

irritability, abstractions, or worse. The cause may be a concealed one, but it is the psychic factor alone which needs treatment. One must remove the cause of the emotional change rather than administer drugs.

The fact of the matter is that all this goes to show that in the detection of mental abnormalities a correct *etiological diagnosis is essential*—a diagnosis of both the physical and mental conditions, for the complexity of psychopathic cases is beyond all belief.

It is important to remember that many people are committed to asylums who would be far better off elsewhere, and that mental disorders and mental symptoms are not synonymous terms.

One is apt to talk rather glibly about a patient having "lost his reason", having "lost his senses", when, as a matter of fact, the mental disturbance may in no way have affected the intellect or the reason, while the changed emotions *alone* may be responsible. The patient has merely "lost his table of values," and is much like a child who cannot adapt himself to his environment, and the inner harmony is lacking.

It is in just such conditions as these that the physician, be he a general practitioner, or be he skilled in the refinements of physical diagnosis, is apt to fall short.

No inconsiderable training is required before one's opinion becomes of value.

Etiologically and symptomatically, the behaviour of the sane and insane is largely one of degree; certainly this is the case with neurasthenics. The chief difference between them is in the mental conflict which requires careful analysis and consideration. The general practitioner is called upon to decide between the sane and the insane, to diagnose exactly, if he can, between the various types of psychoneurosis between the different types of personality, if you will, and to advise as to disposal. To commit, or not to commit, that is the question, and the decision is oftentimes an urgent one. He is called upon to decide as best he can between the emotional and the intellectual, to deal with disorders of human adjustment, and with distorted methods of meeting the complex situations of life, all of which are problems the solution of which requires specialized training.

He must be skilled in questions of mental hygiene, of adaptability to environment, and the reactions that arise therefrom, and no one untrained in psychology should presume to offer a final opinion.

It is obvious that the general practitioner is called upon to decide something in which his previous training has been defective. He has not learned to appreciate the degrees of personality, in fact, he probably does not pre-suppose a personality in most of the patients that come within his ken. Now psychiatry teaches us that each human being