

The objections raised against the Mules' operation are :—

- (1) Greater liability to sympathetic ophthalmia than in cases of simple excision.
- (2) Excessive reaction and prolonged convalescence.
- (3) Liability to fracture of the glass globe at any time after its insertion.
- (4) Liability to extrusion of the globe, especially within a few weeks of the operation.

In regard to the first objection, it is worthy of note that the Committee were only able to find five cases in which the operation had been followed by sympathetic ophthalmia. In all of these the original injury was of a sort that would in itself be likely to cause sympathetic ophthalmia. In this connection it must be remembered that there are many cases on record in which sympathetic ophthalmia has occurred within a few days or weeks after excision, and it is a well established, clinical fact that in these the disease runs a much milder course than when it has come on before excision. Now the five cases above mentioned all followed exactly this rule and all recovered with good vision ; therefore, the first objection loses much of its weight.

As for the second objection, the question of a few days discomfort or a few weeks longer in hospital, can hardly be weighed against the subsequent advantages of the Mules' procedure.

The third objection lacks data to give it more than imaginary value.

The fourth rests so much on the judgment, care and skill of the operator that a definite estimate of its value is scarcely attainable. Some operators report a large percentage of failures, others a very small percentage.

The success of all surgical operations depends so much upon attention to details and perfection of technique, that such discrepancies can only be accounted for by the unknown quantity in "personal equation." The writer has only experienced two failures in twenty-six consecutive operations, and both of these were done in the presence of recognized contra-indications, viz., one in a case of suppurative panophthalmitis, the other in a greatly shrunken globe.

Apart from these two, twenty-four successive cases, all perfectly satisfactory in their results, tell strongly in favour of the technique followed by the writer, as described in a communication read before the Ophthalmological Section of the British Medical Association in Montreal, in 1897, and which differs in some respects from the original procedure of Mr. Mules, as well as from all other known modifications of that operation.

In the minority report of the Committee made by Mr. Thomas H. Beckiston, the statement of his views on the question of excision may,