CANADA LAW JOURNAL.

difficulty presented itself which had to be surmounted by the Commission; for manifestly the line could not be built without some place to string the wires. It would never do to admit to the farmers that the legislation was defective; nor would it be good policy to tell them that the government had given itself the right to use their land without paying for it (though even this was, it is said, used by some of their agents as a threat to extort agreements). But the emergency had to be met, and it was met by the Commission serving on these owners a notice tendering a sum which was "deemed by the Commission to be reasonable value for an easement to enter upon and erect towers, etc.," and further notifying them that "if you refuse or fail to convey the said easement to the Commission, the question will be submitted to arbitration as provided in the Act respecting Public Works of Ontario. And three days after the tender of this notice the Commission will authorize possession to be taken of the said easement."

Here, of course, is a clear misrepresentation and suggestio falsi-for there can be no such arbitration. The Commission by this notice pretends it has a power which it knows it has not (for that has been admitted), and the only reason for such pretence can be the seeking to force a set+lement which it had not been able to effect, and presumably could not effect except by means of some such device as this. Would it be too strong language to call this a false and fraudulent notice?

Whilst one might naturally be sorry for an ignorant farmer who is thus treated, all are much concerned that the government of the premier province of the Dominion should conduct its business with at least as much regard to fairness and honesty as would be expected of a private individual. Surely any citizen, be he high or low, intelligent or ignorant, has a right to suppose that a document emanating from a government office is trustworthy. Has it come to this, that recipents of such documents must submit them to legal scrutiny to escape pitfalls?

It is no excuse for the government to say we do not want to take your land for nothing, and are willing to arbitrate as

498