

May's matches have been manufactured without poisonous phosphorus. It is true that the two efficient alternatives are patented; but the owners of the better known of the two have offered it to their brother manufacturers in the United Kingdom, who have readily accepted the terms offered, which, I may say, are practically but a nominal recognition of the patent rights. The other alternative is the joint property of the manufacturers, except one, and that one has accepted proposals enabling him to use whichever of the alternatives he may prefer.

5. There is consequently no reason whatever why the use of poisonous phosphorus should be continued, and I believe it is well known to the Home Office that in other countries there has been very much more injury to the health of the workers than in this, and it is to be expected, therefore, that very soon there will be unanimity in this matter throughout the match-making countries. But whether there is or not, or whether it comes sooner or later, we claim the time has come and should not be delayed, when Great Britain should be ready to give effect to a proposal which can have none but beneficial effects upon all concerned.

Now, the attitude of the British government in both Houses of parliament, when the subject came up for discussion there, may be stated in a few words. In the House of Commons the Hon. Herbert Gladstone, Secretary of State for the Home Department said in reference to this legislation:

So far as the general necessity for the Bill was concerned, it was desirable, though he admitted there had been few cases lately of necrosis poisoning, if they could do it, absolutely to eliminate the chance of this very dreadful and painful disease occurring. It was so dreadful that, even if only one case had occurred in the last few years, this Bill, which would involve no trouble or expense, would be justified.

These were the words of the present Governor of South Africa. Then in the House of Lords, the Lord Steward, Earl Beauchamp said:

Representations have been made to the Home Office, on behalf of all the manufacturers of matches in the United Kingdom, that if the importation of matches made abroad with white phosphorus is prohibited by law they would be willing that the use of that material in the manufacture of matches in this country should be forbidden.

... I do not think, therefore, that there will be any increase in the cost of manufacture of these 'strike anywhere' matches. In these circumstances and especially in view of the fact that this Bill will go far to prevent the danger of cases of phossy jaw occurring among match makers in the future, I hope your Lordship will agree to the motion for the second reading.

I have dwelt a little on the English legislation, because I feel that rightly the precedent of the British parliament will carry great weight in this country. We

Mr. KING.

have first of all, the match manufacturers themselves in Britain uniting in a petition to have this legislation passed in the English house, recognizing that the best regulation possible to have, was ineffective, and we have both the House of Commons and the House of Lords agreeing to the legislation. Now I do not believe that in this country we shall encounter any more opposition from the match manufacturers than was encountered in Great Britain. I have had a talk with Mr. Rowley, general manager of the E. B. Eddy Company, which I think produces something like ninety per cent of the matches used in this country. Mr. Rowley has stated to me that while he does not see that there is any necessity for this legislation from his point of view, and while he thinks the regulations at present existing are quite effective, I am at liberty to state that his company does not propose to offer any opposition to this legislation. Then I have had an opportunity of talking with Mr. Flewelling, representing the match company in Hampton, and with Mr. Corbett, of Halifax, and also with Mr. McCarthy, who has to do with the business just starting in Deseronto, Ontario; and these gentlemen, while perhaps they would prefer to see no legislation, have told me that if sufficient time is given them in which to make the necessary changes, they do not intend to offer any active opposition to the measure. So parliament, in considering this legislation, may keep in mind, not merely the precedent of Great Britain, the example of all the countries in Europe, but I think may rely, if not upon co-operation, at least upon the tacit consent of the match manufacturers of this country.

I would point out to the House that if there were no reasons other than those I have already mentioned, they are quite sufficient to justify legislation of this kind. Great Britain and the European countries have all found this legislation necessary. Is there any reasonable ground for believing that in Canada the reasons are less strong than they have proven to be in those older countries? If we do not enact legislation of this kind while other countries do, we give a premium to the manufacturer who may desire to produce matches from white phosphorus, and hold out, as it were, an inducement to him to come here. On the other hand, all the countries which have enacted this legislation have also prohibited the importation of matches made with white phosphorus, Canada to-day cannot export matches to Britain made with white phosphorus, nor to Germany, nor to any other European country I have mentioned. We have further the prospect, the probability, of a similar enactment in the United States; so we would also be shut