

**MR. BRYDGES AND MR. CREAK.**  
**THE CHARGES AGAINST THE MANAGING DIRECTOR.**

**MR. BRYDGES' REPLIES.**

We have received, says the *London Railway News* of the 19th June, copies of correspondence, which we have been requested to publish, between Mr. Creak, the leader of the agitation against the Grand Trunk Railway, and its managing director in Canada, Mr. Brydges. No impartial person can, we think read the answers given by Mr. Brydges to the questions put to him without feeling satisfied of their completeness, and that the charges so habitually brought against him by Mr. Creak in respect to these matters have been fully and completely disposed of. We hope, in the interest of all parties, that this ridiculous attempt to revive an agitation which can be productive of no possible good, and which may lead to considerable injury, will not be persevered in. If the feelings of dissatisfaction against Mr. Brydges rest upon no better foundation than that which is involved in the queries submitted by Mr. Creak, then it is neither fair to the proprietors nor just to the management of the company that the attention of the executive and heads of departments should be diverted from attention to the best interests of the company by the necessity under which they are placed of having to defend themselves from a system of ungenerous and unfounded attacks and insinuations upon their private characters and administrative ability. The subjoined correspondence will speak for itself:—

The Wick, Brighton, April 28, 1869.

My Dear Sir,—You were kind enough when you were in England to say that you should be happy to send me any information you could respecting the working of the Grand Trunk. I therefore beg to trouble you with a few inquiries, and I shall be glad to hear from you as soon as convenient, and in such a form that I could, if necessary, show your letter to any of my friends.

1. Mr. Scoville has addressed a second printed letter to me, under date December 20, 1868, in which he comments on your speech in London at the December meeting. I received a copy on the 22nd of April. Will you tell me the exact dates when Mr. Scoville raised his price, and when the Three Bridges scheme failed? Is it correct that you refused Scoville a contract for any term of years, but gave one to the Montreal manufactory? I should like also to know the present price paid for wheels. I have no knowledge personally of Mr. Scoville, nor have I had directly or indirectly any communication with him; but as he positively contradicts your statements it will be well for you to furnish the exact dates for which I ask.

2. How do you account for the great rise in wages in 1867 and 1868? The amount of traffic does not justify such an increase, nor do I think that on several adjacent American lines there is any such increase.

3. The goods traffic for 1868 shows an increase of 4 per cent in tonnage as compared with 1866—was this increase concentrated on one or two points, or diffused more or less over the whole system?

4. How is it that the fuel shows an increase of 17½ per cent. in number of cords over 1866 and the total mileage an increase of about 7 per cent?

5. Out of the free passes issued in 1868 how many were complimentary, and how many official? Were any given to M.P.'s or their families, or other private parties?

6. How stands the charges against the storekeeper. Has he carried an action into court against Mr. Nelson, or has any investigation of the matter taken place before a magistrate, where the parties have been brought face to face?

7. Can you tell me to whom Yates sold his patent? Did it pass into the hands of one of his clerks? I should be glad to hear some clear account of this whole business.

8. Are the rails repaired on Yates' system now? Or is Baines' reversible rail a better plan?

9. What has the volunteer corps cost the company, directly or indirectly? Did the drilling come out of the company's time, and did it interfere with trains?

10. What price do old rails fetch, and what is the cost of re-rolling them? The Toronto Mills are to be ours, I understand, in a short time; but I should be glad to know the cost of re-rolling, apart from the amount paid for the redemption of the works.

11. At what price could you secure Cleveland coal at Lake Ontario ports, and what is its strength as fuel? English coal gives 70 miles per ton. Is American as good? Could not coal be burnt better on the Detroit and Sarnia branch? I see that it is coming into extensive use in the western railways in the States, and as the price you pay for wood in that quarter is so high it might be cheaper to use coal.

12. Is Picton coal suitable for locomotives? This is a long string of inquiries, but we want more information this side of the Atlantic, and although Mr. Hickson has given us some, he is not acquainted with all these details. He mentioned to me the direct line across Michigan to Chicago. I earnestly hope this project will receive your earnest attention. It is a most valuable ally for us to secure, but, I hear, it will be needful to take the line out of the present hands and secure the control of it in Grand Trunk interests. I may just add that although I made a speech at the meeting on the 8th hostile to your management, I did not conclude with any motion, and Mr. Adams' was made on his own responsibility. I voted for it as I could not do otherwise after what I had stated, but I was quite prepared to be beaten, as we had not secured any proxies. My own private opinion is that you would serve us best by giving your attention to the Intercolonial, the Chicago scheme, the International Bridge, emigration, and having your other duties committed to those who could give them undivided attention—no man, however gifted, can do as much well as you are now undertaking. You will, I am sure, excuse the freedom of my remarks; but I have nothing to conceal, or any ends to secure than the prosperity of the company.—

Yours truly,

(Signed) A. CREAK.  
 C. J. Brydges, Esq., Montreal.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA,

Managing Director's Office,

Montreal, May 31, 1869.

My Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 28th ult. reached me in due course of mail; but a pressure of important business, requiring my presence at various parts of the line, has prevented my writing to you before to-day. I have carefully read the questions which you have put in your letter, and I have written specific replies to each in as brief terms as would make my meaning clear, and have sent them with a copy of your letter to our board in London. I am sure you will agree with me that it is the regular course for shareholders to receive whatever information they may require through the board of directors, who, of course, are responsible to them for the management of the company's affairs. You could have obtained, I have no doubt, from the office in London full replies to your questions, as the information upon all points will be found either in statements at the office or in letters which from time to time have been written by myself or other officers of the company. I hope you will, upon receipt of this letter, communicate with the board, and I trust they will have no objection whatever to place you in possession of the replies which I have made to the questions you have asked. I should have had much pleasure in sending the information to you direct, but that I thought it was my duty to forward it through the board. You

will not, I am certain, expect to express any opinion upon the shelving process which you have designed as regards myself, beyond saying that it is not one which I could for a moment entertain. I agree with you that the proposed new line to Chicago would be of advantage to us, and I have given it every assistance in my power. It requires, however, more combination amongst local interests before asking for material aid, and that, I need hardly say, we are not in a position to afford. Since Mr. Hickson has returned he has spoken to me as to his interviews with you about emigration. This is a very important matter, and one in which I take a great interest. I have pressed it strongly upon the Government through the Intercolonial Railway board. Have you thought any more upon the subject? The present condition of England seems very favorable for useful efforts. I am always anxious and ready to give the fullest information in my power upon all questions, and I must repeat what I have already stated to our board in London, but I wish some of the shareholders who think the condition of the property could be improved would spend one or two months of winter with us, and then they would see for themselves how very much easier it is to dispose of difficult questions by mere theory than to tackle them practically on the spot where they exist. Yours truly,

C. J. BRYDGES.

A. Creak, Esq., Brighton, England.

Offices of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, 21, Old Broad-street, London, June 16, 1869.

Dear Sir,—I am desired by the directors to forward you a copy of the "replies" which they received from Mr. Brydges the last mail in answer to the questions contained in your letter to him of the 28th of April last, and in so doing I am instructed to point out to you that your proper and regular course would have been to apply for any information which you required to the board of directors in London, and not to place yourself in direct communication with the executive of the company in Canada. As reference was made in your recent speech at the London Tavern to some of the matters dealt with in the accompanying replies, the board have decided on sending a copy of the whole correspondence to the railway newspapers, with a view to its publication for the information of the proprietors generally.—I am dear Sir, yours faithfully,

J. M. GRANT.

Albert Creak, Esq., The Wick Brighton.

**REPLIES TO MR. CREAK'S QUESTION IN HIS LETTER TO MR. BRYDGES OF 28TH APRIL, 1869.**

1.—Scoville. He never sent me a copy of the printed letter Mr. Creak refers to, and I know nothing of its contents. Scoville's price for wheels was \$15 each from November, 1861, to April 1864, when he raised it to \$16, at which it remained till December, 1865, after which we took what he made from materials he had on hand or had contracted for at \$15 each up to June, 1867, when we ceased buying from him. In the early part of 1864 the Three Rivers concern got into difficulties, and we could not depend on their supply. Scoville delivered all his wheels at Toronto, we carrying those used at Montreal, a distance of 333 miles, at our own cost. The consumption of wheels at Montreal is about five-sixths of the whole. The carriage of Scoville's wheels from Toronto to Montreal added for bare cost at least 50c. to his price for each wheel. We got the first wheels from Montreal in the spring of 1865 at \$15 each. Finding Scoville impracticable we agreed to buy all our wheels from the Montreal Foundry at \$14.50 each, delivered where we use them. All those we take at