

search, however, makes the proposition at present impracticable, and therefore of only academic interest, except in institutions where money has been specially provided for the purpose.

A glance at the hospital field reveals a similar activity, aimed at bringing these institutions up to the requirements for modern clinical investigation, diagnosis and treatment. In no place has evolution along these lines, especially in the provision of excellent accommodation for both private and charity patients, been more active than in our own city, where we now have buildings which compare favorably with those of any great medical centre in the world. In America and Great Britain there has been a recognition of the necessity for radical changes in the organization of clinical departments in order to render effort more productive and to make provision for the practical application of recent scientific discoveries to diagnosis and treatment.

In some features of hospital work, we are still far behind the best continental institutions. This applies especially to the organization of self-contained and independent clinics, each with its own wards, doctors, nurses and servants; with its own theatres, library, laboratories and equipment. These distinctive features of the continental system as contrasted with the British, come naturally with the former from the common custom of having different clinics in separate buildings or clinical institutes.

The advantages of the independent clinical units, in fixing responsibility, in giving freedom in initiative and management, in permitting of the building up of each clinic along lines most suited for its special purpose, in avoiding friction and interference which paralyze action, and in providing generous rivalry, are very evident, and account in no small measure for their greater capacity to produce good team work.

Before the Royal Commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Haldane, the inadequacy of the system so long in vogue in Great Britain to meet modern requirements, was pointed out by many of the witnesses, Sir Wm. Osler characterizing the existent conditions "as a legacy from a period when university ideals had not reached the practical side of our medical schools."

The necessity for considering these defects of organization applies to our own hospitals quite as much as to the British, after which they are modelled.

In no particular has the old system failed more conspicuously to meet the requirements of modern progress than in the correlation of laboratories to the general clinical work of the wards. It is quite unnecessary to urge the essential importance of good labor-