

throughout the land demanding a State supply if such were the case.

But even in those cases where female practitioners are attached to public offices do the feminine portion of the staff flock to them in such numbers so as to show how great was the need for them, how thankful they were for the benefit conferred? My own experience is the reverse of this. Further, there are a large number of women who would submit to an exposure by a medical man, but who would refuse, and do refuse, to be exposed before one of their own sex.

In these bare outlines I submit that I have shown that the admission of the female sex into the ranks of the medical profession is, at least, unnecessary, and I also fail to see its desirability.

Then, as to the question of the wisdom of their entrance thereto, and here we touch the foundation stone of the controversy, for at once arises the vital question of sex from an altogether diverse point of view.

It seems at first sight an absurd question. Why does sex exist? But sex exists, and there must be a reason for the differentiation—some well defined purpose for its existence, some well-based reason why there should be male and female members in the human economy. I do not for a moment believe that the differentiation arose originally by accident, by a freak of protoplasm, or any other of the absurd propositions put forward to explain it. Neither do I believe in the specious, but not even plausible, arguments of Darwin. The question of different sexes was I apprehend settled on far higher ground even than that the earth should be replenished. That was only one of the means and probably the lowest for a given end.

I entertain the conviction that woman was designed to be a help, meet for man, to help him in those conditions of life wherein he could not help himself. I believe that from the first, each was organized to fulfil separate duties and offices, mutually dependent however one on the other.

To man was assigned the battle of life. His the part demanding muscular exertion, and those mental qualities, the active development of which enabled him to "subdue the earth" and bring it into subjection so as to supply all that is needful for him, having however for his chief object in this the shielding and sheltering of woman, who was to be his companion and help from the discomforts, annoyance and failures which are intimately associated with this warfare; whilst on her part she was fitted with capabilities to sympathise with him—to soothe his many hardships, to stimulate by her love his exertions, to watch with tender solicitude his endeavour to gain greater heights in whatever calling he adopted. To share his hopes, his fears, his defeats, his successes, his joys, his sorrows, knowing full well that whatever he gained in the battle of life he would bring as willing tribute to her feet, as a token of the high estimation he held of the benefits derived from his association with her. But there was no interference on her part in his vocation, on the duties assigned to him, no crossing of the border line or trespassing upon that which was his prerogative for which he was designed and organised. Hence I would argue that the original design of the sexes was two beings, differently constituted for different spheres of action, equally dependent one on the other, and when united, constituting an harmonious whole.

In this view there is no room for the assertion that

woman is inferior to man. In fact, in many qualities she is immensely his superior. Her emotions are more refined, her affections are stronger and more stable, her perceptions are far in advance of those of the other sex, she is pre-eminent in fortitude, patience, and self-denial, and if she does not possess that even balance of mind, that power of close logical reasoning, that ability to maintain a continued strain of mind in solving abstruse problems, that solidity of character so essential in the battle of life which belongs to a man, what wonder is it considering that *she was not built that way*? She has many qualities which man possesses, but in a less degree, and vice versa.

It would seem therefore that it was originally designed that different duties should pertain to each sex, for if one could perform all that was assigned to the other, what need for any sex at all?

The above argument is borne out by the fact that if a man apes any of the qualities which are considered to be the prerogative of the woman he is stigmatised by his own sex, who feel their standing degraded by his attitude. He is also held up to contumely by the very sex he imitates; in fact, an "effeminate man" is an object of universal derision.

And here let me ask the new woman, what grounds there are for withholding the same contempt and derision for those of her sex who take upon themselves those duties which have been assigned to man, and which prolonged custom has shown not only the wisdom but the necessity thereof. Why should a "masculine woman" escape the scorn which is poured out on the effeminate man? It will be easily perceived from the foregoing why I assert that woman's mission is not that of the adoption of the medical profession, or, for the matter of that, the legal or clerical. Indeed, once allow the principle, and there is no limit to be drawn. The army and navy must be included the calling of the mechanic, the artificer, the brick-layer, plasterer, slater, joiner, et hoc genus omne must be included. Why not? Again because *she is not built that way*. You cannot amalgamate inherently different duties, requiring a fundamental difference of temperament. I do not suppose the most ardent upholder of so-called woman's rights would like to see a female practitioner with her heel in the axilla of a man, trying to reduce a dislocation of the shoulder, or to witness her endeavours to reduce the head of the femur to its natural position in the person of a navvy; these being duties common to the male practitioner and requiring, not only great physical power, but a large amount of mental ability as well; yet they may fall to her lot, especially if she undertakes the duty of *locum tenens* to a country practitioner. It does not follow, as a necessary sequence, that because a few women by dint of hard work, and struggling against their natural environment, have obtained a legal entrance into the medical profession, and gained a modicum of success, and a partial standing therein, that it is a fit calling for women, as a rule. Even allowing, for argument's sake, that they were able to undertake the arduous mental and physical labours incidental to this profession—it would not furnish any solid reason for their entering therein, considering that in their own sphere there is more than ample work waiting to be done, work, which none but a woman can do.

I therefore assert my strong conviction that the duties of the sexes are not interchangeable. I believe that perfect order can only be maintained by a mutual recognition of this principle. I believe no woman

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)