

nothing in the room and the shoes are taken off and there the child is left to himself and he soon cools down.

Dr. Barr: I had a boy who had outrageous spasms. He ran away, stole a bicycle and ran around the country for a day or two and at last I heard he was in Wilmington, Delaware. I brought him' back and tried a good many things. Finally I put him in bed and kept him there three weeks on milk diet. I have had no trouble with him since. He keeps a record of his spasms which he carries in his pocket.

Dr. Keating'. It is rare for any one to hurt himself in these spasms.

Mr. Johnstone: In one case that we had the boy occasionally had genuine spasms and I have always been afraid of some such thing again. He would begin tapping on desk with his fingers and walking around the room and we paid no attention to him. If he had a spasm we let him have it but on one occasion he got hold of a hot pipe and burned his hands badly.

## DISCIPLINE

E. K. JOHNSTONE. VINELAND, N. J.

WHEN we remember the number of things parents fear when they bring children to our institutions the wonder is that so many are brought. Only the strong pressure of circumstances, the inability to care for them in the home, etc., forces many reluctantly to the point of bringing the child. The fear is great that this little child who has probably had the greater share of the mother's tenderest love and for whom every member of the family has sacrificed will now be among a lot of young ruffians who will abuse him and otherwise mistreat him, or that he will be placed with a lot of children of much lower grade. Almost without exception parents are sure that their child is brighter than any they see in its group. But the thing that is most feared is the methods of discipline that will be used. It is surprising how many intelligent people there are who associate tortures, dungeons and brutal restraints and punishments with the word institution, even at this late day, and the sensational press tends to foster this idea. "How do you punish your children?" is one of the first questions not only by the parent but by the visitor. Even on the application blanks in reply to the question,—What methods of discipline have been used? the few who say "whipping" are sure to add, "with poor results" or "it always makes him worse," so great is the fear of bodily harm to the child.

Even we, who see so much of it, can hardly appreciate how solicitous the parents of these stricken children are regarding this question of discipline, but the loving devotion which has kept the child at home altho the burden is almost impossible to bear, excites our deepest sympathy and because our discipline is founded on the most humane principles we welcome the question, knowing that a thorough explanation of our methods will relieve many anxious hearts.

The State of New Jersey in framing the new School Law this year has inserted a clause prohibiting corporal punishment and extending the powers of the law so as to include also all State and Private educational and charitable institutions. While I believe that there are certain rare cases when such punishment administered coolly and without anger is as efficacious as a dose of medicine given by the physician for certain forms of disease, still I think the law good, for in most institutions the power of corporal punishment is restricted to the Superintendent; in his absence he must delegate it to some assistant upon whose judgment, perhaps, he cannot always rely as upon his own. In institutions for the feeble-minded there are but few vicious children. It has been said with much wisdom, "If we knew all we would forgive all."

In considering the question it is well for us to glance for a moment at the way our employes view the matter of punishment.

(a) Some are not beyond the ancient idea that punishment is for revenge, getting even. The person injured is to be satisfied without regard to the one who has done the wrong. He must be paid back in full.

(b) A second class of employes hold the idea that a child is to be punished so that he shall not repeat the offence and that others will also be driven to good behavior by fear of like punishment if they do wrong. Many of our present laws are based on this idea. "We shall make this a lesson to him and to others," they say. I am reminded of Mark Twain's story of the boy who climbed on a high roof and fell and so injured himself that he was a helpless cripple the balance of his life, and people said, "That will be a lesson to him." The deterrent effect on others might be some good but the value to the individual is nil and after all it is the wrong-doer himself whom we must reach. In the minds of this second class then the one who does the wrong and the person wronged are secondary to the desire to protect others. The doctrine of eternal punishment is based upon this idea, also the idea of capital punishment.

(c) There is still another class of our employes, however, who realize that wrong doing is the result of disease or ignorance. The wrong doer himself is the one to be primarily considered and he is to be trained or cured. Herbert Spencer says that, "Punishment can be justified-only in so far as it is educative, and to be educative it must never be arbitrary, but must be a natural reaction growing out of the wrong that has been committed." The indeterminate sentence laws which with the growing intelligence of the world are becoming more common, are based upon this idea that disease or ignorance are the causes of violation of law. The chief aim in all discipline should be to correct harm. Unfortunately this is too often not considered at all.

So much for the employe, let us look for a moment at the child's attitude toward punishments. Most of our children assume the same attitude as the first class of employes mentioned. "He hit me. I want to hit him back." "An eye for an eye." In nearly every case the aggrieved one must be satisfied not by having the wrong righted but by causing a like wrong to the guilty party. Studies upon a large number of children, conducted by Earl Barnes and Estella Darrah give the following conclusion. "Young children under twelve ignore law, therefore rules should not exist in the discipline of the

school. Each infraction of the law of right and each act of disobedience should be treated on its individual merits."

Our discipline must be based upon the law of loving kindness. Perhaps the most effective way to keep good discipline is to provide occupation. A busy child interested in his work needs no punishment.

The institution life should be full of special privileges. If this idea can be firmly grasped by the employes to the extent that everything that a child is ever called upon to do is a privilege, means of discipline are always at hand. It is only a matter of depriving the child of one of these privileges. The child who doesn't make a bed nicely is not permitted to make another. Tommy gets that privilege now and if Willie "doesn't care" he is not permitted to make any to-morrow, but sits idle while the other boys do his work. It is this idleness that hurts. I have yet to find the child who has sense enough to make a bed who doesn't want to do it, if he finds all of the others doing it and he is constantly reminded that he cannot do it. Nothing so rouses the desire to do as to be told that we cannot do. With new attendants it is often hard to make them appreciate this fact but it simply becomes a question of who will hold out the longest, the child or the employe, and I have never yet known it to fail when the attendant persists. As this idea gradually worked out I often thought I had reached its limitations, but it still expands. It is no longer a mere theory, but the most practical method of discipline I have found.

The merry-go-round, the trip to the Zoo, the ride in the donkey wagon, entertainments, parties, club meetings, skating, etc. all form excellent means of discipline.

The Superintendent who makes it a point to speak to every child who addresses him can help the discipline a great deal by saying, "I cannot say good-morning to you to-day because you have done (or neglected to do) certain things," etc. We have several groups in which children of a certain grade may live only so long as they live up to a standard of behavior. Attendance at band or various of the shops or classes is only permitted while behavior is especially good and work in other departments well done.

Sometime ago there was presented to the Iowa Board of Control a paper on paying inmates of institutions and many plans were given. At that time our system was in its infancy. Since then, however, we have found it admirable and it may be of interest to outline it here. It is not meant to be payment for services rendered, but rather as a method of discipline and we find that not only are children working cheerfully, well behaved, but also that well behaved children usually do good work. We pay a number of our children each week, amounts varying from one to five cents. Each child brings from every department in which he lives or works, a credit slip which signifies that he has worked well or behaved well for the week. No slips of discredit are given- the lack of a slip signifies that the child has not been good, etc. He is not told that he gets no slip because he was bad, but because he was not good. There is a vast difference in the two ways of pitting it.

If A. works in the Laundry and Shoe-Shop and also milks, he must bring four slips, one from each of the above, and one from his attendant. If

his allowance is three cents per week and he comes with only three slips, then he gets three-fourths of three cents (two and one-fourth cents). We can use fractions of a cent because candies, nuts, etc., are sold so many for a cent.

Each Saturday night in one of the rooms a table is tastefully arranged with candies, nuts, ribbons, etc., etc., and the children come in groups to buy. This, coming as it does ones each week, keeps the training idea constantly before them. The children's interest does not seem to lag. The whole thing is an excellent means of breaking up small habits and helps general discipline wonderfully.

Encouragement must be at the bottom of all lessons. Our employes must learn not to say "don't" if they will succeed in their discipline. Down through the years, mankind lived under the rule, "Thou shalt not" until Christ preached the Gospel of encouragement when he said, "Thou shalt." The successes of a child must be noted rather than the failures. Let the blue pencil and the colored chalk mark in all lessons the correct thing and then instead of finding their pages marked with failures, each mark dragging the discouraged little soul deeper in the mire of dissatisfaction, they will bristle with approbation and encouragement and brighter faces and happier dispositions will result. It is scarcely realized how much wrong doing on the part of the child is really caused by a headache or an attack of indigestion on the part of an employe. A quiet voice, an even temper, pretty and clean surroundings, good ventilation, encouragement, employment, everything a special privilege, these are the requisites for good discipline.

I am sorry I cannot recall the name of the author of the following lines, but if the spirit contained therein is kept in the hearts of those who have to do with feeble-minded children, they will not go astray.

"My little son who looks from thoughtful eyes,  
And moves and speaks in serious, grown up wise,  
Having my law the seventh time disobeyed,  
I struck him and dismissed  
With harsh words and unknissed;  
(His mother, who was patient, being dead.)  
Then fearing lest his grief should hinder sleep  
I visited his bed  
And found his lashes yet  
With his late sobbing, wet.  
Then I, with moan,  
Kissing away his tears, left others of my own,  
For on a table, drawn  
Beside his bed, he had placed within his reach  
A box of counters and a red-veined stone,  
A piece of glass abraded by the beach  
And six or seven shells,  
A bottle of blue bells  
And four French coins, ranged there with careful art

To comfort his sad heart.  
 So when that night I prayed  
 To God, I wept, and said,  
 Ah, when we lie at last with trance'd breath,  
 Not vexing thee in death  
 And Thou rememberest  
 The toys  
 That made our joys,'  
 Then, fatherly not less than I  
 Who am moulded out of clay,  
 Thou'lt leave Thy wrath and say,  
 'I will be sorry for their childishness.' "

## DISCUSSION

Dr. Rogers: I think this is a valuable paper and the spirit is excellent. It is always a delicate matter to discuss this subject of corporal punishment, we are so liable to be misunderstood. That corporal punishment is sometimes necessary is a point upon which we will all agree, yet, as a general statement, I do not believe in corporal punishment. I have found cases in my experience where I believed it was absolutely necessary. I do not allow any person to strike a child. If I know that it is done I discharge the employe unless it is done in self-defense. I do not recall more than two cases of the latter kind, both being cases of attack upon the attendant by boys with articles of furniture. I believe there should be rigid rules for the protection of the management and they should be understood. The first is that if there is to be any punishment it should be given by the superintendent and by no one else. I carry that out rigidly. I know there has been much trouble in some institutions that has resulted from delegating that power to others. Another point is that if a\* case is reported where severe discipline is needed it is important that it shall not be administered at once. It can always be postponed twenty-four hours. It is an interesting fact that we may view the situation very differently after a few hours reflection. In that time the child may be honestly repentant and need no punishment. I think the public should understand these rules. The only real trouble I ever had over severe discipline was when I whipped a boy and neglected to inform his parents. The boy informed the parents himself. I believe I did the proper thing for the boy, but I should have told them. He was a great strong boy physically, and had simply domineered over his associates—farm boys—and his attendants, who were forbidden by me to punish him, until the limit of forbearance was reached. His mother insisted upon taking him home. I said that I would like to have the boy taken before the board of trustees and let them see what had been done and hear the reason and then if she cared to take him home it was all right. This was done and the boy went home. A week later I had a letter in which she said she would like to return him under certain conditions. I replied that he could not be returned under any

conditions except to be treated as I thought best. Within a month she sent him back under my conditions and he has been a splendid boy ever since. That is a typical case where I believe punishment was required. He came from a home where there was no control. In fact, I understand, he pounded his mother during the time she had him home after my punishment and I presume this treatment was a powerful argument with her in my favor. It is an extremely rare case where corporal punishment is required. Mr. Johnstone expresses the proper spirit in relation to our children.

Mr. Johnstone: The general public would not approve of whipping a feeble-minded child.

Dr. Wilmarth: We should never whip a boy unless we are sure it will be for the child's good. It is not a question of defying public opinion. I do not think we should ever whip a child.

Question: Do you think you should always notify the parents in advance?

Dr. Rogers: If I could not do it before I would do it at once. I should notify any parent who took any interest in his child. I believe frankness is due to the public and to the friends. It may make resentment for a while, but the community will see the justice of it and that establishes confidence in the institution.

Mr. Johnson: I think as a matter of policy it is a great mistake for a superintendent to do it himself.

Dr. Rogers: I believe it is a responsibility the superintendent should take. I believe no one else should do it. It is the most disagreeable thing and the very fact that he takes the responsibility will make it a thing of seldom occurrence. It is the most disagreeable thing I ever did in my life.

Mr. Johnson: I think he should delegate it.

Mr. Johnstone: I ordered it done once by a person in whom I had confidence and I found afterwards two other punishments by the same employe under circumstances he thought justifiable.

Dr. Rogers: I had the same experience where I deputed minor punishment.

Mr. Johnson: One has to be careful in delegating punishment of course. I once had occasion to tell an attendant to punish a boy who had strayed away by giving him a bath and putting him to bed. It was Thursday. On Sunday he asked if the boy were to go to Sunday school. Inquiry showed that the boy was still in bed. His only excuse was that I had told him to put the boy to bed and had not told him to take him out.

Dr. Keating: When a child is brought to me for admission I make it understood that I am to have authority over the child. If I see fit to give corporal punishment I must give it, and I have yet to find the slightest opposition on the part of the parent. I am opposed to corporal punishment, but I reserve the right to administer it. I do not recall but one case where I ever resorted to it. That was a runaway. He told the neighbors that if he were caught I would give him a thrashing, and I told him that if he ran away again I *would*. The boy did not go for six months. I thought he had forgotten what I said, but when he was brought back I asked if he recollected. He replied, "Yes, you said you would whip me." I said "I am very sorry to do it, but I am a man of my word," and I got a switch and whipped the boy and

he has never run away since. While I am opposed to it, if it must be given it should be given only by the head of the institution. If an employe or any subordinate officer administered punishment without my permission his resignation would be immediately asked.

Dr. Rogers: I do not believe that a person can administer corporal punishment without injury to himself. It is a matter of history that one who is placed where he is obliged to administer corporal punishment feels that it has a thoroughly demoralizing effect upon himself. Prison managers admit this.

Dr. Polglase: I never thought of it in that way.

Dr. Rogers: He can not do it without injuring his moral nature. I think this consciousness would deter a man many times.

Mr. Johnstons: My first experience in corporal punishment was in a reform school where we all used a strip of rubber about the size of my thumb. The first time it shocked me. I was pretty young at that time. At the end of two months I woke to the fact that it did not mean anything to me to whip those boys. I was no longer shocked. I feel pretty strongly now and I would not like ever to get into that condition again. The demoralizing effect on myself was something awful.

Dr. Polglase: I think the times for corporal punishment are very few. The longer we live with these children the more we distinguish certain types. There are the children who are cruel and bloodthirsty and when a boy attempts to burn up a building or do some cruel thing I think a dose of his own medicine is all right for him. Dr. Keating has spoken of runaways. I do not think whipping is a deterrent for them. If a boy has assumed a false dignity, among his fellows and falls from his high estate and does something deserving of punishment I should put him at some manual labor that he dislikes. Every boy should feel that you are sorry to administer punishment. I have one boy who runs away and no punishment would have any effect upon him. It is an impulse that he can not control. I think nothing would stop him unless he were tied. So I keep him constantly in dresses. He will not run away with a girl's dress on.

Dr. Rogers: Another point to be considered in handling young people is that there is a period in the boy's life when he assumes a spirit of bravado. That is as true among feeble minded boys as among strong-minded. It is an age habit. The boy if wisely treated will outgrow that.

Mr. Johnstone: I do not think our discipline should consider the idea of punishing for the offence committed but to prevent its being done the next time. Do not let there be a next time. Whatever is done should be with the idea of making the boy better, so that there will be no repetition of the offence. Whipping for the offence lasts only as long as the smarting lasts.

Dr. Polglase: We had a boy whom we trusted to do many things and he ran away. We gave him some slight discipline, deprived him of dessert or something of that kind. He ran away a second time. He had a great aversion to working inside the low grade buildings and had a contempt for that class of children. He was told that if he would do such things he must mingle with them and I put him there to work. I do not think there was ever a more humble individual. He begged time and again to be taken out

and after I thought the dose was heavy enough I let him out and put him to work. He may run away again; I cannot tell anything about it, but in the meantime I trust him. When I trust I trust fully.

Dr. Keating: If you punish a child by giving him a disagreeable task and he refuses to do it what punishment would you give for that?

Dr. Polglase: I do not know that I have ever had such a case. I should not force him to do it at once.

Mr. Johnstone: Hasn't it a bad effect on the boys who do that work regularly to have their employment looked upon as a punishment? Why should not they say, "Why must I do this every day when I am good, if it is a punishment for a bad boy?"

Dr. Polglase: It would have a bad effect unless you made an explanation.

Mr. Johnson: We say to a boy that he has proved by his conduct that he is not in the right place for him; that he belongs in division "Six" and so in he goes. If I want to be very forcible I have his clothes marked "6."

Dr. Fernald: Is not that the best way, simply to transfer them to a low grade department without any words? Let them draw their own inference. That takes the bravado out quicker than anything else. In regard to punishing feeble-minded boys I never could see why we had any moral right to administer punishment to a feeble-minded boy more than to an insane person. In no country in the world would corporal punishment be tolerated for the insane. Presumably the mistakes of the feeble-minded are due to mental irresponsibility and is it not unfair to punish them for that? It is a short cut, there is no question about that, but I never have been able to see the difference between them and the insane in that respect.

Dr. Wilmaith: If punishment is to improve the child why should you not punish him as you would your own children?

Dr. Fernald: That would apply to adults.

Dr. Wilmarth: It is to strengthen the child's will. When it is done in a kindly spirit, a just spirit, a spirit of love toward the child and solely for its good and the child so recognizes it then it strikes me that punishment is justifiable.

Dr. Rogers: There is all the difference in the world between the adult and the adolescent. Penologists have agreed that with very rare exceptions it never pays to whip an adult, while it might be beneficial to whip a child. When we speak of an insane person we refer to an adult.

Dr. Fernald: Nothing hurts an institution more than to whip an inmate.

Dr. Keating: The errors committed by the insane are from delusions. I do not think the infraction of rules by boys is from delusion; it is usually from *cussedness*. Why should you not punish a *boy who knows* that he is doing wrong? In the case of the boy I whipped it hurt me more than the boy and I think that impressed him. I did it only as a last resort.

Dr. Simcoe: My observation has been that there is as much whipping in insane asylums as in feeble-minded institutions. The employes do it. I have had four years' experience in a State asylum for the insane and I dare say that there is more punishment going on in insane asylums than the superintendent knows nothing about than ever was in a feeble-minded institution.

Mr. Johnstone: You may not know how much is going on in the institution of which you are superintendent.

Dr. Simcoe: I am a firm believer in not letting institutions get too big, for a superintendent *cannot* know what is going on in a big institution. I was raised in an insane asylum town and I knew what was going on when I was growing up.

Dr. Rogers: After all I think we agree on the essential points. An *irresponsible* person, be it child or adult, should certainly *never be whipped*. It is only in those rare cases in our work where we recognize responsibility, and then only as a last resort, that it should ever be employed. In the case I mentioned there had been months of patient effort, and a variety of minor methods of discipline employed without avail before the dose was administered.

#### TRAINING A SPECIAL SENSE.

MISS ALICE MORRISON, VINELAND, N. J.

EVERY one who, when given a task to do, accomplishes it with a reasonable amount of satisfaction, feels perhaps that their's is the best way of doing it. I do not say so nor even think so, but I do know that under our method of teaching I have received very good results.

Two years ago I was given a speech class composed of the apparently Deaf Mutes of the N. J. T. S., those children whom we believed could be benefited by a thorough course of training. It is of three of these children and their progress that I wish to speak especially.

One girl, Elizabeth K., entered the Training School in '97 from the School for the Deaf at Trenton, which reports,—“At times the child seems to hear, at times to be deaf, perhaps her hearing varies.” For some time after her admission she made no attempt to speak, making only animal sounds, and as far as we could tell did not hear at all.

George E. was admitted in '94. He could mumble, a few words which could be understood only by those who were well acquainted with him. He seemed to *feel* sound, but not to hear it.

Isaac C. was admitted in '98. He could not talk and made no attempt to and apparently could not hear.

When definite work was first begun with these children in the spring of 1900, it was evident that for lack of special training those who had been able to mumble even the least bit intelligibly or receive any impression by means of sounds had become to all intents and purposes absolute Deaf Mute. Work was begun along the line of special sense training. Knowing that the training of any one sense strengthens all of the others or the training of all the senses but one would strengthen that one, we set out to train hearing through sight, touch, taste and smell. Until the end of that school year practically no direct effort was made to have these children either hear or speak. They separated materials of different odors, classified substances according to

taste, matched colors and forms, etc., etc. Everything possible was done to strengthen the senses other than hearing.

When school opened in the Autumn they were ready for special work along the line of hearing. For the first half of the year the training of the special senses was pushed vigorously. Three days each week were devoted to hearing and speech. When I use the word days, I mean the period during which these children came to my class, i. e., 45 minutes each day, the balance of the time was spent in other school-rooms or industrial work. Before the middle of the year, Isaac could hear such sounds as loud music, sharp, quickly spoken words. George and Elizabeth could hear loud and distinct tones only through the ear trumpet. Neither of them had tried to talk and could not articulate. Even in laughing or crying they made no sounds. Isaac, however, was trying very hard to talk.

Now what I wish to tell you is how, in the last year and a half, I have been able to teach these children so that today we no longer regard them as deaf mutes. I have in my school-room a large "Primary Reading Chart" which consists of pages about three feet long and two and one-half feet wide. On these pages are large pictures of dogs, cats, foxes, etc., with their names plainly printed around them. Each morning when we assembled for our lesson we sat around the chart. I would give the child the trumpet, then place his hand on my throat; then pointing at the picture of the man, perhaps, would at the same time speak the word "man" into the trumpet as loudly as I could. At first Elizabeth and George laughed as if it tickled, or was pleasant, then they began to move their lips as they saw mine move, but no sounds issued. After a time, however, they began to make slight sounds and about this time I noticed that when I spoke a word as loudly as I had at first, tears came to their eyes; so gradually after this I stopped using the trumpet, finding that as they improved in articulation they correspondingly improved in hearing until it was possible for me without the trumpet, and by speaking about one-half as loud, to make them hear as well as they had at first with the trumpet.

As previously stated when they first began to imitate me, no sounds came, then slight sounds, until finally they could say "man" plainly, and the day when they really said "man" plainly was for them a victorious day. They laughed and were thoroughly pleased. After this they seemed to grasp what was wanted of them and so tried with all their power. As soon as we knew "man" we took up in the same manner, dog, boy, fox, etc., often being aided by the real cat or dog passing our window, or in the room, or by a trip to the Zoo or barn; and I will say right here a child will learn the name of an object about three times as quickly if he sees and handles it rather than its picture. Then we began to name objects in our schoolroom, also to read and write their names until when I gave Elizabeth a piece of crayon and pointed to my table she would go to the board and write "table" pronouncing it as soon as written, or when I said "table" she would write "table" immediately turning and pointing to it. Special stress was laid upon their food, articles of dress, individual toys, etc., for they seemed to take a particular delight in naming their "friends." It was necessary often to blindfold these children to keep them from using their eyes and reading from each other's lips in-

stead of listening for words. It was also very hard to realize that although they had a very large sign vocabulary, they had practically no oral vocabulary.

The evolution of the primitive language of these children to their present knowledge of words would be of interest and perhaps value to the philologist. When Isaac first learned the noun "stool" it meant not only stool, chair, bench, etc., but it also meant to sit. All of them when they learned the word "bite" used it until they learned to differentiate, to mean the entire act of eating, or any article of food. After teaching a great many words, nouns mostly, I began teaching verbs. I chose the verb "run." First I had them run, then I wrote run on the board, then I had them form r-u-n. phonetically with their lips, then say "run" as plainly as they could, after which I had all the children run, thus making the word run a sort of a game until in a short time they knew run, to speak, write, hear and act. In the same way they learned hop, skip, jump, etc.

Following verbs came pronouns. We took up just those we use most, I, me, my, you, your. etc. I taught pronouns in about the same way as nouns, for instance: "You run," pointing to a certain child when I said "you," or, "I run," pointing to myself when I said "I." After saying it over and over again and also writing it all kinds of ways, the child really knew "you" and "I" and also the rest of the pronouns. Yes and no came very easily as the children understood the signs nodding and shaking their heads, thus making it easy for me to say "yes" nodding my head or "no" and shaking my head. The children seeing that the sign and word meant the same, very soon said "yes" and "no" without the sign. The articulates a, an. and the, came naturally after a few times being told about the position of the tongue when saying th, ch, etc.

These children can now count to fifty right plainly, can read almost anything on my chart and call a great many objects by their right names. Isaac especially calls nearly everything by its name and failing to make you understand what he says, will spell the word. To-day these children are wonderfully improved. Isaac leads, George comes next and Elizabeth last. Isaac is quickest, George articulates most distinctly and Elizabeth is one of the most anxious to learn, but her voice seems to drop back into her throat somehow and there is not quite as much brain to work with.

When these children are real happy they succeed much better. One day last week a little boy crept up behind me to put flowers in my hair. Elizabeth, Isaac and George, thinking I did not know, began to laugh. They laughed right heartily. Previous to this their voices had been husky, but afterwards their voices were quite clear and they could articulate much better.

A good laugh seems to clear these children's throats more successfully than anything else I have found. C, K, O, X, and Z, and 3, 13, 23 are particularly difficult sounds for these children to make.

As was said above this work is based upon the theory that any sense could be trained by training all of the others. The general, special sense work has been continued more or less throughout the entire time.

Small adenoids have been removed from the girl's and quite a large one from the boys' throats.

## DISCUSSION

Dr. Rogers: This seems to me to be a valuable contribution to our literature. I have found in my experience that it is difficult for teachers to tell in papers exactly what they are doing with their children, but I think we have to look to the practical work in the school-room for the basis of our progress in the training of these children. When we hear a teacher tell exactly what she has done with her children, what methods she has employed and what the result has been, we have something definite to serve as a basis from which other teachers can work. I wish that we had more such reports. Our school-rooms are rich with material and that ought to be put in shape for the benefit of the profession.

Mr. Johnstone: There were eight in that class. Those three made the best progress. Two made practically none and the work for three years has been of no value that we can see. With all the rest there has been some advancement. Now we hardly consider them as deaf mutes. No one permits those children to talk with signs and no one is supposed to make any signs to them when talking. The employes usually fold their arms when talking to them.

Dr. Keating: I agree with Dr. Rogers that much knowledge of the children can be gained from the teachers, often better than in any other way. I know that their time is fully occupied, but we are all working in a common cause and if we can get more such papers they will be listened to with interest and pleasure. Papers from teachers are eagerly sought in making up the program.

Dr. Rogers: I think superintendents would give a few half holidays for such work.

Dr. Keating: I told my teachers I would give a week off.

Mr. Johnstone: When I suggested this paper it was given with the idea that it could not be done. It should be a question not of what they can do, but what they must. After it is done they will be glad to have done it.

Mrs. Wright: I have a boy in my care who used sign language, but I have been taking special pains to teach him to speak words. He seems to be a bright boy. He writes and spells and has learned to read so that I can understand almost every word.

## SECOND SESSION

Dr. Fernald: I have been specially interested in sense training. I believe that definite training of the senses has a great deal to do with developing the power of attention and observation. I think that the much neglected senses of taste and smell are specially valuable with the feeble-minded child of the lower grade. We have always made quite a point in developing the sense of smell. We find that many low grade idiots whose attention it is difficult to obtain in any other way are interested and will pay attention to varied stimulation of their sense of smell, using first familiar things and afterwards some more powerful perfume, chemical or drug. We have one boy whom we tested with various odors, apparently without any response, until he