

ing, and it matters not from what language they are derived.

Another argument in favor of classics is that many of our best poets and writers make certain references to classical mythology, and in order to understand these references we must read the ancient authors of Greece and Rome. I acknowledge that it is necessary to know these old stories, but why can we not read them in English? I am inclined to believe that if a pupil would read Pope's Translation of Homer and Dryden's Translation of Virgil, in an intelligent manner, he would know more about classical mythology than does the average university graduate.

Another argument advanced by the supporters of the classical school is that the study of Latin and Greek gives pupils a sound mental training which more practical subjects do not give. This, I believe, will depend very largely on how these languages are taught. In this country, and particularly in this Province, the amount of Latin and Greek which is included in the curriculum renders it impossible for pupils to pass their examinations in the time specified by the course of study, unless they use one of these little books with the picture of a large key on the back of it. I may be reprimanded for insinuating that the vast majority of students and pupils in this Province use these translations. I will not insinuate, but will clearly state that the vast majority of the students of our universities, as well as the pupils of our superior schools, use these "cribs." I am a graduate of an academy which has frequently stood first in this Province, and also a graduate of a university which stands at the head of the educational institutions of this country, and I must candidly confess that, during the years I attended these institutions, I only met one who did not use them. I know from experience that a pupil will pass a better

examination if he uses one of these translations than if he does not, because the amount of work cannot be gone over in the specified time, if the pupil has to translate it for himself. Now where is the man who will dare to assert that, with a Latin book in one hand and its translation in the other, a pupil thus translating is training his intellect better than he could were he, for example, endeavoring to write a criticism or an essay on some literary production which he had read?

Lastly, many educators in favor of classics claim that a knowledge of Latin and Greek is necessary to the members of the so-called learned professions. They say that physicians, lawyers, and clergymen must have a thorough training in these languages. I admit that the rudiments of Latin are a help to a physician. Many technical terms are derived from that language, but many also are derived from the Greek, which language is not considered necessary to a physician, nor is it included in the examination to admit them to the study of medicine. The time was when a doctor might strut around and make a display of Latin to his own advantage, but times have changed, especially in this country, where our people, being close observers, and practical, demand from their physician something more than a few hackneyed Latin quotations. I fail to see how a knowledge of Latin is going to help him to diagnose his cases, or to prescribe the drugs most effectual to a certain disease. I should think that in a country like this, where we have two nationalities, a thorough knowledge of French would be more necessary to the English members of the medical profession. I believe, too, that some of the time which they spend on Latin could be more advantageously spent on English. As to the clergymen, I presume it is an advantage to them to be able to read the Scriptures in the original, yet it