

'side the Atlantic, and which were being executed by a highly 'respectable house in England, and under special inspection.' This is all very plausible, but it is not a *valid conclusion*, as no *interference* was necessary. All that was required, was to *complete* the arrangement made by the former Board by appointing an Inspector. Had this been done, by your own shewing, £1800 of the £2000 would have been saved to the Province, for in your letter of 14th April you say, '*The conditions then that provided that the inspection of these Rails should be made by a person appointed by Naylor & Co., led to the loss, certified by Mr. Light to be £2000.*' I have already shown there were no such conditions, except by your *arrangements of facts to produce your valid conclusions.* When I first called on you for an explanation of your charge against the former Railway Board, I was then under the impression you believed the charge correct, I am now of a contra opinion, and I think this a *valid conclusion.*

"I am Sir, Yours, &c.,

"WM. HY. SCOVIL.

"Hon. S. L. TILLEY, Fredericton."

"FREDERICTON, 12th Oct., 1858.

"Sir—I am in receipt of your letter of 2d inst., apparently in answer to my letter of 29th June, as well as that of 7th Sept. I have noted its contents, and in some respects I regret the style in which it has been conceived.

"There are only two points of which I find it necessary to remind you.

"1. My information as to the appointment of the Inspector of the Rails, was derived from the letter of Messrs. Naylor & Co. to you of date 22d June, and yours to them of the 27th June. The words of Messrs. Naylor & Co. are these: 'We understand that in accordance with your letter and the verbal arrangement made with you at Saint John by our Mr. Huntingdon, the Rails are to be inspected before shipment, on your account and at your expense, which inspection is to be *final*, the inspector to be *appointed by our Liverpool House*, and to act under their direction, you reserving the right to supersede him at any time by one of your own appointment, should you see fit to do so.' Your answer was in these words: 'Your favor of 22d inst. has been received and contents noted, which are in accordance with former letters and conversations with your Mr. Huntingdon, except the inspection, which must be at the works as the Rails are manufactured. A portion of this shipment will be required soon, and I hope a portion of it will be shipped in August.' Note the dates of the letters just quoted, and it becomes quite clear on whom the responsibility of the inspection arrangement rests, and that had the late Board appointed Mr. Smith, or some other competent person, as recommended by Mr. Light in his report of 1st June, 1857, the loss would not have been sustained. I am happy to find you recognize a plausibility even in Mr. Reed's