

afraid that the measure relating to bills of lading will be a very delicate one. The hon. gentleman from Montreal adverted to the fact, which is no doubt true, that those bills of lading have become very complex and complicated. The variety of conditions printed on the back of the bill of lading in very small type would take half an hour and a magnifying glass to make them out; yet there are many decisions upon those conditions, defining how far they bind the consignee and the consignor, and therefore any such legislation as the hon. gentleman suggests would have a tendency to unsettle the present condition of things. If it can be done, we will all be very glad to see an improvement effected.

One of the paragraphs, I notice, alludes to the Franchise; it is a proposal to simplify the existing law and lessen the cost of its operation. The Act, no doubt, has been exceedingly unsatisfactory, and will continue to be so until we go back to a recognition of the lists prepared by the several Provincial Governments. Then we shall be spared the expense to which we are now subjected, and we shall have the living men of the time to vote in elections. As it is now, an election held to-day is on a list prepared three years ago. We know that in a country like Canada large numbers of men are leaving, new men coming into take their places—that the people are moving about from one country to another, and consequently the lists are largely defective. An election under such circumstances does not to the fullest extent express the view of the constituency, and to renew the lists every year in the manner that was originally done would, no doubt, entail a very large expense.

Some reference is made in the next paragraph to developing trade with the outside world. My views on that question are in accord with those I have repeatedly expressed in this Chamber. Commerce will find the best channel to flow in, and it is unwise to endeavor to force it into other channels by subsidies. We have from time to time sent abroad Commissioners, with a view to developing trade with other countries, but so long as we maintain a tariff that will prevent the establishment of trade relations with those countries so long will it be impossible to

develop commerce with them. We are told that our attention will be invited to the best mode of developing our trade and securing direct communication by steam with Australasia, the West Indies and South America. The hon. gentleman from Montreal has made comments on this particular branch of the subject. He has told us of the very great development in the importation of raw material. I do not at all doubt it; but has our general trade developed? The raw material has come in for the benefit of the manufacturers, but the great trade of the country has not increased. I find in the Blue Book before us, which has been distributed this Session, that our aggregate trade last year was \$201,000,000, and that in the year 1874 it amounted to \$217,000,000. In 1875 and 1876, those dreadful years while the Grits were in power, the first years of the Liberal Administration, the trade returns were still higher than the figures of last year and the year before. The hon. member has also told us that the United States have thrown great obstacles in the way of our trade with them. Has Canada been entirely blameless in the controversy? Have we not done the same thing in our fiscal policy? But the people are not governed by it; the people of Canada and the United States will trade with each other no matter what tariff laws are enacted. You may build up a tariff wall between the two countries, but the people will trade with each other. When Sir Leonard Tilley was enacting the National Policy he told us that his object was to develop trade with Great Britain and diminish trade with the United States. It was a policy that would favor the mother country. Has that been the effect? Not at all. It has been going the other way, showing how utterly powerless we are to control trade and commerce. Trade will find the most profitable avenue. We may restrict trade, but we cannot drive it into unprofitable channels. Last year we sold the United States, notwithstanding their high tariff—a tariff a great deal higher than our own—\$42,500,000, while to a country which admits everything we send free we only sold \$40,000,000. Does not that show that the United States is a country with which it is profitable for us to deal? Then, from whom did we buy?