weekly.
sailed on
of freight
, 400 car
s of these

ıll car-loads,

ad proper le at Porthad failed

of carrynislead, as acity at all paragraph, not exceed tails of the

what was a ome former and for said protest, and that if you will underby your own e aggregate ag the same vious letter, ed, and for

red to estabthe morning ation, that in ward bound and Portland, of cargo at op receiving ag extra vessels into Portland without notice, when there was not time to get cargo for them from the West, we may be allowed to say that, we cannot recall to mind that any extra boat was ever despatched from Britain for Portland. without our having first communication with you, to ascertain whether cargo could be forwarded, and having in reply obtained your assurance in the affirmative.

As to the mode in which you treat the offer we made to carry by our extra steamers any surplus freight you might take to Portland, we must say that we do not perceive the application of the arguments you use to shew that it was a ridiculous one. You reason upon it, entirely eschewing the fact that when we tendered our extra steamers to you Company, in the early part of November, free of any charge other than the actual cost of running them, there was then but little cargo engaged from Western Canada and the Western States; and as if, instead, we were in the position of having freight brought at our desire and for our benefit to Portland, which, therefore, we should have been under some obligation to carry.

If that had been the fact, we would have admitted that the proposition to make your Company pay for carrying it across the Atlantic would be ridiculous; but we cannot agree that that principle will apply where the facts are exactly the reverse.

The surplus freight was not only not carried to Portland for our benefit, but contrary to our express wish, and contrary to a clear understanding as to the quantity we could carry, under engagements made by your agents from points West of here.

We have no responsibility for it at Portland, and we are under no obligation to forward it.

We never held ourselves out as being willing to run more vessels than one per week from Portland outwards; but, on the contrary distinctly declared our determination not to do so.

Under these circumstances, your Company accumulated this enormous quantity of freight at Portland, for some purpose, or with some motive of its own, with which we have nothing to do, and which we do not enquire into. It is sufficient for us to know that the accumulation of the freight in question, was brought there to serve the purposes of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in some way or other, and not only without any encouragement on our part, that we should be able to take it away, but absolutely against our distinct declaration that we could not do so.

Upon whom then, should the expense of carrying that freight to its destination fall? Upon us who are under no obligation to carry it, who did not desire that it should be brought to Portland, and who protested against its being brought there? or upon the Railway Company which, for its own purposes, and it must be presumed for its own advantage, brought it there, with the knowledge that we could not take it away?