"the original notice posted in the Cobalt office was produced

before the contending parties."

THE MAIL AND EMPIRE and WORLD do not expressly give the time at which the map and notice were said by the Prime Minister to be in the office of the Recorder, but this is supplied by the other papers. There is no reason whatever to doubt the accuracy of the information given out at the time that in order to secure the passing of the Aet in question the Premier stated to the House that the Order-in-Council of August withdrawing Cobalt Lake was posted up in the Recorder's office at the time of Mr. Green's discovery.

It has since been proved conclusively that this was not the case. The evidence above referred to of itself puts this beyond question. Besides this evidence, these statements to the Legislathre are quite at variance with the sworn statements of independent witnesses of high standing and unimpeachable character.

THE RECORDER'S ADMISSION.

It is nuneeessary to pursue this as the Recorder has admitted that this Order-in-Council was taken down when the office walls were being oiled. The statement of the Recorder made to Mr. Green and others at the time, that this Order-in-Conneil had been posted up in the old office but had never been posted up in his new office. His statement now is that it was posted up in the new office but taken down when the office walls were being oiled. No matter which statement is accepted, it is clear that there was no such Order-in-Council posted up in the Recorder's office at the time of Mr. Green's enquiries or at the time of his discovery.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S STATEMENTS.

In THE WORLD of April 6th, 1907, the Honourable Mr. Foy is thus reported: "Hon. Mr. Foy again went into the details of the withdrawal of the lake properties, quoting the aet and the Order-in-Council, and citing the evidence when the original notice posted in the Cobalt office was produced before the contending

In THE WORLD of 18th April, the Honourable Mr. Foy is reported to have said "The ease has been presented before to the Mining Commissioner, to the Department and to the whole Cabinet, which heard the evidence patiently at great length."

In this respect the learned Attorney-General was completely misinformed. In the first place this ease never went before the Mining Commissioner. In the second place, the evidence in this ease was never heard either by the Department or the Cabinet patiently or otherwise.

MR. GREEN'S CLAIM NEVER CONSIDERED.

The Department refused to consider Mr. Green's offer to prove his right to the property by ample evidence as the following let-