

appears to me that the Bible is already translated as well as it can be. It is translated into clear and concise language, which I am constrained to believe cannot be improved upon. I have often heard clergymen in the pulpit displaying their knowledge of Greek, to the disgust of some of the members of their congregation. Probably they would do more good if they would preach the Gospel pure and simple, instead of dilating on the derivation of some particular word. As to lawyers, it is probably necessary for them to know Latin, because much of our modern law, I am informed, is derived from the old Roman law. But the lawyer who has the best command of his mother tongue, and who is the sharpest reasoner, and who knows the facts of his case best, generally comes off successful. Thus many of the arguments in support of the classics can easily be refuted, and many reasons can be given why Latin and Greek should not be taught in a Public School.

Suppose we accept the allegation that Latin and Greek are necessary to the members of the learned professions, is that any reason why they should be retained in Public Schools? I have been in my present position six years, and have had under my control an average of about thirty five pupils per year, only one of whom is studying for the learned professions. Now, all the other pupils must have suffered to the advantage of this one. Some here may object and say that Latin and Greek are optional, and that pupils are not compelled to take them. I know they are optional, yet I have had to teach them, and I can safely say that Latin at least is taught in every superior school in this Province. In order to prepare pupils for their examinations in Latin alone, at least one hour and a half of a teacher's time must be spent each day on that subject, to the detriment of all those who do not take Latin, many of whom are

studying for teachers' certificates, and should receive much of the teacher's attention and assistance.

Another reason why these languages should not be taught is that they exclude English almost entirely from our schools. I acknowledge that great progress has been made during the past few years in the construction and building of sentences, as recommended by Dr. Harper, our inspector, and that many of our pupils can now express their thoughts in good sentences. But it appears to me that our pupils should have a heavier course in English literature and less Latin. Our pupils should be made familiar with the works of our best poets and writers from Spenser to Tennyson. They should be required to commit the most striking passages to memory, and to write compositions on what they have read. They should be able to use their pens as readily as a carpenter can use his square, and to have instilled in them a love for good, wholesome literature. I believe that this could be done if the classics were excluded.

In this country many of our professional and public men arise from the ranks of the poor and uneducated, and the only way they can learn English is by reading the works of our best writers. But having so many other subjects to attend to, they have not time to read very much, and may leave our academies and even the universities with a shameful ignorance of English. In the Old Country it is different—the learned professions there are kept for the rich, who associate with the best educated in the land, and whose children learn to speak grammatically and to use good English from their childhood. I believe the proper way to learn English is to study English. The fact that some of our best speakers are also good classical scholars does not prove anything in favor of classics. Probably some of our best speakers also smoke, and are we there-