

tells us, however, that "he himself called attention, in the public press, to the gross misstatements it involved." And he meets the fact that it was not published by the statement that "a synopsis of his (my) paper *or remarks* was given the press and published." He does not condescend to tell us by whom the synopsis was furnished, nor in what paper it was published.

We had learned the doctor has a very remarkable memory, in that it retains vividly facts and incidents that never occurred (for instance the details of the statement the President furnished the Government—a statement never furnished); and when referring to his averment as to the reading and publishing of this paper before the Association, we conjectured it must be a feat of the same great memory, that there could not be two such in one country. The doctor makes good our surmise. He says, "he himself, in the public press, called attention to the misstatements in the paper"—the paper *that had as yet no existence*. This, however, does not do the doctor's great ability full justice; he can accomplish still greater feats. He tells us that the President of the Council was to give an address twelve days later, and intimates that if the President made "*some remarks*" at the Association, of course he had memorized this address and "*said it* before the Association." Now we did know of his great memory, and we knew of his great ability to see what we had in our hands when he was miles away; but even then, we did not give him credit for being able to read the President's thoughts and criticise them twelve days before they had taken form in words. A wonderfully clever man this representative of No. 12.

After exploiting himself so ingeniously in the display of his exceptional talents, and when he thinks, and hopes, he has so mystified his readers that they will lose sight of his unique truthfulness, he returns to the President's address of five years since. Here he throws himself. What with exclamations and italics he makes out a dreadful case. He declares that I "do not *now* attempt to deny that before the Association" I "manipulated the treasurers's statement," as if one is called upon to deny every vile slander uttered scurrilously in the Billingsgate spirit. He re-informs us there are figures absent that ought to be present. How could that occur only from a desire to falsify the record? And that dreadful man, who made this omission, "must clearly understand that his evidence on Council matters is ruled out of Court, and is . . . in future, worth less than the ink with which it is written." Mr. Editor, the doctor has had his say, and his re-say, on this matter. We invite those who are sufficiently interested to read the original, with his criticisms, and judge whether