

a Grit hungry for office ; and I am not disposed to correct him, because we find that the hope, long deferred, of holding the reins of Government has truly made that definition a fair and proper one. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the people of Canada are alarmed ; and I must say, speaking for my own constituency, that there is a certain degree of alarm pervading it ; but I find the alarm to be based upon a fear that, in the gropings for a policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have been making for the last few years, they may find something that will be delusive enough to appeal for a time to the majority of this people of this country, and that we may be so unfortunate as to have in this House a majority of hon. gentlemen opposite. But I feel assured that when the next election passes over and the people are relieved from this cause of alarm, the alarm will be quickly dissipated, and they will be quite satisfied again to settle down quietly to business, as we have been going on under the National Policy. Now, the hon. gentleman in the concluding part of his oration, referred to certain public works ; and, without going over all the ground he did, I would like to call attention to this weakness in his argument. He takes for granted that the first estimate of the cost of public works ought not to be exceeded, and that, if it is exceeded, the whole amount above the estimate has gone in boodling and robbery. Now, I would like to call his attention to the fact that in the province of Ontario, which is under a Liberal Government, we have recently erected a legislative building, of which the original estimate of the cost was \$300,000 or \$400,000, and the final cost, \$1,250,000.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not so. The original estimate was not the amount the hon. gentleman says.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. COATSWORTH. I think the hon. gentleman is right in his correction. I merely placed the first estimate a little too low ; it was about \$500,000, while the actual cost was \$1,250,000. The hon. gentleman has argued that where a public building costs more than its original estimate, the balance has gone in boodling. If that be the case, the friends of the hon. gentleman, on that one small, public building at Toronto, have boodled to the extent of about \$700,000. My mistake, if there be any mistake, is a very slight one, and the hon. gentleman knows it very well. What I say is this : That if the hon. gentleman applied the same argument to all their own public works that he has applied to the necessary public works of this Government, the boodling would have gone up to \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000, instead of being so small as \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000. He referred to the deficit. It is an old friend of hon. gentlemen on the other side, and I

was not surprised that he should refer to it ; but it seems strange that in the same breath he should blame us for lopping off the mouldering branches and also for having a deficit. The fact is the hon. gentleman and his friends are very desirous of seeing us cut the tree down altogether, because, should we cut the old National Policy down, instead of lopping off the mouldering branches, we will fail in our duty to the country, and then hon. gentlemen opposite will no longer be hungry for office, but will occupy the places from which we will have been deservedly turned out. The hon. gentleman also referred to the question of reciprocity with the United States. I do not propose to deal with that at any length, but there is this difference between our attitude on that question, and theirs. We have always been in favour of a fair, reasonable reciprocity with the United States, which would not sacrifice the interests of this country. We stand in that position to-day, we have stood in that position for the last twenty years, and we will remain in that position rather than sacrifice the interests of this country to those of another. On the other hand, hon. gentlemen opposite, with their unrestricted reciprocity, were prepared to sacrifice the interests of this country. They were prepared to have reciprocity at any price : they were prepared to break down the barriers on this side, give the Americans control of our tariff, allow them to dictate to us what duties we ought to put upon goods, and, ultimately, drive us into annexation. Another subject which the hon. gentleman has mentioned is free trade as it is practiced in England. I must say that we do not yield one iota to hon. gentlemen opposite in our loyalty to the institutions of the mother country. We have forced these hon. gentlemen into a position of loyalty. I say, without any hesitation, that during the last general elections, we heard no word about free trade as it is in England. It is only since hon. gentlemen opposite have found that the people of this country will neither be badgered nor cajoled into supporting any such policy as they have been previously advocating, that they have made up their minds, that, as the Tory party are notorious for their loyalty to the institutions of the old country, the best thing they could do was to copy a leaf out of our book. And so they conceived this policy of free trade as it is in England. I sincerely trust that they will stand to their guns as they have them loaded to-day. We are prepared to meet them on the issue they have laid down—free trade as it is in Great Britain, with a revenue tariff as England provides it. We are prepared to meet them on that issue, and are satisfied that the verdict of the people will be, as it has been heretofore, in favour of the present Government. That policy has been referred to a number of times on both