

Notwithstanding this, the Sub-Committee in their Reports speak of the testimony of experts and practical men that the enterprise would not become a commercial success and that from the beginning the undertaking was regarded by many as one of a very useless character. And these illogical and irrelevant statements are seriously put forward to discredit the scheme and as a justification for our treatment. If instead of being mere opinions these statements were proved, they would still be worthless as a defence, but not a scrap of evidence has been furnished in support of them except the solitary statement of Mr. Baird (see page 32). If, however, the Sub-Committee could establish them, in what position would they place themselves? Beyond question the enterprise was, originally supported in Canada by both Liberals and Conservatives and if the above statements of the Sub-Committee were correct they would merely show that the procedure by which we had been induced to find the capital for the Railway was an elaborate combination of statesmen and public men of both political parties, of Boards of Trade, engineers, commercial men and others, and of Parliament itself, to entrap our investors into a scheme for which Canada cared nothing, except that our money should be spent there. This applies equally to Liberals and Conservatives, and although the Acts were passed while a Conservative Administration was in office there is no difference between the responsibility of the two parties towards our investors. I do not put it forward as any argument, because it is now of no consequence, so far as the responsibility of the Canadian Government is affected, how many are for or against the scheme, but I may add that I have in my possession numerous letters from firms and persons living in the Maritime Provinces which would be benefited by the Ship Railway. These comprise lumbermen, quarry and coal-owners, ship-masters, ship-owners, merchants and others. If printed they would make a large pamphlet and they all recommend the Railway and speak more or less favourably of its prospects.

3. The third reason given—and this one has been repeated many times—is that if the Company were reinstated in possession of their subsidy the investors might lose money by this. I have already shown (see page 33) that this opinion is based on a plain misstatement of fact; and I say, with all respect, that it will obtain no credence from the investors. In expressing it, the Sub-Committee mislead no one, not even themselves, into believing it. To refuse to reinstate the Company on the ground that if the subsidy were paid this might lead to further loss, and that it is therefore withheld from motives of kindness, is too disingenuous for acceptance, and I should be misleading the Sub-Committee if I said there was the slightest possibility of our investors either accepting the opinion or believing in the motive on which it is based.

The above are the only defences set up by the Sub-Committee in their Report for rejecting our proposals. We are distant voteless suppliants seeking redress for grievances which have arisen not from our default but from that of our contractor, the sole originating cause of which was the Act of the Canadian Legislature. After all what can with truth be said against us? Nothing beyond this—that we too trustingly confided in the Canadian Parliament and expended about £800,000 on a Canadian Railway for the development of Canada in the way they desired it to be done. Instead of being treated with the consideration to which we are undeniably entitled our prayer for relief is rejected on grounds which do not bear examination. The first one is a technicality based on a misstatement of fact,