

I may be permitted to speak of Dr. Osler in Philadelphia from two points of view: First, the influence of our quiet Quaker life upon him, and, second, his influence upon us.

First, then, we at once sought to make a practitioner of him. But of that he would have none. Teacher, clinician, consultant, yes, gladly; but practitioner—no! and that with emphasis. This was partly due to his knowledge of affairs, partly to his temperament. One star differeth from another star in glory. His light was to be bright and guiding, and seen of all men. Not for him the dim and shaded light of the sick room, the patient daily service to the weary sufferer, the tiresome round of daily calls, and vexatious failure of the approved method to accomplish the desired result. He recognized his metier and carried out his plan. And this gave him time and opportunity, and of both he made supreme use.

To an institution traditions are what character is to a man. The traditions of the University of Pennsylvania deeply impressed him. Morgan, Shippen, Kuhn, Rush, Caspar Wistar, were to him living personalities. His actual associates were such men as Agnew, Stillé, Leidy, Pepper and others whom we all know. The lives and characters of these men were not without influence upon the young Canadian, trained in the best way by association with men like Bovell, Howard and Ross, and familiar with the best methods and results of British and Continental Medicine.

Not less important was his connection with the College of Physicians, with its cherished traditions and magnificent library. Nor is the part played by the Pathological Society to be overlooked. Here he brought his best work, the result of long and keen study, illustrated by the findings in the post-mortem room at Blockley, and always met in large measure the sympathy and admiration of the younger men.

So from point to point during the five years he was with us, at the best period of his life, he found the stimulus of tradition, of opportunity and of appreciation.

What did he do for us? He made himself agreeable to the older men, and demonstrated to the younger men how medicine should be learned and taught. He broadened our conceptions in regard to the inductive method in medicine. Facts, facts—always the facts. The facts of the ward, of the microscope, of the laboratory, of the post-mortem room. He made it clear to some of the younger men who are now reaping the reward of their work, that it is not necessary for every man to be a practitioner in the ordinary sense, but that long years of hospital and laboratory work constitute a better equipment for the teacher and consultant. He inspired his students with enthusiasm for letters, and taught them the rare rewards that come of searching the medical scriptures. He showed that in the democracy of our profession any man is