

and see if the Award is binding?" But then, as between the hon. gentleman's leader at Ottawa and as between our leader, there are a good many more things than that boundary. Did not Sir John Macdonald tell us that no court, no lawyer would confirm the Award, so far as the boundary was concerned? I think Sir John qualified his declaration, and said no court in the world and no lawyer of any distinction would say that the boundary, giving to Ontario all that we say, was correct. That was the principal contest—We were fighting for the boundary, not for a bit of paper, but for a title to the title, and that was what Sir John Macdonald said we had no right to. He now says, after we have got the boundary, that we have no right to the land. And therefore I contend that as between the hon. gentleman's leader at Ottawa and our leader, the leader of this Government is entitled to credit. But my hon. friend made some reference to

THE LICENSE QUESTION,

as did also the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend from Lennox, in moving the Address, said that the support given by the leader of the Opposition to the Government on the License Question was of a halting character. It was true, he said, that the leader of the Opposition, from his place in this House, asserted that if the power to deal with licenses was not given to the Provincial Legislatures, it ought to be given; but that notwithstanding this, the conduct of the leader of the Opposition and his public utterances with reference to this question, made it a fair criticism to say that his support was of a halting character. The leader of the Opposition appeals to a motion for which his friends and himself voted in the session of 1884. But I don't think he quoted that motion very fairly—he did not quote it very reasonably against this side of the House. The motion was an amendment to a set of resolutions, introduced by the Provincial Secretary, dealing with the liquor license question. And I think that this very action of the leader of the Opposition, in pressing that amendment, made it plain that the support he gave to the Government on the License Question was a halting support. What was his purpose? We were standing stoutly up for the Provincial contention.

Mr. MEREDITH—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FRASER—I hope before I get through to convince the House that a "hear, hear," delivered in that style is entirely uncalled for and unwarranted. We were standing up stoutly for the Provincial contention. I would like him to state here the time, or the place, or the occasion when we did anything else. We did not think anything should be done to make the Dominion contention

MORE EASILY CARRIED OUT.

That phrase exactly conveys my meaning. We believed we had a perfect right to make it impossible to carry out the McCarthy Act. I do not deny it. I say it was our bounden duty,—maintaining as we did that our Provincial jurisdiction was exclusive, or should be made exclusive,—we were bound, so far as we could constitutionally, to discourage the taking out of licenses under the McCarthy Act. I ask any gentleman whether that was not a reasonable course.

Mr. MEREDITH—That was not your avowed object.

Hon. Mr. HARDY—You said that was the object at the time. (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. FRASER—That, then, was the purpose—to discourage the taking out of Dominion licenses. Because, of course, it would be a discouragement against taking out such a license if the hotelkeeper found that it cost a much larger sum than a license under the Crooks Act. Now the leader of the Opposition knew that if the Bill founded on these resolutions became law—if that splendid machine, the veto power, were not exercised—those men would be very rare who would take out licenses under the McCarthy Act and pay the higher fees. The leader of the Opposition saw his opportunity, "I will profess to be as good as anybody so far as Provincial Rights are concerned, but I will do my little best to depreciate this legislation and prevent its being carried." And then he not only quotes his amendment as a positive proof that he was not giving us a halting support, that he and his friends were fighting for the Provincial contention; but he quotes it against the members on this side of the House, because every one of us voted against it. Now my hon. friend for East Toronto

TALKS ABOUT FAIR PLAY.

He counsels us like a good, old father, and hopes we will be better boys. He is very sincere in his appeals to stick to the record fairly and accurately, and to give fair play to our opponents. I hope the member for East Toronto will take his leader away, and have a conference with him, as he did about the License Question, and tell him how unfair it was that he should have just made that one

quotation, and that it should have appeared in his speech, and should have been followed by the assertion that we were opposed to the contention that the Provincial Legislatures had exclusive jurisdiction. (Applause.) This was the amendment:—"Inasmuch as this House is of opinion that the right to regulate the liquor traffic by license laws belongs, under the B. N. A. Act, exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces, it is not expedient to settle a scale of duties under the Dominion License Act, 1883, which this House believes to be beyond the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament." What he wanted, of course, was

TO KILL THE BILL,

because the Bill was one of that class which must be founded on a resolution. He wanted to kill the Bill, and he wanted to do it by this amendment. We voted it down, it is true, but he should have told the House why—he should have told the country why. He is one whose opinions are read. Weak though he is in this House, he and his followers represent a very large portion of the voice of public opinion. But he should not mislead public opinion. He should not allow himself to be quoted as proof-positive the Liberals in the House were entirely against the Provincial contention. He is no more justified in this course than I would be justified if I quoted a resolution which he and his friends voted against. Because in these very resolutions there is a paragraph devoted to this very

QUESTION OF JURISDICTION,

And against these resolutions gentlemen opposite voted. And I would be quite as much justified in quoting that, and saying that my friends opposite voted against it, and leaving it in that bald form to mislead people, as my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, was justified in the course he took. I will read the paragraph in the resolutions:—"Whereas the Legislature of this Province claims and contends that the right to legislate in respect of the aforesaid licenses, and otherwise as to the sale of spirituous and fermented liquors, and to regulate the sale thereof, and the houses in which the same is sold, is, by the B. N. A. Act, conferred upon Provincial Legislatures exclusively." (Hear, hear.) Now every one of these gentlemen opposite voted against that.

Mr. MEREDITH—Read on. Does it not say that doubts exist?

Hon. Mr. FRASER—(Repeating the paragraph)—The word used is "exclusively." I do not see how any resolution could be stronger than that. The paragraph which follows is:—"Whereas, nevertheless, should the said Act of the Parliament of Canada notwithstanding the said claim and contention of the Legislature of this Province, it becomes necessary, in order to the raising of a revenue, for Provincial, local, and municipal purposes, that a duty be imposed upon the licenses aforesaid, which may be issued under the authority of the said Act of the Parliament of Canada." I do not see what doubt is expressed there. But the purpose and object of the Bill were to discourage the taking out of license until the final decision of the highest tribunal could be had. We don't always get up and tell everything that we are thinking of. (Hear, and laughter.) Why, if the hon. gentleman thought that the Provincial contention was right and the Dominion was wrong, why did he not say so boldly and plainly and frankly to the people when he was addressing them? Why did he go to Ottawa to have a secret confab with Sir John? We remember the rumours of a coalition. There was to be a new Government, with a certain number of Liberals. Of course, with a coalition, there must be something done with reference to this License Question. And no matter what the coalition was, I don't suppose they expected that the Liberals who went into it were going

TO EAT THE LEEK.

And therefore I can quite understand how my shrewd old friend (Mr. Morris) who negotiated the treaties with Poundmaker and Slap-Him-on-the-Back—(laughter)—should say: "We must go and see Old To-morrow, or the coalition won't succeed. These Liberals won't go back on the License Question. There will be a row in the camp at once. You must go and see Sir John." If we knew exactly the mind of my friend who negotiated the treaties it would be this, "There must be a treaty, and therefore there must be a conference." I don't say he said so in so many words. But I recollect that it was a common thing to say how he negotiated another coalition, how he brought contending parties together, and made quite a chapter in the history of our country—I heard that remark on the floor of this House perhaps half a dozen times. And therefore I am all the more persuaded—the more I think the more I am persuaded—that my hon. friend who negotiated the treaties made up his mind that unless these little irritating affairs were settled