

*confidence.*" We rest on this. It conveys our meaning, and we stand by the word. And further, now that the doctor has recalled us to words used in the heat of debate and then forgotten, and has dignified them with the appellation of a lecture. We stand by the sentiments.

The doctor says: "If Dr. Williams stops to reflect, he must surely know that the word 'plausible' is ALMOST invariably used in a bad sense as the synonym of 'specious,' while among average people it is looked upon as the equivalent of 'humbug.' Thus, Campbell says, 'Fiction may be as *plausible* as truth.' " Let us try a little substitution with the synonyms the doctor has supplied. "Fiction may be as *specious* as truth.' Again, 'Fiction may be as great a *humbug* as truth.' (Will Campbell roll in his grave?) Funk & Wagnalls would say, "Fiction may be as well 'calculated to win confidence' as truth." Notwithstanding the very great ability of Dr. Sangster, and my high opinion of him as a lexicologist, I fail to comprehend that he makes clear the shades of meaning in the use of the word "plausible," and must content myself with the commonplace of Funk & Wagnalls' Were the doctor to come down from his pedestal in company with Worcester, Campbell, Whately and Locke, to moderns, I might understand.

The doctor thanks me for my advice, but says, "If in the Council chamber I can only achieve success as a reformer by being 'plausible' ["calculated to win confidence"—Funk & Wagnalls], I must be content to remain unsuccessful. The cost would be too great." The cost too great! To put your arguments so that they shall be reasonable and calculated to win confidence!! He says, "The old adage has it that in the end not 'plausibility,' but 'truth is mighty and will prevail.' Till then I propose to fight on and wait." It is truth, then, he is fighting for, is it? I did not understand; I thought it was for an opinion. And those other fellows, the "Solid Phalanx," are upholding falsehood! Mr. Editor, I do not know the doctor's capacity for swallowing. Is there no danger of suicide from so great a bolus of taffy?

He speaks again: "The cry for taffy instead of strychnine is the old cry of might against right." What does this mean? Were it used by some less astute man, we would think it mere flippancy. But when used by Dr. Sangster, it means something. What can it be? Does he think that because it is suggested to him to conduct himself courteously towards members of the Council that they are crying for taffy at his hands? Does he think, when he charges fellow members with being "*recreant*," "*subservient*" or "*ductile*," he is carrying terror in his words? If so, he never made a greater mistake. The members of