formation have contributed, a thorough study of each individual case, his parents and family history by a person trained for this kind of work is now demanded. One American institution has already put four such persons into the field to do solely this kind of work. The few results obtained so far hold out the promise of at last giving us something both definite and reliable. The establishment of the facts in this field will surely cost a very great amount of labor, but if we can really get the facts there will not likely be any great dispute over their price.

I have said that the first aim of the study of the causes is the prevention of feeble-mindedness. But students of this subject have recognized that the duty of their science does not end with this. It should aim at raising the average or standards of normal mental efficiency. This is to be accomplished largely through the same knowledge that will enable us to prevent or limit actual mental defect. What seem to be the causes of mental abnormality are general and widespread. None of us escape all of them entirely. And we cannot suppose that if they produce a gross defect in one person that they may have left another, who has attained what we now call a normal development, entirely unaffected. I believe the thesis could be successfully maintained that no person has ever quite attained the mental development and efficiency that he might have attained had even our present knowledge of the causes of mental defect been applied in determining his hereditary endowment and rearing. Yet this is the one thing far above all others in all the world that every individual cherishes most.

Ob) General educational problems. The questions arising here are more removed from the immediate concerns of the special institution, or feeble-minded, than the preceding. I wish to call attention here only to one general question, viz., that of the psychology of learning. Educationalists have of late turned from the consideration of the methods of teaching to the experimental study of the mental processes and other factors involved in learning. This is the fundamental educational problem of today. If we can find out what mental processes the child must go through in learning any particular thing we have the necessary information for helping him. Now psychologically defined from this point of view, the feeble-minded child is simply one who is unable to learn as readily as the normal. He presents the hindrances to the learning process in a pathologically magnified condition, and thus enables us to discover them more readily.

A STUDY OF THE INMATES OF THE ST. CLOUD REFORMATORY.

BY DR. R. M. PHELPS, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT ROCHESTER STATE HOSPITAL, ROCHESTER, MINN.

The interesting lessons I would point out are many—the difficulty lies in condensing them into one brief article. Supt. F. L. Randall of the St. Cloud Reformatory, from an observation and study of his people, which had seemingly been far more penetrating and pervasive than is customary, began to perceive that many of them were "not right" mentally. After some agitation of the subject, he has brought about a special examination of them.

Personally, in the last ten months, I have reviewed 270 separate cases of this population, which population now numbers about 380. I here present the prominent lessons derived from this study. For greater clearness and brevity, I first present some general results and conclusions; then later the special findings.

1. Hardly any "insanity" (considering the word as used excluding the imbecile forms) is found among the inmates. By the usual course of the cases through the courts, any cases showing insanity or epilepsy, either during or before the trial, will have been diverted to other destinations. Moreover, the age of those committed—usually sixteen to twenty-five, rarely up to the age of thirty—does not favor their being often committed while insane.

2. "Imbecility" is the best name for the defectiveness found. Large amounts of minor imbecility prevail. It is needful at once to make some explanation. Such imbecility may be subdivided into two parts, which two portions may mingle with each other in varying proportions: First, mental weakness or imbecility proper; second, moral weakness or "incorrigibility," as it is commonly called. Most of the cases of imbecility found are of lesser or minor grades, because, of course, the extreme cases have been previously diverted to the Faribault school.

A caution is to be added. Most people carelessly think or infer that a boy who does not go to the Faribault School is not imbecile, or if he does not go to the Red Wing School he is not "incorrigible." Such, of course, is contrary to the fact, these schools getting simply the extreme cases.

Another caution. Most people carelessly infer that the so-called "incorrigibles" are mentally sound, though morally perverse. Though I have not made a specialized extended study of any collection of these boys, I would say that I regard the "typical incorrigible" as a "defective" as one to whom the term "moral imbecile" might be possibly applied. By "typical" incorrigibility I mean that incorrigibility which is a part of the boy—which begins to show as the child develops, just as he does the imbecility proper—which persists during the development in spite of all ordinary motives to the contrary, just as does imbecility proper—which has all varying grades and degrees of grossness, as does imbecility proper.

This is not, however, my main subject, and need not be specially studied in this paper—for I hasten to add that in my marking of these boys of the Reformatory, while influenced somewhat, I tried to make my marking to not depend on that quality alone. For I found sufficient of the more purely mental weakness, to accompany this moral weakness, upon which I could make a downward marking. Thus, of the 49 "incorrigibles" on the list, I have, I find, marked all but six of them as below grade.

3. This imbecility I noted at once could be wisely designated only in terms of "degrees." As I stated it, to designate a case only as "imbecile," stating no degree of the same, is like stating "it has become dark," in that by this latter word we might refer to the passing of a cloud over the sun, or to a twilight darkness, or to a starry night, or to the pitchy blackness of a midnight storm. All degrees of darkness exist, likewise all grades of imbecility.

I therefore constructed a scale running from No. 1 (an average normal state) up to No. 10 (a gross, typical imbecile).

4. The use of such a scale admits fully and frankly that all grades exist, a fact which is practically ignored in practice, though dimly recognized by many people. Most of the cases designated are, of course, of the minor grades of weakness of mind, for the reason that any gross case would usually have been diverted to the Faribault School.

THE FINDINGS.

I examined 270 individuals. These were not all consecutive cases, but a more important "selection of cases" lay in the fact that among the older cases the more favorable ones would be the more apt to have gone on parole, leaving the less favorable ones behind. This kind of selection, however, was unavoidable.

Of the 270 cases, I find that I have marked 98 cases as notably defective or imbecile. This omits 49 other cases of the 270, who had a marking so slight that it seems best to omit it at this time. I would again caution that these 98 cases are not grossly imbecile in many cases—not so gross as to render their admission to the Faribault School easy. Perhaps not more than ten would be admitted. Yet half imbecile faces are plainly seen at a glance at the grouping of them, while large numbers of them cannot learn in school or are lacking in other ways. Testimony to- this effect can be gathered from themselves. Several of the inmates, restless under the examination, protested that they were not insane, volunteered the admission that "of course a good many of the boys are weak and simple of mind." Also by their testimony, those caring for the boys seemed to also see quite clearly the feebleness of mind of those under their watch. Again, in the letters coming to the superintendent concerning the previous history of these boys, I noted frequent expressions such as that the boy "is not quite right," "is not very bright," "was a queer and eccentric boy," "was always incorrigible," and so on through varying phraseology.

Education—A gross lack of education is noted. But it is the lack of "ability to learn" that brings the most significance. One after another. they would frankly admit (one day five out of six consecutive cases thus admitted) that learning was slow and difficult with them. They would say that they were unable to learn like their comrades or brothers. Often the inability was quite gross. To confirm this, we had the school record of each after coming to the Reformatory, and it usually made the matter worse rather than better.

Of the 270, only three had graduated from high school and only 24 had ever been in a high school at all. Only 45 more had ever seen the eighth grade. At the other end, about 120 had never been beyond the fourth grade in school, though remaining in school, with a few exceptions, until twelve or fourteen or sixteen years of age. Surely there is nothing "incidental" about all this. I would add a list to show this, selecting them as they run among the list. I give the age they quit school and the grade in which they quit. Age thirteen, third grade; age fourteen fifth grade; age twelve, second grade; age fourteen, fifth grade; age sixteen, fifth grade; age fifteen, sixth grade; age twelve, fifth grade, age thirteen, third grade; age thirteen, fourth grade. Using figures only, we continue the quotations: Fifteen, 4; 12, 3; 10, 4; 14, 3; 12, 3; 12, 5; 14, 5; 16, 5; 15, 2; 14, 4; 14, 5; 12, 4; 13, 4; 13, 4; 13, 3; 12, 3; 14, 5: 1 2, 3: 14, 3: 14, 4: 13, 2; 17, 3; 12, 2; 14, 4; 14, 3; 12, 4; 14, 4; and many others approximating the same. These boys were kept in school, but they did not learn. Some, it is true, say they did not try, but even if so, their ability must be below par. Many freely admit their lack of ability. Moreover, the Reformatory school tested them again. Before coming to the Reformatory 59 of the 270 stopped in the second or third grade and 34 more stopped in the fourth, while others had vaguely slight and indefinite schooling, not noted by grade. Surely, this is a most significant fact.

Incorrigibility—Of the 270 eases, 32 had spent time in a reform school and 17 more admitted having been "threatened" with being sent to such a school. This means 49 confessed incorrigibles, to which number could doubtless be added some 25 others who had by chance escaped being "threatened" or sent. Incorrigibility, when it is typical, has commenced early in childhood, and has persisted as a moral weakness or perversion through the teens. Even casual observers have noted that it does not seem so much acquired as "inborn." Stealing seems to be the most common court complaint against these incorrigibles, yet a background of general viciousness is commonly present. As the study progressed, the conviction grew more and more strong that the moral obliquity, wickedness or weakness was accompanied in most all cases seen at the Reformatory with more or less mental weakness. All but six of the above 49 are among the 98 cases above marked as of low mental grade. However, the most grossly imbecile ones were not usually those who had been in a reform school.

Inebriety—As the examiner meets case after case, drifting along in an atmosphere of dull, sodden drinking and saloon life, the impression grows that the whole group of crime rises out of drinking; that drinking is the foundation soil that nourishes and fosters all this viciousness and degradation and crime. Losing all their money while drinking, losing their work on account of drink, and drunk when they committed the crime is the usual story. But ever and again, the examiner strikes a case that does not drink, and he wonders and becomes more interested in that one. For how can a young man, tramping or bumming about the country or in city slums or mines or lumber camps with rarely a single associate who does not drink, whose daily recreation is only the saloon—how can such a one avoid drinking, was my instant query. A study quickly revealed that it certainly was from no merit or effort of their own. It was no slightest evidence of righteousness of conduct. Nor was it from any extra intelligence, for some of the imbecile ones were in this list. Urged to say if they had any special aversion to the drink, they were not conscious of any such. They could not tell why. They simply did not want it. They simply were not "built that way." It was a part of their inherited constitution, just as the easy slump of the gross drinker was a part of his. It was but another link to strengthen my chain of evidence in regard to the constitutional, or inborn character of much of this imbecility and incorrigibility. This was clinched by noting many abstainers of quite imbecile type. Twenty-nine of these 270 boys did not drink at all (practically). In not a single case of the 29 was there a claim toward any special righteousness in avoiding drink. Twenty-nine more claimed to drink only slightly. The rest were all sodden and dull drinkers.

Tramping-Though without very exact statistics, many, if not a majority, had tramped more or less even young as they were. By tramping, we mean beating their way from town to town without paying. Of course, they would work at times, as, indeed, most tramps probably do. But most of the rest of the 270 were movable from place to place, from city to city, to the mines or the woods in winter or the harvest fields in summer. I imagine hardly a dozen would have the dignity of a trunk if they wished to move. Probably not over 30 were living in a home at the time of the crime. Hardly any had ever saved up property to $100 or $500'. Indeed, few had ever saved up even $100 except as they were paid up after a job. Practically none of them had any property left behind to be seen to.

Though all but a few (probably not over ten) visited loose women, yet only eleven had had syphilis and only 48 had had gonorrhoea.

If anyone imagines there was much of excitement or adventure or vicious romance in the stories, he is grossly mistaken. Sordid and commonplace is the repeated story of dull, gross, drunken yielding to some unexciting vice or crime. Such a foolish lot of dull crimes would hardly be supposed. Usually done while drunk or drinking, the forgery or the theft rarely involves $50, usually it is $5 or $10 or $20 or $30'. Often it is a little old junk. Sometimes it is whiskey or cigars. Rarely is the value enough to pay a man to escape from the city. Rarely is it enough to pay to pursue the man, if he leaves town. Yet they risk five to ten years of servitude for this bit of money. Verily, as some of them say themselves, it is all "foolishness." Moreover, it is done in a dull way and they usually plead guilty.

Then, too, aside from the needless, unavailing and fool chance of the deed, the officers will remark of a paroled man, "the man surely cannot be just right or he would not go right back to such things again, after his confinement, fair promises and education." And the impression grows and grows that there is in many of them an inborn trend that they are following. It is hard to make people who are not students with experience see this. But in the grossly incorrigible, who from early childhood adopt all sorts of needless vicious action, many are beginning to see that something is wrong. But that is as far as most people will go unaided. To most people, there are unthinkingly just two classes, the wholly responsible and the wholly irresponsible.

The view of a broad trend reaching from highest mental and moral standing above to the grossest imbecility below, dotted with men and boys the whole length of its grade, bewilders them; they begin to fear for moral and legal responsibility and accountability and, even, for the safety of their own minds. Yet the facts remain plain though we ignore them. And there is nothing disastrous in them. Men are daily asserting the graded and growing and changing mental ability of their own children without fearing any disaster to theology or social life. Yet we are all but children of a little larger growth. We work TOWARD perfection, but we do not ATTAIN it.

As for my part, the study is only the scientific one. I do not see clearly any change of policy to propose. I would not change penalties much, if I could. Penalties are for the safety of society anyway, not to compensate evil intent, so as to even it up with justice. There is no such

thing as compensation for evil. If there were, the present laws would give a ludicrous caricature of it. For, if a man aim a gun at another man, if he kills the man, he hangs; if he injures him slightly, he gets a slight imprisonment; if he misses he may often get no penalty at all. Yet the intent and action on his part were exactly the same in all three cases. These boys truly say "there are hundreds outside as bad as we are."

These opinions are going to meet some opposition. Some have argued that they know many boys, dull in school, who in later life have fitted into a success in some occupation. Truly so, but this does not contradict the fact that most of the imbeciles and many reform school boys have failed to learn well. In fact, I might admit still more:

1. In public schools, all grades of ability are seen. There are nearly always some too dull to keep up. The very school children will tell you of this.

2. In any bunch of young men like those in lumber woods, in mines or slums, cases that are below grade mentally could be picked out.

3. In any town of say 1,000 people, where all individuals can be known, one can pick out examples of low grade intellects.

4. Not all imbeciles are "vicious" weaklings. Probably each of us knows some of good repute.

5. The uneducated classes hold the larger number of the low grade intellects, but this is largely because the low grade intellects do not become educated.

Now, I hold that all the above admissions enforce my theories, rather than contradict them. They all point toward varieties both in strength and form of mental endowment.

Opposition to the full acknowledgment of a continuous gradation can only be fully met by a quiet persistence and gradual education of the mass of people up to these views. It may take many years, perhaps a century of them. Old habits and customs yield slowly. Indeed, as a practical thing, it is perhaps best that an adoption should not come too rapidly. This is because our ability to accurately judge AHEAD of time and in the early childhood of the boy is, unfortunately, very poor as compared with our judgment of the defectiveness as it has shown itself and proven itself in AFTER years. But the fact that there are such grades or differences need not be denied for any such reason.

You will note, also, that I have avoided the use of the word "heredity." When using it in previous papers I have found myself often misunderstood. I therefore use the words "innate" or "inborn" or perhaps better, "constitutional." I mean that the quality is a part of the boy's makeup. If you admit this, you can then call it "inherited" or not as you may wish. For illustration, suppose a boy has a peculiar taste and ability in music. I call it "constitutional" or inborn.

The trouble in using the word "inherited" for this and for all kinds of qualities, is that most of our hearers immediately try to find the same quality in the father or the mother. But often, it cannot be found, at least by superficial examination. I do not claim that it is always to be so found, yet, I do claim that the quality is a part of the boy's makeup; is a something that training has not given to him.

A side thought seems fitting in this place. I never before so clearly realized that for this class of moving, tramping, "away from home" population, there is hardly anything open to them out of work hours except the saloon. Several of the boys ,put it quite vividly.

"Where am I to go? We can't shut ourselves in a room. No families receive us. All our associates, almost to a man, drink and get their recreation in saloons. It is almost impossible for us to keep from drinking." Probably several thousand boys in the state are in this condition. The saloons get about all their wages and without the drinking, much of the subsequent crime, and much of the venereal diseases would be avoided. Of course, the crimes themselves, are but incidents, growing out of the general low, vicious living which prevails among them.

In a spirit of caution, so easily do wrong inferences seem to arise, I would explicitly state as follows:

1. Most of the defectiveness or imbecility is of lesser degree, or, as sometimes stated, of "high grade."

2. Traces of imbecility or defectiveness could also be found in groupings outside the Reformatory, but not in such large numbers.

3. I do not see changes of commitment or other disposition in institutions that I would propose or commend, except perhaps in the most extreme cases.

Before concluding this presentation, I would like to enforce some of the points at greater length. The central points of difference, about which most debate might centre, and concerning which clear thought is needed are the two following:

First, the admission of "degrees" of mental feebleness of imbecility.

Second, the admission that typical "incorrigibility" is a defective mental and moral state.

The first of these two is the only one needing much attention here. It is that imbecility exists in "degrees" from that of a gross "idiot" knowing practically nothing at all, up and up till only the slightest traces of imbecility are to foe found. I have been led to consider this opinion many times before in connection with the study of insanity as including imbecility.

So frequently is this idea admitted in practical life that it would hardly seem to need argument or detail. For, wherever you may go, among teachers or citizens, or any educated men, you will meet the common statements that "that boy is not very bright" "that boy is dull" "that boy was never bright mentally" "that boy was always odd and erratic" "that is a sort of foolish boy" "that boy is somewhat feebleminded," etc., etc., indefinitely.

Again, from my standpoint in examining the insane, it has become a habit for me to take the younger admissions and inquire back through the "teens" of the boy to find in them traces of imbecility, or of erratic and defective mental state of other form. We occasionally get typical imbeciles committed as insane, but of those with mild traces of imbecility, the number is also surprising. Such traces are attested by statements from neighbor or friend like the following: "was never very bright," "was always an odd child," "always kept by himself and never said much," "was never of strong mind," etc., etc., such statements coming not from any examiners,

you see, but by such inexpert friends as would see usually only the more gross features of abnormal kind.

I have just run over the last year's admissions of men to see how this has been stated statistically and find that we have admitted a total of 221 men, ten of whom are quite typically imbecile and commonly known as such. Of this total of 221 admissions, there are among the younger patients admitted, ten others who are known before coming as having varying yet quite distinct traces of imbecility. Also, among our present total population of 624 men, we now have 19 quite typical imbeciles. By typical imbeciles, we mean those who do not have delusions, who are not feeble-minded because of epilepsy but who are simply feeble in mind more or less grossly, and have been so since childhood in greater or lesser degree.

So easily as shown by the above, do ordinary people admit the degrees of imbecility to be present in the general population. Yet when the same facts are presented in a blunt statement that all degrees of weakness of mind exist, they shrink. Many doctors will also shrink. In fact, no physician, of course, will wish to so state about his immediate community, nor will any citizen wish to so state about his immediate friends. And blame no one for such reserve. It is an instinctive, conservative attitude toward one's family and one's community life. It is usual to ignore that "imbecility" till it is so fairly gross that it "forces' itself to the attention. And for the present I rather think that is the fairly right thing for ordinary society to do.

But, considered scientifically, and in the way of a study of conditions, there seems no way of reasonably doubting that varying abilities exist. To deny it would be to me an untruth. Of course, in judging, I should supposably lean toward the side of normality in all matters of doubt.

A subordinate question has appeared at times. It is this: "Is LACK OF ABILITY the same as imbecility?" The answer would be that if this lack of ability is due to an injury or disease acquired in adult life, it usually does not take the name imbecility, even though it be a similar weakness of mind. But when it comes in childhood, whether evident from the time of birth or due to accidents or disease at or near birth or due to a defective development after birth or from epilepsy beginning in early childhood, it checks full development and is then the common, and usually known, imbecility. In its essence, this is a lack of ability.

"Insanity" in its broad sense, and in the text books is, as a rule, defined so that it includes and covers imbecility. Thus we, in hospitals for the insane, are technically in legal position to take in imbeciles also. But the more restricted meaning of the word insanity is the one usually used.

It is to be understood, of course, that the "ten" degrees outlined by me are selected in a purely arbitrary manner. Various degrees are noted by authors but the subject seems not to have been fully developed. Various words are used to designate degrees. The term "high grade imbecile" meaning one near the normal state, has become quite a standard term. Also, "low grade normal" has been used to approximate it from the "normal" side. Then, too, among the known imbeciles, the word "feeble-minded" is commonly used where the degree is rather slight. Thus, we might make up a scale by using well known names as follows:

1. Super-normal (one ABOVE the AVERAGE normal state).

2. Average normal.
3. Low grade normal.
4. High grade imbecile.
5. Feeble-minded.
6. Imbecile.
7. Idiot (or grossly imbecile).

One other point. Ordinarily a bright manner of talking, will lead the hearers to declare the person must be considered as normal. Ordinarily it may, doubtles be true, tout occasional cases may show much defectiveness with that brightness and sparkle of talk. It may even be imbecility (which is ordinarily a quite symmetrical weakness) but it is more apt to be that unsymmetrical form called "defectiveness." By the word "defective" we recognize a greater ability along some lines of thought than along some others.

So, too, with ability to "learn." Occasionally one may learn well yet be quite defective in judgment. He may not have "good sense." Of course, most imbeciles of high grade talk with fair accuracy, "far more accurately than do the insane. Of the 19 enumerated as now in this hospital, most every one of them could discuss ordinary matters with accuracy and not give any delusions. This is, also, ordinarily true of "epileptic" patients especially during the early years of their epilepsy.

I feel the need of adding some explicit statements.

I wish to state explicitly that while I have recorded findings of degrees of weakness of mind in the inmates of the Reformatory, I would find them in other groupings of people of like ages also. I think of them in this collection at the Reformatory only as more common and more gross.

I wish to explicitly state that no one would go into private homes and make very free statements concerning weakness of mind, even if he saw them clearly.

I wish to explicitly state, also, that the judgment of degrees of imbecility are "approximate."

I wish to explicitly state, also, that we could not take a group of babies or very young children and pick out so accurately the ones who would thus develop weakness of mind. The demonstration is largely by means of the later behavior.

I wish to explicitly state that I am not advising any change in present methods of commitment. Naturally to be inferred from the above arguments, not the Reformatory alone, but each state institution contains many variations in grade. Every public school contains many grades of ability and it is becoming one of the modern problems how to make all scholars pull together without holding the more able ones back. A hospital for the insane holds many variations and grades; from an inebriate who is nearly sane, or the convalescing one who is nearly recovered, down to the lowest dement. It also usually holds samples of imbeciles, incorrigibles and epileptics. We cannot have separate institutions for each grade.

Again, I would state the opinion, putting it more cautiously and as a personal opinion, that I am not so afraid as some seem to be of confining and limiting the freedom of one who is not quite right mentally. That is, I would not recommend that a mere taint of imbecility or eccentricity or abnormality should free from all penalty of wrong doing. I would

hold that the imbecility or insanity must be fairly obtrusive before it frees a man from the usual penalties. This is the present practice.

F. L. Randall, State Reformatory. Mr. Chairman: The paper by Dr. Newman is largely made up of conclusions which seem to me to be most sound and important; but, in the consideration of the unfortunates, he has confined himself strictly to the topic which was assigned him by the program committee, and in so doing he was fully warranted.

It would be impossible for me, with my present belief, and limited information, to differ from any of the conclusions which Dr. Newman has reached. In fact, I fully believe that every one of them is capable of being-demonstrated satisfactorily to any person who will spend the necessary time in studying the individuals as Dr. Newman has. But there is an extension of the list which should be considered. There are persons who are not insane as insanity is commonly regarded, who commit crime, and still should not be kept in a prison. I was told the other day by a specialist in nervous disorders, who has high standing in the northwest, that the disadvantages of the class to whom I now refer are described under the phrase "constitutional inferiority." 'For them there should be some place, and, while in Minnesota consideration has been given to such persons, and recognition has been had of the fact that there are such persons in fairly considerable numbers, other states have taken the lead in attempting to inaugurate proceedings looking toward their proper custody. It was a hope of mine that Minnesota would take the first place in this regard and maintain it, but she is not doing so.

For a person who is lacking to such an extent, whose equipment is so defective that when he is at large, and acting on his own volition, he violates the law, and is practically certain to continue to do so, the prison is not the proper place. Neither should there be a limit set specifically and definitely to his custodial care.

The insane who were mentioned by Dr. Newman should be committed indefinitely to a custodial asylum for treatment until such time as there is reason to believe that the original cause for their commitment no longer exists. Society now expends effort and money in their behalf, but commits them for a fixed term, at the expiration of which they secure unavailable liberty until the inevitable happens, and then the whole process, involving distress to the defendant and his people and scandal to the general public, is gone over again.

Dr. A. C. Rogers, School for Feeble-minded: That group of cases which Mr. Randall has spoken of is also described as "defective delinquents" in the report just published by the Massachusetts Commission, Dr. W. E. Fernald, Chairman. Mr. Randall refers to the law breakers under state custody who are below par mentally. The time is rapidly approaching when this class must have separate consideration. From the limited experience we have had with individuals of this class transferred from the other institutions to the School for Feeble-minded, I am satisfied that only a limited number can be taken care of at Faribault. Some have not proceeded far enough in their violation of law to be really antagonistic to society. Their susceptibility to suggestion is their danger outside, and their salvation inside of an institution. When their surroundings are reasonably agreeable and they have opportunities for employment and interests that appeal

to them, they get along pleasantly, do more or less constructive work, and learn to lead a comparatively useful life under conditions which develop contentment and satisfaction. Those, on the other hand, who have already gone so far in their criminality, or at least their life in had environment, as to find special satisfaction in it, and who are very anxious to get out into the world again, resisting and resenting constraint, and promoting discontent among their associates (who look upon them as heroes), such individuals could not he cared for in the Faribault institution. This simply suggests that there is yet a field which is not covered, and a very important field, because the class of cases represented are those in the borderland; they have a weak sense of responsibility, coupled with a considerable knowledge of the evils of the world, and are therefore especially capable of doing a great deal of damage to society if not taken in hand early in life.

Referring to two points in Dr. Kuhlman's paper: First, the census. The doctor probably has the number of feeble-minded still too low. It is very difficult to classify defectives accurately in society, not only because of the difficulty in locating all defective individuals but because of the epileptics who are in almost all cases more or less affected mentally as a result of the disease, but not generally regarded as defective. Thus, if we include epileptics, and those who are feeble-minded without the epileptic complication the number would be much larger. I should say, from the best information we have, that there is at least one in three hundred or thereabouts. Second: As to the classification of the feeble-minded in the institution, the doctor spoke of the custom, which has been maintained for many years, of having the person or persons in the institution, from experience best qualified to pass upon the degree of feeble-mindedness, make the classification and determine the place in the scheme of training to which the person should be assigned.

There is another factor that comes into the practical administration of an institution of this kind, and that is the attitude of the parents and friends. Of course, we all understand how strong the personal equation is that makes it difficult for parents to recognize deficiency in their own children. When they bring their defective children to an institution they expect much more than it is possible to accomplish; therefore, much attention must be given to satisfy, to a certain extent, that personal equation and children are often placed under the conventional school training who, we recognize at once, will never profit much by it. Now, the more nearly we can secure a truly scientific classification at the time of admission, the more nearly can we satisfy the parents themselves. In other words, if they recognize that there is a recognized standard of mental diagnosis, not entirely dependent upon any one person's judgment, they are better satisfied to accept more readily the classification as applied to their own children. This is a very important matter, as an economic proposition, both as to expense of training and saving of time, as Dr. Kuhlman has already stated.

Referring again to the census: By having a field agent who studies the sociological conditions pertaining to the children under consideration and ascertains the family histories, we can not only procure valuable information to guide us in our treatment of the cases, but also obtain a much more accurate census of the feeble-minded than we could in any other

way. The eastern field agents who are doing this kind of work find, when they go into a community in pursuit of Information concerning one particular child, it almost always leads to a knowledge of other defective children heretofore unreported. Covering the field pretty thoroughly in time with the field agents would give us an accurate census, which we do not have now.

Dr. H. A. Tomlinson, St. Peter State Hospital: I want to say a few words with regard to these papers. I 'want to speak first in some little general detail of the paper of Dr. Kuhlman, because the propositions he presented in his paper are very similar to those I have from time to time presented in work of my own. In about twenty-five years in which I have been engaged in research work of different kinds, I have run up against the difficulties that he refers to, particularly the question of making practical use of investigations in pure science. I think that there is not so much difficulty so far as this is concerned as there is in our tendency to think in terms instead of the things that the terms represent, and I want therefore in the beginning to emphasize what Dr. Kuhlman spoke of as to the significance of the terms "scientific" and "practical." We are prone to consider science as a result instead of as a means. Now, "science" simply means a method by which we acquire a result. It is not the result at all, and people who use the word "practical" really mean material, not practical. The use of the term grows out of the general impatience and unwillingness to apply systematic methods; therefore, anything which doesn't bring an immediate material return is regarded as not practical, and particularly if the material return is indirect. It may be just as great when indirect, but is not regarded as practical unless it shows a material advantage that is immediate. Now, I think we may safely say, both with regard to the work and the use of the terms, that anything that is scientific is practical, and anything that is practical is scientific, using the terms in their proper sense, because to be practical it must be orderly, definite and regular, and if it is orderly, definite and regular, it is scientific. Science simply means a method of inquiry to get at the exact truth with regard to the thing inquired about. Now, there can be nothing more practical than exact truth, so that a great deal of the discussion is simply a discussion about words and the use of words, instead of things and their meaning.

Then, another thing that stands in the way of a proper appreciation of this general subject is the tendency to use terms that imply processes, as if they meant results or exact states. For instance, if we use the word "feeble-minded," it is considered to apply to a definite degree of mental defect which is fixed and universal: whereas in point of fact, as Dr. Phelps showed, it varies within almost infinite degrees, but if we speak of feeble-mindedness in a child, the public thinks we mean an idiot, or one incapable of learning, whereas a mind may have all of its normal capacity but be feeble, simply unable to control that capacity, and the great advantage of the studies which are now being undertaken at Faribault is that they are going to determine the difference between these types and degrees of feeble-mindedness and their significance. And we are going to learn by and by that there are two individuals who apparently are equally feeble-minded, one of whom may be trained to a fair degree of intelligence and usefulness, and another, with apparently the same degree of feeble-mindedness,

who will be entirely incapable of training, not because there is any difference in their mental outfit, but because there is a difference in the capacity to use that outfit, which is inherent in the constitutional makeup of the individual.

We are coming to appreciate more particularly another thing that Dr. Kuhlman referred to; that is the significance of what is called the anatomical basis of these conditions. We have been studying this for years. I can remember, its full flower began about the time of the beginning of my work, about twenty-five years ago, when the dictum of all pathologists at work on the nervous system was that there was an anatomical basis for all forms of nervous disease or defect, and out of that dictum grew the question as to what might be done for these people. Under this method of study the fact was lost sight of entirely—because no comparative studies were made—that there is a wide difference between form and function, that while there is no difference histologically between a cortical cell in a new born child and a cortical cell in an adult, there is an enormous difference in the functional capacity of those cells, and that nature in the brain, as well as in the other organs of the body, is prodigal; that is, there is always much more functional tissue than is needed for any one given form of activity; consequently, if this functional tissue is limited and there are these anatomical differences, it is still possible, if the rest of the organism is sufficiently sound, to maintain the nutrition of the growing elements of the nervous system, to train the capacity of that individual to a fair degree of uniformity. The reason the one fails and the other succeeds is not because of difference in form, nor even, altogether, difference in functional capacity, but because of the inability of the rest of the organism to maintain the nutrition of the growing elements in the nervous system, because if they are fewer in number it means that they have to be trained to just that much greater capacity, and power of activity, and that what we have to look for and what these investigations are going to determine, is the basis, finally, for our saying which child is capable of development and which child is not, and the basis will not be any apparent intellectual lack, but rather the condition of the whole organism as it represents capacity for growth and development in that particular individual. The apparent paradoxes referred to and the exceptions which are so often used as arguments by the uninformed are composed of the class of individuals in whom the feeble-mindedness is apparent and, yet, where there is capacity for development because the rest of the organism is able to maintain the necessary degree of nutrition for the development of the limited number of active elements that may exist in this particular individual.

Then there is another term that we use very commonly, and which a great many people object to because they think it is indefinite—the fault is not with the term, but the way in which it is used—and that is the word "defective." Now, when we use the term "defective," if we use it properly, we mean simply that the individual is not effective, and that after that it is a question of degree. Anybody who is not effective up to a normal standard is to that degree defective. It does not mean because he is defective that he is an idiot or defective so far as to be apparent in his makeup, or in his appearance, or in his conduct; and if we keep that

fact clearly in our minds there need never be any confusion as to the proper application of this term.

Then there is another side to this same question as to the significance of the word "intelligence" as we ordinarily use it. Here the confusion arises because most people confuse the terms "intelligence" and "capacity." I don't know of any better illustration of the significance of the word "intelligence" as we use it than to say that it simply means that we have all of the elements necessary to normal mental activity properly correlated If they are not properly correlated then they are unable to do their work, and the failure is not a failure in intelligence, but a failure in capacity. It makes all the difference in the world whether we use the terms in this sense or whether we don't, and the more these investigations are made, the more clear these proper differences become. The • confusion arises from the fact that people do use terms in other than their proper etymological, or graphic sense.

The basis for this difference is the change which is gradually taking place in methods of study. Up to within the last ten years—it may be longer, but actively ten years—we have approached all these subjects from the anthropometric point of view, from the standpoint of the developed man. There has been a growing tendency in the last ten years particularly to study them from what is really the proper point of view, the biological, to study the highest developed form of organism from the standpoint of the lower organism out of which he grew, and to recognize the fact that those qualities which we designate as mental, and the capacity which we speak of as intellectual, are simply growths and complications of the simpler characteristics which belong to all animal life, and just as we know that, so far as vegetative existence is concerned, there is no difference in the nature of the activities in a single cell and the activities in a whole organism, so we know that there is no basic difference between the activities of the simplest form of nervous system and the activities in the highest form of nervous system, and that when we have a lack of development it means, in terms of biology, a persistence of rudimentary characteristics. Now, one of the principal functions of the nervous system, since there has been an organized nervous system, has been that of inhibition—that is, the ability to check and control the activities of the organism—and the one characteristic which is present in all forms of defect in the higher functions of the nervous system—the mental functions, or the psychic functions—is this lack of control. You don't find any anatomical difference in studying the brains of these people, except, reduction in the number of elements, and perhaps some difference in their form, but so far as the structure is concerned, it is similar. In the feeble-minded child we are dealing with futility and incompleteness varying in degree. The question we have to determine is the basis for that futility and incompleteness, and how far the organism of the individual generally is capable of responding to our efforts in the training of the functional activities of the nervous system so that the results may be more uniform, and more complete, and for this reason a great deal of study which is regarded as a waste of time by people who call themselves practical, has for its object the ascertainment of these facts as a basis for progressive work. That takes time, a great deal of it, and an enormous amount of material, before any definite con-

clusions may be reached. I have found in my own work that the difficulty has always been to correlate the results of laboratory investigation with the clinical findings, because of the fundamental reason that no two individuals are exactly alike mentally or physically; that there are traits which are individual as well as traits which are family and environmental in their origin, and these differ as the individuals or families and the environment differs; whereas your pure laboratory work, while it is exact, is impersonal, and the difficulty comes when you undertake to apply the results of your laboratory study to the individual under your care; so that I have believed that we could not successfully pursue these two kinds of work separately; that there must be a constant relation between the study of the individual clinically, whether it be from the psychological point of view or from the physical point of view, and the study of the physical side in the laboratory of the conditions of nutrition and waste that interfere with bodily activity, and that just in proportion as we can bring these together have we been successful. That is why in the large general hospitals as well as in the medical school hospitals the clinical laboratory, so-called, has come to displace the laboratory for abstract work. In our institutions, if this work is going to accomplish any results which will be tangible, so far as their usefulness is concerned, it must be from the combination of these two functions. We .must get the clinical or individual study of the patient correlated with the laboratory investigation of the conditions which are general and common to all patients.

I want to endorse the conclusions given by Dr. Phelps in his paper. I made some tentative studies in St. Cloud from a different point of view, but the conclusions that I came to were practically the same as were Dr. Phelps.' I was particularly pleased with the careful and conservative conclusions he gave with regard to the care and disposal of these people—possibly because they agreed with my own. It is an interesting fact, as he referred to and as these young men, will tell you, that there are hundreds outside just as bad or worse than they are. It is with the delinquent as it is with the insane, they are conspicuous only when they are gathered together in one place, and if we could round up any community and select from it the individuals and put them all together, we might find a great many of them who are not very different from those whom we seclude in our reformatories and in asylums for the insane. But this brings in the definition that I made in a paper that I read at our last conference when Dr. Lamb was here, the fact that, after all, delinquency is simply human nature, and that we are all inherently criminals, only training has prevented us from being actively so. It is an interesting fact, though, to anyone who will study these people, as Dr. Phelps has so thoroughly done, how surprisingly they are like to a great many other people whom we know. The one thing that I noticed particularly Dr. Phelps referred to, but not in detail. The one thing common to that type is their inability testicle to anything persistently, and what lands them in these places is this inability or incapacity with the consequent lack of means to gratify their primitive tastes, and they steal simply to get the means of gratification. They are incapable of steady occupation, just as they are incapable of learning, and the result is that, with their mental makeup and their attitude toward the community, they have no hesitancy in utilizing whatever means

is at hand to gain what they are unable to gain in the ordinary way. This should be more apparent when you take into consideration the fact that hundreds and thousands of other people do not steal nor fall into these ways who have no more opportunities, no better training, still are able not only to maintain themselves but to increase their earning capacity. The others, starting out under the same conditions, on account of this inherent lack of their makeup, are unable to do that, with the result that they fall by the wayside and then take up other means of obtaining the gratification of their desires. You will find, too, I think, if you search the court records with regard to the commitment of this type of person, just as you find it with regard to the commitment of the insane, that they won't work; and they become a burden on the community. We know that men steal successfully on a very large scale, and don't become a burden on the community, and are regarded sometimes as an ornament to it; just as the insane are not committed to our institutions because they are insane, but because they are no longer able or willing to work, or because they are regarded as dangerous; consequently, if we are going to do anything permanent toward the appreciation of what these conditions really mean, and get the proper viewpoint on the part of society in general with regard to them, we must teach society to separate the result from the cause, and it is only when they fully appreciate the significance of that that they will be willing to apply the necessary preventive measures and be able to do so intelligently.

Mr. Randall. Mr. Chairman: I assume the fact to be that the people of one state are not so very different from the people of another state in their makeup, their capacity, their inclinations—in other words, their human nature—and as indicating that persons who are defectives, so-called, may be induced, or may induce themselves, to self-restraint, under circumstances where otherwise it would not be anticipated, I wish to cite the fact that in one of the states of the Union—which has a population which is quite considerable although less than the population of this state, white men do not steal, in the sense of pilfering. I was informed by the president of the board of prison managers of that state, when, in answer to his question, I told him that most of our commitments of white men were for larceny, that such was not the fact in his state, and when we visited the penitentiary and the convict farms, we were told by the man who was in charge of those institutions that the commitment of a white man for •stealing was most unusual.

I clipped an article from THE STATE, a leading daily newspaper, in September, 1907, from which I read:

WHITE MAN CONVICTED OF LARCENY.

John Thomas, white, was charged with stealing clothes, etc., from a boarding house on Gervais Street on July 21st. The amount of goods which it was alleged that he stole was $37. He entered a plea of not guilty and was given a trial.

Mr. Thomas was represented by Mr. Pringle T. Youmans, who made a hard effort to clear the defendant. The jury returned a verdict of petit larceny.

In passing sentence, the Court announced that in his long life of practice before the bar he had never before seen a white man convicted of stealing. 'And it is sad for me," he continued, "to have to pass sentence on a white man for a crime of this kind. We claim to be a superior

race, and we are, hut you are a disgrace to the race and I am sorry that I am not allowed to impose upon you a greater sentence than that prescribed for petit larceny. I hope that when you have served this sentence you will go somewhere where the news of this crime has not become known and that you will make some effort to outlive the misdeeds of your past. Your former associates should shun you and you should be ashamed to hold up your head and claim to be a member of the white race."

The sentence imposed was the extreme penalty of the law, 30 days at hard labor upon the public works of the county, or pay a fine of $100.

It seems that stealing is looked upon with so much abhorrence there, by the white people, that even those among them who may be lacking in mental capacity are deterred from incurring the odium which that offense entails.

Henry Wolfer, State Prison: In Florida a year ago, I had a chance to study some of these phases, and it proved very interesting. I took a trip along the Everglade district where they are opening up for settlement a great deal of new country, and stopped in several small settlements. Most of the natives, whose ancestors had lived there for centuries, in the pine woods in little detached settlements—occasionally a small village, lived from hand to mouth. The farm was just a little garden patch. The whole country is controlled by large stock interests, the hogs and the cattle go at large, so much so that for convenience they call the hogs wild. All the cattle are branded but the hogs are not. There it is not larceny for a native to go out and kill a hog or a steer as long as it is for his own use, but if he were to steal and sell it, it is larceny.

'Social conditions are chaotic there compared with the social conditions here, morally, and in every other way. When it comes to the crime of larceny, it is measured by altogether different standards than we are accustomed to here.

Mr. Randall: The state to which I referred is South Carolina. Now, if a condition can 'be created which will prevent white men from committing larceny, why may we not be hopeful that the commission of other crimes may, in the course of time, be minimized by public appreciation of the dishonor attached.

Mr. Wolfer: Social conditions down there cannot be compared with the social conditions up here, morally, nor in any other way, and when it comes to larceny, they have only got another name for it, that is all; and a lot go free down there that would be called to account in this country.

Mr. Randall: If that is the idea, I have been misinformed.

Dr. Tomlinson: I should like to say, to bear out what Warden Wolfer has said, that when I was in Philadelphia and went down in the slum districts to work in those tenement districts where poverty was extreme, where there were no social distinctions, there was almost absolute honesty with regard to personal property.

Larceny, as we ordinarily understand it, did not exist. It struck me at the time—I have often thought of it since—that among the very poor in those tenement districts there was absolutely no disposition to either defraud each other or to take each other's property. In primitive communities history shows the same conditions existed.

Mr. Wolfer: Just illustrating this point that I spoke of:—Mr. Lynch has opened up a very large tract of land down there. He selected one of these squatters, who had been more successful in gardening than any other man in that community, to go onto his place and open up an experimental garden to show what the soil would produce. I met him there and talked with him about his experience in that country, his opinion of" the soil, productiveness, etc., and he gave me a general running history of his life. He had always lived there. Among other things, he told me that he had quite a "right smart drove" of cattle himself a few years before; he had accumulated until he had something like five thousand head; and his neighbors and friends became envious; they didn't like to see him prosper. When they wanted to kill a steer or a hog, they would take his instead of that belonging to anyone else, so that the first thing he knew his drove began to melt away until finally he got down to where he started. He didn't have anything. They simply poached on him altogether until he was reduced; and when I said, "Why didn't you have them arrested? Why didn't you prosecute them?" he replied: "Well, I reckon they took only what they needed for their own use."

Dr. Rogers: This is another illustration of the fact that there may be two methods of accomplishing the same result. When I was in Venezuela it was very interesting to me to learn that in the streets of Caracas the peons would take a wheelbarrow of gold to or from a hank and go through the streets entirely unattended, and nobody thought anything about it; there was no danger of robbing; but if you wanted to transact an important matter of business, you might have to pay anywhere from fifty to five hundred dollars to an official before he would perform the duty which the law required of him.

I was glad that Dr. Tomlinson discussed in such an excellent manner the relation of feeble-mindedness to the terms used, classification, etc. The Doctor takes up the whole subject from the historical attitude, in which insanity stands in a sort of mother relation to feeble-mindedness.

With regard to Dr. Phelps' paper it seems to me that it owes its value to the knowledge which he has derived from long experience with, and observation of, mental alienation and mental abnormality. It is of genuine value in a field where there is little standardization, even though the survey would doubtless vary with every observer. In his discussion, however, I fear he might leave the impression that feeble-mindedness is still classed as a form of insanity, and that no attempt had been made to give a definite meaning to the terms "feeble-minded," "imbecile," and "idiot." Each at the present time has acquired a fairly well-defined definiteness of meaning, and feeble-mindedness, while it falls within the derivative meaning of the term insanity (unsoundness); it is fairly well differentiated from it by reason of its essential character, the age at which manifested, and the character and purposes of the means employed for its treatment. It is essentially a defect, not a disease. It dates its manifestations from birth or early childhood as a result of an arrest in the evolutionary development of the brain and nervous system. Its treatment is pedagogical, rather than medical, and involves the sociological provisions of a segregated community for life as distinguished from hospital treatment with a view of returning the patients to general society.

As to classification, there is now a very satisfactory grouping both by definition and diagnostic test.

The English Royal Commission of 1904 formulated the following definitions—except that I have substituted the term "feeble-mindedness for "mental deficiency" and the word "morons" for "feeble-minded."

FEEBLE-MINDEDNESS is a state of mental defect from birth or early childhood due to arrested or imperfect cerebral development, as a result of which the person so affected is unable to perform his duties as a member of society in that station in life to which he is born.

1. IDIOTS: Those so deeply defective in mind from birth or early childhood that they are unable to guard themselves from common physical dangers.

2. IMBECILES: Those feeble-minded persons whose mental development exceeds that of idiots, but who are incapable of earning their own living.

3. MORONS: Those feeble-minded persons whose mental development is less than normal but exceeds that of imbeciles, and who are capable, under favorable circumstances, of earning their own living.

The American association for the study of feeble-mindedness has adopted this grouping and added the diagnostic age equivalent as determined by the Simon-Binet test, viz.—

		(Mental age)
Morons	High grade ....9 Middle grade ....8 Low grade 7	....8 to 12 years.
Imbeciles	High grade ....6 Middle grade ....5 Low grade 4	....3 to 7 years.
Idiots	High grade ....3 Middle grade ....2 Low grade 1	Birth to 2 years.

All the text books up to within the last two years used the old terms with great confusion. Of course, the terms that imply some pathological condition are still applied; for instance, the microcephalic,—the child having the small head; the hydrocephalic,—the child with the large head—from water in the ventricles of the brain; the microcephalic,—the child with the large head—from excessive connective tissue development; the cretin; the Mongolian; etc. I have referred to this matter thus fully because I consider it too important to pass lightly.

P. M. Ringdal, Chairman: I should like to ask Dr. Newman a question. If I understood his paper aright, it was to the effect that he recommended twenty-five hundred acres of land in connection with an institution for the criminal insane.

Dr. Newman: Yes, sir.

The Chairman: Would that he without regard to the number of inmates?

Dr. Newman: Yes, sir.

The Chairman: It wouldn't then be for the purpose of giving more opportunity to employ themselves in agricultural pursuits, but to give them plenty of room in which to roam about?

Dr. Newman: Plenty of room to roam and plenty of room in which to employ themselves.

C. J. Swendsen, State Board of Control: May I ask a question or two?

Referring back to the criminal insane. I enjoyed very much the paper Dr. Newman read, but I am not exactly clear as to one or two points. Now, if I understand Dr. Newman aright, providing we had the facilities in the way of buildings and laboratories and experts to treat these patients, there is a probability of curing them. That is your contention, Doctor?

Dr. Newman: No, sir.

Mr. Swendsen: You don't think any of them can be cured?

Dr. Newman: Yes, sir; part of them, a certain per cent.

Mr. Swendsen: Suppose one is cured. I presume such a patient, if a criminal, would be returned to the State Prison to serve out his sentence. That would be the natural result, wouldn't it, Warden Wolfer?

Mr. Wolfer: Yes, sir.

Mr. Swendsen: If this criminal had served his sentence, paid his debt to the state, then the question comes to me: Would it be an injustice to society to liberate a criminal of that kind? Or, in other words, would it be safe for the protection of society, although the man is cured, pronounced sane, to again let him out where he may at any time commit a crime? Or, would it be a greater injustice to deprive this man of his liberty after he had paid his debt to the state? I mean ,by that, to keep him in custody for his natural life. Now, I am not clear as to that, and I wish some of you experts would inform me which would be the greater injustice—to deprive of his liberty the man who had paid his debt or to let him out in society?

Mr. Wolfer: The greater injustice would be to deprive him of his liberty, if there is reasonable grounds for the belief that he would go out and take care of himself, and that he could live without returning to crime, although there is no positive proof of it. He should be allowed a trial. Of course, if he went wrong again, that would be a misfortune; but with our limited capacity to read human nature and to judge human minds, we have to take some chances or we might as well go into barbarism at once. About all there is to work for in the uplift of humanity is in taking chances where there appears to be reasonable ground for the belief that it is at least a fairly good risk.

C. E. Vasaly, State Board of Control: It seems to me that society at large ought to be willing to take chances when the Creator is taking chances every day.

I want to ask a question. What proportion of the criminal insane in your institution whom you are going to transfer are fit to labor?

Dr. Newman: All excepting one. There is one not capable of doing anything, and I think he cannot be taught anything.

Dr. Tomlinson: I should like to say, with regard to Mr. Swendsen's question, that Dr. Lamb, who has probably had greater experience with respect to the criminal insane than any other man in this country, experience extending over a great number of years, believes that none of them ever recover, and that it is a mistake ever to let any of them away.

Mr. Wolfer: I think the Doctor is a little extreme. The insane criminal, as a rule, is one of the most hopeless wards of the state, but I believe, nevertheless, that some of them may and do recover.

Mr. Vasaly: I was going to say that I believe Dr. Kilbourne and Dr. Tomlinson do not guarantee anybody that leaves the institution.

Dr. Tomlinson: We say they have recovered from the immediate attack.

Mr. Swendsen: If you don't guarantee him as cured then a criminally insane person should never be let out.

Dr. Kilbourne: There are some forms of crime that are persistent, no matter what the punishment, aside from that which finally winds up their career, and any ordinary punishment doesn't prevent it. The minute they get out they are at the same old tricks again.

The Chairman. I should like to revert to one more point that Dr. Kuhlman made—the increase in the percentage of feeble-minded from one census period to another for the past thirty years. As I understood it, he accounts for this as being merely the result of better methods of taking the census now. At the same time the population of the country has been changing materially from a country population to an urban population, and the urban population has increased very materially. I should suppose that the larger cities, where there are slums, would produce a great many more of this class of people. Now, would that be a correct assumption? Would not the increase in the number of people in the cities to some extent account for this?

Dr. Kuhlman: I think that point would be in general well taken. I think it is true, judging from the figures we have in some instances, that the larger cities produce the larger percentage of defectives. On the whole however, I think it would be very difficult to say absolutely whether this difference in census figures, showing apparent increase in the relative amount of defect, is absolutely due to change in method of taking the census, or whether there is an increase in defect, although in general we regard it as an improvement in the method of census taking rather than anything else. We know that census methods on this point have been very defective. Parents, in general, have come to realize more the importance and necessity of reporting cases when they exist; that is to say, they would not now avoid the census reporter on this point as much as they did before. Things of that sort have to be taken into consideration.

MINUTES OP QUARTERLY CONFERENCE OF BOARD OF CONTROL AND EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF MINNESOTA STATE INSTITUTIONS, OFFICE OF THE BOARD, ST. PAUL, MINN

May 2, 1911.

FORENOON.

Present: Members of the Board—P. M. Ringdal, Chairman; C. E. Vasaly, C. J. Swendsen. Superintendents—Yanz, Coleman, Kilbourne, Tomlinson, Rogers, Merrill, Whittier, Randall, Wolfer, Ohlinger, Morse.

Present by Invitation: Dr. A. G. Newman, Minnesota State Prison; Dr. A. B. Kuhlman, School for Feeble-minded; Dr. R. M. Phelps, Rochester State Hospital.

Meeting opened with a paper by Dr. A. G. Newman. Subject, "What Shall we do With our Criminally Insane?"

This was followed by a paper by Dr. A. B. Kuhlman. Subject, "Problems of a Psychological Research Department in a School for Feeble-minded."

Dr. R. M. Phelps then read a paper entitled, "A Study of the Inmates of the St. Cloud Reformatory."

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON.

Conference reconvened at 2 o'clock.

Present: Members of the Board—P M. Ringdal, Chairman; C. E. Vasaly, C. J. Swendsen. Superintendents—Yanz, Coleman, Kilbourne, Tomlinson, Rogers, Merrill, Whittier, Randall, Wolfer, Ohlinger, Morse.

Present by Invitation; Dr. A. G. Newman, Dr. A. B. Kuhlman, Dr. R. M. Phelps.

The papers which were read in the morning were discussed.

Warden Wolfer moved that there be a committee of three appointed by the chair to correspond with heads of institutions with a view to determining how the investigation for research work should be conducted, and to make a report at the next quarterly meeting of superintendents. Motion carried. The chair then appointed Warden Wolfer, Dr. Tomlinson, and Dr. Rogers to serve as such committee.

Adjourned.