

known of uterine disease, and as to treatment, it consisted of little more than in exposing the cervix uteri, and applying to its vaginal surface, if it happened to be abraded, a solution of nitrate of silver, or of some other mild caustic. Of disease of the body of the uterus almost nothing, of its anterior absolutely nothing was known. A morbid, and as we now know, an unfounded dread existed of attempting to interfere with, or to investigate the condition of the cavity of the uterus. All this is now changed. We know that disease of the cervix uteri is of less frequent occurrence, and of less serious import than that of the body, and that its cavity may with impunity be trespassed on, and disease occurring within it successfully combated. Without doubt the most important practical result of the teachings of Sir James Simpson is this, that we do not now hesitate to dilate the uterus and investigate the condition of its interior, when symptoms indicative of serious mischief within the organ require us to do so.

I am well aware that by some practitioners the dilatation of the uterus is still looked on with dread, and that the attempt, if made at all, is undertaken with the greatest hesitation. I can only say that I believe these fears to be groundless, and that, if due care be taken to select suitable cases, and proper methods of carrying out the process be adopted, the treatment is a safe as well as a justifiable one. My own experience in the dilatation of the uterus has been great. I have practiced it very frequently indeed during the last ten years, and as yet in no single instance has a bad symptom followed, nor have I even once been compelled to abandon the attempt. But I am far from throwing doubt on the accuracy of the statements made by others, who have recorded the occurrence of alarming symptoms, or even of death, as consequent on the attempt to dilate the cervix uteri; and I am quite prepared for the possible occurrence of such, for all are aware that cases must occur in which the most trifling exciting cause will be followed by serious symptoms, though no grounds existed beforehand for anticipating the occurrence of such. But these are exceptional, and I believe, as a rule, that when serious symptoms arise, either during the process or in consequence of dilatation of the cervix uteri, they do so either because an unsuitable subject has been selected in whom to practice the treatment, or an unwise method adopted for carrying it out. On examining the records of the cases in which serious or unpleasant symptoms followed the attempt to dilate the uterus, I find they have generally occurred when practised,

1st. Either for the relief of dysmenorrhœa depending on the existence of a narrow cervical canal;

2nd. When the cervical canal is encroached

on by a fibroid of large size and unyielding structure;

3rd. When the process has been attempted to be carried out rapidly by means of metallic dilators; or,

4th. When it has been protracted over several days.

I have, therefore, in order to guard as far as possible against the serious results recorded by others as following attempts to dilate the uterus, laid down for myself the following rules, which I can recommend with confidence to others.

1. Never to dilate the cervix uteri for the cure of dysmenorrhœa or sterility depending on a narrow cervical canal or conical cervix.

2. Never to dilate in cases in which a large and dense intramural fibroid presses on and partially obliterates the cervical canal.

3. Never to use metallic dilators of any kind, but to choose for the purpose either sponge, or sea-tangle tents, which expand slowly and gradually.

4. Never to continue the process of dilatation for more than forty-eight hours. I prefer, in the few cases I have met with in which, after the lapse of that time, the cervix was not sufficiently open to suit the purposes I had in view, to postpone all operative interference for some weeks, rather than risk the result by prolonging the dilating process.

With respect to the first of these rules, I look upon the treatment of what is termed "mechanical dysmenorrhœa" by dilatation as being altogether a mistake. I doubt if any permanent benefit has ever resulted from it; while in several cases grave symptoms, and in one death, has to my knowledge followed the attempt. Equally, it is of importance not to prolong the dilating process. My own experience of the treatment of uterine disease requiring dilatation leads me to this conclusion, that unpleasant symptoms are likely to occur in a direct ratio to the length of time over which the process of dilatation extends. Again, I have known death to follow the attempt to dilate the uterus in a case where a large fibroid of dense structure, giving rise to menorrhagia and causing intense pain, was developed in the uterus, and encroached on the cervical canal. In such cases, dilatation is doubly objectionable, because the process is useless as well as dangerous; useless, because you will generally find that any attempt at operative interference from the interior of the uterus will be impossible; and dangerous, because inflammation is liable to follow, and that too in patients in the worse possible condition for resisting the attack.

Hardly second in importance to the knowledge that the uterus may be with safety dilated to an extent sufficient to enable us to remove large tumours, is the fact of which we are now certain, that remedies of even a powerful nature may, not alone with impunity, but