

Faculty," was proposed by Mr. Osborne, and responded to by Mr. Cayley. It will be but the truth to say that Mr. Cayley's was the speech of the evening. The Professor fairly excelled himself and kept the men in roars of laughter by a speech longer than some others but so bright and witty that time flew swiftly by.

Lack of space will not permit a full account of all that was said and done on this memorable occasion. Songs were kept up till the midnight hour, and when Metagona and Auld Lang Syne were sung the champions of '95 felt that the feast tendered to them far outshone all previous football suppers. The wounded McTavish was of course unable to be present, but migrations were made at intervals to his reception room and at these times the flowing bowl also mysteriously disappeared.

LITERARY INSTITUTE.

The President, Mr. Chappell, opened the eighth meeting Friday evening, December 7th, by calling upon Mr. Woolverton to read Mr. Dymond's essay on "The Poet-Laureateship." It was well prepared, instructive, and, on the whole, good. Two humorous readings were then delivered by Messrs. Montizambert and Heaven. The selections were both first-class humour but not read as well as they might have been. On the affirmative side of the debate: Resolved, "that a Protective Tariff is the most beneficial policy for Canada," were Messrs. Osborne and Baldwin. On the negative, were Messrs. McMurrich and Rogers. Mr. McMurrich being unavoidably absent Mr. Chappell took his place delegating the chair to the first Vice-President. The leaders' speeches were animated and very good considering the fact that the examinations were drawing very near and demanded the almost undivided attention of all. By reason of this, also, there was a very small attendance. This was the last meeting of the Institute this term.

NOTES.

We are sorry to learn from time to time that some men who are undergraduates of good standing have not been or given opportunity of taking any part in the Institute meetings. The Council can only do its best and such things will occur. But where there are so many men to so few meetings it is impossible to get around them all in the course of one year. If anyone has been overlooked in this way he will confer a favor on the Council by informing one of its members, who will see the matter remedied.

We know of no rule which results in greater practical benefits than the one which provides for discussion on debates from the body of the hall. We have here plenty of men who would make capital speakers with a little practice, but there are not sufficient opportunities possible for them to debate in the regular way, and they thus lack training. The new rule amply supplies this lack. Everyone has a chance to speak as often as he likes in the course of the year. We are delighted to see so many taking advantage of this and hope that all, thrusting repugnance to speaking in public firmly aside, will embrace every opportunity offered them. It is surprising to note the improved speaking of those men who have firmly followed this rule in the past.

The propriety of the regular debaters being allowed to take part in the after discussion has been questioned once or twice. We think there are two good reasons why this should be permitted. In the first place, some of the appointed speakers may be, in the first part of the debate, speaking against their convictions and they should be

allowed the privilege of saying so and of correcting any false impressions of their views. Again, unless some one else two can be got to start a discussion, on many occasions there would be none simply because of unwillingness to begin. The appointed speakers are always keen to speak again and thus the discussion fairly started, goes on with animation. THE REVIEW therefore commends the recent decisions of the chair on this point.

There have been one or two suggestions thrown out by THE REVIEW and endorsed by all which do not seem to have been taken wholly to heart. For instance, we suggested that the two readings given every Friday night should be of different character, one light or comic, the other of more grave description. We hinted at the advisability of the readers coming together before the meeting and arranging the matter. This has not been wholly adopted. We still think that if followed out it would raise the tone of the readings.

* *

Fill high the cup, the loving cup,
Drink deep the vict'ry down;
Shout ho! my lads, well done! my lads,
Shout! heroes of renown,
We've won the game
We've earned a name,
A name that ne'er will die.
Shout, all alive!
Rah! ninety-five!
The well-won cup fill high!

"Rah! Trinity, Di vinity!
Shout Champions, shout aloud!"—
"Uncircumcised, we'll keep the prize,
Well-won, from such a crowd
As ye, ye dogs,
Foul Gentile hogs,"
Pack shouted from afar;
But Osler, grim,
Just smiled at him
And girt him for the war.

Why tell it o'er, why publish more
Of how the battle fell,
How all around the bloody ground
Lay those who battled well;
Why tell again
The number slain,
Again the dire groan
Of 'Ichabod,'
The chastening rod,
Of Israel's glory flown.

But shout alive! Rah! ninety-five
The swift of foot, the strong!
Fill foaming up
The well-earned cup,
Drink deep, drink well, drink long.
You've won the fight
By might and right,
Afar your glory shines.
Shout! All alive!
Rah! Ninety-Five
Your vict'ry o'er Divines!

An open meeting was held in the Dining Hall on Tuesday, December 4th, at 8 p. m., when Mr. Baynes Reed read a paper on "Bishop Patteson," which was written last year by Mr. C. C. Paine.

The paper was one of unusual excellence and was deeply interesting. The writer seemed to have thoroughly caught the spirit of the martyred bishop and everybody present felt as if they had not merely heard the facts of his life but had realized something of the inner character of the man.