

inspire much confidence in patients, though his professional papers and volumes of "Proceedings" may look down upon him from the library shelves as a fine diagnostician. The physician in Rabner's Satires could always tell at once the Greek name of a disease, but was never able to suggest a remedy or a cure. The world is not far wrong in clinging to simple standards of measurement.

If a teacher cannot give satisfaction in the most elementary phases of his work, what guarantee is there that he is doing wonderful things in matters too elusive for any human tests? Nor is there any reason why he should not be held to strict account in details. The great master-works in painting, sculpture, architecture and music reveal perfection in the smallest and least essential elements. It is right that teachers should be asked to produce certain evidence of certain results, and to be able to give certain expert reasons for the things they do and the way they do them.

Here is a field for present investigation. The time of opinionating, groping, experimenting and talking must come to an end, and the way be cleared for research and the establishment—by comparative studies—of reasonable standards for the just testing of results and the efficiency of methods. An educator must be an expert in, or concerning, the *art* of teaching.

DEFENDERS OF THE BOERS?

In a struggle which involves the loss of thousands of precious lives and millions of money—in a struggle which leads to the loss of many of our noblest and best and most hopeful, it is of supreme importance that we should have a clear conscience. It is, therefore, the business of those who profess to guide public opinion to give heed to testi-

monies and remonstrances from all sides. It is clear, indeed to ourselves that the case is so strong against the Boer Government that it is hardly necessary even to examine their protests; yet, on the other hand, if we are so sure of the righteousness of the British cause, our convictions will only be strengthened by listening to the plea from the other side. Such reflections are suggested to us by a recent report of an interview with Mr Abraham Fischer, a member of the "Boer Peace Commission," with a representative of the (London) Daily Express. "If we are at war with the British," says Mr. Fischer, "it is not because we wish or ever did wish to quarrel with them. As we believe the British do not wish to quarrel with us, we have come to see whether we cannot end the war." This is most pleasing, and in a certain sense is true. Great Britain certainly did not want to fight the Boers, and did not fight them until they had invaded British territory and attacked our garrisons. This is a simple matter of fact. On the other hand, it may be said that the Boers did not wish to fight the British. Certainly not; they knew better. They only wanted to do as they liked in a country which was not their own. They wanted to make slaves of the aborigines, to deprive English speaking men of all right of participation in the government of the country, while they paid the greatest part of the taxes, and to "run" the courts of justice in such a way that no Outlander could receive justice. These were very simple wants of theirs! Why should anyone go to war with them on points like these? "Our ultimatum was issued," they say, "under the belief that our destruction had been determined upon." Their destruction! What did the British Government demand? Only fair