power of absorption, probably brought about by the long period of virtual starvation through which the infant has passed. In other cases, again, one is disappointed by a sudden and inexplicable collapse just when all seemed to be going well.

What, it may be asked, is the ultimate result in those cases which recover under medical treatment? Are they entirely cured, or is there only a state of compensation established with some persistent narrowing of the pylorus and dilatation of the stomach? In some cases, at least, I believe that the cure is both complete and permanent. At all events I have examined some of my cases—and those of the worst type—five years after treatment, and found them to be perfectly healthy children, with no sign of gastric disorder or dilatation of the stomach. I know that it seems incredible, when one examines the stomach from a typical case after death, that the almost cartilaginous thickening of the pylorus which is present should entirely disappear, and a complete return to a normal condition be brought about. But we have no right to set a limit to the powers of the *vis medicatrix Naturae*, and I can only repeat that, as far as clinical observation can determine it, such a restitution to the normal does, in fact, take place. But not, probably, in all; I have certainly seen one case in which three years after apparent recovery the stomach was still somewhat dilated, and I was told that the child was subject to "stomach upsets," although well nourished and otherwise in good health. Some of the cases described by Russell²⁶ and Maylard,²⁷ in adults, and to which Dent²⁸ also has referred, may, perhaps, have originated in this way, although others probably belong to the Landerer-Maier group, and it is quite certain that compensation can be established with a gain in weight and disappearance of all symptoms even although some degree of pyloric obstruction, as shown by the persistence of visible peristalsis, persists. Most cases, indeed, pass through this phase, although in the great majority, probably in all, the peristalsis finally disappears. What we really need to determine the question is more *post-mortem* evidence as to the state of the stomach some years after recovery under medical treatment. Such evidence is not yet forthcoming, but we shall no doubt get it in time, and meanwhile the fact of clinical cures is undoubted whether they be real anatomical cures or no, and that, after all, is all we want.

To return, then, to the question of surgical treatment. Is operation never to be recommended in these cases? In practice I think not. I fully believe that there may be some cases which would have been saved by operation that die without it; but I know of no method by which such cases can be recognized, for one can never say of any given case that it is so bad that operation alone can give a chance of life. Of that experience has thoroughly convinced me. As a practical policy, therefore, one is obliged either to operate upon all cases in which the symptoms and signs are well marked or upon none of them, and that the former plan would result in a much heavier mortality than the latter I have not a shadow of doubt.

The only alternative to this dilemma is to treat all cases medically at first, and then to advise operation upon those that do not show any improvement after a certain lapse of time—three or six weeks have been given as the limit beyond which the surgeon should be called in. The objection to this plan, however, is that it means operating at a time when the child's strength is already much reduced and when success is not likely to be achieved, whereas, on the other hand, my own cases show that no case of the disease can be pronounced to be incurable by medical means until the patient is dead.

REFERENCES.

- ¹ *Archives of Pediatrics*, 20, 1903, p. 355. ² *Edinburgh Monthly Journal of Med. Science*, 1841, vol. 1, p. 23. ³ *Caspar's Wochenschr.*, 1842, No. 7. ⁴ *Jahrb. d. Kinderheilk.*, 29, 1888, p. 61. ⁵ Unpublished Thesis. ⁶ *Die Angeborene Pylorusstenose*, Berlin (Karger), 1905. ⁷ *Jahrb. d. Kinderheilk.*, 65, 1907, p. 674. ⁸ *Trans. Roy. Med. Chir. Soc.*, vol. 82, 1898, p. 41. ⁹ *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL*, 1902, ii, 678. ¹⁰ *Proc. Roy. Soc. of Med.*, II, Section of Pathology, p. 88. ¹¹ *Deut. med. Woch.*, 1909, No. 29. ¹² *Jahrb. d. Kinderheilk.*, 70, 1909, p. 253. ¹³ *Lancet*, December 14th, 1907. ¹⁴ *Ibrahim*, loc. cit. ¹⁵ *Archiv f. Kinderheilk.*, 49, 1909, p. 83. ¹⁶ *Amer. Journ. of Physiology*, xx, 1907, p. 283. ¹⁷ *Therapie der Gegenwart*, October, 1906. ¹⁸ *Zentralb. f. Kinderheilk.*, 14, No. 5, 1909. ¹⁹ *Jahrb. f. Kinderheilk.*, 65, 1907, pp. 317, 477. ²⁰ *Med. Klinik*, 48, 1909. ²¹ *Cloves*, *Lancet*, August 22nd, 1908; *Rob*, *ibid.*, June 23rd, 1906; *Pearse*, *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL*, October 30th, 1909. ²² *Trans. Clin. Soc.*, 40, 1907, p. 98. ²³ *Textbook of Diseases of Children*. ²⁴ *Clinical Examination and Treatment of Sick Children* (2nd ed.). ²⁵ *Tobler*, *Archiv f. Kinderheilk.*, 47, 1908, p. 185. ²⁶ *BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL*, July 11th, 1908. ²⁷ *Ibid.* ²⁸ *Brit. Journ. of Children's Diseases*, March, 1910.

An Address

ON

PRIZES AND PERFORMANCES.

DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE MEDICAL SESSION
AT ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL, ON OCTOBER 1ST.

BY

S. SQUIRE SPRIGGE, M.D. CANTAB.,

EDITOR OF THE "LANCET."

GENTLEMEN,—I will not waste your time by expressing at any length my sense of the high honour that has been done me in allowing me to present the prizes at my old medical school, and to address you at the beginning of the new session. It would be ungracious of me, however, not to acknowledge my feeling in the matter, as the position in which I find myself is one so totally unexpected—I am, then, surprised at myself for being in this position, and I know that a good many of you, having regard to the scientific eminence of my distinguished predecessors in this function, and to their services to St. George's Hospital, must share my sentiment.

The ceremony which we have just witnessed—the award to the successful students at the medical school of the prizes which their industry, their ingenuity, and perhaps a happy blend of both qualities, which I will call their wisdom, have enabled them to win—I will take as a suggestion that to look a little into the significance of prize-giving might be interesting. All the year round, and in every class of academic, institutional, and professional training, men are winning prizes, losing prizes, competing for prizes or scratching for those competitions; and a system that is so universally in employment among us may easily become accepted by us in a mechanical way, may cease to have a reason which appeals to us, and be merely regarded as one of those things that happen in the course of education. It is these frequent and general features in the scheme of life that pass unnoticed by us because of their very familiarity. If familiarity with such a ceremony as we have just seen were all that were needed to grasp its full significance we should all know all about prizes—their uses, their abuses, and their relation to the spread of wisdom generally, and to the efficiency of students and scholars in particular. Our opinion upon the matter would be unanimous, and there would be no need for any discussion. But although we cannot conceive any system of professional training without them and their attendant troubles—namely, examinations—such clear comprehension is not ours with regard to prizes and the principle of rewarding early merit in examination by gifts, for among my hearers it is perfectly certain that there are those who have expressed opinions of diametrically opposite natures on the value of prizes, upon the systems under which they are awarded, and upon the utility of examinations generally. I am certain that many of us have said that prizemen are too often found not to fulfil their early promise. This is when we hear of the insignificant future which some brilliant student has made for himself—perhaps when we find the first mathematica scholar in our batch at school as an under-master in a second-rate seminary, or notice the best classic of his year at our college dozing away a valueless existence in front of a club fire, or using his recollection of the classical dictionary in an acrostic competition. It is equally certain that many of us, in congratulating a prize winner, or perhaps in the case of those of us who are middle-aged, in congratulating the father of a prize-winner, have said that nowadays, in a world of stress and competition, there is nothing like making a good start. And some of us have certainly said both these things, suiting our words to the circumstances. And the same diversity of view is expressed by us with regard to the value of examinations as a test of present merit or as a guide to prognostications of future success. Inevitably those who profess to hold cheaply the winning of prizes believe that the easy and rapid passing of examinations must not be credited as furnishing any sure ground for future honours.

There is, then, a considerable difference of estimate with regard to the value of prizes and the significance of passing

examinations, and this is worth a little consideration, as it happens that our educational schemes are largely founded on the promotion of the prizeman and the nurture of the successful examinee. How can thoughtful persons be found uttering such opposite opinions? But observe that, whichever view we take, we all of us accept regular examinations and regular prize-givings as the best and most practical way in which education can be conducted, though when we are called upon to express an opinion concerning the matter we are not necessarily consistent. We take one side or the other—whichever one suits the particular case—congratulations or condolences coming with equal readiness from us, but we never suggest that education can be carried on to a practical end in any other way. Verbally we may be willing to sacrifice a lightly-held conviction as to the value of prize-winning to a desire to be agreeable to some one who has not been a winner, but even then we are almost sure to endorse the principle of examinations and rewards by alluding to it as a time-honoured abuse—one of those perpetual sources of grumbling that we should all be sorry to lose. Now, all this is really an admission that there is no way of ascertaining whether students are up to a certain standard save by examinations, and that there is at least no surer way of stimulating the work of a group of students than by appealing to an honourable, as well as to an inevitable, spirit of rivalry. We have the position that a very important part of our educational system is regarded in two perfectly opposite ways by reasonable people, while at the same time those who have the most to say against it do not come into the open with any alternative proposal. And that fact should put them out of court to a great extent. But it does not. There is a feeling that there is much in both views, so much, indeed, that sincere people sometimes express one view and sometimes another upon the true value of early successes. Of course, the explanation of the divergency is the usual one where sensible people disagree, and I apologize for its simplicity—both parties are not talking about the same thing.

Those of us who cry out most clearly and persistently against the need of examinations and the reliability of prizes as a gauge of future success are regarding education, I expect, as a thing which begins at a certain time and ends at a certain time—begins, say, with the majority of us who are assembled here with our going to a boarding school, and ends with the day when we pay £5 to the Registrar of the General Council of Medical Education and Registration for the right to have our names placed upon the statutory roll of the medical profession. If this view of education be taken, it is easy not only to show that success in examinations is no certain gauge of success in life, but also that the whole system of examinations and prizes is wrong. But education does not happen to end with registration, or qualification, with the obtaining of a commission, a diploma, or a degree, and there is no professional life in which this truth can be seen more clearly than in the medical life, in relation to which it is stark staleness to say that education never ceases and that the longer we practise our calling the more we have the opportunity of learning, of testing that learning, and of obtaining its rewards. This, at any rate, is the fortunate plight with most: a few may get out of sympathy with progressive medicine as time goes on. They often began in a particularly brilliant way, and their later plight is analogous to the condition which the athletic trainer calls "muscle bound," where the muscles under excessive training in some given direction become hypertrophic, and lose their elasticity, reducing the quondam champion to a melancholy inertia. These unfortunate exhibitions of reaction, I believe, however, we shall all agree, are no longer often seen. Modern conceptions of medicine are such that all men, in whatever walk of life they are practising, feel that their life is one long education, and that all that they have learnt in the past may be regarded to some extent as an introduction to all that they are likely to learn in the future. No profession opens so many paths as medicine of a totally different sort, though they all converge to one objective—the discovery, maintenance, and practice of truth; and, as a consequence, this feeling that the whole of professional life is one long course of education appeals to us medical men with particular

force. The colonel feels it as well as the medical officer of health; the operating surgeon shares it with the consulting physician, the bacteriologist, and the bio-chemist; while to none can it come more home than to the general practitioner, whose five-hundredth case of whooping-cough may give him some practical hint for the relief of a certain symptom met with in a certain type of case. Alas! that we do not get these valuable experiences recorded in any regular and systematic manner. The notebooks of a general practitioner, now that the educational level for entering the medical profession is so good, would, I am sure, make most valuable reading; but the translation of their message from the private to the public—the collation in any public manner of things in themselves so often shrouded in professional secrecy—is a matter of such difficulty that at present the clinical experience of large numbers of our calling is but little exhibited for our instruction.

This, however, is a digression, and the point which I wish to bring again to your attention is that the winning of prizes and the passing of examinations mark the results of education at one stage of a long race—the earliest stage of that race. Those who look upon education as a short race, starting in the case of the medical man with his school curriculum and ending with registration, and consider the professional life that follows as a long but completely separate race—another item on the race-card—will hold on the soundest of sporting grounds that the man who wins the sprint need not win the staying contest. And in support of this self-evident proposition we have quoted to us the instances of the various failures in after-life of men who vastly flattered their friends and tutors at the outset of their careers. Those who regard education in a more comprehensive sense, as one long event beginning with the dawn of our consciousness and ending only as our senses and powers fail us, will regard prizes and success in examinations differently. They will see in them proofs of good training, and evidence that the competitors are gauging their strength aright and endeavouring to run the trying course with judgement; and they will appreciate after-successes in life at different stages in the long race with due regard to the way in which the whole track is being covered. Regarding education in this comprehensive way, as medical men must, we find that the two contrary acceptations of the value of examinations and prizes become at once reconcilable. Examinations and prizes have their necessary place in the early educational scheme, because they are a necessary part of our determination that no one shall enter the ranks of our profession who is not so far educated that he can take full advantage for his own benefit, and notably for the public benefit, of the greater tuition which is to proceed for him during the rest of his lifetime. Examinations are a means to this end and no more; prizes are an incentive to this end and no more. Their purport being so good—namely, the standardizing up to a proper level of the knowledge of those who enter our ranks—we ought to be very sure of our ground before we abuse the means or the incentive. But while we must recognize that examinations in their place are not only necessary things but good things, we are not obliged to acquiesce in their endless and vexatious multiplicity. And those of us who admit that examinations are a valuable—and, in fact, the only—way of testing our young men may also without inconsistency deplore the present tendency of the medical curriculum, the strictly student's curriculum, which leans towards over-examination. The system is too hardly worked, because of the unfortunate feeling that all the modern development of medical science, general and special, laboratorial and clinical, ought to be represented in the examination papers. The mesh of the net spread by the examiners has become too delicate; they catch in their elaborate toils too many. We need not commend the multiplicity of examinations any more than we need lay too much stress upon them.

There is an old story of a senior wrangler who happened to enter a playhouse at the same time as King George III, on the evening when the few newspapers of the time had chronicled the scholar's success at Cambridge. The senior wrangler solemnly bowed to the audience before he sat down, believing that the national anthem was being played out of compliment to himself. Inasmuch as we must all find that senior wrangler ridiculous, the story contains in itself an exact illustration of the points which I have been

labouring at too great a length to bring out. In Georgian days a senior wrangler was a made man. There was no need for him to do more. His college made him a Fellow for life, and he became its master, or a bishop, or a judge, or did nothing, exactly as he liked. His educational prize, won at the end of his first lap, counted as a success in the long race. We see how foolish it was now, but in times much nearer than those of Good King George it was perfectly in order for the successful scholar not to try to do anything more; and Thackeray's inimitable university snobs, viewed in this light, were not failures so much as victims of a narrow view.

I am aware that here I am on somewhat delicate ground, as I may seem to be regarding knowledge pursued for its own sake and with no materialistic proposal as of little account. I may seem to slight the erudition of a Porson prizeman who is no longer a made man because of his dexterity in iambics. This is not my desire at all. The subtlest classic and the most transcendental mathematician has his place in the scheme of our education in the broad humanities, and that place is, I think, comparable to the one occupied by the elaborate bio-chemist or statistical eugenist in medicine. Their knowledge is required by us as a reinforcement of ordinary learning, as a proof of its basis, as an index to the direction of its expansion. If such learning could be regarded as a thing apart we should have the right to ask what it is for, but no thinking man should take this view. So far from wishing to say a syllable against learning pursued for the sake of learning, with no eye to a market, I wish to protest against this undiscerning and huckstering attitude. It is unfortunate that the highest ranges of philosophical research seldom bring their due return in money, and their devotees must largely depend for their reward upon the sweetness of their labours, the keen and splendid delight in the exposition of the rarest wisdom.

The mountain sheep are sweeter but the valley sheep are fatter,

We therefore deemed it meet to carry off the latter,

sang the marauder. He was a wise man within his limits, for he knew what he wanted, but he was a marauder, and the triumphs won on the bleak mountain-top, though lean when viewed from a financial aspect, have a flavour of their own compared to which the more material victories of the valley are insipid. In the commercial world, where men are engaged in what Henry James has termed "the horrid vulgarity of getting in or getting out first," the creation of interests is too often intended merely to extinguish other interests. In the world of medicine the gains of one man are used for the good of all, and the supreme type of this altruism is the worker in the highest planes of research. Here, especially in this country, those engaged are far away from the pleasures and lures of tangible prizes. Unless the philosopher can by his learning show the capitalist or the shareholder how to transmute baser material into gold, it is little enough gold that he will get in return for his toil. And this is not because the exponent of the highest wisdom is necessarily a visionary, but because the application of his researches is never quickly obvious to a nation that is still in the ancient attitude regarding education—a nation which still believes that education is something like measles, which you get young and get done with. To such the man who continues in the laboratory or the library appears to be a sort of permanent invalid, removed by a malady of interesting duration from connexion with the real problems of life.

It is to my mind one of the greatest glories of modern medicine that we have taught our generation, as far as medicine is concerned, a broader view, for the whole story of pathological progress, which has been so striking during the last twenty years, may be summed up in the statement that scientific research of the highest and broadest kind in physics and chemistry—in which is included physiology—has been made to play a part in practical medicine, therapeutical and preventive. But although the profession of medicine is showing the way by which in its workaday proceedings the finest flowers of its philosophy can be gathered and used, the fact remains that prizes—material prizes—come no more in medicine than in other walks of life to the actual exponents of that philosophy. The simple way in which this great wrong could be in part set right would be by some wider

endowment of teaching. Into the hands of the leaders of our thought falls the duty of teaching our students, but the duty is largely discharged as a gratuitous one. The shortsightedness and false economy of encouraging students freely with exhibitions and scholarships, while making scanty provision for those who teach them, is simply an exhibition of the old and narrow view of education. The successful student is rewarded with prizes at the end of his first lap—if I may be allowed to harp on my obvious simile; "let him rejoice and be glad in them," for assuredly his strictly academic career will bring him few more emoluments. It is an absurdly wrong policy which leads wealthy and generous persons so much more frequently to found scholarships for the students than lectureships, readerships, fellowships, and professorial chairs for their teachers. Both are wanted, but the needs of the instructed always appear in this country to appeal much more powerfully to donors than the needs of the instructors—a position which seems not to obtain in the progressive educational centres of the United States. What right have we to expect that the highly endowed student will receive adequate instruction if we fail to endow his masters. The course of education is a long one. Those who once were the taught become the teachers; they have the right to expect some continuance of the encouragement which they received at the early stages of the race.

The value of prizes during the educational career is that they help us to standardize our candidates. They are the rewards of industry and intelligence, and in this way may stimulate study. And, above all things, to my mind they do great good to those who do not get them; they persuade those people, often unconsciously, to do better work. They raise the general level of learning by forming a direct object for assiduity. Probably the fact that those who win prizes at the beginning are not always those who do well afterwards has had too much stress laid upon it. With every apology for the obviousness of what I am now about to say, it must be pointed out that the future success of a prize-winner is so taken for granted—despite the cynicism that pretends to hold the other view—that the failure of a prize-winner in after-life is always chronicled as an event. It is talked of; it is remembered; it is used to prove that prize-winners often expend themselves hopelessly in their early efforts; and yet if such were often the case none of these particular episodes would be remembered and chronicled, for it would not be worth the trouble to do so. Similarly when the man who has won no academic or scholastic prizes of any sort comes to the front in later life, the very people who beg you to mark the fact that the race is not to the swift but to the enduring, and who quote proverbs about the glitter of base metal and the staying power of the tortoise and the depth of still water, prove by their puzzlement that the event is really in their minds a rare one. As a matter of fact, of course, as we all know when we pause for a moment to think, the men who make a good start do to a great extent throughout life enjoy the advantage of that start; the fallacy lies in our not remembering how long the race is. To win prizes is only to lead at the first lap, but to say this is not to depreciate their significance; and, indeed, I now ask you to join with me in congratulating the prize-winners of the day upon the just due with which their efforts have been crowned.

A humorist once said, with regard to the success of a lady of fashion, that she progressed in comparative degrees: First she got on, then she got honour, and then she got honest. The process by which success is achieved in the great profession to which we belong is reversed, and all three degrees of comparison may never be reached. But, first, we must be honest, then we shall get honour; and lastly, though it does not follow, we shall get on. And it is not so perfectly easy to be honest at first. The medical curriculum is an exceedingly strenuous test. There is a multiplicity of subjects to be dealt with. There is confessedly inadequate time within which to acquire more than the rudiments of any of them. There is therefore an enormous temptation before every student to slur over the difficult parts, to quote in parrot-wise the phraseology of others in which to clothe personal nakedness. The very scope of the schedule within which examination questions may be set makes the neglect of numerous subjects a matter of no great risk, and many a man

among you here has left out whole slabs of a textbook with a fervent "hope that we shan't get that in the paper." Faced with this situation, the honest, or I should perhaps say *wise*, student—for here the two adjectives have the same meaning—resolves that, come what may, he will understand what he sees, what he hears, and what he reads before he proceeds to the next stage in his education. This costs him a great deal and entails upon him a rigorous process of self-examination, a determination to know himself, which constitutes his wisdom. There are things which he must know and must never forget. He will go over them until they are a very part of himself, despite the drudgery of the process. There are points which are not clear to him although they appear to be perfectly clear to his fellows. He must not be ashamed to ask, and, if necessary, to ask in public, very simple questions. In this way he lays a solid foundation for future knowledge until he finds perhaps, when erecting some higher structure upon this foundation, that he has not built so well as he thought. Later reading and later clinical experience prove to him that he has not grasped part of his back work; that he has misread it; or that he has accepted it without understanding it. Back he must go to the foundations, and cement them or shore them up, regardless of the labour and expense entailed. Here we have drudgery, accompanied possibly with a dispiriting sense of failure, but the student who is honest—that is, the student who is wise—faces the situation, and is repaid by finding that, when he returns to the higher work on which he was engaged, he can execute his task with an ease and a pleasure unknown to him before he had the support of the feeling of security. The next stage follows, and honours come; such honours as those which we have this afternoon seen distributed, and the significance of which, viewed in this light, becomes quite clear. Prizes are the sign that the student is learning to know himself; that he has subdued the natural tendency to go in the direction of the least resistance, and has determined to attack and master the allotted task. Prizes do not prove that he has succeeded in life, but they indicate that he has properly prepared himself to do so. In the long race many prize winners are passed by those who did not start so brilliantly, but let us not forget that it was the example of the prize winners, their methods, and their conception of mental training which aroused in others a proper spirit of emulation. To discuss whether the man who began as being honest, and who early acquired honour, will, in the end, get on, would be to discuss the whole race of life, and we are here only considering the early stages. But it is my belief, and I hope to carry you with me, that the honesty of purpose, the self-denial, in short the wisdom, of the prize winner, in most cases stays by him during life. Gentlemen, in our education, that education which ends only with the grave, let us echo the desire of David that our days may be so numbered that we shall incline our hearts unto Wisdom.

An Address

ON

WOMAN'S SPHERE IN MEDICINE.

DELIVERED AT THE LONDON SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
FOR WOMEN.

BY

E. W. ROUGHTON, B.S.LOND., F.R.C.S.,
SURGEON TO THE ROYAL FREE HOSPITAL.

AFTER some preliminary remarks Mr. Roughton said: The distinguishing feature of this school is that it is for women students and for women only. It is therefore appropriate that I should say something about medicine as a profession for women, and about the suitability of women for medical work. Of late one has heard so much about the equality of the sexes that one can hardly help thinking that in the minds of many people sex distinction is chiefly a matter of costume and political disability. For such, medicine is just one of the numerous occupations which may be taken up equally well by male or female.

On the other hand, there are still some old-fashioned people who believe that woman's place is in the home, and that no occupations outside the domestic sphere are suitable for her. They are apt to forget that owing to the preponderance of the female sex there are not enough husbands to go round; moreover, there is no reason why a woman should get married if she prefers to remain single and earn her own living. Sixty years ago it may have been necessary for Bob Sawyer to engage in pugilism, cock-fighting, wrenching off door-knockers, and such like pastimes in order to make himself sufficiently brutal to be able to perform a major operation whilst the patient was writhing and shrieking in agony. Such a profession was scarcely suitable for the Early Victorian young woman, whose chief occupation seems to have been keeping her hands white and making her mouth a pretty shape by diligently repeating the words "pears," "prunes," and "prisms." The invention of anaesthetics and antiseptics has made surgery a gentle art which can be practised by the most tender-hearted man or woman.

Over and above the fact that medicine is a suitable profession for woman, there is a very cogent reason why there should be a female section of the profession. I suppose that everybody (including even the opponents of medical women) would agree that it is desirable that women should be attended by persons of their own sex, if only one could be sure that the female practitioner was as efficient and reliable as the male. The need for medical women in countries where men are not allowed to attend the female sex is, of course, obvious. Custom accounts for a good deal, and I feel sure that the present custom of women being attended by men has only grown up through sheer necessity, and that when in the course of time there is a plentiful supply of medical women, people will wonder how their grandmothers could have submitted to the services of the male obstetrician and gynaecologist.

Although there are many ailments where the sex question hardly comes in, I feel strongly that the more the sexes are separated in medical matters the better. For my own part, I should be glad to see a complete division of male from female in hospital work. The example set by the New Hospital for Women is an excellent one. I should like to see the male counterpart—namely, a hospital for men, with male officers and nurses; but I very much doubt whether a sufficient number of men would ever be found with the necessary qualities for making good nurses; but that question, though an interesting one, is outside the scope of this address.

I also think that mixed classes of medical students are undesirable, and I congratulate you on having joined a school where there are women students only. I would go even further, and would say that it is desirable that your teachers should all be women; at present such perfection is not possible, but it will come some day.

Granting, then, that medicine is a suitable profession for women, the next consideration is the suitability of women for the profession. Many women will, no doubt, be inclined to dismiss the question by saying confidently, "Of course they are suitable, just the same as men." I crave your indulgence for a few minutes in order to discuss this question, for, although I shall arrive at very nearly the same conclusion, I may be able to lay before you some propositions attention to which may tend to increase your suitability for the profession you are aspiring to enter. First, let me remind you that there are radical differences between the sexes, and that these differences are not comprised by what are usually known as the primary sexual characters; there are other differences between male and female, which are called secondary sexual characters. Some of these are self-evident and therefore well known; for instance, the greater muscular development of the male, the deeper voice, the beard, and so on. These obvious characters have little or no bearing on the practice of medicine.

There are other more subtle differences between the sexes, which are sometimes known as tertiary sexual characters, and which, I think, are more important in deciding the suitability of the sex for the work in question. These characters are especially worthy of attention, because they are not so radical and unalterable as the more obvious secondary characters; they are, to a large extent, capable of being influenced by education and by discipline. In order to understand them, it is