Montreal, 24th Oct., 1890.

My dear Sir William,

I have not asked for a renewal of our conference, because I did not wish to obtrude the subject upon you again unless you desire it. While I regret that we were interrupted before coming to a more definite understanding, I cannot but feel gratified with the result of our conversation, so far as it went. It is some satisfaction to learn from you at last, that Mr. Nelson and Mr. Hague reported to the Board, what I knew they must have reported, that they were entirely satisfied with the explanations which I gave in their conference with me. It is also some satisfaction to know the position which you take up in reference to the legal obligations of the Board and my legal rights, arising from your official action in calling the attention of the Board to the slanderous reports mentioned in your letter of May 2nd, 1888. I certainly assumed as an unquestionable principle of British law, that, when the Board summoned me to answer these

The Board was close upon my heels, but I succeeded in anticipating the Board by a minute. As it was, I was obliged to wait for an adjournment of the Board, and I then had the satisfaction of finding that the Board had actually passed a resolution to the effect that they were entirely satisfied with the explanations I had given in my conference with them. It was also a great satisfaction to me to know that the Board had actually passed a resolution to the effect that they were entirely satisfied with the explanations I had given in my conference with them.

reports, it came under a legal obligation to see, and I acquired a legal right to demand, that these reports should be substantiated by legal evidence, or that I should be unequivocally exculpated from the charge which they contained. I certainly also assumed as an equally unquestionable principle, that no Board has a right to enter in its records a single expression which can be interpreted as even indirectly reflecting on the character of an innocent man, and that therefore the Board of Governors had no right, while suppressing the fact of my vindication, to represent me in its minutes as requiring to be warned against the perpetration of offences, of which, according to your own assurance, I have never been even accused.

Now, there is no use in you and me discussing the legal aspect of the subject, as we can merely reiterate our own unauthoritative assertions. But now that the matter is brought to this definite issue, it does seem to me that the way is opened for an amicable

settlement in a manner that would be satisfactory to you and the Board as well as to me. I shall be very much pleased to know what you think of the subject; and you will find me still, as I have always been, ready to meet the views of the Board in any way consistent with the vindication of my honour.

Very truly yours,

J. Clark Murray

I must repeat the matter as settled as far as the Governors are concerned. We cannot but deplore this, and we recognize quite a consciousness of Genius. Perhaps I have made attempts to reconcile the differences of temperament, but after the experience of last year I feel that I should be a sinner if I accepted an extension of my term of office. I have been anxious to work in close harmony with the Board, and we have worked together for many years. Perhaps it is better that we should part as friends and we will be always glad to meet as friends.

Thomas Ellis
Esq.