

matter of traffic *via* Portland, we failed to conceive how you could possibly deny that an agreement had been arrived at between your Company and ourselves, by which, to quote Mr. Stevenson's own words, it was understood that we would not take from you "any more freight for Liverpool at Portland than the capacity of the regular Mail Steamers, which in figures was put down at an average of 150 cars for each steamer, of which 80 car-loads per week was all which you were at liberty to engage from all local stations and from the Western States."

We have always been under the impression that the General Freight Agent of the Grand Trunk Company had the power to make freight arrangements, and knowing for a fact that he habitually did so, we never previously for one moment imagined that understandings arrived at with him and placed on record over his signature, would be ignored, as is attempted to be done in the present instance. In fact, until our interview on the 3rd instant, all business transactions with your Company in the matter of Freight Traffic, since the retirement of Mr. Stratton, some twelve months ago, have been entirely arranged with Mr. Stevenson; and, we think we are correct in stating that, with exception of a letter received from you last spring, regarding wharfage charges on inward cargo at Portland, we have had no communication directly or indirectly with yourself, on matters of business, in the interim. Notwithstanding this, your communication now before us, conveys the first intimation we have ever had that Mr. Stevenson, the General Freight Manager of your Company, is not the proper officer with whom all Freight Traffic business should be arranged.

If it is your desire to repudiate agreements entered into with Mr. Stevenson,—and your language is too plain and explicit to admit of doubt on the point, it would be well that the general public as well as ourselves should be informed,—that contracts and engagements entered into with the General Freight Manager of your Company are only valid and binding at your pleasure.

In the present instance, it happens, however, that the agreement in question cannot be ignored on the ground that it had not come under your knowledge, for on the 22nd November you wrote us:—

"Mr. Stevenson has sent me a copy of the correspondence he has had with you, with reference to capacity of freight from Portland for the coming season."

"I am sorry you decline to give us the capacity at Portland that we require."

"I can easily load, if I have the vessels there, two ships a week from Chicago alone; but, of course, as you decline to give us the accommodation that we want, I can only take the necessary steps to obtain it in other quarters."