

two opinions, except, perhaps, among the inmates of Rockwood or Trinity. In no department is the question of co-education surrounded by so many practical difficulties as in medical study. With after-the-event wisdom we can now see that the Professors of the Royal College should not have made so risky an experiment, when one of their number was opposed to it on principle, and that one a gentleman occupying a chair from which delicate questions had to be discussed. The students made a mistake when they closed a presentation of the case, admissibly from their point of view, with a threat of leaving. They should have reflected that gentlemen cannot preserve their self-respect if they discuss a question so presented. The Faculty, too, knowing how peculiar are the relations between medical professors and students, might have taken a more conciliatory course at the outset. To return a letter to the writer is considered a species of insult that puts an end to further correspondence.

But all mistakes were thrown into the shade by the action of the Trinity Professors. To say it was worse than a crime, it was a blunder, is weak. It was both, and more. It was a violation of the *esprit de corps* that ought to animate professional men; an offence against college decorum and a downright social indecency. A modicum of good sense and good manners is usually expected from any collegiate faculty; but hereafter this assumption will be made with limitations. Hearing that there is a prospect of breaking up a sister institution, the Toronto Professors are hastily summoned; or the Dean, knowing their sentiments, acts without going through that form. Her Majesty's mail is too slow in such an exigency, and the telegraph is called into requisition; and lest there may be other Deans likeminded, rates are cut so low as to defy competition.

It is a melancholy business, and the ex-

cuses offered by the offenders make it worse. Of course we here speak subject to correction, as we have only the newspapers' statement of their pleas. It seems that they urge that they did a somewhat similar act previously. When a dish was broken Mrs. Maclarty always cried, "It was crackit afore!" But not even Mrs. Mclarty would have offered the excuse, "I crackit it afore." They plead, too, that they thought McGill intended to do the very thing they did. McGill will appreciate the compliment. But what are we to think of the moral elevation of the gentlemen who would use such an argument? A Highland rascal was wont to declare, "If others are honest, I will be honest; but if they cheat, thank God I can cheat too." But even Dugald never dreamed of the code, "If I think others intend to cheat, I shall take care to get the start of them." It is unnecessary to say a word more about the Trinity Medical Professors. The one comfort in connection with the whole embroglio is that those gentlemen went out for wool, and returned home shorn; shorn of their honour and without the least mite of the wool they so desperately longed to get.

THE NEW CURRICULUM.

CHANGES are always acceptable when they tend towards improvement, and changes in the curriculum of a University are in this respect like any other changes. We propose to consider in this relation the recent changes in the curriculum of Queen's University.

A university course may be regulated with a view to serving two different purposes, either to give a broad and sound liberal education, or to make specialist in some department of study. Queen's has always acted upon the assumption that the first of these is the most important, and that specialization really belongs to a post-graduate course. So stringently was this principle carried out in former years that it was quite impracti-