

I not good grounds on which to rest this assertion, hazardous though some may deem it? I have written frankly and have given many of my test cases and my own opinions without reserve.

My views may, at times, appear to be dogmatic, irrational and optimistic; but to me, these terms, if used, seem unjustifiable, for so convinced am I of the truth of what I have written.

Also in the light of my results, have I not a right to ask for a different verdict, or at least if one is given at variance with my own, that it be shown by clinical and demonstrable proofs that it rests upon a foundation as sure and reasonable as my own?

This Combined Treatment seemed to open up so strong a possibility of being able successfully to cope with diseases of the eyes, where previously failures had been the rule, that, at first, I was afraid that my belief in its unusual powers of healing might after a time prove to be misplaced. But after the Combined Treatment had been put to severe and searching trials, it came out still more firmly placed in my confidence. This feeling of reliance upon it has grown, and I am now, and it appears to me rightly, firmly fixed in this belief, that it is this *new use and grouping of old remedies* which enable such satisfactory results to be brought about.