

Liberal principles; why they are opposing the Government construction of that line, when it would, beyond a doubt, be a paying investment to this country. Let them explain why they are not opposing monopoly in regard to this matter as they have denounced it in the past. Let them explain why they are turning their backs upon the west and abandoning us to a stupendous monopoly. And let them explain, above all, why when their conduct is questioned, they have only torrents of abuse to turn upon the person who thinks it his public duty to call attention to the matter. Sir, until these matters are cleared up, I have no fear in standing in this House or any place else in public and stating what I have stated; and I am perfectly willing that the general public should judge who is the liar and the slanderer.

I can tell the "Globe" that I do not intend to be prevented from doing my duty by any methods of blackguarding that they may indulge in. If vilification coming from the hirelings of monopolists and a corrupted press could have deterred me from speaking out in matters of this kind, I should not be here to-day. I have opposed monopoly hitherto and I will oppose it and denounce all who, to my mind, are coquetting with it. During the elections of last June, I fought for what I thought to be best for the monopoly-cursed masses of the west. I have their confidence, and do not intend to betray it even in the altered atmosphere of this Parliamentary chamber. Whatever I might be inclined to do under ordinary circumstances, these are most extraordinary circumstances; when I see that fair western province with all its wealth threatened with complete subjugation to monopoly, I consider I would be unworthy of a seat in this House, I would be untrue to the interests of the people I represent if I did not cry out against the impending calamity and denounce those who are endeavouring to profit by the ruin of my province. My duty is clear; I have taken a stand and I intend to keep it, whether it pleases the "Globe" or any person else or not. I take the stand that seems to me to be dictated by my duty in the interest of my constituents, of my province and of the country generally; and I am ready and willing at any time that my constituents should have an opportunity of saying whether they endorse my action and conduct upon this matter, or whether they prefer the despicable attitude taken by the "Globe." I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government, as I do not see the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) here, if

he can take the House into his confidence for a moment and tell us when the tariff will be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). In the absence of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I may say that I have reason to believe that he will be in a position to make that announcement on Monday.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons. He said: In my explanation at the time of introducing this Bill, I stated that the object was, in the first place, to consolidate the present law with reference to Dominion elections, and that in the consolidation will be found certain amendments. When I state that at the present time one who wishes to understand the law with reference to Dominion elections finds it necessary to consult fourteen or fifteen different statutes, hon. members will be impressed with the necessity and wisdom of consolidating the law upon this subject. This Bill provides for the repeal of the Franchise Act of 1885 and the substitution of provincial franchises, provincial lists and provincial polling divisions. With reference to this particular part of the Bill, I take it for granted that it is almost universally admitted that the time has arrived when it is necessary to make some changes in the franchise law. That appears to have been admitted on all sides and the only question which it was at all necessary to discuss is as to the direction that these should take. The Franchise Act of 1885 was found to be cumbersome and expensive, expensive not only to the state—and that will be accepted by hon. members when I say that since that law came into force in 1885 an expenditure of over a million dollars has been incurred under it by the state—but also to those who had occasion to take part in political matters. I think I can venture to assert that each revision of the tariff that took place involved an expenditure of from \$200 to \$300 by every member of this House. Not only were the public subjected to this inconvenience and expense, but we also found that we were deprived of a real genuine voters' list at the time of elections. I think it will be found the three elections that have taken place since 1885 were held on voters' lists that were two years old. I think, though I am not positive, that in one case it was found that the voters' list was almost three years old when the elections took place. It seems, as I have said, to be universally admitted that some change is necessary. What we have now to consider is what system shall be adopted in place of the cum-