

destined for professions. I intend to answer this objection because the great cant about the utility of the Classics comes in here. But that such a plea should be urged at all appears to me a monstrous thing. The chief school of a district should be adapted to its needs, and not to those of a minority. If this minority desires a training in the classical languages, they should be taught as extras, but should hardly be made the test work of the school; especially when we remember how small a number avail themselves of this training. The actual numbers are as follows:

NUMBER OF PUPILS IN ACADEMIES TAKING DIFFERENT BRANCHES AS PER ANNUAL RETURNS.

	NUMBER OF PUPILS STUDYING			PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS THAT STUDY	
	LATIN.	GREEK.	Some other single subject	LATIN.	GREEK.
1881....	188	40	1259	15 +	3 —
1882....	227	61	1542	14 +	3 +
1883....	231	34	1651	14 —	2 +

Not only you will observe is the percentage small, but, in spite of all efforts to the contrary, the percentage is decreasing. And the percentage would have been lower, if instead of taking the number of pupils in one subject, I had compared the numbers in Classics with the actual number in the schools. For 1881 and 1882 I have taken English, for 1883 arithmetic, as being the subjects that show the largest number of pupils. These figures will, I think, be sufficient to show how unjust must be any attempt to make results in Latin and Greek the test of the efficiency of the schools. Nay further, such a policy would be fatal, as owing to the engrossing nature of the study of Latin and Greek, other branches of study would be sure to suffer from the importance attached to these two.

But let me revert to my former point, viz., the argument that Academies should be forced to teach Latin and Greek for the benefit of those studying for professions. And here let me summon again the able witness that has spoken to us before. Mr. Adams gave his address before a cultivated audience of old Harvard students, of men, therefore, probably engaged in the