committee can, in the service of the schools or of a peculiar medical sept, defy both Council prerogatives and Council traditions, and become bold to the point of audacity. It is only when information is asked for on behalf of the profession that it begins to suffer from the erethism of official conscience.

- 5. A notable feature of the debate is the evidence it incidentally affords of the confident assurance which animates the members of the "Inner Circle" that, however much the fourteen elected men outside the Ruling Alliance may fret and fume and strive for justice on behalf of the profession, they are powerless in their efforts to secure it as long as the Solid Phalanx remains firm, or, in other words, as long as the homeopaths and school men can keep the necessary three territo ial derelicts in leading strings, by tickling their vanity with the hope or the realization of office. This sentiment of almost contemptuous indifference to the earnest efforts of those who were battling for the rights of the electorate, was clearly, if somewhat offensively, voiced by a member of the government who closed the debate with the declaration, "We have had a great deal of words expressed here to-day which might have been as well thrown to the winds."
- 6. In view of the fact that last June the distinguished representative of No. 2 presented the Council with an entirely new justification of the breach of By-law No. 39, it may be well to note that, in this debate, there was no pretence or suggestion of having sought for or obtained a legal opinion favorable to the Council's usage in regard to the Executive Committee. Evidently the President, who had been in the Council many years, had no idea that so good an excuse could be found, and, although several of the oldest members of the Council, including Dr. Williams, spoke on the question and offered each a different and an equally plausible explanation of how the word "three" came to be in the By-law, no one then thought of attempting to cover the Council's delinquency, in this respect, by a suppositious sanction of the official Solicitor.

In 1896, in favor of giving the profession its righteous and necessary representation on this committee, the following additional points were brought out:

1. It was shown that the contention against the motion, on the ground of expense, was a specious and misleading one, which had been created for the purpose of resisting the change. In 1881 there were, it appears, six members on the committee, yet that year it cost the Council nothing. For the six years prior to 1887-88, it cost the Council nothing, not because it consisted then of only three members, but because its functions had very properly been so limited that it had no