

ground. The match, which was with the M. A. A. Hockey Club, was altogether in our own hands, certainly at least in the first half-hour of play, in which time a goal scored by our side, and not seen by the Umpire, was not allowed us. Our gallant defence was broken through but once when the only game scored against us was taken—*Sic fata resoluunt*.

This shortly is the story of our day of '84-'85. A fairly brilliant one, you will allow. The heroes of the above-mentioned contests are follows: Kinloch (Capt.), Elder (point, Brown, Budden, Johnson, Stevens, Palmer, Wilde, Kirkpatrick. The recruits are numerous—the roll giving answer to 45—Hockey at McGill is alive.

Correspondence.

To the Editors of the McGill College Gazette :

DEAR SIRS,—I desire to call attention through your columns to the gross injustice which the opening editorial in your last number does those editors of the GAZETTE whose apology it purports to be. This injustice consists, to be brief, in the identification by Mr. Turner (the sole author of the article in question) of the "we" in that article with his assistant editors, a misrepresentation which will surprise those of your readers who have before believed that the editorial portion of this journal is the joint and combined expression of opinion of *all* its editors. In how false a position, therefore, Mr. Turner's "apology" places his colleagues will be seen, when it is understood that he was the sole member of the staff not only to hold the opinions which the past few numbers of THE GAZETTE have adopted, but even to have any sympathy for them.

For some time past it was seen by his assistant editors that Mr. Turner's views and their own as to the scope and object of a college journal were widely at variance, and the appearance in an early number of THE GAZETTE of an article that had been published without the knowledge of any editor save Mr. Turner, led to some openly-expressed remonstrance at such a course, and to the agreement upon the latter gentleman's part that no further article of an editorial nature should appear in these pages save by and with the consent of a majority of the editors.

This agreement Mr. Turner failed to observe. The editorials in the last two numbers of THE GAZETTE gained admission into its columns not only without the consent of the majority of editors, but without even the knowledge of a single member of the staff.

That these charges are grave I am aware; that they are equally true I am no less confident. My only reason for calling attention to the breach of faith implied in them has been my reluctance to allow to pass unchallenged the only obvious inference to be drawn from a perusal of "The Editor's Apology."

I am, very truly yours,

X.

Editors McGill Gazette :—

SIRS.—The session in Medicine is now drawing to a close and we are beginning to count the number of weeks which still remain to us before our dreaded examinations commence, consequently I hope you will not think these remarks out of place.

Of all the subjects which a primary student takes up, the most formidable is Anatomy, and this for two reasons.

First, because of the magnitude of the subject, and the great difficulty in retaining a vivid picture of the parts in the memory, and, second, because students nearly always have a superstitious fear of the Practical Anatomy examinations.

They hand down traditions from one year to the next of what extraordinary manoeuvres the examiners have recourse to in order to puzzle the students. How one man was asked to which side belonged a "stapes" and a "malleus." How another was required to put a decapitated "fibula" in its right position, and expected to spot the isolated "spine" of an "innominate" bone, forgetting all the while that such questions are not only exceedingly rare, but also were in all probability asked in order to make some distinction between the honor men of the class and from them alone expected. It is not, however, against the examination in Practical Anatomy that I wish to raise my voice, but against the manner of conducting it. It is this that seems so manifestly ridiculous. Students are required to study in the dissecting room for two years before they are considered eligible for examination. But the examiners pretend to be able to tell in ten minutes whether the student does or does not know the whole of the vast subject, which it has taken him two sessions of hard work to master, and not only to find out whether he knows sufficient for a mere pass, but actually to rank him according to his merits. True, there is a written descriptive examination, but some men cannot describe that which they know well, and how much of such a subject can the examinee describe in that time?

The evils of this system are very great. It not only maintains a great strain on the student, who is looking forward for weeks, perhaps months, to the dreaded ten minutes of examination, but it sometimes renders them so nervous as to totally incapacitate them for answering even the simplest questions. In fact, I don't doubt that the examiners have to make a large allowance for attacks of "aphasia" during the examination. However, it would be little use to point out this *bête noir*, which I am sure the examiners must appreciate as well as we do, without suggesting out what seems to me to be the most obvious remedy for it. In the first place I would like to ask, what are the "grinds" through the session intended for? The calendar answers, in order to satisfy the demonstrator that each student knows the work as he dissects it. Well; if the demonstrator is satisfied, as is attested by his initials on the card of each qualified student, what need is there of the ten minutes' farce at the end of the session?

The reason is that when a demonstrator comes to grind the students he asks two or three questions and then appends his initials to their card without know-