

With Professor's Osler's remarks that "In the case of inefficient students, parents ought to be told after a year or two they would never make decent doctors," all will agree. It is a most unfortunate thing for a young man to go on for five years, spending money and giving to these studies valuable years, if he has no aptitude for the science and practice of medicine. It would be an excellent thing for the medical profession if a good deal of pruning could be done among the students. Here we agree with Professor Osler.

On another of his contentions, however, we are not quite in accord with him. We think he is too sweeping in his condemnation of examinations. "There ought to be no written papers at final examinations," and, again, "the student needs that the incubus of examination should be lifted from his soul. We make the study of our profession an intolerable burden by examinations." It would not do to sweep away examinations and depend wholly upon the reports from the various clinical teachers. This is most valuable, but we still hold, should not be the sole test. The well-conducted examination is a review test, and should be collated with the report of the teaching staff under whose tuition the student has passed. We believe such an examination is a force of no small moment in making the student get up his work and carry it with him throughout the session. It must be clearly understood from what we now say that we do not regard examinations as the best means of finding out who will make the most capable doctors; or who may know their work most perfectly. Nevertheless, the examination cannot be discarded; for the observation and notes of the teaching during the session is but one phase of examination.

When Professor Osler says that there has been "an enormous expansion of the subjects of the curriculum," there is but little room for difference of opinion. A careful perusal of the announcement of most medical colleges leads one to think that this is true. It is possible that the good old advice, *ne quid nimis*, not too much of a thing, may be forgotten in the making of medical curricula. The student cannot learn everything, but he should learn the essentials thoroughly. In a medical education, anatomy and physiology take first place in the early part of the course. These are vastly more important than chemistry. It must follow that if the chemical end of the course is made very heavy, the anatomy and physiology are apt to suffer; and the loss to the student, in his after life, is very great. In the final years too much attention may be given to the mounting of slides and bacterial straining to the neglect of the bedside work and the actual observation of the sick as they are found in the wards.