

very practical course in medicine, and cannot surely lay herself open to the charge that John Ruskin makes regarding the current mode of teaching. "On the whole," he says, "and looking broadly at the way the speakers and teachers of the nation set about their business, there is an almost fathomless failure in the results. The main thing which we ought to teach our youth is to see something—all that the eyes which God has given them are capable of seeing. The sum of what we do teach them is to say something." By the use of the microscope we have been taught the normal condition of tissues, and also the changes in morbid conditions. We shall not readily forget the practical demonstrations in the anatomy room, nor the vivid illustrations drawn in red, and white, and blue, and yellow, and setting forth, as the case may be, the relations of the arch of the aorta or the distribution of the cervical plexus. In chemistry and physics we have been taught something of the forces of nature, both in the lecture theatre and in the laboratory. In organic chemistry we were told that, being in possession of one of the lower members of a series, we could with almost absolute certainty predict what the next higher substance should be. "There are theories and there are theories," but for once we realized we were in possession of one that might be operated. As a consequence, that which we had been accustomed to look upon as a heterogenous mass of facts, useful chiefly as a means of burdening the memory, soon became reduced to law and order, and the subject was looked upon as one of the most interesting in the curriculum.

But the time has come when we must say farewell and turn our faces towards a different phase of life.

We thank you friends and citizens of Montreal for the interest you have manifested in us this afternoon. We thank you for the courtesy you have on more than one occasion shown us, and for all your efforts to make our stay in your fair city a pleasant and prosperous one.