

moment in my office. That woman is supported by a sister who has to earn the food required for each of them, and she has been rendered an invalid for the rest of her life. I went to the other home and I talked with this woman, who had lain in bed for four years. At the present time she is the only support of her mother, and she is able to earn \$4 a week. She is without a lower jaw at all and she told me that during her illness she pulled her jaw out with her own hands, such was the condition of the bones at that time.

It is not a pleasant task to bring facts of this kind before the House, but I must say that when I came back from attending a conference at which this subject was being discussed and these facts were put before me, I felt I would be negligent in the duty I owed this country if I hesitated to bring into parliament for the sake of concealing facts of this kind similar legislation to that which has been enacted in Great Britain. We talk a great deal in these days about the conservation of natural resources, but I think that more important than the conservation of natural resources is the conservation of human resources, the conservation of human health and of human life. Resources are well enough; our lumber, forests, ore and minerals were given to us for a purpose, but they were given for the preservation and not the destruction of life. So in the Department of Labour we have taken as one of the objects before us, as part of the work which I trust it will be possible to carry on through the years to come, this important question of the preservation of health, the conservation of human life, the protection of the working people the great mass of the people of this country from occupational or other diseases which help to undermine the strength of the nation. If this country is to be what we wish it to be, a country of happy, contented and prosperous people, it will only be by safeguarding the lives and welfare of the many, and by protecting from injustice and ill the homes of the humble in the land.

Mr. NORTHROP. Would the minister be good enough to state to the House on what grounds he claims this House has any jurisdiction to pass such a measure?

Mr. KING. I may mention to my hon. friend that when I wished to proceed the other day with the second reading of this Bill I was prevented from so doing by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on account of the fact that I had not preceded this Bill with a resolution, as apparently I should have seeing that it related to trade and commerce, and measures respecting trade and commerce came within the jurisdiction of this House. I think, perhaps, my hon. friend will feel

that the opinion expressed by the leader of the opposition is one which he will care to accept.

Mr. NORTHROP. I am afraid the minister who has just taken his seat is about as far astray in the facts he has stated to the House, in the inference he has drawn from these facts and in his general information as to the law giving jurisdiction to this House as he is in the conclusion that he has drawn from the objection stated by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition the other day. In this Bill there is one clause which forbids the importation of any of these matches into Canada. Beyond any question, apart from the rest of the Bill, eliminate every other word from the Bill, and there you have a clause forbidding the importation of matches into Canada which would bring the Bill under the rule which requires Bills relating to trade and commerce to be brought before the House first by way of resolution. But I venture to think, that when the minister considers the various heads under which jurisdiction is given to this parliament in clause 91 of the British North America Act, and the various heads in clause 92 under which jurisdiction is given to the provincial legislatures, he will find beyond peradventure that there is no clause there that in any way would give this House the jurisdiction he claims. Without going into that point, let me ask him to consider that the highest courts of the land have again and again held that the words: 'regulation of trade and commerce' must not be read in a literal sense. As the Lord Chancellor said: If we were to take these words literally giving the Dominion power to legislate on all subjects which related to trade and commerce, surely the Dominion would have the right to legislate with regard to bills and notes, and yet a head is given particularly for bills and notes; surely the Dominion would have the power right to legislate touching insolvency and yet a specific head is given under clause 91 for insolvency. Would not common sense lead the minister to the same conclusion that the Lord Chancellor of England has come to again and again, that when we take the words 'regulating trade and commerce' they mean regulating our trade as between provinces, as between nations, regulating that trade which is existing. And, for the Minister of Labour to confuse the operations of an isolated factory, perhaps in a country town, with the trade and commerce referred to in the British North America Act, is hardly treating the subject with that respect which might be expected from him.

Mr. KING. I may say that I did not rely exclusively on the leader of the opposition, but before this matter was presented to