And now I come to the question asked several minutes ago and still unanswered, namely, are the authors of the Carnegie Report justified in classifying the medical schools of the continent primarily according to the entrance requirements? I have no hesitation in answering, certainly not. It is not the entrance but the outcome that should determine the status of the school. Thus a school may demand an Arts degree for entrance, but if it has not proper control of a hospital or hospitals, if its students have not free entrance to the wards, or if, having that entrance, the hospital is so full of pay patients that the number of patients available for ward-work and bedside instruction is lamentably inadequate; if, therefore, the students have to be taught by the "case method." by written reports and details of real or supposititious cases rather than by the study of the actual palpitating patient; if, I would add, a school permits its students to begin to specialize before the too, too brief four years' course is complete: then I say in all confidence, it may turn out learned men, but as practical, capable practitioners, ready to do their work in the world, its graduates are not to be put on the same plane with the graduates of a school which, while affording a thoroughly sound education in the preliminary scientific subjects, and controlling that education, affords in addition the fullest clinical opportunities: a school which has trained its students to study intimately and abundantly the living patient.

I have spoken more than once of the complete physician. Strangely enough the Carnegie Report passes over, so far as I can see, in absolute silence, a most important phase of his equipment. It has been said, and I think truly said, that the ideal physician is the man who knows and makes it his duty to treat the patient, not to treat the disease. The Carnegic Report deals only with the education that trains the man how to treat the disease. One rises from reading the Report with the impression that he is the most fully qualified practitioner who has the fullest knowledge of the data of disease, the best training to treat each case as a subject of scientific research. The ideal hospital, we are told, for teaching purposes is that in which the medical and surgical departments are directed and controlled by university professors without private practice who devote their whole time to teaching and research. Such a hospital, I freely grant, will turn out the greatest mass of valuable papers and monographs upon disease. Will it turn out the best medical men? I know that this may sound heretical to sundry of my hearers. I know that as a professor of the science of medicine you will expect me