

which he was a member sent tenders all over England and the United States and Canada, for months, inviting competition for this work? Did he not know that these tenders declared that the Government, of which he was a member, was prepared to give 54,000,000 acres of land and \$27,000,000, and 20 per cent. on an unknown sum, which tenderers were invited to state.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. The time for receiving them had expired.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh! the hon. gentleman says, the time for receiving tenders had expired. But why had it had expired. Why, Sir, it expired only because there was no person to be found in Canada, or out of it, who would look at their proposition to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway for 54,000,000 acres of land and \$27,000,000, and an unknown sum, which tenderers were asked to fix for themselves over and above the maximum price. This was the offer of the hon. gentleman and of the Government of which he was a member. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway was as dead as Julius Cæsar at that time. The hon. gentleman knows that the people had ceased to talk about the Canadian Pacific Railway as a thing in which to invest any money, and for very good reasons, as I shall presently show. The hon. gentleman is aware that after giving it the widest publicity, we were able to make a contract for \$78,000,000—valuing the land at \$1 per acre—while they had offered \$31,000,000, calling the land \$1 per acre, and they could not get a bid from any part of the world where they had sent their applications. Under these circumstances, I think it was hardly in place for the hon. gentleman to take the exception that tenders were not invited, for the hon. gentleman himself had been inviting tenders for months with the effect which I have named. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) also wished to explain his views, the views of the hon. gentleman who drafted the resolution and placed it in his hands—I mean the leader of the Opposition. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman was not quite in his right, or was not discharging his duty, in drafting the resolution, or that it was the slightest reflection upon the members of that side of the House to accept the resolution or the services of their leader in preparing it. There was nothing extraordinary in that, but it reminded me of a story I once heard of a Presbyterian Church in which one or two influential parties were becoming rather restive. They talked about going over to the secession or leaving the church with which they were