

Dr. Sangster has been on the Education Committee for two years. Did he fail to grasp the method of doing business? Was he too dull to comprehend a matter of this kind? Those who can believe this, are welcome to the belief, if they can thereby relieve him of the cowardly and dishonest course of misrepresenting, and unjustly accusing a committee, that he may, with much assumed indignation, pour out his wrath upon them.

Another charge made is, that of withholding information from members of the Council. Those who are interested will get the gist of the charges on reading the Announcement for 1895-96 on pages 122-126.

It will be learned that Dr. Sangster wished the officers of the Council to bring down certain returns. That they, knowing they had no authority from the Council, their masters, so to do, applied to the Executive Committee. This Committee could not learn from the Act that it had any right to so order the officers, and declined to exceed its duty. Hence the very virulent charge of the doctor. In his remarks he endeavors to make what he requested appear as small as possible, and refers to it as "some information" he requested. Following the debate, however, we learn, it was more formal "returns" he wished brought down.

When wishing a member of the opposition elected to the Executive Committee, on the ground that he is a member of the opposition, the doctor is anxious to follow British parliamentary practice. What is parliamentary practice with reference to "returns"? How would a member of the Legislature proceed? Would he simply write to the officials, and would they at once bring them down? Dr. Sangster knows, no one better, that he would be laughed at for his verbiage. The officials will make no move, nor will the Government, who have much more power than an Executive Committee, order them so to do. He must wait until he can make a motion and get the sanction of the Legislature, then, and not till then, will he get his returns. Were the Council to follow the loose course the doctor wishes, it is obvious grave abuses might, probably would, be the result. In but one case has the President taken it upon himself to order "returns." He apologized to the Council, and justified on the ground of urgency. His action was endorsed by the Council. In this case the doctor says, "the Executive Committee refused point blank; *they decided that no interest of any importance would be militated against by deferring that communication until the meeting of this Council.*" If, then, this was their deliberate judgment, who would condemn them for not exceeding their duty, and giving an order to have "returns" brought down?