

somewhat foreign to the subject, I cannot but allude to the uncourteousness of a member of the profession in Ontario towards a surgeon of distinction in Detroit who visited Ontario to perform an operation at the request of a highly respectable physician of the place. I am sure you will willingly make me the interpreter of your views in assuring Dr. Jenks, and, through him, the members of the profession in the adjoining Union, of our honest offered courtesy, and of our continued desire for reciprocation in matters which even governments cannot, and should not, attempt to control. Science requires, and humanity demands, in matters of this kind, the most unfettered complaisance and civility.

EDUCATION.

I am naturally drawn from a consideration of the question: What should constitute the qualifications of a medical student before entering upon the *practice* of his profession, to what should be his qualifications on entering our medical schools? Should he have secured knowledge which promised nothing beyond knowledge itself; or, should he, as would have done a Cato, have acquired knowledge with reference only to what it could produce? Should he possess a liberal education; or that sort of knowledge which we now term useful? Should he possess refinement and enlargement of mind; or only sufficient knowledge of Latin to translate Gregory or the Pharmacopœia? Should he possess liberal knowledge, or, as it has been happily termed, a gentleman's knowledge—which, to possess it, is something, though it produce nothing;—or that utilitarian knowledge which is of use only when acted upon? Should it be the education which is philosophical, which rises to, and is enriched with, ideas; or servile and mechanical, and which expends itself upon what is external and visible? Should it be the education which gives a high tone of thought, a high standard of judgment; or that education which merely makes of the memory a passive receptacle of scraps and fragments of knowledge, to be served out confusedly and without method. The education I vindicate should give cultivation to the intellect; it should give a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dispassionate mind, a noble and courteous bearing in the conduct of life. It should open the mind, correct it and refine it, and enable it to "know and to digest, master, rule, and use its knowledge, and give it power over its own faculties, application, flexibility, method, critical exactness, sagacity, resource, address." With the intellect, thus tutored and instructed, the student might enter upon the study of that most difficult profession of which we are members; engage in a calling the due discharge of which requires all the attributes of the mind, and the highest culture of the

intellect; and pursue with advantage a particular course of study which might issue in some definite, and, perhaps, remunerative work. It may be gathered from this that I share not with those arch levellers who advocate a low Utilitarianism; but rather with those who think the student should be formed "not by a parsimonious admeasurement of studies to some definite future object; but by taking a wide and liberal compass, and thinking a great deal on many subjects, with no better end in view, perhaps, than because the exercise is one which makes him a more rational and intelligent being." But this is not what has been obtained for us recently in a hurriedly prepared law relating to our profession in an important province of this Dominion, where our colleges and seminaries of learning have been degraded from their position. The graduate in arts, the student who has completed his eight or nine years curriculum at any of our colleges, should, by that fact alone, be qualified to enter upon the study of medicine. But no! our universities may grant degrees in arts, but the colleges and affiliate medical schools over-ride them!! and subject the candidate to a new ordeal, from which he should be exempt!!

Yet the possessor of a *liberal* education, compared with one *crammed* for an examination—the nature and extent of which he may have learned from those who had gone in before him—is, to use a familiar comparison, as one standing on the timber to be divided, seeing the line to be followed, and guiding the instrument intelligently, compared with the one beneath, who mechanically aids the work, but, blinded by the dust and particles he has detached above his head, is uninformed as to the progress or nature of the work being done. And so it is with labour of an intellectual kind. We must be above our knowledge, not under it. If above it, we may generalize, reduce to method, "have a grasp of principles and shape our acquisitions by them." If below our knowledge, we are confused and oppressed; and the greater the number of facts the more those facts confuse and oppress.* This is markedly the case in medicine. An ill-informed physician is easily startled at every change in the condition of a patient; and rushes in to check, control and interfere, when, with a better trained mind, he would be led to observe, and to note, that, if need be, he might, with greater advantage, guide and direct. The uneducated man, unaccustomed

* In an able editorial in the *Philadelphia Medical Times* for May, 1877, it is asserted that the standard of graduation in the United States, south of New England, has been steadily lowered, and although "new matter has been added to the curricula," and "the bait of clinical instruction has been alluringly spread, the effect has been evil, because the attempt has been simply to pour into vessels already overfull." Would it not have been *nearer* the truth to say the vessels had not been prepared of a capacity to contain what they received, but could not retain?