

position, as alleged by me, but I must repeat that I have not met the foundation of your assertion, that at Mr. Reed's first visit, he was of opinion that the manufacturers were not doing justice in the manufacture of the Rails.

"2. You emphatically assert that the late Board ordered only 700 tons of Rails, and made no agreement whatever for any further quantity. In my letter of 25th June, I was quite explicit as to the manner in which the 300 tons were ordered, and I find no cause for correction. Be so good as refer to Messrs. Naylor & Co.'s letter to you of 22d June, and you will find these words: 'We are glad to learn, through Mr. Huntingdon, that you will probably, soon place a further order in our hands for about 300 tons of Rails to be shipped the present season.' I am justified therefore in what I said on this head. But admit, for argument sake, that your Board had made no allusion whatever to any additional quantity of 300 tons of Rails, the loss imputable to the late Board would not be reducible in proportion, for these Rails *were necessarily inspected under your arrangement*, which the present Board had no opportunity of testing until the Rails arrived here, when the matter was past remedy, in consequence of your having agreed that the inspection should be final.

"I am yours, &c.,

"S. L. TILLEY.

"W. H. SCOVIL, St. John."

SAINT JOHN, N. B., 24th Nov., 1858.

"SIR—I received your letter of 12th October in due course. I intended my last letter to end this correspondence. It is quite apparent from your last letter, as it was from previous ones, that you have no intention of confining yourself to facts. You still strive to cloak yourself under *your arranged facts*, and multiply words in support of these imaginary images of your own creating. Therefore, it is useless to continue this correspondence while you will persist in this unfair course. As proof of this I will make one quotation from your last letter. You say, 'My information as to the appointment of the Inspector of the Rails was derived from the letter of Messrs. Naylor & Co. to you, dated 22d June, and yours to them of the 27th *idem*.' Confining yourself to those letters for information, was done inadvertently or intentionally; if the former, you have had ample time to correct yourself. Not having done so, but instead, heaping up words to support your false position, shews it was done intentionally, and this is more apparent when these letters are referred to; for in Messrs. Naylor & Co.'s letter of 22d June, in the first sentence, they acknowledge my letter of 3d June. My reply of 27th June refers to previous letters and conversations. The conversations are of no importance, as neither the present or former Board, or Messrs. Naylor were bound by any private conversation between Mr. Huntingdon and myself, further than are expressed in the letter, which was the result of these con-