

"social hour" had been spent, "the officers and other business were talked over," and the "members decided on their course," but "the personnel of the Council officials was not settled." Thanks, Dr. Williams! This is all I wanted to get from you. Every one knows that the formal election of officers can only be held in full Council. But, in a Council of only thirty, if sixteen members in caucus "decide upon their course," the matter is practically settled. Its resurrection in the Council chamber is merely a matter of form.

In his great tribulation—the squirming incident to the exposure of an untruthful and dishonest speaker and writer—he appeals to your readers for sympathy on two grounds. He avers that I was the aggressor. In this statement, as usual, he is incorrect. I am, on principle, except in self-defence, strictly impersonal in my remarks, written or spoken. I attack combinations, not men. I expose the misdeeds of a Council, or a committee, or an Inner Circle, or a Wing of an Inner Circle, but I never, unless first singled out and attacked, as in the doctor's celebrated lecture last June, give my strictures a personal application. Then he says I wanted to "get at and sting a person I dislike." In this he is also wrong. I have no feeling of dislike towards Dr. Williams. On the contrary, notwithstanding his official disloyalty and abusive language, I confess to still having a sneaking regard for him. I abhor his methods of debate and controversy as unmanly and dishonorable, and I am moved to bitter indignation at the systematic manner in which the profession has been cheated out of the advantage it had secured by the Act of 1893, and I blame Dr. Williams and his elected friends in the Inner Circle for being concerned in this act of treachery towards the electorate. But I have no dislike to Dr. Williams personally, and I would still rejoice to see him turn over a new leaf and devote his great ability to the service of the profession. I am a forgiving rather than a vindictive man, and were it otherwise, did I harbor enmities and ill-will, I would not be so stupid as to import private animosities into public life, or into public debate.

He wants me to prove the existence of an "Inner Circle" by the testimony of an independent member of the Council. I have done better than this. I have time and again asked your readers to examine the contentions and votes of the "Inner Circle" itself, in proof of the truth of my averments and the justice of my strictures. In this present letter I have cited Dr. Williams himself. I am willing to trust my whole case on the debate I have herein reviewed, and I affirm that no unprejudiced man, of any intelligence and discernment, can, after a critical examination of Dr. Williams' speech and the