

Sir, I have not imposed this review of the debate on your readers without having a clear and definite object in view. It affords the strongest possible evidence that the existence of a "Ruling Alliance" in the Medical Council is no mere figment of the imagination, but a solemn and a deplorable fact, while, at the same time, it serves to illustrate Dr. Williams' ordinary methods of Council argumentation, and how marvellously convincing with the "Inner Circle" is a manner thus "*calculated* to win confidence." Here was a motion simply aiming to give the profession its righteous and necessary representation in the most important committee of the Council. Its adoption was urged courteously, but firmly, on the grounds of legality, of consistency, of justice, of uniformity, and of safety to the vital interests of the electorate. There was not a single valid pretext advanced for its rejection—only specious nothings, puerilities that would have been laughed at in any school-boy's debating society, and plausibilities which were promptly met and exploded. It was defeated clearly and indubitably by a combination, call it what you may—"Government," "Ruling Alliance," "Inner Circle" or "Solid Phalanx," just as, during the past two years, every other motion which involved reform or retrenchment or an act of justice or grace to the profession, has been defeated. I respectfully ask your readers to examine the yeas and nays given in the Report. Three territorial men, who would all have voted for the motion, were absent when the vote was taken. It may be claimed that five independent members voted with the "Solid Phalanx." True, but as there was an entire absence of argument, this is only an evidence of Dr. Williams' personal influence and winning way. His whole stock in trade is put in his front windows and consists, merely, of a manner "*calculated* to win the confidence" of the unwary. He has been nearly twenty years in the Council, and new members who have not yet learned to distrust his loyalty to the profession, or to recognize the dishonesty of his methods, or to suspect the artful tactics of the "Alliance" to which he belongs, are apt to take his statements at their face value and to think him as truthful and as honest as he is plausible and crafty. When they get to know him better and to distrust him more, his personal magnetism will affect them less.

Since penning the above I have received the April REVIEW containing a third letter from Dr. Williams, very concise replies to a few points of which I hope you will kindly permit me to append. I also note your intimation as to the length of future correspondence and will cheerfully cut my letters, after this, to the regulation size. I hope, however, you will not restrict my friend, Dr. Williams, to four or any other