

inion Government accept from their friend who purchased ? It is almost incredible, but the undoubted fact is, that not only did they not demand an increased price, but they did not demand or obtain one-tenth of the sum which our sale of thirteen years before had produced ; in fact not much more than one-thirtieth. In a word, the trifling sum of \$316 was accepted instead of the \$9,000 which we had got thirteen years before, or \$5.50 a mile instead of our \$100 a mile. There is no pretence that this sale can be defended as correct or proper. The purchaser shortly afterwards sold for \$15,000 the interest which he had bought for \$316, and in a short time afterwards there was a re-sale at a still larger sum.

HUNTER'S ISLAND.

Then again, take the case of Hunter's Island. This island was in the disputed territory, and contained a large quantity of valuable timber. Long after the award had been made deciding the island to be within our boundaries, and while the Dominion Government was, notwithstanding, disputing with us as to the title, that Government undertook, without any communication with us, and without advertising, to sell this limit also to a number of persons, and without exacting any bonus whatever. The purchasers immediately after their purchase put the limit into the market at \$600,000, and would have got that sum from Chicago purchasers, but the intending purchasers discovered in time that the Ontario Government claimed the island, and they therefore declined to pay. What the Dominion Government had attempted was to give away without any bonus a property estimated at \$600,000. The Province could not stand that way of dealing with the property of the Province.

ANOTHER CASE.

Take, again, the scandalous purchase by Mr. Rykert. That gentleman was at the time a member of the House of Commons, and he got at private sale, without any bonus, a limit for which he and his partner in the transaction almost immediately afterwards received \$200,000. This was not in Ontario territory.

The sworn evidence in the McGreevy case shows that the parties who get wrongful profits in transactions with the Government are expected to turn over a large share of these wrongful profits to the election purposes of the party, and that they do so accordingly.

Looking at the timber and land policy of our opponents where they have power, and on the fruits of that policy, as compared with the policy of the Ontario Reform party, and the fruits which the Reform policy has yielded, the Opposition carpings at our financial management are absolutely grotesque. Thus, they occupied a great deal of time in the Committee of Public Accounts to show that the officer whose duty it is to look after the supplies of groceries to the Toronto Asylum had allowed the sellers to get for some of the articles somewhat more than was necessary ; that a cent a pound might have been saved on some currants and some tapioca ; that a few cents a bottle might have been saved on some Anchovy and Worcester sauce ; that three cents a gallon might have been saved on some vinegar ; and so on ; that an unconscionable number of eggs appeared in the supplies for one of the medical officers, who lived in the asylum ; and that some objectionable luxuries appeared amongst the supplies obtained by others. I suppose every house-keeper sometimes finds that he might have got this or the other item of his supplies at a little lower rate than he paid if he had been more wide awake and better informed ; and an officer will sometimes be too lenient in regard to supplies desired by brother of-