Almost exactly the same words are used. So it seems to me this Bill is entirely unnecessary. Then it provides for a board of arbitration. But the only difference I can see between the board in the Act of 1900 and the board as proposed by this Act, is simply this, that in the old Act the minister may pay the members of the board what he thinks fit; in this case the members of the board get $10 each a day, and expenses. It is left to the minister how much he shall pay the chairman. It seems to me the only result of this Bill will be to give the minister an opportunity of employing a few more of his friends to act at $10 a day and expenses, to make an inquiry, or become a mediation commission. In this Act there is no provision for an arbitration, if I understand arbitration correctly. I have always understood that arbitration was an attempt to ascertain the differences between disputants, to adjust those differences and reach some conclusion. In this case no conclusion is reached, they only make an inquiry and report. Therefore in my judgment this might more appropriately be called a provision to appoint a commission of inquiry, than to appoint an arbitration commission. They have power to inquire into differences, only to inquire and report back to the minister. Now I do not know whether the first Act would give powers to the commission of inquiry to deal in the same way with railway companies and their employees as it does with other companies and their employees, but I think it does. If it does, there is no need for this Act because it is practically the same as the other.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). It seems to me a very unwise thing to put on the statute-book an Act that is of no use, and can be of no use. Now when the minister introduced his Labour Bill last year he used these words:

> Although this is hardly the occasion for any lengthened observations, still, as the measure is somewhat novel, perhaps a few words now would not be out of place. I would say that the proposition is in effect one of compulsory arbitration between railway companies and their employees in regard to the various subjects of controversy that from time to time arise between these parties. The measure is confined entirely to the railway world, it does not deal with any other than railway industries.

Now since last year the minister has found that there is a strong objection to compulsory arbitration. I will not say now whether I agree with compulsory arbitration or not. A year ago when the minister brought in this Bill, there may have been a general feeling that compulsory arbitration had been successful in Australia, and especially in New Zealand. There can be no possible object in a Bill of this kind unless it has power to do something. This Bill has no power to do anything. It has power to get certain information in connection with certain railway strikes, but the only final power it has is to make a report, and that report shall be published at the country's expense in the 'Labour Gazette.' There is no power to compel either sides to agree to an arbitration. There is no reason, under such a Bill, why either party to a dispute should refer their case to such a tribunal. We have an instance of this in what was called the arbitration board of the board of trade, in Toronto, which was copied, I think, from a scheme of the board of trade in England. After a great deal of trouble had been experienced on the part of members of the board of trade in various cities, a board of arbitration was appointed which it was thought would result in doing away with the heavy legal expenses which arose when disputes occurred between members of the board of trade, principally in connection with grain operations. It was thought the disputes might be referred to this tribunal, and so save large legal expenses. I think I am right in saying that this board of conciliation, or this board of arbitration, has been an absolute failure. When a man wants to get a dispute settled, instead of going to his friends in the board of trade, he goes straight to law, where he can get a decision and pay the costs of it, which sometimes amount to more than the award he gets.

Another weakness in this Bill is that it is confined to railway disputes. Now how can we define railway disputes? We have to-day, perhaps, the most serious strike that has existed in Canada, in the case of the dock labourers in Montreal. I would ask the Minister of Labour whether, under this Bill, he can call upon these dock labourers to arbitrate their disputes, and publish the result of that arbitration in the 'Labour Gazette.' I do not think he can, if I read the Bill aright. This Bill takes power to arbitrate strikes of the most trivial character between street railway companies and its employees, in a town of five or six thousand inhabitants; but it ignores entirely the larger interests connected with railways. This Bill is brought in with the idea of adjusting railway disputes, but it does not provide for arbitrating disputes between teamsters and their employers in any of the large cities of Canada. It is narrowed to a small section of labour, it absolutely has no power and I contend that it can do nothing but bring about soreness and friction between the parties who are supposed to be parties to the arbitration which may be held under the Bill.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) stated that the railway organizations are perfectly satisfied with this Bill. If so, I feel that that entirely relieves me from making any suggestions to him towards perfecting the Bill. What I arose specially to say was this: Some very hard things have been said about the or-