the Vanderbilts, the Rockafellers, the Miss Garretts, and others with them are beginning to realize that unendowed instruction in medicine must lead to imperfect results, and that private endowment, in the absence of state aid, has become an absolute necessity to a proper medical training. I am not an advocate for state aid to universities, and I rejoice that the university to which I have the honor to belong is not so dependent, as it might thus be deprived of those gifts of private munificence to which I have just referred. All honor to those far-seeing, open-handed men and women who are giving of their abundance in order to elevate the standard of medical education, and by so doing benefit their kind. As Gould very tersely puts it in one of his clever articles: "I think our reliance must be upon private bequests, and these can be secured only as we interest the rich. We must never weary in showing the neglect of the greatest, most palpable, most certain means of doing good. There is a strange fatality in men, an unaccountable inability of seeing the need that lies nearest the good that is dearest. There is more money to-day devoted to astronomy than to the prevention of disease. It is positively wonderful to think that men should be more interested in stars and constellations than in their bodies and their physiological life."

A question which is now-a-days agitating the minds of those especially interested in medical education is the kind of groundwork which is likely to bear the most direct relation to the future studies of the medical student. I think it is now conceded by all that he is placed at a greater advantage who first passes through an arts or a science course. I am happy to be able to report that from 15 to 20 per cent. of those who are studying medicine in this country to-day have had a collegiate training in either arts or science. Which of the two should the parent or guardian choose? Had I a son whose instincts were in the direction of medicine, I think I should choose for him the science course. The late Professor Huxley thought it was a self-evident proposition that the educational training for persons who proposed to enter the medical profession should be largely scientific; not merely or even principally because an acquaintance with the elements of physical and biological science is absolutely essential to the comprehension of human physiology and pathology; but still more because of the value of the discipline afforded by practical work in these departments in the process of observation and experiment, in inductive reasoning and in manipulation.

The subjects in the science curriculum might be specially selected for the future medical student. Of course it may be said in favor of the arts course that many of the subjects such as physics and chemistry constitute part of the curriculum; but then calculate the loss to the future surgeon of that training of the hand and eye which would lead him to be a skilled operator; or to the scientific physician whose complicated instruments of precision employed in the diagnosis of disease need some mechanical knowledge for both their use and repair. Besides the number of those has been increasing in number and complexity with the increase of scientific knowledge.

But can we not make a new departure: can we not urge that a special scientific education be arranged by the universities for those who desire to enter the medical profession? Such a course would embrace elementary Latin and Greek, French and German, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, elementary mechanics, a practical laboratory course on electricity and drawing. After two years' study this might entitle the successful candidate to the degree of Licentiate in Science.

Something of this kind has been recently attempted in the University of McGill. By a special arrangement with the Faculty of Arts it is now possible for students to obtain the degree of B. A. along with M. D., C. M., after only six years of study. It has been decided to allow the primary subjects (anatomy,