

year," so there is no immediate prospect of "my Lords" organizing a Staff College for schoolmasters. But those who can "dip into the future, far as human eye can see," may have a "vision of a world" in which such a college is thought not a "wonder," but a necessity. Already the *New York School Journal* (5th Jan., '89) suggests that such a college, or course of study at least, should be established in connection with some university,

to which teachers might turn aside for a year or two. Here they might make a study of "the history of education, educational psychology, methodology, systems of instruction, State educational laws, criticism of theories, and personal suggestions." There is, perhaps, as much to learn about children as about cannons, and even greater harm may be done by mismanaging them.—*The Journal of Education* (London).

CORRESPONDENCE.

FRENCH SCHOOLS IN ONTARIO.

Editor MONTHLY:

SIR,—Permit me to make a correction in your account of what took place in the Legislative Assembly during the recent debate on this subject. You say that the Minister of Education denied certain statements made by Mr. Craig, amongst them one to the effect "that the French language was the current tongue and English the foreign." I heard the part of the Minister's speech in which he dealt with this point, and I can assure you that the above quotation misrepresents his position. That position can best be indicated by a few brief statements which fairly cover the ground. Mr. Ross told the Assembly:

1. That prior to 1885 there was no regulation, or any other enactment having statutory force, which made it obligatory on school boards to have the English language taught in all public schools; that the regulation of 1885, making the use of English Readers compulsory, was passed, at his instance and before the question had been publicly discussed; and that, though there were many schools in 1885 in which not a word of English was taught, there is not now a single school in Ontario of which this can be alleged.

2. That before the law, the German and French languages are in precisely the same position; and that, if English is more generally used in German than in French districts the law has nothing to do with the difference—statements which were not "questioned on the floor of the House," and which are not likely to be questioned anywhere else.

3. That, pending the more general acquisition of the English language—as a foreign language, of course—by the French speaking children, they must be permitted to acquire knowledge of school subjects through the medium of their own language—the only one they can use for that purpose. It is here simply a question of expediency. Is it better to educate the French children in French than not to educate them at all, except in so far as learning English (to them a foreign language) gives them incidentally an education?

4. That the French people are not unwilling to have their children taught English, or taught in English, but the very opposite, as a rule—a statement that was fully corroborated by Mr. Balfour, who represents part of a county (Essex) which is largely French; and that the real obstacles in the way are the scarcity of competent bilingual teachers and the poverty of the people.