

really seriously meant any such statement as that he must be pretty nearly approaching absolute idiocy. (Cheers and laughter.) His hon. friend was not in that position—he knew very well how the matter really was, but he thought just now it was in the interest of his party to represent things as being different to what they were. The Government were as anxious as he was to see their French fellow-subjects speak the English language; but the difficulty was how to bring about that result. The plan proposed by his hon. friend was a very bad one, and if carried into effect, not more English would be learned, but less. The Government wanted English to be learned by the French portion of the population, but they wanted them also to be friends. Nothing could be gained by proscribing the French language in the schools, but a great deal was to be gained if they recognised to a certain extent the use of that language in the schools. The French population contributed to the support of the schools, and the object sought could be secured a thousand times more effectually by respecting their prejudices, by respecting their love for their language, by respecting their desire that their children should be taught their own tongue, than by adopting a coercive policy. (Cheers.) He wanted the French children to learn their language, to study their language, to read books in their language, and he wanted them all to study the language and literature of England. His hon. friend had said that he could not imagine what the policy of the Government was, and challenged him (the Attorney-General) to tell him their policy. The hon. gentleman could be very obtuse when he wanted to be obtuse. The Minister of Education had already appealed to the "Instructions for Teachers" for the purpose of showing what their policy was. The member for London had read those instructions, and after reading them it was absurd for him to pretend that he did not know what the policy of the Government was. The hon. the Attorney-General then went through the instructions seriatim as regards the use of French in the schools and the directions for the teaching of English, pointing out that the French children were not to study French only but to study English also. The policy of the Government was to have English taught in the schools, and to adopt the best methods of teaching it and the best methods of educationists elsewhere had been adopted. There no doubt was in some counties a scarcity of teachers qualified to teach English, and the Government wanted to remove that state of things as speedily as possible. The Government recognised the necessity for doing something, and were taking steps to provide teachers where that scarcity existed. The Government were anxious to have children thoroughly trained in English, and with that object in view they were adopting the methods that experience had proved to be the best. The object aimed at could never be accomplished by exhibiting a spirit of hostility to the French population—certainly not by proscribing the use of French in the schools. The Attorney-General quoted from correspondence previously used by him in his recent speech at Woodstock to show that Dr. Ryerson and the whole Council of Public Instruction had regarded the use of French in the French Schools in the East much as they regarded the use of English in the English Public Schools, and showed how this condition had gradually changed until the recent regulations of the Education Department had been issued, by which English was to be thoroughly taught and teachers thoroughly trained in English in every school in those counties. (Loud applause.)

*Mr. Evanturel.*

It was nearly half-past two o'clock when the Attorney-General ceased speaking. Mr. Evanturel rose for a moment and expressed his regret that