

Cost of Feed Purchased.....	7,117.35	7,117.35
NET EARNINGS.....	\$10,852.95	
Less Citizen and Inmate Labor, Approximate.....	1,590.00	
		\$ 9,262.95

*Milk includes: 662,248 pounds at \$0.015 per pound....	\$ 9,888.75
162,929 pounds at \$0.025 per pound....	4,959.28
	\$14,848.03

Butter and Cream included with the Milk.

At the present time, Herd consists of:

Cows, Milking.....	66
Cows, Dry.....	12
Steers.....	20
Heifers and Calves.....	57
	155

Cattle feed was exceptionally high this year due to the drought. This is the only year hay was purchased and at a high price. This report does not include the rental of pasture lands.

FEED COSTS FOR CATTLE ONLY Feed Costs for October 1935

5 tons Bran.....	\$18.00	\$90.00
3 tons Gluten, Corn.....	30.00	90.00
120 bu. Oats.....	30	36.00
1½ tons Oil Meal, Cotton Seed.....		51.00
¼ ton Mineral Feed.....	41.50	11.00
30 tons Silage.....	3.00	90.00
16 tons Alfalfa.....	10.00	160.00
9 tons Beets.....	8.00	72.00
Total Feed Costs.....	\$600.00	
Inmate Labor.....		50.00
Civilian Labor.....		110.00
TOTAL COSTS.....		\$760.00

Amount of milk produced—58,921 lbs. at \$.025.....	\$1,643.02
Less cost.....	760.00
NET EARNINGS.....	\$ 703.02

Statement of Charges and Credits in Connection With Poultry For Period of July 1, 1934 to June 30, 1935

Cost of Chicks purchased.....	2000 only	\$ 174.00
Cost of Feed purchased.....		2,342.15
		\$2,516.15

Returns from Poultry:

Eggs.....	9640 doz.	\$2,068.78
Dressed chickens.....	4868½ lbs.	755.15
Dressed ducks.....	1081½ lbs.	152.61
Dressed geese.....	151 lbs.	22.65
Dressed turkeys.....	1233 lbs.	195.62

Total returns from Poultry.....		\$3,194.81
Less cost of Poultry.....		2,516.15

CREDIT..... \$ 678.66

Poultry on hand this date as follows:

Chickens.....	2,700 only
Ducks.....	179 only
Geese.....	21 only
Turkeys.....	295 only

35- WSE-JMM SUMMARY:

Due to drouth conditions, feed purchases in both quantity and price, have exceeded any previous year in the history of the institution.

No civilian or inmate labor is charged on this report.

No charges have been made on this report for feed raised on institution farm.

Inez B. Patterson, Superintendent, Home School for Girls: Our figures are very insignificant when compared with Mr. Whittier's, but we had a profit of \$207 on our poultry.

We are not prepared to give any figures on our herd this year because we have had Bang's disease.

B. F. Smith, M. D., Superintendent, Rochester State Hospital: We feel that it pays to keep a dairy herd at the Rochester State Hospital. The farm is allowed 1½ cents a pound for milk furnished the institution, and our figures for last month show that we produced milk at the rate of 1.3 cents per pound. A dairy herd does afford employment for a large number of patients.

Mr. Vevie: I am sure Doctor Smith has shown a profit because he sold us some of his cows last year.

Doctor McBroom: The next topic is, What shall we do with blind mentally retarded children?

Doctor Murdoch, will you discuss this question for us?

Doctor Murdoch: Mr. Chairman, that is a subject that was discussed by the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection under the title "The Blind Feeble-minded." The feeling developed at that conference was that the School for Feeble-Minded was the place for the care of "the blind feeble-minded."

We classify our feeble-minded children into three groups.

First, those with mental ages up to three years. They require more nursing and medical care than training. They remain with us always.

Then there is a middle group with mental ages of from three to seven, who can be trained to be useful but who always require special supervision. If they have no habit disorder, if they are not delinquents, and if they do not get into special trouble, after a course of training many of them may be returned to the home if the home condition permits, but the majority of them will always require institutional care.

Then there is that upper group, sometimes called morons, with a mental age of seven to twelve, many of whom can be trained to become useful citizens.

I do not think there can be any doubt about where the two lower groups, those having mental levels below seven or eight years, belong. They could not profit by the usual training given in the School for the Blind.

I am going to read to you what Dr. Henry H. Goddard, of Ohio State University and formerly of Vineland, New Jersey, said on the subject.

"There is no question whatever in my mind that the feeble-minded blind and the feeble-minded deaf belong in the institution for the feeble-minded. This was frankly agreed to by such men as Fernald, Rogers, Kutnewsky and institution men generally fifteen to twenty-five years ago. If there is a change of opinion now, I should say it is due to loss of insight rather than to any new discoveries. Feeble-mindedness is the fundamental defect. No feeble-minded person ever learned to read and count with sufficient efficiency to earn his living thereby or even to help earn it. Braille and lip-reading are no easier. The kind of training that ought to be given and is given in our best institutions for the feeble-minded is far better for the blind and deaf feeble-minded than anything they can get in their own institutions.

"Moreover, it is hard enough to make the blind self-supporting. Why add to our burdens by efforts to put the feeble-minded blind into society where he will never be very happy and seldom useful! Why not say: With this double handicap he deserves to be cared for without submitting him to a constant struggle and worry. We will assume the burden without further ado, and give him a comfortable happy home as long as he lives. By this treatment we also save the transmission of any of his defects to posterity."

In that symposium Dr. F. Kuhlmann, Director of the Division of Research in the Minnesota Department of Public Institutions, said:

"I believe the school for defectives would be the better place for the blind defective. The mentally normal blind child has the possibility of becoming a self-supporting adult. The blind defective has not. His daily requirements, therefore, place him with the defective group, and it would be better to have the same organization that is to be responsible for this be responsible also for his early training."

Dr. Kuhlmann said considerably more on the subject.

In Faribault the grounds of the School for Feeble-Minded adjoin the grounds of the School for the Blind. We see both types. Each institution has easy access to the other. When the children from the School for Feeble-Minded go out walking they pass the School for the Blind, and it is interesting to note their reaction. When they see the blind children they say: "What a pity! Those poor children are blind!" not thinking of their own defect. While the children from the School for the Blind say: "Isn't it terrible, those poor children are mentally weak!" Each group feels sorry for the other. There is something in that that applies to life in general. We see the defects in others but not in ourselves.

There is another interesting presentation on this subject that came out of this White House conference which came from the superintendent of the Pennsylvania Institute for the Instruction of the Blind at Overbrook, Dr. O. H. Burritt. He stated:

"It is suggested that for the group usually diagnosed as morons and any others who may belong to the so-called borderline area, there should be provided in each residential school for the blind and in conjunction with each day school for the blind, where feasible, an observation cottage. Under a teacher trained and experienced in work for the blind, it can be determined

gradually whether these children belong in the group of blind feeble-minded, whose primary need is suitable elementary training and custodial care, or whether they can be advanced educationally in some subjects by individual instruction and other subjects by class instruction in the school for the blind."

When a family has a child classifying as a moron who is also blind, naturally that family feels that the mental condition is due to blindness and that the place for that child to receive training is in the School for the Blind. I think it would be fine if that child could have experience in the School for the Blind. If, after a course of training, the family cannot care for the child at home, it may become necessary later on to have it enter the School for the Mentally Defective.

We have a number of adult blind working in the cabinet shop in the School for Feeble-Minded who are exceedingly useful. We have a blind boy who is one of the best workers in the shop. He can saw, put in nails; in fact, he can use all the carpenter's implements. He is a happy and contented boy and is interested in his work. He had early training in the School for the Blind, which no doubt accounts for a lot of his ability. We have some blind girls who do housework quite as well as those who are not blind. Some of them can sew, do fancywork, make baskets, and so on.

So far as the industrial training is concerned, I do not see any reason why we cannot take care of that in the School for Mental Defectives.

We do not give any training in braille. I do not believe there are many of these children who are going to take advantage of academic training or braille. I think where there is any doubt as to this they should be given an opportunity for training in the School for the Blind if they have no personality or habit disorders which make them objectionable in that group.

We have in our School for the Feeble-Minded thirty-one totally blind, of whom there are only three who have an I. Q. over fifty. We have twenty-eight partially blind, ten of whom have an I. Q. over fifty. Of the totally blind under the age of twenty with an I. Q. over fifty we have none. Of the partially blind under the age of twenty with an I. Q. over fifty we have four boys and one girl.

Mr. Lysen, the superintendent of the Minnesota School for the Blind, reports that last year out of a total of 115 students thirteen were classified as morons having I. Q.'s under seventy-five, and that he believes there are a dozen or so who have been denied admission because they are definitely feeble-minded.

My opinion is that unquestionably the place for the training of those whose I. Q. is under fifty is the School for Mental Defectives. For those whose I. Q. is over fifty, with a pleasing personality and no habit disorder, I should like to see them given an opportunity in the School for the Blind. If they do not get along satisfactorily there they could later be transferred to the School for Mental Defectives.

Mrs. La Du: I should like to endorse what Doctor Murdoch has said. I think his conclusions are good. But I do think that if we are to have this group of high-grade morons in the School for the Blind there should be a teacher specially trained to teach them and that they should not be taught with the normal blind children. The normal blind child has such a handicap to overcome under the most favorable conditions that he requires very close individual attention from the teacher. If that teacher has a high-grade blind moron in the same class, she is going to spend more time with the mentally defective child because of his double handicap and neglect the normal child. I think we should be very careful before we classify a blind child as normal or subnormal, and for that reason we should have a skilled, special teacher to observe the blind children who appear to be defective mentally and determine whether or not they are trainable. If not, and

they cannot be cared for at home they should be at the School for Mental Defectives. If they are trainable, they should be taught by special teachers and not at the expense of the normal blind child.

Doctor McBroom: Mr. Tynan, you are familiar with both sides of this subject. May we hear from you?

M. I. Tynan, Supervisor, Division for the Blind: I did not expect to speak today; therefore I am more or less unprepared.

This is a question in which I have been very much interested for a great many years. I first wish to say that my ideas on this subject concur with those which Mrs. La Du and Doctor Murdoch have so well expressed.

Retarded blind children present many problems, but the cause of retardation must, first of all, be determined absolutely before we can arrive at any definite conclusions; in other words, we must be certain whether blindness or low mentality is causing the retardation.

I think the idea of thoroughly testing questionable children at the School for the Blind is excellent. I believe every school for the blind in this country has had more than its share of mentally low-grade blind children, and there is no doubt that they interfere with the education of the normal blind children.

Personally, I believe when we are convinced that such children are mentally retarded it would be more satisfactory to educate them in connection with the School for the Feeble-Minded for this reason:

As Doctor Murdoch has pointed out, their parents are very much incensed, in a great many instances, if the children are sent to the School for Feeble-Minded rather than allowed to remain at the School for the Blind. On the other hand, if we keep them in the School for the Blind over a period of years, we find their parents are more than joyous over their progress and think they have accomplished far more than they really have. When it is time for them to leave the School for the Blind and go home, not only their parents but many in their community feel that the Division for the Blind is not doing its duty when it does not make a special effort to see that these children are employed or given occupation. It is sufficiently difficult to assist a normal blind person to secure employment, and when we add to that the additional handicap of low mentality it is virtually impossible.

I think the problem of the retarded blind child is one to which we should give serious attention. I wish it were possible to secure the expert suggested by Mrs. La Du. We could then keep the mentally retarded blind children separate from the normal blind children.

There are moral problems which arise in a great many schools for the blind due to the mentally retarded children, and there are other problems which have led me to believe that, if we could arrange it, it would be far better to have a unit for such children at the School for the Feeble-Minded rather than keep them, after their period of tryout, at the School for the Blind.

Thank you.

Doctor McBroom: Thank you, Mr. Tynan.

Is there any further discussion? Mr. Lysen.

J. C. Lysen, Superintendent, School for the Blind: I asked the question, What shall we do with blind mentally retarded children? because I think it is one of the hardest questions that we have to solve.

I think it should be said to the credit of Mr. Vevic, who preceded me as superintendent at the School for the Blind, that he did his very best to try to keep up the mental level of the school; yet, despite his efforts, we had last year thirteen

children whose I. Q.'s were less than seventy-four. It is very difficult to have to turn down an application because a child is mentally retarded.

During a routine examination of new students at the Minnesota School for the Blind a year ago, Doctor Hales, from Doctor Kuhlmann's office, found that a little girl, totally blind, had an I. Q. rating of sixty. This year Doctor Herring gave her a rating of eighty-three. In my estimation this does not mean that her mental level has raised, but that her ability to do things has increased. Last fall, according to the test of Doctor Hales, one of our boys had an I. Q. of eighty-seven; this fall Doctor Herring found he had an I. Q. of 113.

I made a suggestion recently to Doctor Murdoch that he provide custodial care for mentally retarded blind children and that we have our faculty teach them. Under such an arrangement doubly-handicapped children would be committed to his institution with the understanding that instruction would be provided by the School for the Blind. Parents might object to the arrangement, but I believe it would be a solution.

Mr. Carlgren: What is your method of procedure when you receive an application for the admission of a mentally defective child?

Mr. Lysen: When an application for the admission of a child to our school is sent to us, we have Miss Gaffney investigate the home, and if on the surface of things it appears that the child is mentally defective we arrange for a test by an examiner from Doctor Kuhlmann's office. On the other hand, if the child is ordinarily bright we accept it. Later on an examiner from Doctor Kuhlmann's office comes to the school and tests all new admissions at one time.

This year we admitted a child whose I. Q. we have discovered is only fifty; his appearance, however, does not coincide with his low mental rating.

Doctor McBroom: Thank you, Mr. Lysen.

Our program is rather too extensive to cover everything this afternoon, but we have one question that seems to be attracting a great deal of attention, What legal holidays are given to the staff and employes and what arrangement is made to cover the service due to this loss of time?

Doctor Smith, may we hear from you?

Doctor Smith: There isn't very much to say on the matter of holidays.

All employes at our institution are granted one day for each of the following legal holidays: New Year's, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Good Friday, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Armistice Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas, making a total of ten in the odd years and one additional holiday in each of the even years because of the general election which comes in November. The staff is allowed a day off for each holiday. Usually they make their morning rounds—doing such work as is urgent—and take the balance of the day.

The problem of when the employes shall take their holidays I imagine depends upon the type of institution. In an institution similar to ours we can allow one day off for one person on each ward per day. It takes about two or three weeks to allow all the employes to have their holidays. We cannot close our doors like an office building, so it does take considerable time to grant all the employes their holidays. There are some departments, such as the occupational therapy and industrial departments, which can close their doors and take each holiday as it comes.

We do not allow employes to accumulate holidays. Each employe is allowed one day off a week.

Miss McGregor: We do not give a whole day off for holidays. No employe is allowed more than half a day and they are expected to arrange for it in the week in which the holiday falls.