

more regular in the future. Of a society which has excited such thoughts and purposes, it cannot be said that it has no practical value. Let us come, however, to hear something more definite.

It may be permitted, for a moment, to look back beyond the year which has just passed, and to commemorate those who have gone over to the majority after having here served their day and generation. The original members of the society numbered eighty, twenty in each section. There are now 96 members, 24 in the 2nd and 4th sections, 23 in the 3rd, and 25 in the 1st. Of those who have been presidents of the society, the first four and the sixth have passed away. When we mention their names, Sir William Dawson, the Hon. Mr. Chauveau, Dr. Sterry Hunt, Sir Daniel Wilson, and Dr. G. Lawson, it will be felt that not only the society, but the world, is the poorer for the loss of them. Happily we still retain the greater number who have shared that honor, and they are not among the least known or the least valued of our members.

Glancing at the various sections into which the work of the society is divided, we become aware of the ravages of time in every department. In the first section, that of French literature, we have still twelve of the original twenty, and among them those who (as the reports of the society will show) have done much valuable work. It is sufficient to mention the names of the Abbé Casgrain, Dr. Fréchette, Sir James LeMoine, Dr. Marchand, and M. Benjamin Sulte, all of them among the original members of the society, and still remaining with us.

In the English section our losses have been more severe. Of the original twenty only eight remain, although three of the remaining

twelve are yet alive. Of those who have passed away, special mention should be made of Evan MacColl, the Gaelic poet, Charles Sangster, the Canadian poet, and Mr. John L'Esperance, *litterateur* and journalist, all of whom have distinguished themselves in their own department; and to these should be added the names of Dr. Alpheus Todd, whose work is too well known, not merely in Canada, but throughout the Empire, to need any comment or commendation from me; and Professor Paxton Young, who, although, as far as I know, he left no writings of much importance behind him, during his period of teaching communicated his thought and much intellectual stimulus to the minds of many men who, as students, came under his influence.

Passing on to the third section, I find that eight of the original twenty have left us; but one of them—a much valued member—Professor Chapman, is still alive. Dr. Sterry Hunt was a loss to science and to Canada. Of the fourth section, eight have also gone. But here I am passing into regions of which I can speak only from hearsay. The late Mr. Matthew Arnold expended a good deal of labor in proving that *Belles Lettres*, as he called it—shall we say *Literature*?—was much more cultivating and civilizing than science. However this may be, we who are literary and not scientific may be wiser if we do not expose our ignorance of science.

On one point, however, in the relation of science to theology and literature, I may be permitted to dwell for a moment. It is hardly necessary to refer to the old-time feuds and controversies between the men of science and the men of theology. To go no further, the late Duke of Argyll has set forth this discord abundantly in his "Reign of