

Act, that if the Company would build the Railway the Government would pay them the subsidy; but the Government took advantage of a default on the part of the Company—caused by the Government's own mistaken legislation—and refused to allow it to complete the Railway, by which they deprived the Company of its subsidy. It is impossible for any man to say such treatment is just or honorable. The loss should be shared between the Government and the Company, and when this is being done the fact should not be overlooked that the Government received about a half-million dollars\* of the Company's money in duties and railway charges; therefore, while the Company is ruined the Government which created it has profited by its misfortune. It is humiliating to us as Canadians to feel compelled to point out such a transparent breach of good faith.

Now, we have here shown that the origin of a Chigneco Highway of Commerce was even anterior to the Royal Commission of 1870, which strongly recommended a Ship Canal. Out of this came the Ship Railway, for which both political parties were responsible, and both should now join in closing this unfortunate chapter of Canadian promotions by uniting to settle the amount of compensation which is to be paid to the Company. And the amount of this should be fair—even generous. Do not let us add meanness to injustice. But if a sum cannot be agreed upon, then let it be referred to some impartial referee.

*From "The Ottawa Evening Journal," 21st April, 1903.*

The importance of this question is our reason for returning to it again; want of space prevented our dealing as fully with it yesterday as we desired.

This unfortunate Company is a victim of our political system, which creates in some minds the opinion that one administration may repudiate any acts of its predecessors so far as it may suit. But those who think so must submit to be told that such views cannot be acted upon honorably.

The principle we contend for has undoubtedly been disregarded in this case. The Company has asked to be treated in the same way as all our administrations have treated Canadian investors. This is the very least these English investors are entitled to, and it has been steadily denied to them. Time to complete the Railway was refused, and their offers to refer the claim to arbitration or to a Judge or to a committee of the House, or indeed to any tribunal, were also rejected, while similarly means of settling claims have been invariably provided for Canadian contractors. We might go back for years and recite case after case when the appeal came from Canadians for redress, and show that it was always given in one form or

\* \$600,000.