

cleanliness in every detail of my work. I trust no nurses or servants without overlooking, and am constantly and at unexpected times turning up carpets, taking down shelves, and rooting out cupboards. In this way, and by a process of weeding, I have obtained a large staff of good servants, and have formed a large establishment in which every available precaution is secured. I can give no other reasons than these for my success, and probably they will commend themselves to you.

There are some causes intrinsic to the work itself from which the success has sprung to a large extent, and of which a few words may here be said with advantage. The first, of course, is the discontinuance of the clamp, of which I have said a great deal elsewhere. Whatever Sir Spencer Wells may say to the contrary, neither with nor without Listerism would anybody go back to the clamp. But the curious thing is that, from our recent experiences in hysterectomy, it would appear that it is not so much the clamp that has been to blame as Mr. Spencer Wells' method of using it. Hysterectomy must always be a more serious operation than an ovariectomy. But Dr. Bantock has now obtained better results in removing the uterus with the clamp than Mr. Spencer Wells ever got in removing simple ovarian tumours, and we must bear in mind that Mr. Wells always insisted that he used the clamp for his simplest cases with long and easy pedicles. Puzzling over this mysterious and startling contrast, I went to see Dr. Bantock operate, and amongst other things I found he had given up using perchloride of iron for the purpose of tanning the stump. I asked him why he had done so, and he told me he was quite sure that the use of the perchloride of iron had added greatly to the mortality of the clamp, because with a thick pedicle secured by a clamp it is impossible to accurately close the abdominal wound and prevent draining into the cavity. I did not at once accept Dr. Bantock's explanation, but I determined to use the perchloride no more. Like everybody else, I was prejudiced in favour of the statement made by Mr. Spencer Wells, that a putrefying stump would poison the wound; and therefore I could not make up my mind to allow it to remain without some kind of interference. Years ago, in blaming the clamp for our high mortality, I had pointed out the likelihood of this incomplete closure as being one of the causes, if not

the chief cause, of death; but I certainly did not suspect the perchloride of iron as being the fatal agent. A few days after my interview with Dr. Bantock I had to perform a hysterectomy, and I dressed the stump with crystals of thymol. The patient died of peritonitis on the fourth day, and that the thymol had trickled into her peritoneum we had proof enough. Since then I have done a hysterectomy without dressing the stump at all, and the patient has done perfectly well. It will be curious and no less instructive, if we find Dr. Bantock to be right, and that the use of perchloride of iron, the only contribution Sir Spencer Wells has ever made to abdominal surgery, should turn out to be the cause of his tremendous mortality. In any case, it is a remarkable example of how absurdly we are all governed by *a priori* statements absolutely void of any argument in support of them, and having been made by some one with an authoritative name and position, are accepted without doubt. If Dr. Bantock's brilliant results are obtained by others in the same way, then we have been going on destroying women with perchloride of iron merely because Mr. Spencer Wells said we should use it.

As the whole aspect of abdominal surgery is, at the present moment, controversial—as the progress and practice of this part of our art form the chief objects of my life, you need not be surprised if I have made this address somewhat of a polemic. The greatness of the opportunity—the fact that an address given to you will be read where mere utterances of mine would be passed by—obliged me to take advantage of the opportunity you have given me to carry on the discussion. The course of this particular line of work has, as you are all aware, taken a sudden bound of activity within the last few years, and the reason is a very simple one. The immense success of the removals of ovarian tumors such as threatened to destroy life with absolute certainty, which followed the efforts of Baker Brown and Keith, led some of us, myself especially, to venture into regions where life was not necessarily, or, at least, not apparently threatened, but where suffering was persistent and unendurable, and where the sufferers had been proved by protracted trial to be outside the powers of ordinary remedial measures. In a recent paper by Sir Spencer Wells, published in the *Med. Times and Gazette*, the argument is completely dislocat-