that other causes than the extension of the facilities for matriculation had much to do in producing the increase in Victoria. This seems to indicate that the constituency which supports Queen's does so for some reason or reasons other than the facility of appearing at matriculation examinations, and Queen's would have been equally well off if she had followed her former course and held her own examinations at a few selected centres.

2. Some strange peculiarities manifested themselves at these examinations. Thus, *all* the candidates for honors in history and geography were candidates for Queen's, and so also were all of those who took the science options. The science candidates were few, and generally speaking the schools which sent up the best candidates in classics, mathematics and English sent up no science candidates. This fact, coupled with my having had to read the science papers, suggested some thoughts upon science teaching in schools, the substance of which I now purpose giving. Tyndall has said that "Nature lays her beams in music," which is a poetical way of saying that all natural operations are rhythmical. This may possibly explain those singular waves of opinion which sweep over a nation at times, and threaten to revolutionize the oldest established customs and ideas. Our forefathers thought that classics and mathematics formed a fitting preparation for a university course, and a continuation of these with metaphysics and logic was quite a sufficient mental exercise for the whole work of the course. To these in later times the critical study of English was added, and later still came experimental science. In recent times speakers and writers who threaten to overturn this ancient order of things have appeared by the score. These are the so-called practical men. What good, say they, is your classics and your mathematics, and your metaphysics? Give us something practical. If you must study languages, study those which you can have the opportunity of speaking. Throw aside your logic and give your attention to chemistry and physics and geology—learn to know your own physical system, and the means of keeping it in order —"it is better to know where your liver is than that its Latin name is *jecur*." Says one: "Give your best energies to science." Says another: "And you may reap some benefits from your study; you may possibly some day make a discovery that will bring honour to your name and money to your coffers." But why should those practical men stop here? Carpentering and blacksmithing and shoemaking are even more practical than chemistry, for fifty carpenters are needed for every chemist needed. And the same may be said with respect to physicists and geologists.

If our highest education is to consist in learning how to make money easily and respectably, or how to bring to ourselves honour or fame, or how to plead the cause of the guilty or to relieve the afflicted, our universities had better be turned into technical schools, and the ancient classics and their old time associates give place to science and law and medicine and the various technical arts. But if the highest education is to consist in the expansion and cultivation and development of the student's mind, and in giving system and accuracy to his thought, then classics and mathematics and metaphysics need not fear any modern rivals. In the days of Kane and Fowne and Libeig and Silliman, descriptive and theoretic chemistry was thought to be of some account, and was accordingly allotted an important place in their works upon the science. But the tendency in modern works is to begin with an experiment, to continue by experiment and to close