

porters to shout loud enough to keep it before the meeting.

Of course by writing hastily and remote from the seat of action we cannot go as fully into matters as we would choose, but we venture to suggest some changes which would probably turn out well, and at least we hope by this article to arouse some of our vigorous reformers to action in this matter. First and foremost then a committee should be chosen to sit after the regular council meeting and gradually revise the whole constitution. They might read their improved versions and bring up doubtful points at the next general meeting. If they were well chosen, and worked steadily it would not take long to review the whole. Then it might be fairly copied and submitted to a general meeting of the society for debate and approval, after which we fancy it would be a good thing to reproduce it in several copies. For instance one for the reading room, one for the secretary, and one for use in the body of the hall, and so on. This would let the members get a good knowledge of the constitution, which at present they sorely need. One great defect of the present book is that contradictory rules exist together in it, and also another is that it is without arrangement or system. It would be a good thing to bring the new one out in chapters and sections, dividing it under general headings, such as the duties of the officers, the order of proceedings, and so on. This would not be hard to do when the whole had been revised, and was awaiting the general discussion. Hitherto, when a revision of the constitution has been demanded, some particular rule has been changed, or else the secretary has been set to work to make another copy, arranging the divers amendments, and contradictions in regular order. But all must agree that the evil lies deeper than this.

Another reform we venture to suggest is that the chairmanship should be a regular office, filled by election, and totally independent of the council and their vicissitudes, and also of snatch votes, so as to insure impartiality. If a good man were chosen he would add greatly to the strength of order, and would soon become deeply versed in the constitution, and accustomed to giving decisions. Whilst as an offset to his unique position he would lose the chance of becoming a councillor, and also his vote in ordinary business. Practical experience abundantly shews the entire necessity of such an office in every assembly for free debate. Of course the legislation regarding this office would be entirely new to our constitution.

Again it seems ridiculous to us that individual members of council should not be called individually to account. The result of the present custom is that a member who turns out unsatisfactorily is far beyond the reach of reform, because the college is naturally unwilling to upset the whole council, which, in our small society, is generally the best that could be chosen. The council are elected one by one, with particular reference to

the posts they will hold, and why should they not be turned out one by one if they prove unsatisfactory? The only reasons are that it has been the custom, and that currents of prejudice and personal dislike should not be allowed to affect the public interest. To the first we would reply that it has been the custom too long already, and to the second that a majority of the whole house should express the will of the house, and that our members are gentlemen and can be trusted to see that councillors are not wronged in this particular.

We would further suggest that a smaller room would be advantageous, for warmth, for order, for hearing and for appearance. Also that the seats might be arranged in regular rows facing each other down the room, and that every member should have his own particular seat. This would stop small practical jokers and assist the chairman in running his eye over the meeting to select the next speaker. We think it a mistake to quarrel with members for reading or writing in meeting. It is the best way they can pass an uninteresting part of the work, and at any rate is better than their absence.

We would insist strongly on the respect to be shown to the chairman. No one should speak unless called by name by the chair. All members should bow to the chair both entering and leaving, and all should rise when the chairman enters, and so forth. All this would lend authority to the office. To the same end we would have him the only man in academics in the room. Refusal of his ruling should be a cause of expulsion from the Institute.

We would discourage the roll call and suspension of non-attending members, as after all it is only a confession of weakness. Our meetings should be their own attraction, and every member should be his own master. Fines and rewards we also think weak and savoring of the Sunday School for the same reason. All these suggestions would work in the direction of solemnity, formality, and order, and would tend to produce the latent talent for debate among our members, and we think would if well elaborated and acted on prove a distinct gain in the future.

TRINITY MEDICAL COLLEGE NOTES.

The great event of last month was the Sixth annual banquet of Trinity Medical College, held in the Rossin House on the 8th ult., and successful in the highest degree. A large number of distinguished guests were present, besides many graduates and undergraduates of the College. Mr. F. W. Dickson, a fourth year student presided. After ample justice had been done to the good things provided, the Chairman delivered an address in which he spoke of the importance of the medical profession and the necessity for a thorough training in medicine. The doctor, he said, ushered the human being into existence, stood by him through life, and not