

WHAT CAN THE STATE DO FOR DEFECTIVE CHILDREN OUTSIDE THE INSTITUTION?

RETYPE FROM ORIGINAL

I am asked to suggest what can be done for defective children by the state outside the institution. The question implies a fact with which we are all familiar, namely: that there is a class of defective people on the borderland between independents and dependents. The line of demarcation between normal and abnormal people is so indistinct that the number affected by this question is larger than one would at first suspect. We must distinguish, however, between those who are really feeble-minded and those who merely develop more slowly than the average normal. Intellectual power in man is truly measured by continuity of growth through life until the period when physical decline begins. A precocious child may be, and usually is, a complete failure as an adult; and there are children who make progress slowly both in the school room and in the particular productive occupations to which their environments attach them, yet who constantly display capacity for knowing and learning things. They are characterized by persistence and application, and at least fairly good self-control. These children will grow into useful independent lives if fairly reasonable opportunities are afforded them. The truly feeble-minded child even though he may apparently be possessed of quick perceptions, is born with marked limitations for development, and still more marked inability for self-control, and this latter is the most serious defect. In my judgment such a child should early be placed in training in, and for, an isolated community of his class. I believe as a general thing that an abnormal child can not be cared for in a normal family either to his or their advantage. This reduces the proposition in theory to a point where there are no people to be cared for outside of the institution except those that can be cared for in private families. It is largely because of the fact that the above stated proposition is not realized by the public at large, and more particularly by the people most interested, that we really do have a number of people incapable of staying in normal families and difficult or impossible to retain in public institutions, that require some special attention. Parents are usually slow in realizing deficiencies in their own children. For twenty years there has been slowly developing a scheme of special education for backward children in the public schools, based upon the theory that special training and opportunity for more deliberate advancement would enable backward children to become entirely independent citizens, and that this training could be obtained in special classes in connection with the public schools, and thereby avoid the necessity of sending such children to state institutions. To the extent that these schools devote their energies to the class of children to which I first referred, the merely backward ones, they will become permanent and exceedingly useful features of our public schools. Naturally, however, they are expending a good portion of their energy in attempting to train children who are really feeble-minded, and already the supervisors of some of the oldest schools of this character are recognizing the fact that a large number of pupils who have received training in these schools eventually become dependent upon public or private charity; so in the management of these special schools, as well as in the management of the state

institutions, the authorities are obliged to recognize the sentimental elements and meet conditions that actually exist as best they may. Now, as a matter of fact, there are boys and girls growing up in this commonwealth who are actually so defective that only the closest guardianship prevents them from being nuisances, and in some cases, criminals in their respective communities. Usually those under the guardianship of their parents or interested friends lose this supervision eventually either because of the death of their natural guardians or their enfeeblement by age, or they become uncontrollable. If they have no relatives or friends they begin early to drift around from place to place and so earlier become involved in inharmonious relations with their surroundings. If this lack of harmony becomes too marked, and some public or official interference with their lawless acts is required, the question of what to do with them is often a difficult one to answer. They will probably be sent either to the Hospital for Insane, the Training School, or the School for Feeble-Minded. When sent to the Hospital they are pronounced not insane; when to the Training School their mental insufficiency is too marked to enable them to be placed out in families, or the shift for themselves, even after a course of training and discipline; if sent to the School for Feeble-Minded it is almost impossible to retain them as they have become so thoroughly accustomed to the shiftless life of non-restraint that they embrace the first opportunity to escape.

Then again, there are individuals who grow to adult life who are normally bright in the acquisition of knowledge, but who were always spoken of as "queer" and who are more or less out of harmony with their surroundings. They would not be considered either feeble-minded or backward, but they do not make a success of life. If they are the cause of disturbing the peace they are apt to be sent to the Hospital for Insane. In fact the hospitals no doubt have a larger experience with this class than does a school for feeble-minded.

The one very essential characteristic of all these borderland cases is lack of self-control. As has been very pertinently remarked of this class, "With them it is not a question of becoming self-supporting, but self-controlling."

Referring especially again to the experience of the school for feeble-minded, the records of that institution on Aug. 1, 1904 showed 144 who had been dropped out for various causes; first, because their parents felt that they were capable of partially or entirely supporting themselves; second; relatives were willing and anxious to be responsible for them in their own homes, or third; they were restless and comparatively ambitious persons who felt themselves capable of getting along independently in life, and it seemed best to give them a trial. At the present date 56 have been reported as doing well either independently or under the supervision of relatives or friends. The fact that of the 144 above referred to 93 have already returned to the guardianship of the institution, and that others have gotten along unsuccessfully, emphasizes the fact that for the majority the institution must be their life home. Of the others we have been unable to obtain any information.

Let a few cases illustrate:

Case 1. #38-J.P. Age 16 years at the time of admission, April, 1882. Could count a little, but could not read or write. Left in 1884. In 1887 his father reported as working hard on farm, grubbing, etc. Made about a full hand, but could not be crossed. If praised

did very well. In 1899 again reported doing well, could never learn to drive a team or to plow, but could shock up grain, pitch bundles, and do chores around barn and grounds. "He is not vicious or dangerous, unless aggravated, which we do not allow." His father says stepmother is fond of him and so long as both she and the father lived, he would be cared for at home. In March, 1905 the stepmother writes that the father is dead and she cannot control the boy. He was re-admitted to the institution on the 3rd of last September, now nearly 40 years of age. He has been a good helper at getting in the garden stuff. Gets along pleasantly with the boys.

Case 2. #1057-L.G. Seventeen years of age at the time of admission in January, 1897. Large and strong - passionate, even considered dangerous. His admission was urged on the grounds that he was liable to kill his mother. Could spell a few words, but did not read or write, or count. Was in school 3 years. Did not accomplish much in a literary way - could read a little in the first reader, count 12 and write a letter from copy. Did very well in the industrial classes, made laundry bags well, did well at bench work, and made such articles as floor polishers, kneepads, curtain poles, etc. He was not a difficult boy to control. He went home for vacation in June, 1901 and did not return. In May of this year his mother reports that he is doing nicely. "He is in good health and works well when he has some one in company with him. He even worked in the railroad last year when his brother was with him." He was then staying at home and was quite good help to his mother.

Case 3. #324-O.H. 18 years of age at the time of admission in April, 1888. Large, weighed about 175 pounds, could read and write both in English and Swedish languages. Had a fair knowledge of numbers, could add and subtract. Enjoyed constructive occupation. Went home for vacation in 1892 and did not return. A relative reported in 1899 that the boy was doing fairly well. He was then working on the railroad as section hand. He was well and strong and could do good work when he wanted to. He was very lazy and could not be depended upon. He had made a violin the winter before that was quite neat.

Case 4. #589-L.M. 12 years of age at the time of admission in June, 1891. He came to us from the State School at Owatonna. He could read in the first reader; count 20 or 30, write his name and a few short words. Learned multiplication and division, etc. He did very nicely in sloyd and shop work. He was then sent to the farm to work. Was difficult boy to control. Was always dissatisfied and finally was permitted to go to work for an outside farmer. He did fairly well here for a time, and remained until the farmer moved away when he went to work for another farmer. This was in May, 1900. he stayed at that place until the 5th of July, of the same year, when he ran away, and presumably hired out with some circus people that happened to be in town. He returned the 29th of Aug. On the 22nd of the following September he stole some of the farmer's oats which he took to town and sold, keeping the money himself, and a few days later he took some money and disappeared. On the 6th of December he came back to the institution, promised good behavior and was permitted to remain. He became restless and started out for himself again the latter part of the month. Except drifting about from place to place. Much of the time we have not known where he was. He has gotten into a good many

scrapes. He was reported last spring as serving a month in jail for stealing. He was sick this summer and returned to the institution, only to run away again as soon as he was better. Do not know where he is at the present time.

Case 5. #2351-C.H. Admitted 25th of last January. He is 38 years of age; large and strong. Has twice been committed to one of the hospitals for insane, only to be discharged again. He reads and writes. When he is at home drinks and is perfectly uncontrollable. His mother and neighbors are afraid to have him around. He has been employed about the grounds most of the time since he came to the institution and is capable of good work, and at times does pretty well, but as a rule lacks application or continuity - needs close supervision. He thinks himself capable of earning big wages and taking care of himself.

Case 6. #1257-W.K. Admitted to the institution Sept. 1898, and was then about 20 years of age. Strong and healthy, had attended school for ten years with scarcely any results. Could count a little, but could not read or write. He was placed in school but did not accomplish very much. Read poorly in the primer, writing poor; could count to 33. Was taken out of school and put to work outside. Was mail carrier for a time. Was a well disposed boy. In May, 1901 his father sent for him to come home and go to work on a farm. August, 1903 the father wrote that he did not consider the capable of self-support without supervision. He stated that he was too old now to look after him and was going to give it up and send him back to the institution in the fall when he could get him off. He said the boy "was working for a farmer and quit in the middle of July and went to working for nothing."

Case 7. #51-W.P. Admitted April, 1882. eleven years of age. After some years in the training department proper he could read well in the fourth reader, had some knowledge of numbers, and wrote a very fair letter, and became a good brush maker. He was then transferred to the farm where he did quite good work, teaming, milking and general labor. He became restless and finally ran away in May 1902 and went to work for a farmer in this vicinity. He returned in the fall of his own accord, but ran away again in November, 1904. He worked in various places, and finally made his way home. His people could do nothing for him and he returned to the institution a few weeks ago, forlorn, ragged and dirty.

Case 8. #598-H.B. Admitted in May, 1894, then 16 years of age. Had been in school for three years and could read and write a letter. After four years in school he read in the 3 Reader; writing fairly good, spelling poor. In sloyd and shop work he showed originality and considerable skill. Made several cabinet articles. He a difficult boy to control - sly and underhanded, could not be trusted at all. Became very restless and in May, 1902 his sister took him out of the institution to shift for himself. Have not known definitely where he has been employed, but he visited the boys last spring and he then indicated that he had been spending the winter in the logging camps. He was dirty and unkempt. The summers, he said, he spent working in bowling alleys, picking up pins, etc. and other odd jobs.

Now, if you will permit me to modify the question assigned to me by the Committee, "What shall be done by the state to insure the best welfare for defectives outside of the institution," I will answer by saying that in my judgment they should be under the supervision of an authorized agent similar to those employed by the schools at Owatonna and Red Wing, and in order to make this system of supervision effective I believe provision should be made by law for placing certain defective people under permanent state guardianship by direct act or Court of proper jurisdiction. This plan the writer has advocated for several years, and he is thoroughly convinced of the advantage of such a plan. The functions of such a supervising agency would be two-fold, first, secure homes for such persons as gave promise of reasonable access under proper supervision, and second, to determine by actual observation from time to time whether such individuals were making sufficient degree of success to continue in the outside world, and if not, to secure their commitment to the proper institution. An agent of this kind would be a natural referee in assisting the courts to determine the disposition to be made of all these borderland, defective people, and this plan would be an important link in the chain of the state's duties to its defective classes.

Mr. Rosing: Is that system in vogue anywhere, Doctor?

Supt. Rogers: I don't know that it is. It is an extension of the State Agency plan. That is the idea in which, I believe, Minnesota leads anyway.

The Chairman: As I understand it, some authority must be empowered to determine what class of persons would come under the agent's supervision?

Supt. Rogers: My thought was -just take an example. This applies to boys, because girls can't be placed out. Take any boy that is very anxious to work outside and that shows a fairly reasonable ability for it, place him out and try him under a contract with a farmer or manufacturer; then this agent, or whatever he would be described as, would supervise this location and his work and conduct and his treatment, just as the agents do for the other institutions. If necessary, place them under this permanent guardianship that I referred to, but let that be an entirely different matter. If he should become entirely uncontrollable and it becomes necessary, then bring him before a court of proper jurisdiction and have him placed under absolute guardianship, so that he could be returned to the institution if he didn't make a success outside. If he ran away, bring him back and put him in again.

Mr. Leavett: Your suggestion does not go to the point of having them admitted first to the institution and then put out under the supervision of the institution?

Supt. Rogers: Not necessarily, although I think there would be an advantage, if they were eligible, to have them come to the institution, because in a great many cases where boys can't get along at all outside the very air of the institution controls them. They seem to drop into the routine. They are not understood outside and they are usually antagonized or spoiled and their lack of self control increases lack of self control, and they feel that everything is against them; people don't have patience with them and they are constantly deceived. But brought to the institution and treated fairly and their cases studied very often they get along very nicely. We have a great many boys in our institution today that belong to just this class, who simply couldn't get along outside at

all, but we occasionally get one that we can't keep. Now that occasional one should be under the supervision of this agent, in my judgment.

Mr. Leavett: You take that class you can't keep there, are they particularly vicious in any one direction? Usually?

Supt. Rogers: Not necessarily. The one thing that is characteristic of all this class is lack of self-control.

The Chairman:

Mr. Merrill, you have had considerable experience with boys and girls, and some of them have had to be sent to other institutions. We would be glad to hear from you on the subject of this paper.

Supt. Merrill: Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse the idea of the Doctor (Rogers) that great good could be accomplished with a large number of defective boys by having them under the supervision of a state agent. They could be cared for and looked after in this way, it seems to me, to advantage to themselves and at less expense to the state than to undertake to take care of them in an institution. I think that it is important that they should be under state supervision. When we withdraw state supervision there is danger of neglect, especially if they fall back upon the uncertain care given to paupers - if they receive the common paupers support in a county poor house, which seems to me very improper and very dangerous. Under the care and supervision of an agent, as the Doctor suggests, they might be made, in a measure, self-supporting, and wholly so perhaps, and they would become, instead of nuisances in the community where they live, people that could be tolerated and would live happily themselves.

I think it would be an advantage for them to first pass through the institution on account of the acquaintance with the peculiarities of the child the authorities of the institution would get by a short life in the institution. We find this is true in our work in the State School, that there is a great advantage, especially with the boys and girls who are inclined to be troublesome when they are placed out in homes. If we know their peculiarities and weak points it is a great deal easier for our visiting agents to settle questions which arise in the families after they are placed out and to avoid the necessity of their being brought back to the school. This knowledge of the child and the knowledge which the visiting agent has of the home and surroundings in which the child is placed enable them very often to adjust difficulties and to settle the child in a home which he can retain, and by following this supervision on to the age of self-support, they become really strong, self-supporting young people; otherwise they would drift out and perhaps, instead of being absorbed into the normal community where they lived, they would become criminal or constantly troublesome. I think the idea that the state can do good work for such defectives, through state supervision by means of a state agent is a good one and one that can be made practical and useful to the state.

The Chairman: Is it the duty of your agents to communicate to people where children are put out what their peculiarities are?

Mr. Merrill: Yes sir that is done by our agents and also by correspondence through my office. This aids in securing proper and wise treatment of

the children by the people with whom they live. The more the people know about them, the better they are apt to train them.

Mr. Leavett: I would like to ask you a question, Dr. Rogers, (I don't feel competent to discuss this question very much), but wouldn't it be an absolute necessity for someone skilled in the treatment of this defective class, who have made it a study, to determine when they were of a nature and disposition that would justify their being put out in some home in the hope that they might earn their livelihood, and also wouldn't there be a necessity, as Mr. Merrill has said, of the party knowing something about the boy that they were taking into their family? Could that be done by a court? The ordinary court wouldn't know any more about it than we do and wouldn't be able to determine that question, and consequently wouldn't there be a necessity for the child to be first committed to your institution and kept there long enough for to learn its peculiarities and disposition and how it could best be handled and then also determine, in addition, whether it was a child that should go out and, if so, when the time came when it should go out? Could that be done in any other way?

Supt. Rogers: I think that would be the best way, - to have the child committed first, but it seems to me that I can see that in time the agent would be able to determine the question without the child being committed. The agent necessarily would have to be one who was thoroughly familiar with that class of children, presumably from institution experience with them, because of the large number brought together there. He would be an advisor for the court. A boy may be eccentric and all that, and out of harmony with his surroundings, and it may be shown, if you come to examine his history carefully, that there are distinct delusions there and well-founded delusion, on account of which, if the study was gone into the probate court would send him to an insane hospital. The agent would be an advisor of the court in cases of that kind and he would be called upon to lookup the data.

Supt. Dow: Are there not cases where they would resent very seriously being sent to such an institution and be really enraged by being sent there so that it would be difficult to handle them, perhaps?

Supt. Rogers: Well I think that that might be true in some few cases, but the very fact that they could be placed and tried in some family under the agent's supervision would enable the agent to study them more carefully and then determine what should be done. Of course after the authorities are fully satisfied as to what should be done it isn't a question of sentiment. This question of sentiment is a very uncertain thing. We have had little boys, and girls, too, come to the institution with big, burly policemen and perhaps and assistant, crying and acting as though they were raving maniacs, and perhaps the first remark the policeman would make would be "Better look out for him". One of our ladies would go and sit down with them and in ten minutes they would be perfectly quiet.

Mr. Leavett: Could an agent possibly study the numerous cases indifferent parts of the state, perhaps seeing the child once in a month or two or three months? Could he make any study of the child that would be of value, as compared with the teacher in constant intercourse with him?

Supt. Rogers: I don't know that I made my position clear. I don't think the number that would be out would be very large. I think the institution is the home for that class of people. It would only be in the cases of those who wouldn't come to the

institution or shouldn't be detained in the institution that this agency would especially be of advantage. I think that the majority of these cases will have to come under institution care, and that the village community for defective people is the ideal life for them.

Supt. Kilbourne: Do you have many of those feeble-minded girls who go out that have children?

Supt. Rogers: Well there have been a few cases where girls have gone out under protest and gotten into trouble. We have five who have gone out and got married.

Supt. Kilbourne: Their children are all feeble-minded, are they not?

Supt. Rogers: Sometimes they are brighter than their mothers. Depends upon whom they marry.

Supt. Merrill: I wish to call the Doctor's attention to the case of a little baby sent to our institution from the School for the Feeble-Minded some years ago, which remained there for a year or so and has been placed out. I have a written application now from the family, after several years, to adopt that child. They say that the child appears to be bright in every way and is developing well. We can't tell how long that may continue. May be this development may be very slow a little later. At the present time the child must be about ten years old and she appears to be a bright child in every way and, as I said, the family are very anxious to adopt her and have applied for permission to make her their legal air as their own child.

Mr. Leavett: If it is a proper question for these medical men, I should like to inquire, if this girl, who is apparently normal in every way, that you have under discussion, eventually marries and has children, isn't it more than probable that this trouble will show in her children where it doesn't show in herself?

Supt. Rogers: I don't think I could answer that as well as some of the other physicians, but my impression is that, that we don't know very much about the laws of heredity yet, and though one side of the family may be quite weak, as n the case of this woman (this woman is quite weak, the mother of the child) I don't know about the father. He might have been an unscrupulous man. I think they were not married and he may have been a very bright man mentally and his strain may have been the strongest strain and of course that would naturally give something of a chance to that child.

Mr. Leavett: In view of the necessity of protecting society which all concede, not only from these people but some others perhaps, that is from their having an opportunity to propagate their species and so bring into the world many other dependents, should there any encouragement be held out to anybody that the children of people who are weak mentally, will ever become a part of the normal people and should we give them opportunities we think perhaps they ought not to have?

Dr. Rogers: I don't think we should. But it is pretty hard, if a child is apparently normal to feel that you have a right, knowing as little as we do about heredity, to shut the child out from all attractions in life. Give the child a trial in the absence of more accurate information.

Mr. Leavett: You mean now if the child appears to be normal in every respect?

Supt. Rogers: yes, unless we know the family history pretty thoroughly. We can't shut them up and deprive them of anything.

Mr. Leavett: Those cases are rare, are they not, where a child comes to your institution that is apparently normal?

Supt. Rogers: Those cases like the one Mr. Merrill refers to were born in the institution. The mothers came to us because they were in a family way to be taken care of, and the child grew up pretty bright.

Supt. Welch: I agree heartily with Dr. Rogers recommendation that some agent should be appointed to look after these cases and, as he says, I don't think there would be very many in the state - say fifty over the whole state. Many of these cases are sent to the insane hospitals first and more or less of them we transfer to Dr. Rogers' institution. But we always have them in our institution. I think it would be better to have them go to the institution first before being placed under the agent. There we could observe them and get at their characteristics.

The Chairman: Well, parents will not send their children to the institution voluntarily?

Supt. Welch: No, parents wouldn't do anything voluntarily.

The Chairman: How, then, are these cases to be found and gotten out of the community?

Supt. Welch: Well, let the thing take its course. When an individual becomes a nuisance to the surrounding population, he will be brought before the probate court and either adjudged insane or feeble-minded and committed to the one or the other institution, and then, after observation in one of those institutions, I think, if in our opinion they are capable of living outside, they should be placed under this agent.

Mr. Leavett: Dr. Rogers, are there people, for instance, ten years old and over, who go to your institution, that after study, treatment and care, you find to be normal, or even approach normal, or is this confined to infants that you take in this condition and they prove to be normal?

Supt. Rogers: You are speaking of those that are bright? Well, in every case, except one that I have in mind they have been infants. A child is very apt to be sent to us who has been tried in the public schools and made a success there or developed as the ordinary child, because everything is against, and properly so, of course, sending a child out of the family. It is only when parents find that the child doesn't get along somewhere, either in the school or with his playmates that he is sent to the School for Feeble Minded.

The Chairman: Mr. Whittier, you have had experience, now, with this matter of placing children out and managing them through agents and so on; we would be glad to hear from you.

Supt. Whittier: I hardly know what to say, except that I have some very positive notions along the line of state agency. Perhaps they came from my former work in that line. It has been my opinion for a good many years that the agency system ought to be materially enlarged, and that the probation system ought to be enlarged. The two are so closely united, they go so near hand in hand, that I believe the only right way is to combine them into one central agency. I believe the time has come when the state agents of our state and the probation officers of our state should work under a central agent. Anyone that has been in the work for any length of time will be astonished to find, where there is a record kept of the different names in the different institutions, that there is a frequent repetition of names in the different records. I have a case in mind now where a family has a boy in the School for Feeble Minded, a girl in another institution, and two boys in the State Training School. That discovery was made by our State Agent. When I

was in the agency work going from place to place looking up histories of men committed to the prison and reformatory, I was surprised to find the number that were in the different institutions. The information that could be gathered concerning these family histories and compiled and furnished to the heads of the institutions, it seems to me, would be very, very valuable, and even the superintendents would be surprised to know, if they had a way of knowing, of the close relationship that some of their inmates have with inmates of entirely different institutions and along different lines, that is, they may be in the penal institutions or institutions for dependents. My idea is that the probation system and the state agency system are systems that ought to be enlarged and to be cultivated. I don't believe that any too much agitation or education or public sentiment can be instituted along that line. The time has come, I think, when it is our duty as heads of institutions to agitate that thing and get the public educated up to the fact of the necessity of that thing, also to educate the public up to what the institutions are trying to do, to educate the public into the notion that the State of Minnesota is not trying to build up large institutions, and if it is possible to take care of its dependents outside of institutions, that is the place to do it. That can best be done by the agency and probation officers. They are so near alike in their work that I think eventually they will work themselves into a central agency, and when that is done I believe we will have more efficient work by all our agents. So far as the institution with which I am connected is concerned I know we have perhaps as efficient an agent as we can ever hope to have. We all know Miss Johnston and her work. Miss Johnston could perhaps furnish Dr. Rogers some information that he does not now possess. I know she could come to Mr. Merrill and perhaps even to the insane hospital men.

The Chairman: These boys and girls, of whom you have so many, and there are many outside of the institution, do you regard them as defective or simply delinquent?

Supt. Whittier: Very many of them are defective. It is hard to determine sometimes as to defectiveness and delinquency, where one begins and the other leaves off. Many of them are defective. Their great trouble is a lack of self-control, as Dr. Rogers says.

Supt. Tomlinson: Are they not delinquent because they are defective, a large number of them?

Supt. Whittier: Yes, I think that is true. It is true, also, the other way - they are defective because of delinquency either on their part or on the part of their parents. I think neglect a great many times on the part of parents brings about defectiveness in their children, and I know positively that delinquency on the part of parents will bring about delinquency on the part of children, even although it may not be inherited. From the nature of things, you can't bring up a good boy in a bad family. If the parents are delinquent to such a degree that they are perhaps criminally inclined, you can't very well help to have the child criminally inclined. The state agency idea is the one in which I believe this state leads now and I believe we should keep on leading.

The Chairman: Mr. Dow, you have to do with children more or less. We would be glad to hear from you on Dr. Rogers' paper and the questions involved.

Supt. Dow: I don't know as I could say very much along the lines that have been referred to thus far, but there is, however, a point of contact between this topic and something I have in mind and have had in mind for a long time, that is the necessity

of providing for the protection or looking after blind children who have passed beyond the age or period of school life, especially blind girls who are, as most such blind girls are, somewhat frail physically, and not precisely frail mentally, yet frail so far as any knowledge of the world is concerned and taking care of themselves. I have in mind probably half a dozen cases of girls who ought to have guardians, yet, as far as I can understand, there is no provision under which such guardians could be appointed. If they had property they could have guardians. But they haven't any property and there doesn't seem to be any way of providing guardians for them. For instance there is girl in Goodhue County. She has grandparents living, but they haven't ever done anything for her, and she has some distant relatives who have been anxious to shift her upon somebody else. She is disagreeable, she is defective in other ways than blindness and yet she isn't feeble-minded. She is simply hard to get along with - a troublesome girl. I might compare her somewhat to a case that Dr. Rogers knows, that he has had in his institution, two of them, - he has got one of them there now. Now there came a time when she could no longer remain in the institution. She had got all she could get from there and she didn't want to stay there any longer and she resented going back to her parents and her grandparents were not in any condition to do anything for her, and nobody else would, she couldn't live with them, she made so much trouble. She wanted to live in a family outside of Faribault and went there and stayed a year or so, and we lost all control over her, and she has drifted around. Been down in Iowa, over in Wisconsin, and she turned up in Southern Minnesota last spring with a husband. The husband wanted to get a place to work in the institution and that was the way we found out that she was married. Now, such a girl should have had a guardian. It was almost criminally wrong for such a girl to be drifting over the country.

I have in mind another girl of more strength of character and yet frailer, perhaps, mentally. She has been in the insane hospital in Wisconsin, had been there before she came to our institution. She was wandering about the country. The last I knew she had a father and mother down in the southern part of this state but she simply wouldn't stay with them.

Mr. Leavett: Would she stay with a guardian?

Supt. Dow: At any rate she ought to have a guardian or somebody to keep track of her when she got into trouble, perhaps, and help her out. I have in mind a girl in Minneapolis. She is doing pretty well, but she is frail. Most of these girls are good girls, that is they haven't any moral delinquencies, no tendency to evil, but they are frail and liable to get into trouble. I can't recall that any of them have.

Question: That is, they have a lack of self-control?

Supt. Dow: Well, I don't know - they can't take care of themselves, that is all. They need to be taken care of by somebody. Now my solution of that problem is somewhat different from what has been proposed. I have suggested guardianship only as a palliation. I think that there ought to be a state home for blind women. I don't believe in state homes for blind men, my experience and observation tend the other way; but I do believe in state homes for blind women. I think it is a crying shame that these blind women should be going about the country trying to do for themselves - nobody interested in them, nobody to care for them. The trifling expense of making provision for the comparatively small number of them is so insignificant that I think it is utterly wrong. Some of you may recall that I made this plea in my report several years ago, but it didn't

meet with any response from the legislature and I didn't expect it would. I guess Mr. Leavett was in the legislature at that time. I still hold to that idea, but I don't care to go into it.

Mr. Rosing: I case the guardianship idea should prevail; the institution would have to be the guardian, wouldn't it? You couldn't expect an individual to accept such guardianship.

Supt. Dow: Perhaps that would be the surest way to secure some kind of guardianship.

Mr. Rosing: if they have no property, would they devote any time or attention to them, or would an individual care to assume a burden of that kind? It would have to be a state guardianship?

Supt. Dow: The guardian would have to be appointed by the state.

Mr. Rosing: Yes, but I mean that it would have to be a state institution supported by the state?

Supt. Dow: Not necessarily a state institution, but under some sort of state guardianship. Of course this girl who married down here, she didn't leave the institution because I was not willing to have her remain. She was often an unpleasant element in the institution and made trouble with the pupils, but we have to meet these cases unless they get too serious; but she didn't want to stay and we had no right to keep her. She was over twenty-one.

Mr. Leavett: Do you not frequently find, Mr. Dow, in your experience with the blind, that the blindness comes about through some delinquency on the part of the parents to the extent that sometimes you have several from the same family and some of them border very closely on the idiotic or mentally incompetent class?

Supt. Dow: We have this last feature that you speak of, that is, we have often several children from the same family. There are several such families represented in the institution today. In one family there are two; in three families there are three and in one of these families there is a fourth one who is old enough to come and who might possibly come this year, but I advised the mother to keep the child at home another year and by another year there will be four children from that family in the institution. That family is what would be called a fine family. They are poor people. The mother is one of the best of women and the father, so their minister tells me, is a hard-working, industrious, honest man. There is nothing that anybody can see that is any way out of the way in the father or mother. The mother comes up every year with the children, brings them to school, comes up and visits them at Christmas comes up and takes them home at the end of the year. She is very much interested in their welfare, their progress and their spiritual welfare. She visits their minister there and he comes to see them, and everything seems to be perfectly straight in their family history.

Question: Are the parents blind?

Supt. Dow: No.

Question: Have they any children that are not blind?

Supt. Dow: Yes, the first child was not, the oldest child. The children are bright, too, very bright, would be considered unusually bright. There is another family in which there are three in which the family history is somewhat different, but this really doesn't belong to this question, but of course I am glad to discuss it.

Supt. Tomlinson: In this family where all the children are blind, what is the condition of the eyes? Is there an absence of development of the eye ball?

Supt. Dow: Yes, to a large extent. They are small and undeveloped.

Supt. Tomlinson: You don't know whether the nerve is atrophied or not?

Supt. Dow: No, I don't know. In another case where there are three blind children, the family relations are these: the father was an old man and an uncle of the mother, who was very much younger. They were married and had either one or two, I think two, my records would show, children that were normal, practically normal - one of them has a slight defect in vision. These three are totally blind and come in between the two, that is there was one younger that has sight and one older. Not only are they defective in sight but they have many of the characteristics of degeneracy. I have been disposed to think one of them should probably be called feeble-minded. There seems to be certain peculiarities or unevenness of mental development, developing along certain lines quite strongly normal and in others very feebly, wanting in - well childlike, that is about it - girl fifteen or sixteen years old, good enough in her studies, right up in her grade and yet child-like in all her views of things. Another case where there are three children, none of them totally blind, but nearly so, cases which seem to have arisen from a certain tendency to weakness of the eyes rather than to anything else. The family are fine people, the father is one of the best business men in Faribault, moved there on account of putting his children in the school. One of them, the oldest boy, graduated last year and is in a local piano factory. He is a pretty smart boy and has a good business head all right. The two younger girls, one is pretty well grown and the other a little girl. They are smart and keen in every way. Parents are all right.

Supt. Kilbourne: I don't feel competent to discuss this very interesting paper. It did strike me, however, that these people should not be on parole at the age of puberty. I don't see how you can prevent a woman having children and it would be a difficult matter to keep them constantly under observation. It seems to me that if for nothing more than to protect the state against a multiplication of such cases that they should be continually under supervision.

The Chairman: Would you segregate them in a separate community?

Supt. Kilbourne: Yes sir, unless they are in families where they are looked after, but that isn't often the case.

Question: I would like to ask the Doctor (Rogers) when he considers further advancement in education at an end in his institution?

Supt. Rogers: A feeble minded person's education is at an end usually from sixteen to twenty-two years old. Their limitation is very marked.

Supt. Kilbourne: I would like to ask how many cases over twenty work about the place, what proportion are there of workers?

Supt. Rogers: I can't answer that so as to be accurate, but a majority of the workers are over twenty I should say.

Supt. Kilbourne: You have sufficient work at the institution to employ all those people?

Supt. Rogers: We will have when we have plenty of ground devoted to shops.

Questions: Have you any statistics to show how many feeble-minded there are in the state that ought to be in an institution of that kind?

Supt. Rogers: There are about 3000.

Supt. Kilbourne: Now it seems to me, I hesitate to advance an opinion or idea in the matter, but it seems to me that the state should provide permanent supervision and segregation and employment for those people. Is there any way to bring in the 3000? Cannot commit anybody can you?

Supt. Rogers: No.

Supt. Kilbourne: I don't see why the plan that is followed with regard to the insane at Anoka and Hastings, I don't see why that wouldn't be a very good scheme for the feeble-minded. The state has any amount of land particularly in the northern part of the state around Fergus Falls that isn't good for anything and up north of Fergus Falls some better land that might be set aside for just such colonies. Up north they have got a lot of land that is some of it good. It seems to me the state might set aside 5000 acres of land, divide it into quarter sections and put up lain, ordinary farm buildings on these quarter sections and segregate twenty-five men on each quarter section after they are old enough to work a farm, making it self-supporting. I would like to see it tried. Of course I know it is impossible to carry out that idea - in fact all those things are impossible until they are tried. I have advocated that with regard to the care of the in-sane, but the idea seems to prevail that you have got to mass them all together in one large institution. Two or three people know all about it, you know, and immediately sit down on a proposition of that kind, may be they are right. But I think the main point is to segregate them and be careful about paroles. If I had my way (if there is no reporter present) I would have a surgical operation to unsex everyone of them, men and women.

Question: And then parole them?

Supt. Kilbourne: And then parole them if they wanted to be paroled.

Supt. Tomlinson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this subject first from the standpoint of heredity. It is true, as Dr. Rogers says, that our knowledge of heredity is not exact, but there are certain facts that I think have been fairly well demonstrated, sufficiently so that we may accept them as a working hypothesis at least and that have only recently come to be understood. The popular idea of heredity is that the condition in the parent is transmitted to the child and this has caused so much of the discussion of this subject which has been futile and which has lost sight of the main point, and that is the adaptation of the knowledge we acquire from the study of development generally and the study of heredity. It doesn't necessarily follow that the child will inherit the physical or mental defects of the parent, but, on the contrary, there will be a transmutation - in other words, I have found from a statistical study of our own institution that about forty-six percent of our patients have tuberculous parents and not insane parents, or tuberculous collateral relatives. Again all the insane who die of tuberculosis are not necessarily the children of tuberculous parents; and, other things being equal, the insane who become tuberculous are not the children of tuberculous parents, and the children of tuberculous parents may not, and as a rule never do, have tuberculosis. There has been a transmutation of defect between the two generations. It is also true that tuberculous parents may have feeble-minded children, blind children or deaf children.

I believe that the commonest cause of the defect in the class of people discussed by Dr. Rogers is chronic alcoholism in the father of the children. When we are discussing this subject from the standpoint of the relationship of the family to the children

and the condition in the family to the condition in the children, we have to bear in mind that anything in the shape of a defect, physical defect, not necessarily mental defect at all, but physical defect in the parents, may result in mental defect in the child. And we know now, from some recent studies of development that the nervous system is the last in the order of development and the most complex in structure and that when the degeneration begins, either in the individual or manifests itself by transmission from parent to child, the tendency is, other things being equal, that the degenerating process will begin where the developmental process leaves off. No matter what may be the defect of the parents, if there is nothing to produce a particular defect in any other part of the organism, the tendency would be for that defect to manifest itself in the development of the nervous system, or the brain and its higher functions. The process down is simply the reverse process up and process degeneration begins where the process of development leaves off and it follows the regular reverse order, and I think this fact accounts for the large number of defective children where there is apparently no cause for it, so far as the superficial observer can determine, in the parents themselves. Then we have that characteristic which is shown in animal life, and especially in vegetable life, of the skipping of a generation or two - the manifestation of what is called atavism, that is where the characteristics of two or three preceding generations, or the generation that preceded the present one by two or three, manifest themselves without any apparent reason in these children. Sometimes we find a child of very defective parents that is extraordinarily bright and extraordinarily capable, but in all those cases, where there is an opportunity to study the history of the family, it will be found, if we seek two or three generations back, that there have been those elements of strength which, on account of atavism, have returned to manifest themselves in this generation.

Then there is another condition that we have to remember on the physical side, and that is the temporary condition of the parents at the time of conception; the condition of the mother during her pregnancy; the condition which surrounded her during her labor; the character of the labor, its length etc. All those things may have their effect on the offspring. Mal-nutrition of the mother affecting the nutrition of the child may result in that child being, not necessarily undeveloped, but having a lesser potentiality than it otherwise would have or ought to have normally and that lesser potentiality is apt to show itself in the development of the nervous system. Again, as Dr. Rogers knows, there are very commonly accidents connected with prolonged labor, here there are hemorrhages of the brain, which do not show themselves, so far as we can tell, because there is no paralysis, but which may stop completely the development of the brain, so far as the intellect is concerned, and produce an idiot, or it may arrest temporarily the development of the brain and produce a slowly developing child, both physically and mentally, or it may handicap the brain permanently and produce a feeble-minded individual, where in the parents there was no apparent cause, except in those cases where a small woman has married a man with a large head and disproportion between the child's head and the mother's (pelvis) is apt to be extreme and prolong the labor. Now, these are all factors which are not generally considered, and which are more important than the ones that are generally considered, in discussing the relation of physical conditions to the manifestation of feeble-mindedness and idiocy in children.

There is another point that is worth considering, and which follows as an obvious sequence, - that there is no difference between the defect which manifests itself later as

insanity, because the only difference between the feeble-minded individual, so far as his relations to the community are concerned, and the insane person, is that the insane person has completely lost his self control after having acquired a considerable degree of intelligence, whereas the feeble-minded person starts with less self-control makes him as conspicuous as it does the person who is insane.

Then another interesting point in connection with these cases is the study - of course I don't have opportunity to study this with relation to the feeble-minded - is the study of the concurrence in families of different kinds of degeneration. For instance, it is very common to find perhaps a sister of an insane person tuberculous or perhaps epileptic, which shows that there is some defect at work in the parents, some inherited defect or some condition in their environment, which makes it impossible for them to bring into the world physically or mentally sound children.

Again, and this is important with regard to the training of these children, there are two epochs in the life of the child which have an important relation with the nervous system. The first is the period between six and seven, which is not ordinarily recognized but which, to the careful observer, shows the first evidence of instability or defect in the nervous system, that is, it is one of the times when you have to watch the child most closely. Then next comes puberty, and that is the final one, and this is the time, too, when the loss of self-control is most marked, or its absence becomes most conspicuous and where the ordinary domestic environment fails to keep control of the child and tide it over the period and start it through the period of adolescence in the direction of training its self-control. As a rule the parents of children who are feeble minded or defective otherwise have not themselves much capacity for self-control, and the tendency in the management of their children is to follow the lines of least resistance, and if the child is willful, of a violent temper and resists efforts in its behalf, it is liable to be let alone, by yielded to and even encouraged, at least tolerated, because effort to prevent is more than the parents are willing to undertake or intelligent enough to appreciate the importance of. It is out of these conditions that grow the marked losses of self-control and the development of those tendencies which makes the child a candidate for the School for Feeble Minded or the reform School at Red Wing, or, if he lives long enough without coming within the province of the authorities, for the institution at St. Cloud..

So far as the community is concerned, my experience has been that there are only two factors considered:-Is the individual a nuisance in the community or is he a financial charge upon the community? As long as neither of these two conditions obtrude themselves upon the community very little cognizance is taken by the public in the immediate environment of the individual of the welfare of the child or his condition. If, on the contrary, on account of his loss of self-control and his faulty training at home, he commits over acts or otherwise makes himself troublesome in the community, then the community takes cognizance of him, not on account of his mental condition or any need that may result from it, but on account of its own convenience and comfort, and it is then that the question begins to be canvassed as to what disposition is to be made of him. So far as my experience is concerned, if he has criminal tendencies and his disposition is violent, he is regarded as incorrigible and committed to Red Wing; if he is more or less of a nuisance, they try to get him into Faribault; failing there they persuade the Judge of Probate Court to commit him to hospital for the insane, not because he is insane but because they want to get rid of him. Now this involves also the question of support in

cases where these children have no natural protectors. In my experience this is the only factor that operates upon the community at all. If the individual is going to be a charge upon the community they can very easily find an excuse to get rid of him in some way; if he is not a charge upon the community they can find equally strong reasons for keeping him out of the institution, even when he ought to be in there. And it is this class of individuals who are kept in the community through the influence of family or friends which produce the vicious, feeble-minded classes and increase the number of that class in the community. I think it is a mistake, however, to consider that our feeble-minded and our vicious classes are contributed from their own social level. I think we get them from degeneration from above, more than we do from failures below, and that the very worst element in our vicious class is that which comes from the higher classes intellectually, who have gone to seed from their vices or from their habits. Shiftlessness and alcoholism contribute more children to the feeble-minded school, to the training schools and reform schools than does mere feeble-mindedness among what are called, in ordinary English parlance, the lower middle class, - that is, the ordinary family the community. And not only that, but this class of people contributes, particularly, the reckless and irresponsible defectives, and the vicious and uncontrollable defectives; in other words, it is what you might call the abhorrent and uncontrolled manifestation of decayed intelligence, and because there had been that intelligence in the preceding generation, or the one before that, there is a capacity in these individuals to be that much worse than the ordinary simply feeble-minded child who comes from ordinary parentage-just as we find in our institutions for the insane, among the foreign-born population, that there are people who come to this country and become insane simply because they have lost those strong elements of control in their own homes, - that is, a paternal government, a paternal church and a fixed social status. They come away from these three controlling elements at home and meet the stress and strain of competition in this country, and there is a complete transposition from to license and they are not able to bear up under it, they haven't the mental capacity to do it and they go to pieces, whereas if they had remained in the old country, under the conditions under which they were born, they would have had sufficient mental capacity to carry them through life without breaking down.

Now as to the family or community control of these people, I believe thoroughly in the plan outlined by Dr. Rogers, and which I have heard him outline before. The details, of course, might be food for argument indefinitely and would have to be settled by experience. I have observed among the insane who go home to the care of their relatives, that where the relatives have a vital interest in the welfare of the patient and desire to do for him, they are practically always able to keep him at home, even when his condition was such at the time of leaving the institution that it didn't seem possible to do so. On the contrary, I have seen them go home when you would think them perfectly capable of caring for themselves and mentally competent to get along in the world without any difficulty, but, on account of bad environment or lack of desire or capacity on the part of relatives or friends to care for them, they have been returned almost immediately, or in a short time, with a recurrence of their mental disturbance.

While it might be difficult at first, with some experience on the part of the state agents and those having this matter in charge of studying of the individual and then studying the family in which the individual was placed to see how well they were adapted to each other, I think that it would be possible to get a large number of men, at least,

cared for outside and successfully cared for and made comparatively useful members of the community. But I just as firmly believe that something will have to be done with these children, when they are children, and especially between the ages of seven and fourteen years, or seven and sixteen. Some special training will have to be given them in the cultivation of outward self-control in order to fit them to live comfortably and in order to prevent them from being either a nuisance or harmful to the community. And for that reason I am of the same opinion as Dr. Rogers that there are comparatively few of these people who are competent to be dealt with before first having passed through a certain degree of training and self-control, which from their failure in the family shows that the family is not competent to give them and which can only be given them rightly where they can be studied impartially and treated intelligently, with the elimination of the personal equation of the family and the bias of the parent toward the weaknesses of the child.

Supt. Dow: Would it be possible, do you think, in the case of this family where there are four children born blind, for some shock to have befallen the mother, during the stage of development of the child she was carrying, so as to prevent development, we will say, of the organs of sight and that shock, producing blindness, of course, in this child, to have left its mark, as we commonly say, on the mother, so that when the same stage was reached with the next child that she bore, the same lack of development might occur and so on through the four? The defect seems to be very similar in all.

Supt. Tomlinson: It would be difficult to answer that question with certainty, but there might such a condition arise as you describe which would permanently lessen her capacity to bear the strain of maternity, so that, at a certain stage of development, she wouldn't be able to sufficiently nourish the child, and that would result in this physical defect which showed itself as blindness, and the tendency would be, I think, for that defect to manifest itself uniformly.

There is another possible explanation. There may have been conditions present during labor which resulted in hemorrhage in the fore part of the brain, in the neighborhood of that part of the brain out of which the optic never develops, which would have prevented the development of the optic nerve.

I don't believe that any of these cases exist where a rational explanation cannot be found, if it is thoroughly and intelligently sought for, and it is because of the importance of exact knowledge on these subjects that the observations referred to by Mr. Whittier would be very valuable. That is one reason why I have always urged so strongly, whenever opportunity offered, the importance in our institution work of not only studying the patient, but, so far as practicable, studying the whole family and keeping accurate and detailed records of the information obtained; because it is only as we do this intelligently and persistently for a long period that we ever will be able to get that sort of exact knowledge which will enable us to deal intelligently with the conditions which we now deal with only with the object of palliating them, and enable us to use preventive measures where now we merely use palliative ones.

The Chairman: The main question right here is, what can the state do for this defective class outside of the institutions? What can it do in the way of educating the public or the establishment of any system of observation and control of any kind? How can the state, as a body politic, protect itself against this class and against the increase of

their number - care for those that are already defective and prevent, as far as possible, having them reproduced? Now the opinion seems to prevail here that they must first be sent to the institution and from the institution they may be sent out and put under the control of agencies, but is there not something that can be done in the way of educating the community in such a manner as to prevent the present condition or, at least, mitigate it?

Supt. Tomlinson: It seems to me that so far as preventive measures are concerned, at least for the present, they practically have to be confined to the education of the public, first in some intelligent knowledge of some of the simple rules of hygiene and sanitation in order to overcome the physical conditions, and then the cultivation of a public knowledge and the public conscience, or rather you might call it individual knowledge and individual conscience, of the absolute necessity of training children in self-control and the appreciation on the part of the parents that there is no one factor so absolutely essential to the mental and moral welfare of the future of the child as the teaching of self-control. The reason these things are so conspicuous is that, in this country at least, we are suffering socially from a re-action from the rigidity of Puritanism. It seems to me that the one thing that shines out in Puritanism, especially as manifested in this country, as its most brilliant achievement, is the success with which they taught the child what an infinitesimal atom he was in the community and of how little importance he was to the community, and few of their children in those days grew up with an inflated idea of themselves or their capacity. I think we might borrow back, very much to our efficiency as a community and in families, some of the old sayings that a great many of us in this later age remember "Children should be seen and not heard"; "Speak when you are spoken to"; "Come when you are called". The practical application of those factors in the old puritan social economy and family economy, I think, might be very fortunately and successfully brought back for the benefit of the community in the future, because we have gone to the extreme of an exaggerated individuality and social license. But I don't know what the state could do better in the beginning than just what Mr. Whittier and Dr. Rogers have suggested, - the employment of state agents and trained observers. I have an idea something like this: That these people might be trained and might be set to work to visit communities and become familiar with the existence of families in whom there were children, where the parents were known to be defective in self-control themselves or incapable of managing their children, and to get acquainted with them and visit them and try to teach them the importance of these factors in the training of their children, and in that way become familiar with those children in the community who are liable, if they go on indefinitely in that condition, to become later so confirmed in their defects mentally and morally as to become simply future charges upon the state, instead of being factors which have to be dealt with in a preventive way. Of course anything of this kind is bound to rub up against the exaggerated individualism of the day, and it is bound, naturally, to rub up against the family feeling in this regard - the natural parental idea that there is nothing wrong with their children and that the child which manifests these characteristics should be humored instead of being restrained. There will be difficulties no matter what we do. But it seems to me that the most practical thing at the present time is the multiplication of these trained observers, who will bring the result of their experience and training to bear in the initiation of such preventive measures as are possible, and when it became necessary to deal with these subjects authoritatively, then

the knowledge of these trained observers will be very beneficial to the community in determining just what is best to be done in each individual case.

Dr. Rosing: As I understand it, Dr. Tomlinson, in Europe, Sweden, Norway and Germany - children are kept very much more strictly than they are here. Do we have an excess of feeble minded or delicate children in this country over and above European countries?

Supt. Tomlinson: No. The difference is that there the influences which cause mental defect are physical, not social - that is, not the lack of training, but physical defects which come from want of sufficient food and proper housing.

Mr. Rosing: With our superior mode of living, with plenty of food and plenty of work, we ought not to approach their percentage at all, if the children were properly trained?

Supt. Tomlinson: No.

Mr. Rosing: To me this has been a most wonderfully interesting discussion, and I do not think that this subject of self-control is at all understood by parents as a rule.

Supt. Tomlinson: I am quite confident it is not.

Mr. Rosing: It seems to me that, in addition to securing this additional agency system, and perhaps enlarging it into one, as Mr. Whittier suggests, this body could not perform any better work than to place the importance of this idea of self-control before public. We are getting the benefit of this splendid discussion - a dozen men here. The people of the state ought to have that. I think that through the medium of our press committee this matter ought to be placed before the people. It don't do much good for us to get together and discuss this thing unless we can let the public in. If we are to have any benefit the parents, and even the children, should have a chance to read and understand this discussion. I am very much in favor of having this made public.

Supt. Kilbourne: It would be a very difficult matter to teach self-control to congenitally defective children.

Mr. Rosing: On the other hand there are these border-land cases that Dr. Rogers speaks of,, which only become defective because they haven't been taught early enough.

Warden Wolfer: That is not only true in the ordinary walks of life with the common people, but it is almost universal. That is the one place in this country where we are degenerating - there is a lack of proper family and parental control and allowing of doing things in every day life that are looked upon lightly that are sapping the very foundations of society.

Supt. Tomlinson: That is why I said, Mr. Chairman, that we were degenerating from above.

Mr. Rosing: I believe that parents usually teach self-control simply from the criminal standpoint, that is, they teach them that they must not do anything that is criminal, but that lack of self-control may lead to feeble-mindedness or insanity I think very few people appreciate.

Supt. Welch: We have had under discussion this very important subject for the last four years and it seems to me we always run up against this wall of educating the public. It seems to me it is a good deal like the search of the Jews for the promised land - it is going to take us twice forty years before we get to be educated on any of these

subjects. Why can't we take this one thing today and do something with it tomorrow, next week or next month and begin in a small way, in a practical way, to do something. Put some man on to this work in a small way. Let him go to the institutions and study conditions and be a member of this board of visitors.

The Chairman: Do you mean to have some agent appointed to study the matter and publish statistics or information that he may receive?

Supt. Welch: Take some man, take a clerk in this office or a man out in the street who has a little ability, and put him to work to study conditions. Send him to Dr. Rogers' institution, send him to Mr. Whittier's and send him to the insane hospitals.

Supt. Kilbourne: I would like to ask the opinion of the gentlemen present as to the proportion of feeble minded children a hundred years hence, no matter what efforts you made to educate the public or the parents?

Supt. Dow: I don't believe it would make a particle of difference.

Supt. Kilbourne: You will have just as many feeble-minded children, no matter what you do. If you hire all the people in the country you will have just as many feeble-minded people, despite any effort you make, a hundred, five hundred or a thousand years from today was you have today. This may seem pessimistic but it is the truth although I won't be here to prove it. It is all nonsense to talk about educating the public and parents. How are you going to educate feeble-minded children in self-control?

Supt. Tomlinson: I would like to say for the benefit of Dr. Kilbourne, - it is invidious to make comparisons - but there is a certain book which we are taught to revere as an authority, and it certainly is, and in the early portion of that book there is an interview between the diety and a certain individual and the question is asked him as to what had become of his brother, to which he replied: "I am not my brother's keeper"; and we know the criticism that was passed on that reply at that time and which has generally been accepted since then as a very valid one.

Dr. Kilbourne stated that he believed in looking out for his brother as much as anyone.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Chairman: Our discussion was broken off rather abruptly this morning. We would be glad to hear from anybody on the subject of the paper read this morning.

Mr. Leavett: Mr. Randall might tell us what he doesn't know about the subject while we are waiting for Mr. Dow to come in.

Supt. Randall: I wouldn't have time.

The Chairman: If there is no further discussion on the morning paper, we will now listen to a paper by Dr. Dow on "How can our State Institutions secure desirable Emoployees?" This is a practical subject and, as I understand it, it is not to be discussed along the same lines that it has heretofore been considered, but rather with a view to showing how the institution may get in touch with the public with a view to obtaining necessary assistants.

Supt. Dow: I shall have to reverse Dr. Rogers' opening statement by saying that my piece will probably be more formidable than it looks, because when you haven't anything to say on a subject it always takes you a good while to say it. I really haven't anything new to say on the subject. I think I intimated something to that effect to Dr.

Welch when he requested me to open the discussion. I suppose that we have all tried all the methods of securing help we could think of or could find out by inquiry and investigation, that is immediate methods. When we needed help, then we set to work to find it and generally waited until we did need it before we set to work to find it. Of results by this method each one's own experience is, perhaps, to him the best information, and I can speak chiefly only from my own personal experience, for the time has been limited since I was asked to take this subject and I haven't had an opportunity to apply to others for their experience, which might lie outside of my own, or to secure other sources, if there are any such sources, the experience of others in reports and so forth.

RETYPE FROM ORIGINAL