

versations, so far as the Board thought advisable to confirm and act upon what had passed. And by this letter all were bound. And you know this letter of 3d June, referred to, contains the order for the Rails, and the conditions for their inspection. There is nothing in these subsequent letters of 22d and 27th June to alter or annul these conditions. This letter of 3d June, you are still determined to keep out of sight. I say still, as it was not convenient for reference when you wrote your letter of *better arranged facts and valid conclusions*, of 29th June last.

"Before closing, I will notice one other remark in your last letter. You say, 'If the late Board had appointed Mr. Smith, as 'recommended by Mr. Light,' &c., &c., &c.'

"This is taking up a new point. You have already selected and assigned your reasons for making the charge of mismanagement against the former Railway Board, and to these you must confine yourself, or acknowledge you were wrong, and then I may reply to the new point you now attempt to introduce.

"However, I do not intend to notice any further communications from you on this subject, unless you confine yourself to facts.

"I am, Sir, Yours, &c.,

"WM. HY. SCOVIL.

"Hon E. L. TILLEY, Fredericton."

[SUPPRESSED BY MR. SCOVIL.]

(COPY.)

"FREDERICTON, 2d DEC., 1858.

"SIR—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th ult., in answer to mine of the 12th of October.

"Throughout the correspondence that has been carried on between us since June last, relative to the loss sustained by the Government from the defects of the Iron Rails imported for the European and North American Railway by the late Commissioners, I have endeavoured to argue the case in a fair and candid manner; and in order to sustain my views, I have, on all points, produced evidence—the authenticity of which has not been questioned—from the correspondence between the Commissioners, the Contractors, and their Agents; and I must again repeat that the opinion I first arrived at, is still retained by me, and that the arguments I have presented are, to my mind, unanswered.

"You now object to my adducing new evidence in the case, and state, that in order to sustain my position, I must confine myself to reasons given in my former communications, or acknowledge that I was wrong. I was under the impression that our object was to elicit all the facts of the case, and, as contributing to that end, we were not to be confined in this correspondence to legal quibbles and technicalities, and your insisting on such a course, must weaken your position with impartial judges. Be that as it may, I am quite willing that my case shall rest upon the facts quoted, and the arguments based on them in my letters, without referring to the new