

the charge that there was any desire on the part of the Council to withhold information from the profession. The very contrary is shown to be the fact. Third, it brings out, too, that if "Council money" was used to pay this journal, the profession derived the benefit. There should be no difference of opinion on the necessity of giving the profession the fullest possible information on Council proceedings; but there are honest differences as to the best method of doing so. Subsidizing a journal to do the work has been tried. It is now changed to sending a stenographic report in the Annual Announcement. It is yet an open question which will prove the better method.

The doctor intimates that "twice and twice only heretofore" have I "appeared before the profession in print over (my) own signature"; "once in a letter to the public press, and once in an essay or paper originally read before the Ontario Medical Association." In this his history is at fault, but we will not now quarrel with it. On the first he declares he "does not propose to dwell," as he "has not now at hand the newspaper containing . . . the *corpus delicti* referred to;" but he gives us "the simple facts as he remembers them." "Some five years ago, in his capacity as President of the Council, the doctor furnished, for presentation to the Legislature, a statement showing that the whole cost of the Council's real estate was \$50,000, that the building was to the Council a source of revenue, and that at any moment the Council could take \$100,000 cash for it." That on this being challenged the "President rushed into print, professing to have now made a close and careful examination of the Treasurer's Financial Statements," and to have found the "exact cost of the real estate was just \$83,000." In this the doctor is astray in just a few particulars. First, neither the Government nor the Legislature, nor any member thereof, ever asked the President for a statement. Second, the President never furnished a statement; and third, the President never "rushed into print" to correct a statement he had never furnished. What a remarkable memory the doctor has! It retains vividly facts and incidents that never occurred. But "why should he hesitate" to make facts as well as "mould them to his purpose?" Is this the same Dr. Sangster who talks about "status as to truthfulness and honesty in public discussion"?

With reference to the "essay or paper read before the Ontario Medical Association." Up to the present I have not had the honor of reading a paper before that institution. On one occasion, at the invitation of the President, I addressed the Association on "Recent Medical Legislation." There was no paper read, and if my memory