

no doubt, by this time learned to expect whenever the plausible doctor opens his mouth to speak or takes up his pen to write on Council affairs. I do not propose to follow it in detail, as, after the unhappy exposure I have been forced to make of his utter freedom from the restraints that govern honorable men in public debate, *that* would be purely a work of supererogation. Dr. Williams stands before the profession to-day as a tricky and unscrupulous controversialist—*self-convicted* of dishonesty of purpose and untruthfulness of statement in his Council relations. If, therefore, his studied averments, his subtle creations, his artful insinuations, his labored sophistries, or his high class plausibilities thereupon, still carry a particle of weight with them, it can only be among members of the Inner Circle in whose behalf he speaks and writes, or among the few *good-natured* or *torpid* souls who either have not cared to look into these things, or whose judgment is clouded by the charity that believeth no evil. While, however, only cursorily reviewing the letter as a whole, I am tempted to deal with some one paragraph of it more fully, for the especial edification of those members of the College, if any such there still remain, who have not even yet learned how liberally the salt of discretion must be used with every statement that either flows from the nib of his pen, or falls from the tip of his tongue while dealing with Council affairs. And allow me, sir, to premise that, while I must select a single paragraph for this purpose, the production contains no paragraph that could not be used with almost an equal effect.

The distinguished representative of No. 2 opens his letter with one of those men of straw which he is much in the habit of setting up in order that he may valiantly knock them down. I have never said or implied, as he avers, that the "statute law" declares that the Executive Committee shall consist of five members, or that its irresponsibility is due to any defect in the "statute law," and, consequently, your correspondent's long and turgid peachment thereupon is simply balderdash. I did say that the Council By-law assigns five members to that Committee, just as it assigns seven or nine or eleven members to each of its other Standing Committees, and that the Council has no more right to depart from the requirements of its own By-law with regard to that Committee by electing thereon two gentlemen who already, by By-law, *ex-officio* belong to it, than it has a right to elect these same gentlemen on any or every other standing committee to which they are *ex-officio* attached. I pointed to the existence, in the Council, of an immoral and a traitorous combination created expressly, it would appear, for the purpose of defrauding the profession of the control of the Council, which it was thought to have