

But is it true? In the first quotation in opposition to the actions of the doctor and his party, who moved no resolution of condemnation or censure, is the direct statement of the doctor himself. Which speaks the louder? The old adage has it, "actions speak louder than words." This is unquestionably correct. The statement is without foundation. The doctor's unsupported assertion will not stand against his actions, when supported by his party of "Stalwarts."

The second quotation says nothing. It is not even a "half truth," yet it is teeming with the "*suggestio falsi*." It is intended to leave the impression that the schools, through the Executive Committee, shovel into the profession all they wish of unqualified men. Yet the writer was quite aware when he wrote it, that it could not be supported by facts; that it is without truth, hence an innuendo is used in place of a direct statement. Surely the case against the Executive Committee is not so weak that it must rely upon a fertile imagination for evidence, and upon innuendoes when direct proof would be more convincing. Let the doctor put up evidence from the transactions. If this course, on the part of the Committee, is "habitual," and continued up to last year, there need be no lack of cases.

In the February number, at page 62, another charge is made in very vigorous terms. It is that of a "daring and insolent usurpation, in 1895 and 1896, of one of the Council's most important and most cherished prerogatives—that of deciding whether there shall or shall not be a Fall examination—the Executive Committee is not covered by a single rag of excuse on the ground of right, or expediency, or usage, or necessity, nor had it any semblance of Council authorization for the unwarrantable act." This quotation makes clear how the animus in a man's mind may lead him to strong assertions and denunciations when there is no cause. The Executive Committee did nothing in this matter. It has no power to decide the question; and were it to write a resolution for the purpose, it would be waste paper. The Committee was not the authority under which the Fall examination was held, nor did it claim to be. Hence the vigorous denunciations of the doctor are thrown away. Well, who authorized the examinations? The Council. That body has a set of regulations, which will be found in the Annual Announcement, that *continue from year to year unless altered or amended by the Council*. It is customary, either in the report from the Education Committee or directly by the Council, to authorize the Registrar to make the necessary clerical alterations to bring them into harmony with the year, but *no changes are made in the regulations unless directly authorized by vote of the Council*. These regulations provide for Fall examinations. The Executive could not have hindered them had they so desired.