

to-day will succeed to-morrow a still greater number. Then there is the nature of one of the problems involved. Life as manifested in the single animal or vegetable cell is an inscrutable mystery, or it appears so to be, but the human mind will never recognize any obstacle to its progress, and as the problem is of transcendent interest it will ever attempt the solution of the secret. Medicine, therefore, will inevitably gain enormously, for every fact won regarding the constitution of living matter and the solution of the secret is a contribution to rational medicine.

The bearing of all this on the courses of medical training designed to fit the student for the practice of medicine during the two coming generations is obvious. The student who thinks that the practice of medicine in the future will not be much different from what it is now will certainly be disillusioned. He should recognize that a change is coming and that he must do his best to orient himself with regard to it. Of course, this change will not take place all at once, but it will be accomplished in the next twenty-five years, and it will be a much more profound one than any which has yet taken place in the history of medicine.

One of the defects of every medical curriculum of to-day is that it is constructed with the idea of turning out the student at the end of four or five years of study as a finished product in all departments. I hold that to be a profound mistake. That result is unattainable even with the exceptionally able student. As the practice of medicine was thirty years ago it was possible to equip a student of fairly average ability with a large amount of the knowledge he needed afterwards in the exercise of his calling. I do not say that he was so equipped in every instance, for the instruction at the bedside was not nearly as efficient as it is now. To-day there is more earnestness in those who instruct and the teaching is vastly better than it has even been, but in proportion to what he is subsequently supposed to know the student acquires less in the four or five years of his course than the student of thirty years ago was compelled to know. He knows much more of the sciences, his proficiency in clinical medicine and surgery is much greater, and yet, though he may be a credit to the institution which gives him his training he is not the peer of his type of thirty years ago.

Now this is not the fault of one teacher or group of teachers. The clinical teacher is apt to think that he has not enough of time, that the sciences are crowding too much on the attention of the student and leave him little opportunity for training in the professional subjects. The clinical teacher everywhere is prone to assume that the student