and the practical. He expressed the opinion that in many of our modern hospitals with their laboratories "students are not taught to observe so carefully the evident symptoms of disease, and are becoming mere mechanics. . . . The higher and more intellectual means of drawing conclusions by inductive reasoning are almost neglected."

On the other hand we have scientists who think that such ideas are entirely wrong and not even worthy of consideration. Some of our advanced educationalists are even growing a little tired of John Hopkins, because those Baltimore men still stick to the old-fashioned idea that the student should be encouraged to observe and think and reason. We are told that they hope soon to be able to manufacture machine-made physicians and surgeons who will be vastly superior to the home-made article.

As a matter of fact, the differences between the schools of thought commenced many years before Shepherd sounded his note of warning. About fifteen years ago the late Sir George Humphry, Professor of Anatomy, Cambridge University, in an address delivered in Oxford, spoke as follows about methods of teaching medicine: "There is too great a mass of facts heaped on the memory and too little reflection on them. . . . The science of physiology and histology have become, and those of pathology and anatomy are becoming, more separated from medicine, delegated to special teachers, doubtless to the advantage and width of scope of these sciences, and to the greater knowledge of them, but I fear there is hereby engendered a tendency to take the student too far afield. . . . It is apt to lead too much to meandering in altitudes, too little to straight going on *terra firma;* too much to pride and obstrusiveness 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 demand 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?