

HON. MR. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

HON. MR. PLUMB—The hon. gentleman is quite right, I wish to emphasize that statement, and the hon. gentleman is kind enough to enable me to do so. The difference is one which will hardly bear dispute as to how it came about. I say that with the policy of seven or eight years ago, a loan offered with the whole credit of Canada, when there was abundance of money, brought 87½ cents; and the loan offered under most adverse circumstances three or four years afterwards, sold at 96; whereas both of those loans are now selling at 104, which certainly offers food for reflection to everyone, and leads to the conclusion that there is something in the change of policy and of administration to account for the position of the country to-day with its largely enhanced credit, notwithstanding the fact that the Government had the temerity to attempt to subsidize the great work which is to unite the two oceans, and had given a subsidy which it was declared would ruin us to pay. In regard to that subsidy—which will not be fully payable until the time when the work is completed,—I think the interest and a sinking fund sufficient to pay it off will be raised out of the customs receipts at Winnipeg and at Emerson. Those last year were \$1,050,000, and if you take a sinking fund on \$25,000,000 at one half of one per cent. it would be \$125,000, and interest at 4 per cent. would be \$1,000,000 more, so that the receipts from customs at Winnipeg last year were nearly enough to relieve us of the whole burden of the subsidy given to the Canadian Pacific Railway. This, as I said before, we could pay out of the Customs receipts at Winnipeg alone, and that is entirely in consequence of the policy which has opened that vast country. The receipts from the Land Office last year were \$2,250,000, and they have only begun. We were laughed at for saying that there would be sales to a certain amount, and that a certain population would go into that country. A calculation was given by Sir John Macdonald in 1880, and was ridiculed by those gentlemen who have no confidence in the progress of the country, and who are always desirous that we should take a

retrograde position. But it has been more than fulfilled. The ratio for this year has been much larger than that which was anticipated or predicted during the discussion when it was proposed to have a large amount of land put aside for the purpose of completing the Canadian Pacific Railroad. I know that statements of this kind are of a tedious character and I shall not weary hon. gentlemen by going further into them. There are many more subjects which are most interesting and which would be entirely germane to an address such as I am making, but I will refrain from trespassing upon the patience of the House. I only say this, that we are a prosperous country; I only say that with regard to the country alongside of us, and our position, I have endeavored in some slight degree to make a comparison. Amicable trade relations now exist, as I hope they always will, between the two countries, as it is the interest on both sides to maintain that cordial understanding; we are both engaged in carrying out a great experiment, one in which the whole world is interested—the experiment of self-government—in which it is the great interest of the world should be allowed to proceed. I know that on our side we have seen some of the elements of true freedom which are not possessed by our neighbors on the other side, and one of those we have taken from the British Constitution. I believe it was said when the charter was granted by which the separation of the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec was made by the British Crown—"we have the true form and impress of the British Constitution." The great difference between us and our neighbours upon the other side, apart from universal suffrage, is that we have responsible Government, responsible directly to the people, and that feature cannot be found in their constitution. We have also that which I believe is most important for the preservation of liberty, we have an unwritten constitution—a constitution of precedent rather than an iron bound form of words, which every country must outgrow, and which can be only changed by political violence which it is not at all desirable to provoke. I have said that it is desirable we should make our marches forward in parallel lines—that the true mathematical definition of parallel lines