

tus were sent to Holland for the purpose of depressing the stock which was bought in at a mere nominal figure? Is he not aware that the receiver of the road after accomplishing this discreditable work was refused his share in the profits, and brought suit in the Court of St. Louis to recover it? Has he forgotten that the case was dismissed because the judge would not entertain a suit in a United States Court of justice, brought by quarrelling speculators to divide booty? Nor can he forget that a powerful clique of the defrauded Dutch bondholders through threats of bringing the matter before the courts, compelled an extra dividend and the matter was hushed up? Men with such doubtful antecedents are not received very cordially on the London or continental markets, more especially when one of the Home Rule members of Parliament, at the instance of Mr. Parnell, declared on the floor of the House of Commons that the "men connected with the Canadian Pacific Railroad were men of very fishy reputations."

It was not the intrinsic merits of the Canadian Pacific as a stock investment that caused it to be shunned as a security, but the *fishy reputations* of those who were connected with it that made it a very suspicious stock on the market. And this ancient and fishlike smell will cling to it so long as certain of the present Syndicate are linked to it. The taking of a bank's rest, to such a large amount, without the knowledge of the directors, caused much comment in financial circles and was denounced in no measured terms by the press of London. Journals here, with their usual amount of backwoods' self-sufficiency, dealt lightly with the subject and imagined that as a consequence the world at large would regard such a very reprehensible transaction in the same venal light. Did the