

it joining in to pick it to pieces in order to try and put it better together again; and there is ample range of topics of school ethics and practice and literature and intelligence for pages of any periodical, without trespassing upon the debatable ground of school politics."

Here the law is still further expounded. "Must not disparage school books or public bodies." "Must confine themselves to the duties of their office." "Must not assume the office of judges." "Must not trespass upon the debatable ground of school politics." Well, we admit this is reading Inspectors a lecture with more than ordinary insolence. Who has constituted the editor of the *Journal of Education* a judge of the duties of Inspectors? Is he confining himself to the course ordinarily pursued by his paper not to discuss personal or theoretical questions of law, or is he bold enough in this particular instance to venture forth the champion of Jacobin tyranny and say, "Every thing pertaining to the Public Schools as sanctioned by the Council of Public Instruction, as embodied in the School Act, you must justify and sustain whether you believe it to be right or not, and you are not to venture an opinion on these matters, nor to give your ideas in any way to the public, except through the proper official channel."

We hardly think it necessary to notice the *innuendo* contained in the remark, "that Public School Inspectors are not likely to be a unit on any question beyond that of salary, any more than others." Well, speaking from experience, it is admitted that like others, School Inspectors agree in regard to salary—that is they agree to take *all they can get*. We only trust they will always be able to explain satisfactorily how they get it.

Referring to the establishment of the ONTARIO TEACHER, it is said "that the doubt or the expectation of the non continuance of the *Journal of Education* may have had something to do with it." We can assure the Editor, who seems so very

jealous of our rivalry, that the existence of the *Journal of Education* is to us a matter of the greatest indifference. As an "auxiliary" in the cause of education it may be worth something, but we believe it is dear at the price paid. As a rival we care nothing for its opposition, or its assistance. We believe the Teachers of the Province would rather *pay* for a live, practical and progressive paper, than *take a stale, irregular and subservient* journal for nothing. On what business principles it is conducted we know not. One month we have a rehash of the Reports of gubernatorial visits to different cities, copied from the daily papers; again we have a draft of a School Bill that has been withdrawn a month or more before it reaches the public through the Journal. The October No. appears in December, and the April No. appears in June. And what with its fluctuations and irregularities, it is certainly neither a model for imitation nor a rival to be feared. True, it has a little more editorial soul since the inception of the TEACHER, but certainly not enough, if it depended on the public support, to sustain its existence one month.

Again, complaint is made that "no intimation was given at the recent (?) Conference of Inspectors in Toronto, of the new antagonistic agent to be employed against the Council of Public Instruction." Now we most emphatically *repel* the insinuation contained in the above quotation. We challenge the Editor of the *Journal* to shew by word or line from the TEACHER, fairly construed, that it *was* or *is* antagonistic to the Council of Public Instruction *per se*. We do not pretend to say that we will not criticize the acts of the Council. Neither do we say that we will not dissent from some of its conclusions. If this is antagonism then are we antagonists—then is every free and independent thinking man an antagonist—then is the minority (if there ever is such) at its deliberations. To construe free, fair and fearless criticism into