

ants "for property taken, damaged or destroyed", "it would not make the claimant whole", and, in consequence, the condensed decision of both Commissioners is reflected in a brief sentence extracted from Commissioner McDougall's judgment, which reads in part as follows:

"A sum payable in the PAST is NOW equivalent to that sum with interest thereon as covering the value of the use of that money during the time the owner has been deprived of it."

It is still further submitted that the actions of the three consecutive Parliaments in these foregoing specific instances or transactions, in which Canadians as a whole have acquiesced and which have involved, up to March 31, 1932, the payment of interest

amounting in all to.....\$3,329,208.70
paid on the total principal sum of.....\$6,790,904.75

has thereby bound us, together with every Canadian taxpayer, to contribute both in principle and in money to the fulfilment of the basic and fundamental principle of the payment of interest as "compensation for the loss of the use of the money", and yet, for want of permanent statutory provision enforcing the general application of this same basic and fundamental principle, the single individual, every-day taxpayer or citizen, upon whom the National Treasury must needs depend absolutely for its revenues, is debarred and denied from participation in the very principle and benefits to which he has been forced to contribute for the benefit of others in the specific instances hereinabove referred to.

For the foregoing and other reasons, amongst which are those set out in (Exhibits B, C and D), hereto attached, we, the undersigned, hereby support the general application of the principle involving the payment of interest as "compensation for the loss of the use of the money" to all taxpayers and citizens alike, without distinction or discrimination.