

lead too much to meandering in altitudes, too little to straight going on *terra firma*; too much to pride and obtrusiveness of supposed higher knowledge, too little to reasoning, and too little to power by reasoning upon simple data, and too little to that sort of reasoning which constitutes the basis of common sense. The scientific and the practical, in short, become too much separated. What is needed is a greater regard to that connection between the two which should be maintained through the whole period of study." If these opinions expressed fifteen years ago were correct, they will apply with still greater force to the teaching of to-day. Let us come to more recent times—especially the last two years.

Let us quote from a physiologist of high repute. Professor Ernest Sterling, of University College, London, during a discussion at the meeting of the British Medical Association at Sheffield in 1908, said: "The tendency for anatomical education to be imparted by professed anatomists has led to increased demands upon the student in the way of accuracy of knowledge.

. . . Pharmacology is practically a new science. . . . The work demanded of a student has practically doubled in amount and is steadily increasing. What is the result? We are trying now to get two pints into a pot that formerly held one. . . . The result is that the student is over-burdened from the very beginning of his career. In his first year we try to make him a man of science. To this end we stuff him with facts and absorb the whole of his time in classes, so that he has no leisure for independent thought."

The following extract is taken from a leading editorial in the *British Medical Journal* last April: "Biology as taught by non-medical biologists must go. All the biology a student wants can be given him in his physiological and anatomical courses, and in the study of parasitology and helminthology under the pathologist. Chemistry in the future must be taught by the physiological chemist, and physics by the physiological physicist, by medical men who have gone through the whole training and know the needs and aims of practical medicine. . . . In anatomy great reform is needed, for the size of the present textbooks, and the mass of useless detail required, have reached the limit of pedagogic absurdity."

While our college professors are studying methods in medical education, many of our general practitioners are watching the situation with a very deep and intelligent interest. We think the majority of physicians consider it unwise to endeavor to stuff a quart of material into a pint pot. Many of them also