

discussed in Parliament. An hon. gentleman beside me asks who were the drunken crowd.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He asked me. The hon. member for East Grey asks who were the drunken crowd. I could tell who were the drunken crowd, but I will not do so; perhaps he knows. But that there was a drunken crowd, I am prepared to say; I will not say whether it was in this House or out of it. I believe I might say there were some in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to insinuate that hon. members were disorderly or drunk in this House? If he has made use of such an expression, I must ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. All right; I will withdraw it.

Mr. BOWELL. Or I will insist upon its being taken down.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If it is to be taken down, it must be done immediately after it is said.

Mr. BOWELL. I was not interrupting the Chairman while he was speaking.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is perfectly right that this expression should be taken down, because it will go to the country through the press. Insinuations are made about men who do not drink a drop of spirituous liquors of any kind, and I think it is time we should understand whether such falsehoods should go to the country or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he knew of hon. gentlemen in this House being drunk. If he said that, I would ask him to withdraw the expression.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant.) I did not say that. Now, I was going to say, Mr. Chairman —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will mind the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood that I complied with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I did not understand so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He withdrew.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I was going on to say, there are some remarkable things in this discussion which are worthy of being noted. A good deal of ability has been displayed by some men on the other side of the House on previous occasions in discussing questions in the interest of the Government. How is it that there is this perfect silence on this particular question? We all know that it is a very difficult matter for the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) to keep his seat when discussions are going on here; but he has maintained perfect silence during the whole of this discussion. We all know that it is very difficult for the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) to keep his tongue quiet in this House; but he has been perfectly silent. We all know that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has frequently discussed questions before this House; we all know his eloquence and ability as a pleader before the Privy Council in Great Britain; but how is it that with all his learning and education, he has not opened his mouth to take part in this debate? We all know that the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) is an important member of this House; we all know the legal lore which he brings to bear upon the discussion of legal points that occasionally come under the consideration of the House. Why has he been silent? Why has the melodious voice of the hon. member for Cornwall

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant.)

(Mr. Bergin), the Surgeon General of the Government—whose eloquent tones in introducing the Factory Bill thrilled the whole House—not been heard on this important measure? We want to know why the hon. Minister of Agriculture has kept silent; he might have told us at least that "there ain't nothing to it;" but he has kept his seat. We want to know why the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster), the silver-tongued orator from the shores of the foamy Atlantic, has kept his tongue quiet? We want to know why the hon. member for Kings', Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth), who at one time had a gravel pit that cost this country \$9,000, has maintained silence? We want to know why the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who stands in the front rank, always ready to defend whatever the Government brings under the notice of this House, has remained silent? Why do not those members who come from the Pacific slope raise their voices in defence of this measure? Why have we not heard from the member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Shakespeare), the descendant of our own immortal Shakespeare? and from the member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer), whose name is historic, and whose namesake of ancient times was famous for his erudition and poetic eloquence? And why is my hon. friend from Hamilton silent? We want to know where the other member for Hamilton is, on this occasion. Then the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has not said anything, and we all know he is so eloquent that, when he rises to address the House, he at once clears the reporters' gallery, because his eloquence is so strong that they cannot stand the pressure.

Mr. SPROULE. You were asleep in the smoking room when I addressed the House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No, Sir, the noble band on this side of the House have not been asleep, when they were on the post of duty. We have been working to uphold the dearest rights ever given to the electors of this country, and we have not had time to sleep. Hon. gentlemen opposite are the men who have slept at their post of duty, and I tell them that the electors will take them to task for their neglect of duty. But I would like to ask why the gentlemen on the Ministerial side have been silent so long, after the row we had on Monday or Tuesday last. It must have been that the order went forth that they were to maintain silence, in the hope that the Opposition would become exhausted and that they would be able to force this obnoxious and iniquitous measure through the House, without an opportunity for its discussion. I have understood, and I believe it to be the fact, that many of the men who sit in the House in dumb silence, are not aware of the provisions of this Bill, and many of them have stated that it is not the intention to enfranchise the tribal Indians—the savages of the plains. And yet we have been told by the First Minister that when the North-West is divided into Provinces these Indians on the reservations will have votes. I cannot conceive of a more outrageous proposition that could be presented to this House, or such an outrage upon the public opinion of this country—as that these Indians, from whose depredations the North-West is now suffering, should be enfranchised—men who have already shed the blood of some of the best of our sons who have gone up there to maintain law and order in that country. We all know that there are mourning hearts throughout this Dominion at the present time, for the loss of life which has taken place there, and now we have the audacious proposition of the Prime Minister that these Indians shall have votes, while this Bill does not give the franchise to the men who are quelling the insurrection there. We are ready to give the vote to Indians who are properly enfranchised under the Indian Act; we wish to see the Indians elevated and educated so as to become fit subjects of Her Majesty and of the Dominion. This is what