

he scheme, and helped in giving it a practical form. But I understood that he did so as a *friend*, not as an official of Government.

"The powers of the Committee, I certainly understood to be *plenary* and complete for carrying out the Resolution to its final conclusion. In fact, the power of adding to their number at their own discretion seemed to imply this."

The Committee at the same time mailed the subjoined letter to Rev. A. S. Hunt, to which he sent no reply and which he has since publicly characterized as "too insulting to merit an answer."

[COPY.]

HALIFAX, June, 15th, 1872

REV. A. S. HUNT, M. A., *Superintendent of Education* :

DEAR SIR,—I beg to inform you that I communicated to the Forrester Memorial Committee, your views, as stated to me in a recent interview, respecting the right of the Superintendent of Education *ex-officio* to be consulted by the Committee before final action is taken for the erection and inauguration of the monument to the late Dr. Forrester.

In reply, the Committee desire me to say that they are unable to concur in this interpretation of the Resolution of the Educational Association for the following reasons :—

1.—Because it is inconsistent with the spirit and intentions of the framers and supporters of the Resolution, as expressed in the Association at the time of the appointment of the Committee. From their own personal knowledge of this fact and of all the circumstances of the case, the Committee have always acted on the principle that the nomination of Mr. Rand was made on *personal*, not *official* grounds. He was selected along with Mr. Calkin, not as the Superintendent of Education, but as a prominent Educationist, a *personal friend* of Dr. Forrester, and the *originator of the project*, to co-operate with the Committee in securing "a memorial worthy of the man." The appointment being personal, not official, he continued to hold the same relation to the Committee after he ceased to be Superintendent of Education, as before. The Committee, accordingly, have not the power now to exclude him from their deliberations.

2.—Because this new interpretation is at variance with written testimony in the Committee's possession from leading members of the Association of 1869, and others identified with the Association from its first inception, who spoke and voted on the resolution—confirming the soundness of the view entertained by the Committee on this point.

3.—Because for two years and a-half, including two Conventions of the Association, at which the matter of the Memorial was brought up, no exception was taken by any member of the Association to the constitution or procedure of the Committee, nor anything done to correct the alleged erroneous