

and the measures to be submitted to the House. These measures, and particularly that relating to matters of banking, will receive from this side of the House the consideration to which they are entitled, apart from any political bias whatever; for these banking and currency matters deeply affect all our great commercial interests, indeed all interests. With regard to the Pacific Railway policy I fear that it will be impossible for us to coincide in the views expressed in the Speech and those of the hon. member for Halifax in regard to the expenditure incurred in that work. The first Pacific Railway Act passed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and subsequent enactments, declared the intention of the country to proceed, as fast as the resources of the country will permit, without increase of the existing rate of taxation, with the construction of the work; and all proposals, promises and negotiations were subject to that limitation. A resolution to that effect was proposed in the House first by the late Sir Geo. Cartier. It was successively enacted by the two Administrations which followed, and stands therefore as a parliamentary declaration of policy. I cannot help looking, with great alarm, on the prospective expenditure as being far beyond our resources. I do not object to the completing of the operations, so far as to enable emigrants from Lake Superior to proceed to the free prairies. This might be done with comparatively small expense. It is well known that the late Administration aimed at two things: first, to build sections of the railroad where no other means of conveyance could be had, and, in the meantime, to utilise the water between such points till the position of the country would permit us to proceed further, but building every section on the right line for an all rail route. Hon. gentlemen opposite affect to believe that the sale of lands would defray all expenses of completing the railway. I differ wholly from that opinion, and I enter a *caveat* against the supposition that we are to commit ourselves to the expenditure which is foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne and in the remarks of hon. members opposite in reference to it. We will be prepared, on our part, to consider everything that may be submitted, in a fair, impartial, and just spirit, and in such a spirit as may best conduce to the general

benefit of the country; but we will not be deterred, though small in numbers, from asserting what course should be pursued, and what course the country demands to be pursued in reference to this and other public works involving an expenditure on the country. Before sitting down I will say a few words about the Ministerial changes. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will doubtless give us information when the Address is passed; but I think it is a matter of great interest to us to know how Senator McPherson became a member of the Administration and the presiding officer of the other House—an office to which he will no doubt impart weight and dignity. He published two remarkable pamphlets, containing a great deal that was not true—in fact, very little that was true; but there are certain very remarkable statements in one of those pamphlets about another matter. We find that he condemned utterly and wholly any expenditure on the Pacific Railway; and now he becomes a member of the Administration which boasts of this expenditure, both that which has been already incurred and that which is to be incurred in prospective years. I hope he—or rather not he, but the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government—will be able to give us some satisfactory reason for such a change of policy on the part of the hon. Senator. He wrote the pamphlets, he told the public, not as a politician at all; though he used very strong language for one not wholly committed to any political party. For a gentleman in that position his language was exceedingly bitter and vigorous, and would induce any stranger to class him as an unscrupulous partisan. I have no doubt he will be able—or the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will be able—to tell us whether Mr. McPherson has understood that there was to be an expenditure on the Pacific Railway, or whether he is now willing to agree to the expenditure so that he may have a place in the Government. The hon. gentleman opposite is to be congratulated on killing a formidable foe in this professed friend. He has performed the operation very often; but we are very glad to have the presence of a gentleman in the Cabinet who goes even farther

MR. MACKENZIE.