

**FEMALE DOCTORS—AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO THE
CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—
VIEWS OF THE ADVOCATES FOR AND AGAINST THE MOVE-
MENT—SPIRITED DISCUSSIONS.**

For several years the subject of admitting representatives from Female Medical Colleges as delegates to the American Medical Association has been a matter of serious consideration, and on Thursday, May 4th, it was again brought up by an amendment proposed by Dr. Hartshorne, of Philadelphia, at the last annual session. Following is a report of the discussion which followed:

IN FAVOR OF ADOPTION.

Dr. Harding, of Indiana, moved the adoption of this resolution amending the Constitution, viz.: "Nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prevent delegates from colleges in which women are taught and graduated in medicine, and hospitals in which medical women graduates attend, from being received into this Association."

The President: That is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution?

Dr. Harding: Certainly. It requires the action of this Body, however, to make it an amendment. It has been laid over for one year.

I have but a word or two to say in relation to this question, a question which is at issue before the country and before this Association. It has been termed a vexed question. It has been before the Association the last year, the year before, and the year before that, and it is a question that is growing in importance and magnitude. For one, as a member of this Association, I am anxious to see this vexed question determined and settled, and I think this Association owes it to itself to meet fairly and squarely an issue of this kind.

For myself I can see no good reason, if female practitioners of medicine are graduated under as high a standard of requirements as male members of the profession, why they should not be regarded as legally and in fact members of the medical profession.

There is one view of the question that occurs to my mind, which I would like to present and urge upon this Association, and that is, that the sphere of female influence and usefulness is widening and expanding throughout American Society. We all realize that, and it is an aspect of the female character and its usefulness, I think, which is not to be regretted, and in my estimation not to be repressed, and the cold shoulder is not to be turned to it; on the contrary, in its proper and legitimate sphere it should receive the encouragement and the God-speed

of us all; not specially or particularly in the department of medicine, but in everything else.

However we may regard that question, it is an issue before the country, and before this Association. We have ignored it and thrust it aside year by year, and now it becomes us, in a dignified and manly spirit, to meet this question, which is on trial before the tribunal of this Association, and before the country. The idea I wished to suggest to the Society is this: That the widening and extending influence of females in this country, its increasing intelligence and influence cannot be readily thrust aside. There are female applicants for place and for recognition in the regular medical institutions of the country, and that influence we cannot suppress if we would; but if it is shut out, or thrust out from the avenues and thoroughfares of legitimate medicine, it will go to that *ism* or that *pathy*, and the best interests of the science of medicine will be injured by our want of liberality by which we refuse to receive females seeking admission, legitimately and legally, into the ranks of the regular profession. If we thrust them aside, we drive them into homœopathy, into irregular medicine, into empiricism. Let us meet the question like men, in a spirit of liberality and chivalry.

ARGUMENT AGAINST THE AMENDMENT.

Professor N. S. Davis, of Illinois: I hope the question will not be taken until the Association is sure that it understands the full bearings of the adoption of this amendment. I have no personal, or, at least, no strong personal predilections as to how this question shall be settled, so that we understand fully the full meaning, scope, and final result that may follow from the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment is worded so as to state that the Constitution and By-Laws shall not be construed to prevent any college or any hospital that permits females to attend lectures, or graduates from female colleges to attend them under instruction, from being admitted as members of this Body. Now, this

question comes before us from an institution in Philadelphia, but there are many others besides those females in Philadelphia. There are hospitals in which female physicians are operating. There is a hospital in Chicago in which females hold the same relations, and there is a college in New York devoted exclusively to the education of females in medicine. There is another in Philadelphia, and another in Chicago, and I do not know how many more. I speak of these simply that we may comprehend what we are doing. The meaning of that resolution, if adopted, is that those institutions are all eligible to send delegates to this Body, to meet with us here. So far, those institutions which have sent delegates here have not sent females, but men, male representatives, men unexceptionable in their character, men against whom, so far as they are concerned, no fault that I know of can be alleged; but it must be remembered, if we adopt that amendment, it opens the door by which any institution can at any time, instead of sending us a male delegate, send us any female members of their Faculties to sit with us in this Body, and it would undoubtedly result before another year, or at least before two years rolled around, and very likely at our next session, that some of those institutions would send female delegates to participate in our proceedings. I am not saying that they should not do so. I am only stating what would be the legitimate result, so that we can vote understandingly.

Now, Mr. President, let every one consider fairly and fully whether the time has come or not that we, as the great representative Body of this profession in our country, are ready by deliberate action to open the door and welcome the female portion of the community, not only into our profession, but into all the professions? Is the time come? Do we desire it ever to come? Is there any difference in the sexes? Were they designed for any different spheres? Are we to heed that law plainly imprinted upon the human race, or are we, as a Body, to yield to the popular breeze of the times, and say it must come, and therefore we will yield to it? Now, I make no

comparison between the sexes; I claim that there is no comparison to be made. The female in her proper sphere is just as far superior to man, as man in his sphere is superior to woman. [Applause.] You, sir, and I, can no more do properly the work that God designed for woman than she can do the work designed for you and me to do. [Applause.]

RESULT OF THIS SPIRIT.

What will be the result of yielding to this spirit? The result will not only be in one direction, that we are to open the occupation for women to come up, as they term it—though it is not up in my estimate at all, but it is looked upon as coming up by some—to give her the right to come into the profession, but we are to break down the barriers, we are to destroy that which God has imprinted upon our race as the distinction between male and female in the operations of this world. It is not merely that she is to come into the circle of lawyers and into the profession of medicine, but she is to go into the pulpit, the rostrum, and on to the platform; and there is another direction in which she must come in, and that is, she must come in the direction of the school, the spade, and every avocation of life. The great distinctive feature, impressed upon civilization by the religion given to us, by our Christian character, has tended at every step to lift woman, to bring her from the position of slavery and degradation that barbarism put upon her, to that lofty pinnacle where, with reverence, we bow in homage to her, in that condition whereby with her influence she makes her impress upon the youth of our land. Let her remain in that sphere; let her make that impress; let her status and her mission in the world be held sacred; let no man anywhere say aught against her ability or her dignity in regard to her mission, but do not let us yield to popular clamor about woman's rights, or man's rights, or anybody else's rights, and by so doing stultify the laws of the universe. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. President, these are, plainly, my sentiments. I said, in rising, that I had no strong predilections in the matter. I am not prejudiced, because I have lectured to women in the

same class with men day after day in the lecture-room in the Medical College, and I have stripped patients' chests, and women have examined and have listened with the stethoscope to their ears, and have attended to the whole subject matter, and in other cases I have not reserved anything which I should have said if they were not there, but after all the experience which I have had, and I say it plainly, that experience has caused me, and those acting with me, to decide to have no mixture of the sexes. The experience I have had teaches me that, and I think the world would be better, civilization would go on faster, and men and women would be better off if each sex were to act in its own proper sphere, and do not lend our influence to the popular clamor. I say it would be well if men and women would stop the eternal wrangling about rights, and each would ask his or her own conscience a little more day by day, What is my duty and what are my obligations?

Dr. Donahue, of Iowa, moved to lay the resolution upon the table.

The Vice-President (Dr. Weatherly) in the chair: The motion is not debatable.

Dr. Davis: I hope there will be no disposition manifested to cut off debate.

Dr. Donahue withdraws the motion to lay on the table.

ARRAYED ON THE SIDE OF WOMAN.

Dr. James King, of Pittsburg: I am not accustomed to speaking on this question of woman's petition. It has been so much brought up in the Society of Pennsylvania—the State Medical Society—that I want it settled, and I rise for the purpose of stating somewhat of what is the attitude of that question in our city.

It has been debated in our Society for a number of years, every year warmly and earnestly debated, and when the vote was taken I remember, on one occasion, it stood 47 on one side and 45 on the other—a majority of two against the woman. Such arguments as have been urged by the learned gentleman, who has just taken his seat, I have heard repeatedly over and

over there, and I have generally found myself arrayed on the side of the woman. I think, sir, that this war against the women is beneath the dignity of a learned Society of scientific men. It would better become us if we would go with General Crooke to Arizona to fight the Indians if we must gratify our bellicose dispositions, rather than to carry on this war against women.

Mr. President, I agree perfectly with the gentleman who has taken his seat. That woman in her sphere is superior to man, and man in his sphere is superior to woman; I would sustain that proposition with as much earnestness as he has done; but the gist of the question, after all, is: What is woman's sphere? Perhaps the gentleman has obtained his idea of it from India. A woman in India never appears in the street unless veiled, and never appears in the parlor of her lord; her place is back in the kitchen, or in the open field,

"Doomed by the law of man to toil,
Grouped with the beast and fettered to the soil."

That is the idea of woman's sphere in India, but the tendency of Christian civilization everywhere has been to lift her out of degradation to which man would consign her.

Now, sir, is not the practice of medicine an honorable calling? Is it not a noble calling? Is there anything that does not call forth all there is in the heart of a man or all there is in the heart of a woman? What is there in it that is degrading? Sir, if I thought it was degrading, I should abandon it to-day. It is an honorable and noble calling, and there are some gifted minds in it who ignore the distinctions of sex or complexion, and hold that it is beneath the dignity of an honorable Association like this to repress this rising tendency—that it is beneath the dignity of that profession to say: "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther." It is said:

"When pain and anguish wring the brow,
A ministering angel thou."

That she is all very well as a nurse, but, say they: "You cannot come in as a physician, not at all; you have not mind

enough." This is the argument. *We* have the intellect—not the women; they are poor silly runners after fashion, and what do they know about intellect? Why, sir, it is because woman has been kept in the background—because she has been kept down, that she has not manifested her superior intellect. I have read some of the writings of one of the professors in the *Womans' Medical School*, which Dr. Thomas comes here to represent, and I must say, so far as my judgment goes, those writings are equal to the writings of any other professors in Philadelphia, in the way of pith and point.

Now, Mr. President, I want to see this question settled, and I want this war against woman ended. To show the tendency of this thing, I will give you an illustration of an important question that occurred in Williamsport, Lycoming county, Pennsylvania. There was a lady professor of acknowledged merit, highly educated in her profession—a lady who had no disposition to do anything else than pursue the code of ethics, so called. There was a friend of mine, a worthy physician in that place, who was applied to as a consulting physician, and he went to visit the patient of this lady, and the reason why he was asked to do so, was that he had experience in just such cases; he went into the room, and what did he do? Why, just what he was bound to do by the laws of the Medical Society of Pennsylvania, that is, if we stand by its law, he was bound by those rules to turn her off: "Turn that woman out of the house, and I will come in and attend to the case!" Sir, I would rather have cut off my right arm than have done so mean a thing; the meanest and most contemptible thing that a highly educated and honorable physician could do; the meanest possible thing for a physician to say in regard to his juniors, or in regard to one who in other respects would associate upon an equality with him, and especially in regard to a woman, who is excluded by the rules of the Society, is to say: "Walk out of the room, and let me have the case; you are not recognized, and I have the right to attend to it." Sir, an honorable and educated physician will never do such a thing as that. Now, sir, let us not

stultify ourselves in this regard. I find, in reading over a document, which I have in my hand, an account of a hospital in Philadelphia, and the medical staff of that hospital is headed by the name of Mrs. Ann Preston, and I see among the consulting physicians of that Institution, presided over by female physicians, the name of the honorable President of the American Medical Association, the gentleman who adorns the chair, and who delivered to us yesterday so eloquent a speech, Alfred Stille, M. D., Ellwood Wilson, Albert H. Smith, Henry Hartshorne, John Forsyth Meigs, Thomas G. Morton, and S. Weir Mitchell. Now, can you find a nobler set of men belonging to the medical profession in the city of Philadelphia? I trow not. And these gentlemen are the consulting physicians, in violation of a resolution which stands upon record in the Philadelphia Medical Society, which resolution visits the penalty of expulsion upon any member who will consult with a female physician. We have a woman in the chair of that Institution, and the distinguished Professor of the Practice of Medicine in the University of Philadelphia, Dr. Stille, a man who adorns that position, does not hesitate to consult with female physicians; certainly it is a thing he has a right to do, and under certain circumstances. Now, sir, having elevated him to that position, I say we have to recognize his position in this respect, otherwise we stultify ourselves by this war upon women. [Applause.]

A VOICE FROM CALIFORNIA.

Professor Henry Gibbons, of San Francisco, Cal.: It has been several years since I commenced active practice—in the early period of my life—and I never yet stood upon a platform in which this question was brought up, but upon this occasion I am inclined to place myself upon the record in regard to this question, whether popular or unpopular, in respect to profession or the outside world.

I have listened, I must confess, with some degree of surprise to some of the remarks that have been here offered by my worthy friend, Dr. Davis—a man who holds almost the highest place in the profession. He rather astonished me by assuming

the position he had, and which savored very much of that kind of logic attributed yesterday by our worthy President to the female sex, an *ad captandum* form of argument, alluding to the terrible position in which we should be thrown if a woman should come here as a delegate to this Society and claim a seat by our sides. The terrible picture which he presented, I have no doubt, almost caused the blood to curdle in the veins of some in this room. I almost forgot at the moment, carried away by his enthusiasm, that my mother was a woman, and that I had any respect for that class of animals, existing in creation, known as woman; further than that, he linked the question at present under consideration with the idea of female suffrage, female voting, and he told us of females aspiring to every department in life. This is exactly in accordance with the old *ad captandum* style of argument which he has himself, doubtless, heard and answered a thousand times in days past, when he stood up for the rights of man, irrespective of color: "Would you have your daughter marry a 'nigger?'" There is the whole gist of the argument on that point in regard to this Association. I have never gone as far as my friend has; I have never taught mixed classes of males and females; I have never stripped a "subject" upon the dissecting table in the presence of both men and women who are students; and, what is more, I am never likely to. It is not likely that I shall ever do it. I have never gone so far in that respect as my brother, Dr. Davis; I acknowledge a limit in these things. There are certain limitations in regard to the position of women in the profession which I do acknowledge, and the idea of teaching them in mixed classes, the promiscuous intermingling of them in our schools and hospitals I utterly repudiate. [Applause.] But when it comes to the abstract right of a woman to study medicine, and to perfect herself in the science and art, and to be acknowledged on a par with man, if she shows herself to be his equal, I cannot, for the life of me, see what reasonable objection there can be to such a proposition as that. I am not jealous of the ascendancy of woman. If a woman can teach herself, or be

taught, the science of medicine; if she can perfect herself in the healing art, and comes forward in the same circle of society in which I move, I am not going to repudiate her because she is a woman. If she is capable of competing with me, I will allow her a chance of competition, and I will not trample her under foot because she is not dressed in breeches. [Applause.]

THE COURSE IT IS TAKING.

Mr. President, standing here, as I do, upon the extreme verge of our continent—and looking abroad over the world—as I think, with an impartial eye, not within the whirl and confusion of this question as it has been agitating our brethren in the Atlantic States, standing here impartially, as I consider, looking at the great field of action over the world, looking at the course things are taking, looking at the progress that has been made within a few years past, by the female sex, in this direction of medical education, and being capable, as I conceive myself, of considering it with some degree of impartiality—placing my hands every day upon journals from different parts of the world, observing the course that this question has taken in the world, everywhere, seeing that a very large number of the brightest lights of the medical profession are favorable to giving license to women, in regard to the practice of medicine and education as physicians, observing what is going on in the old countries in Europe—in London, where Mrs. Garrett, Doctress Garrett, if you will, received the highest vote of merit in the London Board of Education, and in that Board she has acquitted herself so well as to be, it is stated, the most popular member of the Board, speaking, it is said, only when proper, and withholding expression with remarkable judgment; seeing that in Edinburgh and in other parts of the Old World the doors of the medical schools are more and more opened every day to the medical education of women; seeing that where women have had these chances of rising with man on the platform of medical education, they have almost invariably done the profession honor and themselves credit, and become highly respected in the circles in which they moved; seeing that in America the

cause of female education has been going forward at a rapid rate, promoted rather than retarded by the resistance presented by medical authority, I think the day is come, Mr. President, I think the day is finally come upon us when we must admit, to some extent, the prevailing sentiment as to the propriety of female education; and in receiving it, as we are now doing, we are cutting ourselves off from the aid of a large number of individuals who would be honorable to the profession and useful to us when associated with us; and not only that, but we are weakening the bonds connecting us with many of our brethren who are the brightest luminaries within the horizon of medicine, who are associated, as in the case of President Stille and other eminent men in Philadelphia, with female institutions. Now, are we prepared to do this? The longer you oppose resistance to this current, the stronger it becomes by opposing it. We shall add the force of Niagara to the current that is coming down upon us, upon this question of female education, and the result will be, if we persevere in maintaining the position we now hold, that we shall not only fail in accomplishing our purpose, but we shall ourselves be swept away by the current. [Applause.]

Apart from principle, there is something due to policy. I would not give up principle for the sake of policy at all, but where principle and policy coincide, there, I say, it is proper and legitimate to look a little to the question of policy. I do not wish to prolong these remarks with regard to the time that is before me, and I have not a long time before me in my career, but I have examined this question, I think, fully and impartially, and I wish to place myself upon the record in the position which I have defined here at this time. I feel confident whether it is regarded as a matter of policy or a matter of principle. I feel confident as to what the coming day will do. It will not do what the clamorous advocates of woman's rights are now aiming to accomplish—that I am willing to acknowledge—but it will do something, it will bring forward the female sex on an equality with man on the score of medical education

when the parties are properly deserving of being thus put forward. That is what it will do. That is the only point I am aiming at here, and I want my friends here, men who have been old acquaintances of mine, and whom I have not seen for twenty-five or thirty years until I had the unspeakable enjoyment of taking them by the hand during this Convention, to know where I stand on this occasion at the present time, and I want to be placed upon the record on this question in view of the coming time—the time when our children will settle it irrespective of the action we may take at the present moment.

OPPOSITION TO THE ADMISSION.

Professor Johnson, of Missouri: I have listened with pleasure to the discussion of the amendment of our Constitution with regard to woman, and I confess, sir, that my mind is not fully made up upon it. Nevertheless, it is sufficiently so to enable me to state my own impressions with reference to this question, and what should guide us to a proper solution of it.

In the first place, I do not understand that woman has asked admission to this floor. We have had delegates sent by the medical schools of Philadelphia, or the Societies there, but they have had male representatives, and I believe, if I am correctly informed, that they were not admitted at the first meeting at which they were proposed for admission, and from the fact that they were not admitted, this amendment was proposed by one of the delegates who was denied admission as a delegate, but simply claimed the privilege of offering it as a permanent member. Now, sir, I am wholly opposed to the admission of women here. I am willing to accord to them every right and every privilege that, as citizens, they claim under the Constitution of the United States of America; I would not throw an obstacle in the way of a woman being admitted to the very highest point to which she is susceptible; I would not deny them any privilege in relation to the formation of societies or the formation of colleges, or the formation of institutions of any kind whenever and wherever they choose to establish them, and I would bid them God-speed; but I would like to know why the

question is forced upon us here, for it has been forced upon us. This Association has never made war upon woman; it has never declared war, but the fire-brand was forced upon us, and we are obliged to meet the question. The war was declared on the other side, and I stand here as a member of this Association and say let women have as many medical associations as they choose, and let them attend to their own business, which they generally know pretty well how to manage; let them attend to their own business, and we will attend to ours. Look at the religious associations of women, and other associations. Do men ask or claim the privilege of going into them? Look at their benevolent societies and associations which they attend to themselves; they do not ask the co-operation of men, nor do we want the co-operation of women. [Applause.]

I tell you, gentlemen, this is not so light and frivolous a subject as some of us are disposed to treat it. I have looked upon the question somewhat, and I tell you that the sanctity and the sacredness of home is about to be invaded upon this question. [Applause.] Some of us have recollections of home—recollections which I trust we all have—and if there is any position in which woman presides in a Godlike position, it is as that of a mother; and I would like to know what a woman in that position would do in this Association? A mother, with children at home, and her duties at home in that legitimate sphere in which she was created to move? I say let her stay at home and put on an apron, and attend to her children, and not come to a Medical Association. [Applause.] Why, we should expect to see a woman here in breeches, as the gentleman stated just now; not only that, but we should expect to see men with women's clothes on. It is all very well to say that we do not allow them to come here, by this argument; but, gentlemen, this is one of the steps, and ridiculous as it may seem, it will end in that. Women will become men, and men women, in disposition and character; because one or the other must rule, and one or the other must be at the head, and either the man or the woman must be master; and that is the very gist of the

whole question. Now, sir, I am opposed to this. I for one am willing to meet this question fairly and squarely, and I say this Body will stultify itself by the admission of women. It was not contemplated in the original Association that it should ever have women among its members; it was never supposed that the question would ever be brought up before us, but it has been brought up before us, and I am for meeting it here to-day, and I am entirely opposed either to the reception of women, or the reception of any representatives of women from any college or other institution,

WHAT PENNSYLVANIA WANTS.

Dr. Atlee, of Philadelphia: We of Philadelphia have been asked why this question was brought before this Body? We have not brought it here to-day, but our worthy President has presented it before you. That answers the question of the gentleman in regard to that.

Dr. Johnson, of Missouri: I ask the pardon of the gentleman. The amendment was proposed by Professor Hartshorne, representing the Female College of Philadelphia, at the last session.

Dr. Atlee: That may be granted, but in Cincinnati, you will remember, Dr. Davis got up and told us to settle all our difficulties at home; to go back to Pennsylvania and settle our difficulties, but when we got back to Pennsylvania, we were told to go to the American Medical Association and get admission there, and then come back to that Society. Now, what are we to do? We are bounded from one Association to the other in shuttlecock and battle-door style, and how are we to act? We are sent back to Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania sends us back here, and we are now here. The whole question comes down to one simple point, and that is this: Does the code of ethics, which is the supreme law of this Institution, prevent any institution being represented here that complies with that code? Unfortunately, this opposition to female colleges generally comes from the professors or controllers of other colleges. Is that the position in which they wish to place themselves? Is

it proper, as a medical organization, to put our feet down upon another organization merely on account of sex, when there are colleges standing up before the community that teach just precisely as other colleges do, and that stand, in many respects, better than many others of the colleges represented here, colleges which give obstetrical and clinical instruction, when a majority of the colleges represented here have no such instructions; have no clinical instruction? These institutions are chartered by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and there can be no exceptions made to them except upon the score of sex. Now do we, by our code of ethics, undertake to suppress them? I say it is unjust, it is unconstitutional, and we have no right to do it by our code of ethics.

DARE NOT CONSULT THE FEMALES.

Putting aside the qualifications of sex, we meet with many arguments which the gentlemen bring up here; but let them go into the medical profession and see if they themselves stand any higher than the well-educated female physician. By the rules of our Medical Association, I dare not consult with the most highly educated female physician, and yet I may consult with the most ignorant masculine ass in the medical profession. Is that right, sir? Qualification ought to govern this matter, and not sex or caste. [Applause.] I hold in my hand an announcement of the Women's Medical College, of Philadelphia, and I ask those gentlemen who are standing in opposition to that College, constituted as that is, to say whether there is anything in it that is not based substantially upon as correct principles as any in the land? You may take the first institution of Pennsylvania, the University of Pennsylvania, and compare both together, and you will find the one standing in the same position as the other. [Applause.]

All these discussions about sex and the proper position or sphere of women are out of the question, as it appears to me in this matter. For woman is not always a mother; she has not always the blessing of being a wife. There are various positions for women connected with domestic duties. Many women earn

a livelihood over the wash-tub, and many others by the needle, and why should they not as well by the profession of medicine? If they do not come up to the highest position, that is no reason why they should not practice it, because how many hundreds of our sex fail to arrive at a high position, and yet they practice the profession; and if they get into difficulty, they claim the assistance of men who are higher in the profession to assist them out of their difficulties, and why should not women have the same privilege? Sir, I think it inhuman for a Body like this to put its foot upon the weaker sex, as this Body appears to intend to do, and keep them down. Let us rather elevate them to the proper position to which they are aspiring.

Now, sir, we in Pennsylvania are not only prevented from consulting with any female, no matter how well she stands upon the code of ethics, but we are prevented from consulting with male practitioners of an institution, with the consulting physicians of an institution, which our President, whom we have elevated to the highest position in this country, in the profession, is associated in. I dare not consult with him without endangering myself to the penalty of being expelled from the Pennsylvania Society. That is the position in which you have placed the man whom you have thus elevated, and I am amenable to the discipline of that Society and this Association if I consult with him.

Now the question, it appears to me, comes down to one simple point, and that is this: Here a code of ethics refuses admission to a Female College, when based upon the same principles as all other colleges are based upon. I care not what may be the qualifications of an individual, if he fulfills all the duties of his profession, or comes up to the code of ethics of the American Medical Association; if he is a graduate of medicine, a physician in regular standing, I will consult with him, and I should like to have the same privilege of consulting with any physician, whether male or female. Qualification, and not sex, ought to be the discriminating point between members of the medical profession.

As one gentleman has remarked, females have made no application to be heard as delegates, but they have been represented by male representatives. I think that is proper. I do not object to ladies being present with us, because we have them here in all our transactions, and we are always glad to see them, and they infuse into our meetings a very happy influence [applause ;] but the point, I think, is sufficient that I make, that it is a matter of qualification and ethics, and not of sex.

I shall now call upon the delegate from Woman's College (Dr. Thomas) who is present, requesting him to present his views upon the matter. I believe he has already been admitted upon the report of the Committee of Arrangements, and I hope that he will have a proper hearing.

NOT A QUESTION OF COMPETENCY.

Dr. A. L. McArthur, of Illinois, obtained the floor and said : It seems to me there are several questions being discussed in regard to the proposition now before the Association. All arguments in reference to Woman's sphere seem to me irrelevant. We have nothing to do with whether or not she is competent for a physician, a lawyer, or a minister, but the question is, whether it is the bounden duty of this Association to receive women as delegates. Let women be educated in every department of science, every profession, if she chooses. If Dr. Davis were to desire his son matriculated in the Woman's College of Chicago, no one would complain if he were recognized. Let women have their colleges, and if they choose their American Association, and we will welcome them to the entire field of medicine. If a woman can cope with a man in surgery and medicine, let her do it, and I should be willing to consult with a female who was properly educated as a surgeon or physician ; but that we shall associate with them or their colleges is quite another thing. I have had some experience in the bringing of ladies and gentlemen together in a clinic, and there is something in the nature of man, and I hope in that of every woman, that revolts at the idea. [Applause.] I am opposed to uniting the sexes in the colleges and in associations, while at the same time

I would not raise a barrier against the progress of woman in the field of medicine and surgery.

REMARKS OF DR. THOMAS.

Professor C. H. Thomas, of Philadelphia: The remarks of the gentleman who just sat down struck me in some respects as being exceedingly just. However, he raises a question at the close of his remarks on which I cannot agree with him. The remarks also of the eminent gentleman who preceded him, Dr. Johnson, of Missouri, I believe, whom I have not the pleasure of knowing personally, relate to the same question. Why does the women's medical interest desire to be represented here? Why do they wish to mix with men? The question is rather a complicated one. I say, however, to you, as matter of fact, that the ladies do not wish to be educated in common with men, in medicine, at all. They prefer a contrary method. In the Woman's Medical College in Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, we have no men present as students, nor will we have any! In our hospital no men students are present, and we will have none. We do not wish that at all. If we were admitted into the large hospitals with students we would prefer that they should go by themselves or attend the demonstrations of cases only of a strictly general character; but the question is asked, Why do we wish representation? Why do women force themselves in here? Why does that Body, in other words, send me here, unworthy as I feel myself for the work that is to be done—work of such great magnitude—much greater than many have an idea of? In the Eastern States the medical education of females has already become a very important matter. I have a list in my hand of hospitals in which we have graduates scattered now all over the land. And I hold in my hand a package of letters which I received in reply to a circular letter, inquiring what difficulties ladies suffer under for want of recognition. If I could have time to read extracts from these letters, I can assure you that many of you would be astonished and indignant at the illiberality of medical men, and the unfairness with which ladies have been dealt with by medical societies.

Respectable members of the profession dare not consult with ladies. In that city in which I reside, the County Medical Society established the rule, and it was afterwards adopted by the State Society, making it an expulsoy offence for a medical man to consult with a woman, and further than that, for any man to teach a woman medicine, and further than that—if any man shall consult with a man who dares to teach a woman, or consult with a woman, he receives the same penalty. That is the position in which we stand there. That distinguished surgeon, Dr. Atlee, has well said he dare not consult with a man who teaches women or consults with a woman. He dare not even consult with our President, Professor Stille, for Professor Stille consults with women, and therefore Dr. Atlee dare not consult with him. I say, further, that Dr. Atlee held a consistent position in this matter. He will make no rebellion in the Medical Association, and will do nothing against the laws of those societies, preferring to fight out the battle with them. Several gentlemen say they have their common rights taken away by this rule, the rights which God gave them at their birth, and they prefer to break the law, but Dr. Atlee says: "I will not break the law," and therefore he never dares to consult with Dr. Stille. I have been asked why I came here, and I think I have now answered it. I should be glad to answer further, and glad if I had this to say for Pennsylvania alone. Now, in other States, the situation is nearly the same. Here are packages of letters which tell me that County Societies, where the writers reside, forbid their members consulting with them. That is an expulsoy offence in many cases. These ladies are called in to attend difficult cases, and they desire, like every practitioner, to have consultation; but they are not only refused consultation, but when their names are mentioned to these practitioners by the patients of these ladies or their families, they are told, "Why, your physician is not a physician. Her diploma is not recognized by the American Medical Association." That is what I came here for to-day. It is to ask you to admit us to a just position. We want to be judged by our merits—nothing else.

I would like, and I ask it, that a committee of the American Medical Association be appointed to examine our institution; to examine into the methods of teaching and into the terms of our lectures, which are now five months and a half. I would like the graduates of the past year to be put through the same examination that you did the graduates of the other colleges. I see eminent professors here, and I would like these very gentlemen to re-examine them, and see whether or not they are fitted for equal rights in the profession with men.

Much has been said in regard to the ill that may happen if we allow these women to "unsex themselves." It is a frightful theme, to be sure, and the horrors of it have been hinted at, though it is hard to define exactly what they are. Gentlemen, I have seen these women in practice, and I shall presently read the names of gentlemen who have consulted with them. I know these ladies well, and know they are not "unsexed women." Some of them are wives and mothers, some have their families dependent upon them, and one lady has a paralyzed husband, and that lady is a most distinguished lady graduate of the Maternite Hospital in Paris, holding the certificate of the Ecole de Medicine of Paris. We find this lady in the condition of having a paralyzed husband and a dependent family; though, however, she is in an excellent practice and drives her carriage, and is recognized by every physician who knows her, as a woman of eminent ability in the profession in which she is practicing.

FEMALE PHYSICIANS RECOGNIZED.

I do not wish to occupy too much time, but there are some points I do wish to come to. One is this: That our lady graduates are already recognized by many physicians, in spite of societies, and especially so in some parts of Pennsylvania. In the Montgomery County Medical Association of Pennsylvania, Doctress Anna Lukens, one of our lady graduates, was elected last year. That, however, placed that Society outside the pale of the Pennsylvania Medical Society, if that Society ever dare to enforce its rule. They were challenged last year in Phila-

delphia to enforce that rule, and they dare not. Dr. Traill Green rose and said, and I have the report with me: "Gentlemen, I dare you to enforce this most unjust law." Dr. Parrish rose and said: "I will consult with women if I choose, in spite of any law of any Association!" It has been done again and again, and the Society dared not come up to the enforcement of its penalty. Yet, in some of the other States, our graduates stand in as bad positions. And laws so filled with evil that they cannot be enforced in the face of the community, are still used covertly to their serious prejudice.

In order to prove to you that some physicians do consult with women, I hold in my hand a list of hospitals where women are attending physicians, and where a consulting staff has been in active service with them for a greater or less length of time. The gentleman (Dr. Keating, of Pittsburg) read a list of the consulting staff of the Hospital which I have the honor to represent, the Woman's Hospital of Philadelphia, including Dr. Stille, Dr. Hartshorne, Dr. John Forsythe Meiggs, S. Weir Mitchell, Elwood Wilson, and the rest. I have here also the consulting staff of the Dispensary Department of the Woman's Institute in New York City, and though its regular physician is a graduate of our college and a woman, we find associated with her as consulting surgeons, Dr. Willard Parker, Dr. Frank H. Hamilton, and Dr. S. B. Ward, and Dr. Noyes and St. John Roosa consulting oculists and aurists, and as consulting physicians, Fordyce Barker, W. A. Hammond, T. Gaillard Thomas, and Frederick B. Lente. Those are names of gentlemen who dare to consult with a woman whom they know is a good physician, and who has been in the same institution with her a considerable length of time. I find, also, another institution in New York—"The New York Infirmary"—presided over by a graduate of our college, and the consulting physicians of that institution are Willard Parker, James R. Wood, William H. Van Buren, Thomas A. Emmet, Isaac E. Taylor, Gustavus A. Sabine, Austin Flint, Thomas F. Cock, and T. G. Thomas. So, you find some of the same men consulting physicians in that in-

stitution again. Still another one: "The Western Dispensary for Women and Children," presided over by a woman who graduated from the college I represent. The consulting physicians are A. Jacobi, J. B. Reynolds, J. R. Leaming, and Foster Swift. The consulting surgeons are C. C. Terry, Benj. Howard, S. B. Ward, and H. G. Piffard, and the attending physician is Doctress Mary E. Greene. In Boston we go a step further, and I will read but a very few more names. I have not the published circular, but from my personal knowledge, having talked with some of them myself, I know that among the consulting physicians are Professor Calvin Ellis, Dean of the Medical Department of Harvard University, Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, Dr. Samuel Cabot, and Dr. Walter Channing. Dr. Bowditch consults frequently with lady physicians, and he told me himself that he defied the Massachusetts Medical Society to lay any law upon him to prohibit him from consulting with a woman, because from his personal knowledge, they were reliable, excellent physicians.

A single point in passing—lest I forget it, because this is not a prepared address, and I had no idea that it would be advisable for me to speak. There are some who seem to fear that ladies are going to attempt surgery and all difficult operations going under that name; that they expect to put themselves into all that class of work of ordinary practice which seems to be considered the special province of men to fill. Let me say as a practical fact—facts, they say, are stubborn things, and I know some times they are stupid things—but this is a fact which I claim to be relevant. We find for reference, that women practically restrict themselves to a single or special department. Of the women I have the honor to know, and several of them are already venerable in the practice—and Professor Ann Preston at the head of them, a most distinguished and refined lady and an excellent physician—I find that women practically treat their own sex and children almost exclusively. This is the practical result, no matter what the possibilities are that may be suggested.

ATTAINED MAJORITY.

Now, gentlemen, the College I represent has attained its majority this year. It is twenty-one years old, and I ask, that as a full-grown honorable institution, it be admitted in the same class with the rest of the colleges in the land. We ask to be examined as to what we are teaching and how much, and we want our students examined, and if any other institution in the land will put its students by the side of ours to be examined, we will most gladly accept the position.

I will ask to detain the Association a single moment longer. It will not be more—knowing the pressure of business upon it—than that, in regard to the College I represent and the position we assume; for we have made a great advance, in our opinion, as regards teaching. We have instituted a method by which the studies of our classes are rendered more thorough. We examine them at the close of the second year in anatomy, physiology, materia medica, and chemistry, and when they pass that examination, we allow a third year for the practical branches—surgery, obstetrics, diseases of children, and practice of medicine. At the end of the third year, if qualified in the latter, they are eligible to their degree. We believe this is an advance, and ours was the first institution to carry it into operation and effect. We believe we have already done something for the cause of professional education. Still further than that, we find as a matter of fact that other colleges are beginning to admit our status. We find that the Medical Department of the University of Michigan has just graduated a lady upon one course of lectures who had studied with us two years, thus admitting us to recognition and placing us upon their *ad eundem* list. One of the professors of that institution is present here, and he told me that this lady passed a creditable examination, so much so that any college in the land need not be ashamed of her. These are facts, and under the circumstances, in the hurry of the hour, and the shortness of the session, I forbear drawing any conclusions from them. I prefer that each member should draw his own conclusions for himself.

[Dr. Thomas was listened to throughout with marked attention.]

Dr. Moore, of Boston: I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentlemen on both sides of the question. I think they have ventilated themselves fully. I trust now we shall bring the subject to a close. I have been a member of this Institution almost from its commencement, though, unfortunately, I have not been able to attend every meeting. I did not expect that the subject of woman's rights would ever come up before us. I am not opposed to women, but I am opposed to their coming into this Association. As a man, I would wish to see woman educated, and am always willing to advise and assist them if I can do it, and I trust the other gentlemen will do so. We don't ignore women, nor deny their intelligence. We want intelligence among ourselves. I think we have talked sufficiently upon this subject. If women can be educated to do more good in the community than men can, let them do so without hindrance, but I do object to their coming into this Association. I hope they will have an Association of their own, and possibly they may show us that they can excel us. I move, in order to put the subject at rest, that the whole subject matter be indefinitely postponed.

The vote was taken by ayes and noes, and the Secretary announced the result as 80 ayes to 25 noes.

So the proposition to amend the Constitution was indefinitely postponed.

THE SUBJECT RENEWED.

At the morning session of the Association on Friday, the subject was renewed by Dr. Atlee, of Philadelphia, who offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the American Medical Association acknowledges the right of its members to meet in consultation the graduates and teachers of Women's Medical Colleges, provided the code of ethics of the Association is observed.

Dr. Storer said the subject had been discussed fully yesterday. The Association should be careful how it acted; it in-

volved the lives of many members of the community. The question had been discussed fully; he was not present; if he had been he would have presented arguments against the matter that had not been touched upon. It had been settled by a viva voce vote of the Association, which was almost unanimous. He protested against the measure coming up again; it had been indefinitely postponed. Dr. Atlee undoubtedly was moved by good motives in offering this resolution; he was not actuated as some were, to have the consultation fees flow into his pockets.

Dr. Johnson said he hoped the resolution would be adopted. It was not to admit women on this floor, but to enable the physicians of Pennsylvania to consult with women. He was willing to grant women all privileges, and if they wanted associations of their own, let them establish them, and he would bid them God-speed. In justice to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the resolution should be adopted, as they were not recognized as regular practitioners by the local Societies; and he understood even the venerable gentleman now in the chair (Dr. Stille) was not recognized.

Dr. Stille: Such is the case.

Dr. Johnson resumed, saying he did not consider it unprofessional for practitioners to consult with women. All barriers in that respect should be removed. [Applause.]

At this point, Dr. Gibbons, Sr., interrupted the speaker, and called for the reading of the resolution.

Dr. Storer: I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Dr. Johnson: Can a motion be made while I have the floor? [Applause.]

President: No, sir.

Dr. Johnson concluded his remarks by stating that according to the existing state of affairs, even members of the Association could not consult with the President, who was one of the consulting physicians of a Female Medical College of Philadelphia, without violating its laws.

Dr. Weatherly said there was nothing in the code of ethics of the Association preventing physicians from consulting with

women. If local Societies had it on their statute books, they could not help it.

Cries of "Question," "Dr. Atlee."

Dr. Atlee: We are sent here by our State Society to get the endorsement of the American Medical Association, just to that purpose. They say that the Pennsylvania Association oppose our action. We ask your endorsement for a privilege which is exercised by Dr. Johnson, and should be by every other medical man in the Union. But we are tabooed, and we dare not consult with a female physician when the Medical Association forbids it. We are tabooed, and what we seek is to have the rules of the Pennsylvania State Association abolished, in hopes that we then will be free to act as men in other parts of the country act, that is all we ask.

Dr. McArthur: Inasmuch as I made a very few remarks touching the matter yesterday, I wish to say to the Association that as I understand it, the American Medical Association is not a body from whom we require primary legislation. It is rather a court of appeal.

Dr. Atlee: We are here now on an appeal.

Dr. McArthur resumes: I understand that the city of Philadelphia has invited the American Medical Association to hold its next session there. I understand further, that the physicians of that State and city are divided upon this question, and we do not wish, as an Association, to go into the city of Philadelphia, where we expect the hospitalities of the profession upon any uncertain footing. Now, this is no question of ethics that comes up from any Association of the city of Philadelphia. If it were, then we would feel called upon to adjudicate upon the matter; but I say here, there is not one word or one sentence in the ethics of the American Medical Association that prevents any member of the profession to consult with any lady physician who is fully qualified to practice her profession.

Dr. Gibbons, Sr.: Then why not say so? [Applause.]

Dr. McArthur: Because it is unnecessary. It would be a work of supererogation. There is not the least call for it.

When the matter comes up from any Association of the State of Philadelphia, then it will be time for the American Association to adjudicate upon the matter.

Cries of "Question," and confusion.

Dr. Gibbons, Sr.: One word; I shall not detain the meeting. Does the gentleman say there is not the least occasion for action of this kind when the President of this Association stands here in the preposterous attitude of a man tabooed from consulting with members of the State Association? When Dr. Atlee, a distinguished surgeon of Philadelphia, dare not consult with the President of this Association for fear of expulsion from his State Society, do you tell me there is no occasion for action in this case? Do you tell me that when a motion of this kind will settle the discord existing in the State of Pennsylvania, and place their position in accord with that of the physicians of all the States of the Union this knotty question will be set at rest, as it will be by this resolution, for it is only the declaration of a truth? [Applause.] The only objection urged to it is that it is superfluous. If it is superfluous, what harm can it do? Adopt the superfluity, for the sake of peace, for the sake of harmony, and for the sake of consistency. [Applause, and loud calls of question!]

The President caused the resolution to be read again.

AN AMENDMENT OFFERED.

Dr. Toner: I propose to amend that resolution by adding "when their supporters are recognized by the local and State Medical Societies."

Dr. Storer: That is not the motion. I made a motion to lay this whole matter on the table.

Dr. Storer endeavored to get a hearing, but was prevented from speaking by the President.

Dr. Storer: I ought to have a chance to be heard. The Chair allowed one or two speeches to be made on a motion to lay on the table.

The President: If the Chair committed one error, it will try to avoid that same error hereafter. [Laughter.]

The motion to lay on the table was lost by a vote of 53 to 61. [Loud cries of ayes and noes! Let's adjourn for Oakland!]

Dr. Davis: I hope the Association will not entertain any dilatory motion to call the roll. Let us in five minutes finish this work one way or the other. It will neither kill nor cure anybody.

The amendment to the resolution was called for.

Dr. Storer: I ask the courtesy of the Chair for once, and I will state, with all respect to yourself, that in view of the argument on this floor yesterday, and the action that was had yesterday, that it would be a stultification of the action of this Association, including yourself, to pass this resolution, and I venture to say that you would not have been President of this Association if—

Dr. Gibbons: I call the gentleman to order.

Dr. Storer: I accept your call to order, Doctor. I say that this stultification might have taken place—and if it did take place, then that it would be a full stultification of this Association to take this action now, in the face of the former action of the Association.

Loud cries of "Question!" And while the vote on the amendment was being taken—

Dr. Toner: Is there a gentleman here who would be willing to consult with any one not recognized by the local or State Association?

The amendment was then put to vote, and lost by a vote of 41 to 45.

Surgeon Browne, U. S. N., moved the indefinite postponement of the resolution.

Dr. Davis: I must ask the members of the Association if they are willing to give falsity to our record of yesterday, in which we agreed to go on the excursion to Oakland this morning? We can finish this business just as well to-morrow as to-day. It is a question only of tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

Dr. Cole moved to adjourn till 8 o'clock P. M., which motion

was carried almost unanimously, and the members started for Oakland.

EVENING SESSION.

Dr. Stille called the Association to order, at 8 o'clock Friday evening, and read the original resolution proposed by Dr. Atlee.

Dr. Storer, of Boston: Before a vote is taken, I desire to say a few words. And first I wish to repeat, in the most decided language, what I thought I said distinctly enough this morning; that my remarks with reference to the President of the Medical Association were without the slightest personal reference; that I entertain, and have always entertained for him, personally, the most profound respect. I supposed that this was distinctly understood by every man in the hall this morning, and by the President. I understand, however, that in regard to the last gentleman, I was wrong; and I now repeat my statement, and if that is not sufficient (if he thinks it is not sufficient) I now publicly and from my heart apologize to him and to you. [Applause.]

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE.

Dr. Atlee stated this morning that if this resolution was passed, it was all that was desired, because it was practically an endorsement, by this Association, of female physicians. This being the case, I would say a word or two in regard to points that I did not speak of yesterday, because I thought it was entirely unnecessary, and in this matter I speak from experience. There are other gentlemen present who have had similar experience to my own. It may be, however, that they do not care to state that experience as plainly as I think the importance of the question demands. I have thoroughly tried this experiment. I felt several years since that the question was of such importance, allied, as it was, more particularly to a branch of the profession to which I had devoted myself, that it was of sufficient importance to be looked into, not merely theoretically, not merely on the ground of the respect we have for woman, but in its relations to the community; and therefore, gentle-

men, for several years I occupied the position of a surgeon to a hospital at which there were women physicians, and for two years I had some association in private practice with one of the very best woman physicians, a graduate of the Female College, as I suppose there is at present in this country, and I will tell you distinctly, gentlemen, that by the best portion of the community, by the most refined, the most delicate ladies in the community, there is not that confidence in the woman physicians that there is in the men, in the matter of practice. I state this because it is claimed that there are certain branches of the practice filled by them, and for which they are peculiarly fitted; that on the other hand, the relations of the physician to his patient, and the relation of the patient to the physician entirely debar the idea of sex. In the case of confinement, what lady hesitates to send for a male accoucheur? In the case of a difficult confinement, provided she is attended by a midwife or nurse, what lady hesitates to have a male physician called in, if the anxieties of the case demand it? It is so, gentlemen, with regard to all other cases which are claimed to be the peculiar province of women. But, Mr. President, there is another point underlying all this. We will grant that some exceptional women are as interested in our science as ourselves. That some of them have those peculiar qualities, that especial temperament, that gives them not merely a taste for anatomy and surgery, but courage to face the greatest dangers and anxiety in surgery; that there are some women who are able to go out in inclement weather and brave the storm; we may grant that women, some of them, may have had peculiar means, or favorable opportunities, which allow them to get the same education that men have; we grant that, and grant it freely, that in some matters, intellectually, women are as completely mistresses of their subject as we are masters of ours; but beyond this there is a point that is fundamental to the whole matter, and out of very many physicians that have discussed the matter with me (I may say out of many of my patients who have discussed the matter) I have to see the first one that does not agree with me

in it; and that is this inherent quality in their sex, that uncertain equilibrium, that varying from month to month, according to the time of the month, in each woman, that unfits her from taking these responsibilities of judgment which, as I said this morning, are to control the question often of life and death. Women may be, and are undoubtedly the best nurses; they may carry out to the letter the direction of the physician; but every physician who is familiar with women, and every woman, almost without an exception, who expresses an honest opinion in this matter, will say that women from month to month and week to week vary, up and down; that they are not the same one time that they are another; that their diagnosis varies, and comparing the average of women with the average of men to-day, they are inferior in the matter of judgment.

BASE MOTIVES.

Now, I know there are many sides to this question. Dr. Thomas read to you a list of leading men in the profession who allow their names to be used as consulting physicians, or directors, or trustees of various educational establishments, and it is claimed that that use of their names is a guaranty that the system is endorsed. We, all of us, know that very many men are compelled to allow their names to be used, in the same way that they endorse Seltzer water and surgical instruments; and I have no doubt, from the statement made upon both sides of the question by one prominent gentleman in this assembly, that it is possible that his heart may direct him one way and his judgment another. I said this morning that I would not imply that any man of standing in the profession would be governed in his profession by pecuniary considerations, but it is evident that gentlemen who are practicing in a certain department, providing their organizations allow them to endorse female physicians, are thereby sure of an increase in their consulting fees.

There is one other argument, Mr. President, which has been used, and which has been printed and circulated throughout

the country, and it is a strange one in the portion of the country from which I come, and that is this. It has been stated here to-day by one of the most prominent champions of this movement, and that is that no male physician, no matter what his standing, can enter the chamber of a sick woman, no matter in what position, who is unmarried, without exciting in her mind delicate feelings. I hate to refer to this, but it is upon the record, and it is one of those base arguments which is used for the purpose of destroying an influence throughout the whole land.

AN HONEST CONVICTION.

Dr. Atlee: The gentleman says that I stated on the floor this morning that the American Association ought to endorse the female practitioner. I said no such thing. What I said was this, that by passing that resolution it would place me on the same footing precisely with my professional brethren throughout the United States, giving me the privilege of consulting with whom I pleased who was a physician, male or female, that lived up to the code of ethics, not that I endorsed either male or female physicians, but to give me my rights as a physician.

There is another matter, and that is the matter of pecuniary motives. That was alluded to this morning, and there has been allusions to it this afternoon. I deny the insinuation that has been made, and I hurl it back in the gentleman's teeth. I have no pecuniary interest in the matter, I occupy my position honestly, and I hope to retain that honest position till death. I conceive that females have rights, and these rights under the American code of ethics I will maintain as long as I can under the institutions to which I belong. If pecuniary considerations had governed me, why should I refuse consultation with them, when other gentlemen, under institutions that have the same laws, hold such consultations? I think that will disperse anything of that kind, and I hope the gentleman who has made that insinuation will apologize before the Association for it. Gentlemen who know me in Philadelphia and in Pennsylvania will not dare accuse me of such a thing.

PHILADELPHIA ENCOURAGES FEMALES.

With regard to the qualifications of females we agree to disagree. I have a right to my opinion as any gentleman has to his. I have met with females, as the gentleman I refer to has met with them, before these obnoxious laws were passed, and I felt elevated by such association, much more so I may say than I have with a majority, perhaps, of physicians of the male sex with whom I have associated. We have in the profession female physicians, and we cannot get rid of that fact, and they are encouraged largely by the community. I do not care what the public sentiment of Massachusetts may be; I know the public of Philadelphia does encourage females to the extent of \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year; and if women practitioners in Philadelphia or any other part of the country are inferior to men, why, we have nothing to fear. I do not charge any gentleman with a pecuniary motive in fearing that some woman will take away his practice, and yet, sometimes it looks to me very much as if some men were afraid of it. Now, sirs, humanity demands that we should have an opportunity of going in and aiding a female physician under difficulties, as much as a male physician. If she has a difficulty which she cannot manage why should she not have the same privilege of calling in one of more experience, as is done every day by younger physicians, who by that very act of calling in another physician to consult with them, acknowledge their inferiority? I say it is inhuman to consider anything but the qualifications of the practitioner, and I say it is violating the very spirit of our institution, which is to promote the progress of science, and in the spirit of humanity to carry out the code of ethics, which is broad and wide enough to cover the whole ground of that resolution. We should only be governed by that code in our communications with others; by that code, whether male or female, black or white, and by that alone.

APPEAL FOR HUMANITY SAKE.

Dr. Jones, of Ohio: I do not wish to occupy the time of this Association with words, but there is one argument that suggests

itself to me on this resolution, that I wish to advance, and I do not know how to get over it, and that is, that we are bound to consult with ladies for the sake of humanity itself. Suppose a patient sees fit to employ a lady, and the case is a peculiar one. The patient is brought under the influence of remedies, and the physician cannot tell what effect these remedies would have upon the patient. Then I say humanity demands that we should countenance this physician, even though to a certain extent she may be an irregular physician. If she is a lady and a graduate, under the code of ethics it does not seem to me wholly in keeping for a strong man to array himself as we appear to be trying to compel men to do against women, too strong for some of us, however, I am afraid, who oppose this resolution. This matter is one which will regulate itself. Here and elsewhere society regulates the grade of each and every man. You bring a man above his level in society and he will soon be brought down. If a man elevates himself above his position, he will be brought down very soon, and the whole matter will regulate itself. If it is beyond the scope of woman to grasp with disease, the world will soon find it out. If a lady has the intellectual ability to become a good physician, she is entitled to her inheritance, but that is not the ground upon which I make the appeal. It is in the name of humanity that I say this resolution ought to pass.

Dr. Gibbons, Sr., of San Francisco: We have a right sometimes to judge of a proposition by the arguments which are brought forward for its support, and if we are to judge of this proposition by the arguments brought forward by my friend from Boston, I think it would prove conclusively the weakness of his side of the question. One of his arguments was, that female physicians fluctuate in their judgment, in consequence of natural changes in their systems; that once a month their judgment was influenced by these natural changes. Now, I appeal to your observation, Mr. President, and that of any other medical man here, whether it is not a fact that any large majority of male practitioners fluctuate in their judgment not once a month with the moon, but every day, with the movement

of the sun—whether one-half of the male practitioners of medicine are not to a greater or less extent under the influence of alcohol at some period in the twenty-four hours? [Applause and hisses.] Gentlemen, we have an Academy of Sciences in which we place all specimens of strange animals, and if some one will catch me one of these hissing animals, I will be glad to present it to that Academy. [Hisses.] I was not aware that I was stating anything offensive, because I was stating a positive fact in regard to the habits of men. I do not pretend to say that men in the practice of medicine get drunk, by any means. [A voice: "Temperance lecture!" Hisses.] But what I do say is this, and I insist on the privilege, as I believe I have been misinterpreted, of correcting myself—what I mean to say is, that the great majority of the community, say three out of four, do make use of wine, or some kind of intoxicating drink, under the influence of which, without being drunk, their judgment is more or less affected, and I lay that down as a physiological fact in our society, and that is all I mean, when I refer to the changes that take place in the judgments of men. [Hisses.]

The President: Gentlemen, allow me to appeal to your good sense and courtesy against any such manifestation as this.

A delegate: I ask the Chair, then, to call any speaker to order who shall violate the rules of decorum by such a reflection.

A QUESTION OF TYRANNY.

Dr. Gibbons [proceeding]: Another position on the question taken by the gentleman from Boston is, that no physician can enter the chamber of a female without exciting delicate feelings. Now, I say no absurdity of that kind ought to be brought before this body on a question like this. All this argument is out of order upon the question before us. It is not a question as to whether females should be educated as physicians or not; the resolution pending has nothing to do at all with that, and one who may be opposed firmly, permanently and fixedly to the education of females as physicians, may still with propriety vote for this resolution. We have a code of ethics of the American

Medical Association extending over the whole country. That code of ethics has been interpreted by us, and it has been said on this floor that it undoubtedly gives the privilege to every man of consulting with females, or any one else, with that code; but in a certain portion of our country it is interpreted differently, as prohibiting members of the faculty from associating medically with women; and, not only that, but as prohibiting them from consultations with members of the profession who do consult with women, or members of the profession who teach women, or consult with physicians who do so. In Pennsylvania we are told that this is the rule, and there are some who dare not consult even with the President of this Society, lest they should come under the ban of this Society at home, in consequence of that interpretation of the code of ethics. Is it proper for this Association to permit such an interpretation of our code of ethics, working disorder in the profession, and setting its members by the ears? Is it proper for us to require our members to submit, as Dr. Atlee does, to the tyranny which prevents him from consulting with a female physician, and from consulting with any other member of the faculty who does? [Applause.] They must do that; or they must break loose from that code of ethics, or at least from the interpretation given to it by the Societies to which they may be attached, and set those Societies at defiance, daring them to enforce such a law. It is the worst possible position in which to place members of the profession. If we allow such loose interpretations of the code of ethics, I say it is perverted from its original design. In permitting members of the profession to be expelled for associating in consultation with female physicians we are not doing our duty. For these reasons I want the sanction of this Body, not only in Philadelphia, but elsewhere in the United States, by declaring that the code of ethics does not prohibit or prevent anything of the sort. I have consulted with female physicians on several occasions, and I am willing to do it again; and I have found them standing as high, in point of education and in moral standing, as myself or any other male member of

the profession; and when I find a respectable woman like that I will consult with her; and I hold it is the right and duty of every physician to do so. We should declare that right to exist in the State of Pennsylvania and all over the United States. Individuals come here from Pennsylvania and tell us that the right is there denied; and they ask us to pass this resolution, in order to relieve them from the difficulty, by declaring that the Pennsylvania Society shall give the same construction to the code of ethics as is given to it elsewhere. In conclusion, inasmuch as my first remarks seemed to give some offence, although I did not intend anything of the kind myself, I beg to apologize, and assure members of the profession that no man has a higher regard for every member of this Body than myself. I assure the members that my remarks must have been misunderstood in regard to intoxicating drinks; and therefore I apologize for those remarks and recall them. [Applause.]

COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS VERSUS COUNTY SOCIETIES.

Dr. Stille, the President (Dr. Gibbons having been called to the chair): I am not going to make a speech, because I do not wish to detain you; but things have been said here in regard to the State which I, in part, represent that are not altogether correct. Some things have been said, evidently through inadvertency, and others through ignorance, both of which I wish to correct. A statement which has been made through inadvertence is, that the Society—by which is meant, I presume, the Medical Society—the Societies of Philadelphia have enacted a law forbidding their members to consult with female practitioners of medicine. Now, that is not a correct statement. The County Medical Society has passed resolutions of that sort. But there is another Society in Philadelphia, which has existed for more than a hundred years, and which is known to many of the members of this Body as the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, the oldest Society of the kind in the country, and which includes all that is eminent, all that is renowned, all that is useful in the medical profession, and excludes all that have not some decided professional claim to membership. Now, that

Body decided when this question was brought up differently from the County Medical Society. It turned it out of doors, and left everybody to do as seemed good in his conscience. So it should be understood that in Philadelphia it is only a particular Society—the County Medical Society—and not the College of Physicians of Philadelphia that has adopted such an illiberal course. I have the honor to be one of the members of that College of Physicians, and one of the censors of that Society, an office which I have held, if I remember rightly (after having the honor of being President) for eight or nine years, certainly for seven years. I am familiar, therefore, with all that has been done upon this question in the County Medical Society, because it was likely to come before the Board of Revision to which I refer; and not a single member of that Society has dared to test the question before the Board of Censors. They have passed in the Society a resolution condemning the consulting with female practitioners, and there they have stopped. If I may speak for myself, I will say they have known that I have done so, and others whose names, if I were to mention them, would be familiar to the ears of all of you, have consulted with female practitioners. Some of those gentlemen, when they found they were acting in opposition to the rules of the County Society, withdrew from its fellowship, and others did not hesitate to consult with female practitioners, and defied the Society to enforce its rule. I repeat that it is only the Philadelphia Medical Society which has adopted such a rule; and it is a question upon which the Board of Censors has never been called upon to pronounce.

IN A PREDICAMENT.

Dr. Atlee: I stand corrected in regard to the societies of Philadelphia. But I would ask of our worthy President whether the College of Physicians is represented in the State Medical Society.

Dr. Stille: No, sir.

Dr. Atlee: The County Society, and not the College of Physicians, then, is represented in the State Medical Society; as

the College of Physicians consists of the more respectable members, and a greater number of them than the County Society, it should be represented in preference. I believe that is the fact. And yet, this County Society being represented, the State Medical Society puts a ban upon any physician who consults with a female practitioner; while the College of Physicians, the most respectable body in Philadelphia, perhaps the most respectable in the United States, as the President tells us, leaves that matter to the code of ethics. The County Medical Society, the inferior body, so read the code of ethics as to prohibit any man from consulting with them. It is under this state of facts that we call upon this Body for relief. I am a member of both the County Society and the College of Physicians, and I feel that I am authorized to state that it is only by the action of the County Medical Society, an inferior organization, that we are placed in this predicament, from which we ask relief.

NON-INTERFERENCE COUNSELED.

Dr. Weatherly: The more I hear of this matter the more fully convinced I am that this Medical Association should pursue the same policy as heretofore—namely, not to interfere with local quarrels. [Applause.] Up to this time such matters have been referred back to the State or the county organization. If these gentlemen in Philadelphia, or in Pennsylvania, cannot manage their own quarrels, they should not bring them here. We have heard the whole subject discussed, and I think the general opinion is that we do not violate the code of ethics in consulting with female practitioners; but we should leave them to settle their own local quarrels; and I therefore move that this resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion to indefinitely postpone was carried by a very decisive vote.

NOTE.—All will agree that there is in this debate much that is not stupendously valuable; much that is childish; much that reads like an extract from the life of Helmbold; much that is disreputable; but as a debate on a question important both in this country and Europe, these sentiments delivered in the highest representative Medical Body in America are historical, and are worthy of a permanent record.—ED.