

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—I do not often find myself voting differently from the hon. member, Mr. Coles, but if he presses his amendment, a regard for consistency will induce me to vote against it. As to waiting for the Commission to decide upon this offer, I cannot see the propriety of that course, for I have no great faith that it will be in operation, and still less that its operation will be followed by any practical benefit to the tenantry. But supposing that the Commission were in operation, and even were the land liable to be escheated—the proceedings would render the cost to intending purchasers greater than the amount now asked for it. But the probability is, that the Estate would not be in the market when the Commission should sit, for it is idle to suppose that Lord Selkirk will hesitate to accept from private individuals that which he has consented to take from Government. I do not coincide with the hon. member, Mr. Pope, in his opinion that all the credit which may accrue from the acceptance of this offer is due to the hon. the Leader of the Government. I rather think that they who passed the Land Purchase Bill, under the provisions of which it is proposed to purchase the property, are deserving of any reputation which may accrue from this operation. While I say this I do not hesitate to award all praise for sincerity of purpose to that hon. member, but my hon. friend the leader of the late Government is justly entitled to the credit of the measure which his political opponents have adopted, and I regret that he should appear to repudiate his principles because of such adoption. It ought to be a source of gratification to him to see his opponents acting on his measures. In 1855 the then Commissioner of

Public Lands applied to Lord Selkirk to sell his Estate to the Government, and I believe his Lordship authorised his agent—Mr. Deans, to treat for the transfer, which might then have been effected had it not been for the intervention of middlemen. The Government seek to veil their inconsistency by charges of mismanagement of the Worrell Estate. The Bill under which that purchase was effected, and which they are about to extend, was opposed by them before a foot of land had been bought; and had not the present Col. Secretary interfered, it would have been procured for much less. But notwithstanding these complaints about that property, no evidence has as yet been adduced that any loss has been sustained from it. I am prepared to support the resolution of the leader of the Government, and I hope that the management of the Selkirk property may be such as to prevent any necessity for retaliating upon them charges similar to those they have preferred with reference to the Worrell Estate.

Hon. Mr. Coles' amendment was then put and lost on the following division:—

Ayes,—Messrs. Coles and Cooper,—2.

NAYS,—Messrs. Whelan, McKay, Wightman, Speaker, Yee, Pope, Montgomery, Beer, Gray, Longworth, Haviland, Laird, Howatt, Hohn and Davies,—15.

Hon. Col. Gray's resolution was then put and carried, and a Bill in accordance with it was brought in and read first time.

W. M. Howe, Reporter.