

Letters to the Editor...(continued)

I had promised to send you a response to the *Suggested guidelines for hysterectomy...* (*Medical Ethics* May-July, 1994). When I actually started formulating it, I found that the statement we have prepared on behalf of the group named *Paryav* appropriately conveys my message... (See page 6-7 for an abridged version of the statement. **Editor**) Please note the distinction made between the helplessness of the natural parents of the handicapped women and the resources available to the State.

If the overall perspective of the statement is accepted, your guidelines are very good as a practical compromise.

Let me add that I am not convinced that the Indian State does not have the resources to manage the menstrual hygiene of those who cannot look after it themselves.

Dr. Anant Phadke
Block 50, L. I. C. Quarters
University Road, Pune 4 110 16

I have been reading *Medical Ethics* regularly. I find the issues tackled are topical. We should continue the newsletter at all cost.

I was particularly impressed by the guidelines for hysterectomy in mentally handicapped women (*Medical Ethics*, May-July, 1994). They are practical and positive with **sufficient** safeguards against misuse of the operation.

I have some suggestions for the dissemination of the issues discussed in the journal:

- a) It should be sent gratis to all Chief Justices, State Medical Councils, leading advocates and leading, conscientious practitioners for at least a year. It may be worth sending it to some groups on a long term-basis.
- b) Advocacy appears to be proving increasingly effective in development. There are a number of groups on the lookout for causes. Could we sensitise such groups to issues in medical ethics?

We shall have to raise **funds** for these purposes but that should not prove a major hurdle.

Dr. Dhruv Mankad
Nasik.



“This is all very fine, Hippocrates, but there’s nothing here about pay.”