

with it, there would always be something present of a painful nature. The term "pain" was used generally and included any hysterical or emotional condition. But if the conflict could be satisfactorily settled, from the patient's point of view, that distress would be no longer present; there would be no manifestation of repression coming back into the consciousness. Freud maintained that hysterics were unsatisfactory attempts at cure, that satisfactory attempts would not express themselves. He wished to thank Dr. Stanford Read for answering the point about the paradox, and he endorsed that gentleman's view entirely. He could not see a paradox in forgetting. Dr. Stanford Read's instance in regard to Jung's name was of the kind he, the speaker, quoted. As to whether different analysts would arrive at different conclusions on the same cases that depended on the analysts. Very much depended on the line adopted towards the patient by the first analyst who saw him, as well as on the line the patient adopted towards him. Any subsequent interview, whether with the same analyst or another, would suffer from the impress made by the first, and it would be a case of the result of this second analysis *plus* the first result. One of the great difficulties in the practice was caused by having chronic cases which had undergone tinkering by several other people, who often said the patient must try to drown all memories; he was told by one that he had nothing to worry about, and another told him he would never get well. It was being realised that work was going to be one of the most potent helps for these people, *i.e.*, a more conscious employment that the psycho-analyst could give. He had never yet met with a case in which he could—in an inebriate, for example—find out whether the forgetting could be traced, and then treated along Freudian lines.

THE ASSOCIATION'S BRONZE MEDAL.

The PRESIDENT said two essays had been sent in for the Association's Medal. Both of them were able, both showed painstaking work; but those whose duty it was to examine them and adjudicate upon them had concluded that neither came up to the level demanded by the Association for the bestowal of its medal. One of the essays was considered to show so much promise that the writer should be invited to enlarge the subject, for, with the addition of a little further work, there might be a good chance of securing the medal.

This concluded the meeting.

SOUTH-WESTERN DIVISION.

THE AUTUMN MEETING of the Division was held, by the courtesy of Dr. Blachford, at the City Mental Hospital, Fishponds, Bristol, on October 28th, 1921.

Dr. Soutar was voted to the chair, and the minutes of the last meeting were read and signed.

Dr. Bartlett was nominated Honorary Divisional Secretary.

Drs. Good and Soutar were nominated Representative Members of Council.

The place of the Spring Meeting was fixed for the Dorset County Mental Hospital, and the Secretary was instructed to tender the thanks of the members to Dr. Peachell for his kind invitation.

Dr. BLACHFORD then read a most interesting paper on "The Functions of the Basal Ganglia," and Dr. HADFIELD, Pathologist of the Bristol University, demonstrated a brain specimen showing a sclerotic patch in the optic thalamus from a case with a history of epileptiform fits, increasing in number and severity, for three years without permanent motor symptoms. Drs. SOUTAR, HADFIELD and BARTLETT took part in the ensuing discussion.

At the conclusion of the meeting a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to Dr. Blachford for his kind hospitality.

SOUTH-EASTERN DIVISION.

THE AUTUMN MEETING of the South-Eastern Division was held by the courtesy of Dr. C. M. Tuke at Chiswick House, Chiswick, on Wednesday, October 12th, 1921.

The members were entertained to luncheon and were afterwards shown round the house and grounds.

The meeting was held at 4 p.m.

Dr. C. M. Tuke took the Chair.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

Dr. D. BOWER proposed, and it was seconded by Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH, that the Spring Meeting should be held sometime in the month of April.

At a meeting of the Committee of Management held the same day it was decided that the day and place of the Spring Meeting be left to the Hon. Divisional Secretary to arrange.

Dr. TUKE then read his paper "On Some Points of Historical and Architectural Interest in Chiswick House," and Dr. G. W. SMITH gave a short account of a case of "Mania in Myxœdema," which was followed by a discussion, in which Dr. EDWARDS and Dr. G. F. BARHAM took part. Dr. SMITH replied.

A vote of thanks to Dr. Tuke was carried by acclamation, and the members were then entertained to tea, which concluded this very pleasant meeting.

PARLIAMENTARY NEWS.

November 3rd, 1921: Ex-service men in asylums.—In reply to a long question by Capt. Loseby, Mr. MACPHERSON said that he was bound by law to send a certified patient to an asylum or some other place approved by the Board of Control. The places he utilised for this unfortunate class of men were very well run indeed. He did not ask for any charity. It was an obligation of the State to attend to this work. Mr. Macpherson added that he had no personal knowledge of the success or otherwise of Chartfield. A report was now being submitted. He should consider the individual merits of the place. It was, of course, his duty to see that the various institutions under the department were good and were carrying on successful work. He refused to send ex-service men to a charity institution.

Sir WATSON CHEYNE asked whether it was not a fact the general asylums were fully aware of the hope and possibility of treatment, and put that as their first object in receiving patients.—Capt. LOSEBY said he could not follow what kind of hardship was held to be inflicted upon the insane by compelling them to mix with the sane.—Mr. MACPHERSON said it was difficult to discuss the question of policy by means of question and answer, but he refused to mix insane patients with neurasthenics.

November 8th, 1921: Ex-service men in asylums.—Capt. LOSEBY asked for the number of lunatic asylums approved by the Ministry of Pensions for ex-service men and the number of these which were run for private gain.—Mr. MACPHERSON said that approximately 240 institutions were under the control of or had been approved by the Board of Control and the Ministry, and of these more than 60 were private establishments.

November 9th, 1921: Ex-service men in asylums.—Capt. LOSEBY asked the Prime Minister if the treatment allowances upon which some 6000 ex-service men depend, were paid strictly on the condition that these men consented to be confined in lunatic asylums, whereas the allowance was refused in respect of patients being treated and anxious to be treated in certain private institutions of the Board of Control; also whether the official figures showed that on January 1st, 1919, there were 2507 ex-soldiers confined in lunatic asylums; that the figures had risen to 4673 on January 1st, 1921, and to 6435 on October 27th, 1921. He asked, further, if the Prime Minister was aware that bitter laments were continually emerging from the men so confined, and whether he would consider the advisability of setting up a Commission of members of the Houses of Parliament to hear complaints and consider whether conditions could be improved.

Mr. MACPHERSON, who replied, said that the lunacy law required that every person who was certified as insane should be sent to an institution approved by the Board of Control, save that under certain conditions a single patient might be placed in a private house not specifically licensed for the reception of lunatics. Treatment allowances were granted, and the necessary cost of treatment was defrayed by the Pensions Department in respect of all certified patients whose insanity was due to war service and who were receiving treatment in institutions,