

is, they have not been absent there to Mr Aldous. I think the hon. gentleman must have forgotten himself when he said that he was never opposed to the Purchase Bill. The resolutions go to show that he was opposed to both the Loan and Purchase Bills. I do not blame the Government for endeavoring to obtain the land from Lord Selkirk at as low a rate as possible, and to make the best bargain they could. The hon. member has certainly explained away some of the objections to the course they pursued, which appears to have been occasioned by the circumstance that Lord Selkirk possessed a greater quantity of land than was at first represented. They may have made the best bargain in the case that lay in their power, but we did the same with respect to the Worrell estate; and after all there is not so much difference between the rate paid for the two, as the cost of that Estate was about 5s an acre. It seems that the Government considered they would be justified in giving something over 2s 4d sig. for Lot 54, because they obtained the Selkirk estate for less. Even with such a pretext, I think they were not warranted in making the purchase, for who is to pay the extra charge but the Tenant on the Township; it will never do to lay it on those who buy land on the Selkirk estates. We should not, however, quibble at these little points, but co-operate with each other in the Purchase scheme, as it will probably be the only one, by which the question will ever be settled. I was