

antagonism, is not only grossly unjust in itself, but a palpable absurdity in fact.

Moreover, are we to regard the Council of Public Instruction with such reverence that a word of criticism must not be uttered regarding its doings, nor a breath of opposition expressed against it? Who is this Council—this educational Inquisition against whom no man and no journal may raise the voice? Who would, in this free and enlightened age, constitute themselves a Board for the transaction of public business, and then through the columns of a public organ, sustained for the free and full discussion of educational matters at the public expense, tell us that we are antagonistic—that we want to pick the school system to pieces—that we are assailants—because we dare give utterance to our sentiments freely, and decline to accept the *ipse dixit* of the editor of the *Journal*? Could the Star Chamber of mediæval despotism outrage the tendencies of the times more flagrantly than is done by the doctrine thus enunciated? Burke said, "Give them a corrupt House of Commons, give them a venal House of Lords, give them a truckling prince, but give me a *free press* and I defy them to encroach for one hour on the liberties of England." But this Editor—the people's Editor—would even muzzle the Press—or would try to excite hostility to a new enterprise because it possessed the element of independence, without which the public press of any kind would be the reverse of what Scripture enjoins as magisterial duty—a "*praise to evil doers and a terror to them who do well.*" All we have to say is, "Heaven forbid it in this Canada of ours."

"But nothing was intimated at the Conference of Inspectors about this new agent." Intimated to whom? It certainly was to the Inspectors, and that long before January. Our Prospectus was issued in November, and most journals in the Province, as well as every Inspector, received a copy.

We had received the greatest encouragement from leading educationists before a single No. of the TEACHER was issued, and the public to whom such enterprises should be intimated, was prepared to welcome our advent.

It may be possible, however, that we did not intimate to the Editor of the *Journal* that we were about entering upon a new project. If such is the case we are willing to cry *peccavi!* We should not have neglected so important a character, nor so influential a journal. But we trust to survive our negligence. And it may be that even without the benediction of the only educational journal in the Province, the ONTARIO TEACHER may be flourishing in perennial vigor when the *Journal* will be laid upon the shelf of the curiosity hunter of the next generation.

It is still maintained that the *Journal of Education* is a medium of "intercommunication" between teachers. Well, perhaps so; certainly on a very small scale. It has now reached its 26th vol. and we venture to say that the ONTARIO TEACHER has already secured—even omitting what is promised—more of the educational talent of the profession than any fifty numbers of the *Journal* that have ever yet appeared. No doubt certain communications would be quite acceptable to the editor, and would be duly published. But they must be of a *certain* kind. Well, this is right. The editor must be judge. And that the profession values the privilege very highly, is evident from the extensive character of the correspondence, a correspondence which, limited as it is, might be said to constitute the only redeeming feature of the periodical for many years.

That the *Journal* has been "practical" the Editor wishes its readers to refer to its columns and then, by way of contrast, refer to the TEACHER. We accept the conditions of proof, and leave the verdict in the hands of a discriminating public.