

KIT SERVED OUT TO MILITIA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Were the Guards, of Ottawa, the 65th and the Toronto Infantry School corps, or either of them, and if so which, served out with boots, moccasins, forage caps and tuques, or any of these articles? Were the Queen's Own and the Tenth Grenadiers, or either of them, served out with any and which of the above articles? Had the Government received any information as to the worn-out condition of the uniforms and knapsacks of one of the Toronto corps?

Mr. CARON. The company of Guards from Ottawa were supplied with boots and forage caps before leaving for the North-West. The 65th were authorised to procure boots in Montreal and did so. Tuques and moccasins have not been ordered by the Department to any of these corps. 600 pairs of boots were, at Col. Otter's own request, before he left Toronto, sent to Winnipeg for the Queen's Own, the 10th Royals, and the Infantry School corps. None of the other articles mentioned were applied for. No information has been received by the Department as to the worn out condition of the uniforms and knapsacks of one of the Toronto corps.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Were the Ottawa Guards supplied with boots before leaving Ottawa?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood it was by private subscription.

Mr. CARON. They were supplied here before they left.

LICENSE INSPECTORS.

Mr. GUNN asked, When is it the intention of the Government to pay license inspectors appointed under the Act of 1883?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That question is now engaging the attention of the Government.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On amendment of Mr. Mills:

That the following words be added after the word "Indian," "who has been enfranchised under the Indian Act and has had conferred upon him the same civil capacities as other persons who are qualified to vote under this Act."

Mr. MILLS. I desire first to refer to something which fell from the First Minister on Saturday night, and also to something that fell from the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made a very violent attack on gentlemen on this side of the House, but, as his observations were rather in the form of scolding than argument, I do not think it necessary to say anything in reply. The hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster), laid down a series of extraordinary propositions which I do not think he has very seriously considered, and which, I am sure, he will find no authority, under our system of Parliamentary government, to support. He assured the House that it was the business of this House to register the wishes of the Administration, that that was its function, and that an Opposition being in a minority had no right to put forward any views in opposition to the views of the majority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. I made no such statement.
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. MILLS. He said he was here to register the decrees of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman states a part of what I said without stating all, and thereby creates a false impression of what I stated.

Mr. MILLS. I am stating the views of the hon. gentleman as I understood them at the time. I have looked for the *Hansard*, but the number is not yet out, and, if it were, I would repeat the precise words of the hon. gentleman. But the hon. gentleman's proposition would mean that a view brought forward, a measure brought forward by the Government, that never was before the country at all, that public opinion had not been expressed upon, that the public were in the dark about, because it was brought forward by the Government, was bound to be supported by the friends of the Administration. In fact, according to the view he laid down, if the First Minister were to propose to annex this country to the United States, it would be the bounden duty of hon. gentlemen on that side to support him.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated no such thing.

Mr. MILLS. I am stating it as I understood him, and as I believe he stated it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that, as the hon. gentleman's understanding is so mistaken, he should wait until the *Hansard* is before the House before he discusses it.

Mr. MILLS. Every one on this side of the House understood him in the same way. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had not seriously reflected upon the observations he was making, but that was the effect of the views he put forward.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. I so understood it. I do not admit that. I stated at the beginning, and it is what I have all along mentioned, not only in this discussion but always, that it is the business of an Administration, in every matter relating to the constitution itself—because, while under our system, we may not have all the alterations of the constitution brought within the purview of Parliament, our system is federal and there are some matters which we have not the power to change, in other respects it is in the same position as the Parliament of England—not to interfere in matters of this kind without the consent of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman was no more called upon to support the proposition of the Government than he was to support a proposition coming from this side of the House, when it was not one upon which the opinion of the country had been taken. He also said it was our business to accept this measure as it was presented by the Administration, to abdicate our functions as a Legislature, and that it would be time enough to suggest any change when the effects were discovered. I do not so understand my duty or that of any hon. gentleman on that side. I consider it the duty of the representatives of the people to consider carefully and with serious attention every measure and every paragraph of every measure, which is brought forward, to reject that which we believe to be wrong and to support that which we believe to be right. The proposition before us is to enfranchise the Indian population, whether they are emancipated from Government control or not, so long as the property in their actual possession is sufficient, if it were purchasable property, to be estimated of the value required according to the provisions of this Act. A great many gentlemen have not, I think, seriously considered the effect of this measure, and I believe that the gentlemen from British Columbia are not aware that, if it passes in its present form, the Indians who reside upon reservations, whether they have location tickets or not, if they have the amount of property in their possession which