

tions, the source of which is not clearly apparent at the time, may lead to failure in performing intelligence tests or to confusion and inaccuracy in the interpretation of their results. Therefore, however useful these psychological tests are for determining, within broad lines, the rate of intellectual growth or the level of intelligence attained, they can not be relied upon alone, in making the diagnosis of feeble-mindedness. That must be done with all available data at hand, and, in my own opinion, should always rest in the hands of a physician who has had special training in psychiatry. This condition was adequately met, however, in the case which I mentioned and the hasty and ill-considered ridicule of the judge was directed toward the best combination of methods which we possess for determining mental deficiency.

It is impossible to overestimate the harm which can arise from clouding the really important issues of feeble-mindedness by such controversies as these. The momentous problems which have grown out of our failure to deal with mental deficiency require for their solution the absolutely united efforts of lawyers and law-makers, physicians, educators and social workers. Such meetings as this show that co-operation can readily be obtained in the study and discussion of the problem. If such co-operation can be secured and maintained in urging these matters before the Legislature success is assured.

We may set ourselves the task of providing an adequate frame-work of law for dealing with feeble-mindedness, secure in the belief that its accomplishment will not only bring a new world of security and happiness within reach of the mentally defective, but will remove from society a menacing shadow, which grows every day and every hour during which we ignore its existence.