two wholly unnecessary and unauthorized Fall Examinations, each involving an average loss of \$700, and its petition fiasco and preparations to amend the Medical Act without the knowledge and concurrence of the Council, involved a loss of several hundred dollars more. It is in flagrant violation of the fundamental principles of all responsible government, that any members of the Council, who are quite outside the reach of the electorate, should have a voice or a vote in questions involving the expenditure of a single dollar. But it will become anintolerable hardship, if the financial well-being of the College is to be thus placed at the mercy of an irresponsible committee, not containing a single loyal exponent of the views of the electorate.

The motion on behalf of the profession was defeated last June exclusively by the specious nothings and high class plausibilities of Dr. Williams, whose contentions—lettered for reference—were the following:

He deprecate, the recognition of parties in the Council (a); claims that all the members of the Council stand on a fair and equal basis, and that "all should be treated exactly in the same way as long as they are here" (b); insinuates that Dr. Geikie is the only medical school teacher in the Council (c); affirms that certain appointees of the schools are just as much territorial men as any of us (d); asks whether Dr. Britton, the appointee of the University of Toronto, has any special interest in furthering the interests or views of that institution (e); again prattles about the cost of this committee, twenty years ago, when it contained ten or a dozen members, and was permitted to meet when it pleased (f); affects innocent surprise or ignorance that the committee had ever been known to withhold information when asked to-give it (g); implies that Dr. Sangster had shown that the Council usage with respect to this committee worked well (h); informs all concerned that the Council had "kept a tight rein on that committee ever since" (1); and declared that the Solicitor sanctioned the departure from the By-law (7).

I must again ask your readers to turn up the report of this speech (Announcement 1896-97, p. 100) and read it for themselves. It is a fair sample of the puerilities and plausibilities which the learned doctor so frequently sets forth in Council debates, and which his associates of the Inner Circle find so irresistibly convincing. And they are all advanced so speciously and so seriously, in a manner so calculated to win confidence, that one often wonders whether he is himself aware that he is equally discrediting his own intelligence, and insulting that of his auditory. Let me briefly advert to each of these points not already dealt with.