

February, respecting my correspondence, with your kind permission I will say a few words.

As you gave me the credit of being a "little hasty" last time, and as I suppose you will admit it is about as bad to be a "little slow," I will try to go this time at a medium pace

I said Mr. White "being asked his opinion on the subject," your reply is, "Mr. White did not volunteer his opinion on the subject." Then with much ingenuity you discover, that the displacement of two small words "*slightly* alters the sense," my extract read, "whether a pension act was *at all* desirable," what Mr. White said was— "whether a pension act *at all* was desirable." Now, if you will kindly place the emphasis on the "at all" in both passages, and tell me *truly* which passage is the strongest, and which the weakest I will take it as a favor. Then you say "lastly Mr. White's remarks were merely intended to bring a rather rambling debate to a focus," granted. Then I should say when one of his remarks was the question of the desirability of the pension act "at all," it probably was made when not in his happiest vein.

And, now, as to "J" who has at last drawn the sword which (he thinks) cuts the tangled knot, if it is any help to him to know what I "think" as to how "teachers are chosen" he is welcome to it.

I have thought, think now, and will most likely continue to think, that "teachers are chosen" somewhat in the following way—When a candidate receives a diploma or certificate after passing a satisfactory examination he or she is I take it one of the "chosen" endowed with authority to teach, and when an applicant receives an appointment, that applicant I would say is then "chosen" to teach.

As to "J's" insinuation that I "appear to think teachers are obliged to teach whether they will or not" this rubbish can go for what it is worth. But what I do believe is that the migratory lights should bear their share of taxation, the same as teachers who remain in the profession, and further it would be much more like justice for the rovers to be obliged to pay a double share.

Finally, how long the "prime and flower" of "J's" intellect were exercised before he conceived his original yet brilliant idea—so utterly impracticable in the present order of things, and lying as it does in the region of impossibilities—viz., That each individual in our army of teachers should have his or her salary so augmented, that all could lay aside a sufficiency to support them in declining days,—"J" alone can tell. Although partaking entirely of the absurd it is, nevertheless, an amusing and ludicrous divergence and is, in its miraculous and comprehensive nature, a gem towering far above the sayings of Solon, and one which would sweetly adorn the proverbs of Solomon.

TEACHER.

QUEBEC, 13th February, 1882.

NOTE.—We have no room for a letter signed by "O. K.," more especially as he has been anticipated by "Teacher," in justice to whom we have inserted his reply to his critics. We cannot publish any more correspondence upon this subject, unless it has a distinctly educational value.—EDITOR.