

years the coarse (?) attacks in this (the present) magazine," and its closing one, that "a decided aversion to discuss personal matters has prevented our (Gage & Co.) doing so before"—*both being untrue to fact*, as a reference to the *School Journal's* onslaught on us, in its issue for April, 1881, will testify.

Beginning and ending with statements which the publishers of the *School Journal* would perjure themselves were they to endorse on oath, it will occasion little surprise if we affirm that the rest of the article is manufactured out of the like "whole cloth." There is scarcely an assertion made which we cannot honestly and truthfully refute. Under the first head, Messrs. Gage & Co. undertake to discredit THE MONTHLY as "an independent journal," affirming that "it was started with three objects: to attack the Education Department and the members of the Central Committee 'to write down books issued by our (Gage & Co.'s) house, and to write up those published by the chief subscriber to the (Monthly's) guarantee fund,"—*all of which statements are absolutely and unqualifiedly false*. With the further purpose of criminally decrying the undoubted independence of THE MONTHLY, Messrs. Gage, with partisan rancour, connect the names of three High School Masters, at whose "instigation" THE MONTHLY is said to have been started, with the obtaining of "a guarantee fund, given by certain publishers," but with which the gentlemen referred to had nothing whatever to do. It is true that Messrs. Seath, MacMurchy, and Dickson, with others who longed for an able and independent professional journal, at the inception of the magazine gave it hearty countenance and support, and their words are on record in behalf of the approved aims and objects of the publication. Their desire for a rigidly independent magazine was repeatedly expressed at meetings of the Provincial Teachers' Association long before the present publication came into existence, and on its appearing it was accorded support on the sole and emphatic understanding that it was, and should remain, in good faith, independent. It was also a condition, which was

ratified when the publication was acquired as a property by an incorporated body of well-known and responsible teachers, that it should be "no one's mouthpiece, nor be used to puff any particular book-store, or set of men." That THE MONTHLY has consistently adhered to this platform, it need hardly be affirmed by us, for the fact has on all sides been acknowledged, and its proof is to be found in the pages of the magazine itself. That we have had the advertising patronage of the publishing houses, is but an acknowledgment of the value of the publication as a medium of effectively reaching the influential members of the profession, and an indication, in itself, of our merit and success. That this source of revenue has sapped our independence, or made us partial in our literary criticisms, we utterly deny; and here again the proof is in our own pages, and, as it happens, in those also of our contemporary. To substantiate this, we have only to point to the recent reviews in our columns of the two editions of Cicero *Pro Archia*, by Messrs. McHenry and Parker—the first of which, *published by Messrs. Gage & Co.*, we were happy to be able to speak well of; and the latter, though published by the firm whose books we are accused of "uniformly lauding in most flattering terms," the *School Journal's* own pages testify to Mr. Parker's grave, though, as we think, indiscreet dissatisfaction with. We admit, at the same time, that Messrs. Gage have reason not to be in love with our reviewing, but this, considering the slatternly work of much of the school literature the firm has issued, and the circumstances connected with the publication of books upon which the Department and the public have, on our exposure of the facts, damagingly spoken, is an added proof of the soundness of our criticism and the endorsement of its moral value.

On another point Messrs. Gage & Co. desire to libel THE MONTHLY, viz., in refuting, with a cheap flourish, the claim which it sets up for us, that the magazine is "high-toned." But this act of baseness is wholly gratuitous, for we have never laid claim to the distinguishing term, and have not the