

years, I am absolutely ignorant of anything which can possibly justify such ridiculous exaggeration. I have publicly challenged Sir Spencer Wells to indicate the proceedings to which he alludes, and to produce the evidence upon which he bases his charges; but up to the moment of my leaving England he had not taken up the gauntlet. It is a somewhat remarkable fact that, in another journal of the same month, the same writer actually pleaded in favor of the removal of tubercular lungs, that such an operation would be justifiable if it saved one patient in twenty of those operated on, and it seems to me absolutely impossible to reconcile such a recommendation with the denunciation I have just read. So far as my own work in Battey's operation is concerned, in not a single one of the six patients operated upon were the uterine appendages normal. Two of them were carefully investigated by independent observers, one of whom was the well-known and accomplished pathologist, Mr. A. Doran, by whom the specimens were fully described and figured, in the *Brit. Med. Journal*.

The results of these operations were, in the first place, that all the patients made easy and uninterrupted recoveries; the operations were performed after the most careful consultation, and with the full cognizance on the part of the patients and their friends of the results which were certain, and the entire speculative nature of those it was hoped would be obtained. As I have already published the cases in detail, with the exception of the last, which was only performed a few weeks ago, I need not here repeat them, save in general terms, and that is to the effect that in two cases the results are such as to completely justify the proceeding. In both of these the disease before the operation was so intense that it was threatening life, but now it is almost entirely subdued, and the health of the patients has been enormously improved. In one case, the disease was arrested for a year and a half, and though it is now returning the patient has been transformed from a wretchedly feeble and broken-down girl into a healthy and robust woman, although affected by epilepsy almost as badly as before. In two others, the disease has been greatly modified, and the health of the patients has been immensely benefited. From this brief record it is quite a matter open for discussion as to whether the continuance of the proceeding can be recommended, and I am bound to say that I have not myself a very

strong opinion in the affirmative; but I think, if I had a daughter with feeble health, the result of pronounced menstrual epilepsy, I would advise her to have the operation performed. From what I have seen of it myself, I think there can hardly be any risk about it, and if performed with the precautions indicated, I do not think it can be brought under the sweeping category of Sir Spencer Wells as being either rash, dangerous or unnecessary. There is another argument, and I think one that may be said to have some moral force, in that it will assist in the prevention of the distinctly pronounced hereditary tendency of the disease, and we should at least hesitate before we entirely condemn it. Certainly a great deal more can be said for it than for the proposal of pneumonotomy for phthisis, on the assumption that the removal of a lung would only save one patient out of twenty. Removal of the uterine appendages for epilepsy would probably not kill more than one per cent., and I am certain it would materially relieve fifty per cent.; it would improve the health of the great majority of patients, and I don't think it would make any of them worse than they were before the operation. I am hopeful, therefore, that the verdict of professional opinion will not be adverse to a fair and reasonable trial of Dr. Battey's proposal, and I trust that the freedom from the prejudice and the shackles of tradition which we find on this side of the Atlantic will secure for it a fair field.

And now, in conclusion, let me thank you most sincerely, and not only you, but many other professional bodies and large numbers of professional friends, for the kindly, I may say overwhelming, reception I have met with at your hands. For many months before I left home, there arrived hardly a mail which did not bring me invitations to partake of public or private hospitality, and these kind expressions of regard brought forth feelings of deep regret that my stay here could not be prolonged for as many months as it is limited in days. There is one thing in this reception I recognize above all others, and it is, that you are treating me not on account of any merits of my own, but as the representative of a large body of men in my own land to whom you have owed much in the past, and with whom you are in the present united in a common bond of brotherhood and community of sacred purpose. I predict that in the future this union and unity will be more and