been done; untruthful, because they charge us with doing things that we have not done. They impugn the motives of those engaged in the work and question the results obtained by them. The critics freely admit, on the one hand, that the work should be done, and the next moment they denounce us for having the timerity to do it. They institute an inquiry on purely speculative ideas and receive shoals of negative opinions. When I say negative, I mean the endorsation of their standpoint from those having little or no experience of the subject. What estimated value can be placed upon negative opinions when weighed against positive statements: the finished product of actual experience? We deny the right of any one to pose upon theoretical grounds alone as a critic of gynecology among the insane. As all the objectors have arrogated to themselves the position of judges on this subject, it is only fair to ask them to produce the premises upon which they have qualified themselves to act as arbiters of the treatment of gynecic disease among the insane.

What have our critics done to qualify themselves to sit in judgment upon us? What patients, and how many, have they examined for pelvic disease? What gynecologists have they called in in consultation? What have they found? Do they expect us or the profession at large to be guided by their mere opinion resting on nothing, as against the evidence of our actual investigation?

In spite of the continued publication of the restoration to health of many cases resulting from the removal of physical disease through the agency of gynecological surgery, the critics persist in ignoring the facts and reiterating the absurd cry that "we operate for insanity." Unprejudiced observers, upon perusal of the cases as given below, will at once admit the fallacy of this assertion. The text of our work has always been that "*these operations are done primarily and specifically for the removal of physical diseases and the promotion of bodily comfort.*" Why do these critics persist in repeating this old, baseless plaint "that we operate for insanity"? Why will they not point to even one case in which an operation was done for, or because of, the mental condition? They cannot prevent the profession from obtaining the true status of the work.

"That we look for disease and find it" is the sarcastic comment advanced by one critic as to the manner of our gynecological diagnosis. This criticism is made without the slightest knowledge of the facts, and casts doubt upon the conjoint opinion of at least two or more medical men. No operation is done in the London Asylum unless my diagnosis of the disease is agreed to by our skilled consulting gynecologist, Dr. Meek.