

lieve that I may, without fear of contradiction, affirm this, that of the good books now extant in the world more than nineteen-twentieths were published after the writers had attained the age of forty."

*The British Medical Journal* of recent date editorially remarks:—"Professor Osler's statement that all the best intellectual work is done by men under forty is not by any means borne out by facts. To Dr. Osler's dogmatic assertion we oppose the above equally positive statement by Macaulay an oracle of at least equal authority. This is in accord with the fact—which can scarcely be denied except by those who love paradox more than sober truth—that the intellectual powers do not reach the stable equilibrium of full and harmonious development till the age of forty or even later."

The *Texas Medical News* says, "History, we believe, does not bear out the eminent doctor in his statements. Who, for a moment, doubts that the world is better, nobler, purer, for the work done in it by men who, before the age of forty, were scarcely known, or, if known, were more productive after that age than before? Suffice it to say, then, that Dr. Osler's statements are not borne out by the opinions of practical character students. We think it unfortunate, to say the least, that this statement was made under the circumstances."

The *Journal of the American Medical Association* remarks that, "No one knows better than Osler that old age is a term that is applied arbitrarily to any specified age; that some men are old at 50, while others are young at 80. We are all as old as our arteries, and as young as we feel."

In *American Medicine* we read: "Dr. Osler blames old men for being no longer young, a foolish criticism at best, and too indiscriminately made, because much of the energizing work and worry of the great discoveries have been made by men over 40; but he fails utterly to say a word against their wretchedest fault—the rejection of new truth that the young men have discovered."

The *Kansas City Medical Record* thinks that "Professor Osler made one great and only blunder of his life."

The *Maryland Medical Journal* is of opinion that "the uses of old age should be exploited. Its good fruits are of necessity precious, being rare, for the old are but 4 per cent. of all of us."

The *Medical Mirror* in an editorial declares, "the medical profession does not agree with Dr. Osler. History arrays many examples against his theory. Science refutes it. Every time one turns around one sees living evidences against it, and Dr. Osler's own work contradicts the truth of his remarks. The nearer he approaches the period of euthanasia, the better the quality of his work becomes and his own work differs very little from that of countless co-workers in the field of medicine. It is