

The review contains other ridiculous inaccuracies, but I think these examples are enough to make my point. I welcome scholarly criticism based on a real acquaintance with my work, but this is something altogether different.

W. G. Fleming
O.I.S.E.

Rejoinder to Professor Fleming's Letter

Professor Fleming is quite right — I did not go through *Ontario's Educative Society* with tape-measure in hand, adding up the number of lines and the number of index references devoted to particular persons and events. In a short review of a lengthy work, the reviewer must content himself with conveying impressions gained from a careful reading. Further reading of the eight volumes has confirmed my original impressions — that the criticism of William Dunlop and the glorification of John Robarts and William Davis need tempering; that there is an undue emphasis on institutional aspects of schooling; an emphasis on structure and an unfortunate neglect of process; and, finally, a concern for quantitative growth rather than the quality of education dispensed. Fleming maintains that most of these impressions are inaccurate and/or unscholarly. We must agree to disagree on their validity.

Robert M. Stamp
The University of Calgary