

a wholly medical environment, he would have been less able to work in conjunction with Brooks.

The particular variety of union of which these men gave such a striking demonstration, is followed at the present time only in rare cases. The lamentable result is that their descendants at second remove have become split into two camps. One party, the experimental zoologists, ignoring their essential relations with the comparative group, seek to handle their own training in the technique of experiment. Their present didactic work is characterised by narrowness. Meantime the comparative group, albeit with greater range of material, has been all but driven to sever its teaching relations with the experimentalists. The mistake arose because the Americans failed to note two things, (1) the difference between broad physiological and mere special training in particular experimental problems, (2) the fact that both Brooks and Martin held the comparative viewpoint.

It so happens that we have the opportunity at McGill of repeating the type of collaboration that once occurred at Johns Hopkins. One is prompted to ask, "Why has it not already been set in operation?" For one thing, physiology was here considered as having relations only to the Medical Faculty - and in any case the medical teaching had first to be set on its feet. Then again, we had not fully realised the complexity of university organisation, the action and interaction whereby the welfare of one Faculty, or of one department, endlessly involves the strength and welfare of the others. One of the most inspiring recent signs in our University has been the subsidence of a desire, once markedly manifest, to administer in terms of the isolated needs  
or /