

If the disease has involved the lymphatic vessels and glands, the chances of cure are materially diminished, but in many such cases an operation has proved to be of great service in relieving suffering and prolonging life for months, and in some cases from one to two or three years.

After the local disease has existed a sufficient length of time to contaminate the blood and infect the general system, a cure by an operation or by any other method is absolutely hopeless. Great progress has been made in successful surgery within the past few years by a resort to the operation at the earliest possible period—that is, so soon as the existence of the disease can be determined. The most recent and probably the most authoritative writer on this subject, Mr. Butlin, of London, asserts that every week of delay increases the danger of the contraction of various adhesions, of affection of the secondary glands, and of the formation of secondary growths. But duration alone is not a conclusive argument against the success of an operation, for, as the same author adds, “when long duration of a malignant tumor is associated with a very slow progress, small size, absence of serious adhesions, absence of affection of the neighbouring lymphatic glands and of secondary growths, so much the more favorable is the prospect of permanent relief from operation for its removal.” The question of the locality of the growth is one of great importance in forming a decision as to the necessity and probable success of removal, and will always be carefully and conscientiously weighed before a decision is made. These malignant growths may appear in any tissue of the body, external or internal, and eminent surgeons of this city, as elsewhere, have removed them, with all the success anticipated, from muscles, bones, lymphatic glands, the eye, the face, the lower lip, the tongue, the breast, and other external organs.

If this were a fitting opportunity and time would permit, I am sure all present would be interested in hearing an account of such as I have personal knowledge of, either from my own observation or from a knowledge derived directly from the operations. But such details would be inappropriate on the present occasion, and I am compelled to deny myself the pleasure of paying a just tribute to the skill and sound judgment of surgeons that we have in our city.

Dr. S. W. Gross, of Philadelphia, asserts: “The convictions are steadily gaining ground that this disease in the breast is primarily a local affection and not a constitutional one, and that these views are supported by many of the most eminent men living; pathologists such as Virchow, of Berlin; Billroth, of Vienna; Fersche, of Breslau; Esmarch, of Kiel; Nussbaum, of Munich; Volkmann, of Halle; Erichsen, Hutchinson, Gull, Simon, Bryant, Green, and others, of London, and the late

Dr. Goss and Dr. Parker, Dr. Peters, Dr. Moore, Dr. Richardson, and others, in the United States, have shown by the statistics of their own practice and that of others the usefulness and success of the surgical removal of the disease. But, as I have before said, removal of the disease by operation is not restricted to external organs, but many operations for removal of internal organs have been performed with all the success that could be anticipated, although, it must be added, there have been many failures. On November 14th, three weeks ago, I was present when one of the medical board of this hospital performed one of the most difficult operations ever attempted in surgery—viz: the entire removal of a most important internal organ. I had previously seen the patient, and concurred in the opinion that the operation was imperatively necessary, and that it offered a fair promise of success; I may add that the opinion of the operator and myself was given independently, each without the knowledge of the other. This patient, as I have learned within a few days, has had no unfavorable symptoms which have retarded her convalescence. It is possible that she may hereafter escape any return of the disease. It is certain that her life has been prolonged, and that she has been saved from months or perhaps years of suffering, which would have soon ended her days. A fair number of cases have been reported in which such results have been attained. And yet so late as fifteen years ago any proposal to attempt such an operation would have been condemned by the universal sentiment of the profession; and if it had been attempted and resulted in failure, the public would have denounced the operator as a reckless, unscrupulous butcher, who had no conscience as regards the result to his patient, but simply sought personal glory in the *éclat* of having performed a wonderful operation. All of us have before heard such language applied to surgeons.

The case which now commands the most universal sympathy and interest in all nations of the world, is that of the Crown Prince of Prussia. It is an unparalleled event in history that three men, two of whom had been at the head of the government of their respective nations, and the third whose probable inheritance was an empire, should each have been victims to malignant disease, in contiguous localities differing only in some minor details, at the same period in the world's history. In the case of President Grant, the locality of the malignant growth was such that it was decided by most competent authority that from the beginning a successful removal by surgery was not practicable, as the danger from such an attempt would be much greater than the probability of any benefit. During the illness of General Grant I received a letter from the brother-in-law of Dom Ferdinand, ex-King of Portugal, and his attending sur-