its administration that element of humanity which demands that the upbringing, environment and mental capacity of criminals shall have some place in determining the quantum and character of their punishment; the revision of the Criminal Code so as to catch up with the modern developments of crime; these will indicate