

discussion, and a just verdict, much discredit for our art would have been spared us. The just verdict has now been arrived at, and the misrepresentation of which this operation was the centre has now ended. But the example is a very telling one in illustrating the want of logical application in our present method of research upon surgical results.

This vast and powerful Association could accomplish almost anything it wished after determining that it was for the good of the world, and after a reasonable method was pointed out for its accomplishment. We tried an expensive experiment in the way of a collective investigation, but from intrinsic reasons it was a failure. The fact is that its plan was lost in diffuseness and defeated by the machinery involving a vast number of contributors—in fact, to increase the means of success involved the very essence of increase of risk of failure.

If you want a thing done well, you must either do it yourself or trust it to a very small number of workers. I do not think it would be too much to ask our Association to place every new drug and every proposal for a new surgical proceeding under the observation of a small responsible committee, whose judgment should precede anything like a wholesale experiment by the professional public at large. This step would certainly clear away a vast amount of rubbish, and would direct more extended research into definite lines, instead of the indefinite and haphazard roads it now runs upon in almost every instance. And I cannot help feeling it would prevent us doing the great deal of harm which is now done in the early stages of even our best proposals.—*Lancet*, Aug. 2.