

the year 1887, and, when I asked for a far less elaborate sheet of information, the Registrar was instructed to refuse it. If I were sure this tabulated statement emanated from Dr. Williams alone, I should reject it as worthless, inasmuch as he stands self-convicted of manipulating figures to suit his purpose. This is one of the most cherished means of his "*calculated* to win confidence," and; although he may have been recently taught *as by fire*, caution in its use, he still, I fear, on occasion resorts to it. If, however, we may assume that the table was furnished by the Registrar, it is doubtless correct, and I thank Dr. Williams for its insertion, since it completely proves the correctness of my contention, that the only proper way to curtail the cost of that committee is to discourage it from holding formal meetings at all by cutting off all allowance for attendance thereat. The table shows that on some occasions the committee when consisting of ten or thirteen members cost nothing, while on others, when composed of only three members, it cost as much as \$306.70.

He avers that, the larger the committee, the more prone it was to assume the functions of the Council, and that one year it went "to the length of changing the date of the examination!" This latter was not a very serious delinquency as the date of the examination, *i.e.*, the established spring examination, has never yet been legally fixed by By-law, as the Act directs, by the Council itself. And all such comparatively trivial usurpations of Council functions by the larger committee sink into insignificance, in view of the insolent and defiant and demoralizing and costly acts of usurpation of Council functions of which I have shown that this smaller committee of three has been guilty, and the force of my exposure of which, Dr. Williams is now vainly trying to break by his usual tissue of pretty nothings, and artful plausibilities, and daring misrepresentations, and unscrupulous resort to means "*calculated* to win confidence."

To show the writer's utter want of scruple as to the truthfulness of his statements I promised to more fully examine a single one of his contentions. My aim is *at any cost* to break, if possible, the force of my exposure of the misdeeds of the Executive Committee. His method of trying to compass it is strictly and peculiarly Williamsesque. Among the several paragraphs written to that end, there is, perhaps, but little to choose, although, as a specimen brick of the whole structure, I select the one denying my charge that the Executive Committee has, for the past two years, insolently and defiantly usurped the Council's prerogative of ordering a fall examination. That his treatment of the case is heroic, goes without saying. He shows, in fact, a disregard of consequences, so reckless that it would make his auditory catch its breath if exhibited by a performer less practised than he