

those belonging to the Inner Circle as to make the committee of three embrace one school man, one homœopath, and one territorial representative—the latter not open to the suspicion of being troubled with any inconvenient notions of super-loyalty to the electorate. The grounds on which the Council was urged to place three territorial men on that Committee, were chiefly these :

1. That of legal requirement. The By-law clearly prescribes that the committee shall consist of five members—three elected and two ex-officio.

2. That of justice to the electorate. The Legislature has given the medical electorate a representation equal to three-fifths of the whole membership of the Council, and this membership-ratio of the Council clearly ought to be respected in the appointment of all the Standing Committees of the Council, and, especially, should it be respected in the selection of this governing committee, to which the entire control of the profession is confided for fifty-one out of the fifty-two weeks of the year.

3. That of courtesy, which would further point to the propriety, in accordance with British fair play, of assigning one of the three seats pertaining to the profession, to a member of the opposition, as is the time-honored parliamentary practice, not only in the House of Commons and Provincial Legislatures, but of every reputable deliberative body existing in any free and enlightened country.

In 1895, the suggestion to fulfil the requirements of the By-law, by giving this committee its legal membership, was followed by a discussion of which the principal features were these :

1. The suggestion was opposed solely on the specious ground of expense, and exclusively by members of the Inner Circle,—one territorial representative (Dr. Williams), three homœopaths and four University appointees resisting the proposed change.

2. A charge was explicitly laid against the Executive Committee of having refused to allow the Registrar to furnish, to a territorial member of the Council, certain information touching matters of great moment to the profession, and this high-handed proceeding on the part of the committee was urged as a reason why the profession should have increased weight in its membership.

3. This charge was replied to, in a very lame and characteristic manner, by both the members of the committee then in the Council. No attempt was made to deny the charge, though specious and disingenuous reasons were assigned for the refusal complained of. My esteemed friend, Dr. Williams, was present throughout this debate and took part in it, yet last summer the incident appears to have quite