person with my limited experience to discuss, but Saturday evening, when the warden asked me if I could come up here today, I told him that I couldn't fill his place, but I would take it.

Now, in a state prison we have two classes of defective delinquents, the one class insane and the other mentally defective to a certain degree. It seems to me that these defectives should not be sent to prison for punishment. What they require is a training which we can't give them at the prison. We can give them the discipline, but they need the personal touch, some training. As they are in a great many instances boys—we have no girls at our institution—they probably began their experience at some training school for boys, went through the reformatory, and then to the prison. It seems to me that if we could devise some means or some institution where we could take care of these defectives, and give them the help and the personal touch, we might be able to do something for them.

C. S. Reed, State Reformatory: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: "What shall the state of Minnesota do with her defective delinqeuents?" is a subject of vast importance; not only in the matter of caring for these unfortunates, who should have a strong claim upon us, but also for the protection of society at large. It would seem that proper segregation it absolutely necessary.

The assertion has 'been made that if every feeble-minded woman should be faithfully segregated for twenty years, at least fifty per cent of the feeble-mindedness would disappear. That feeble-mindedness is one of the most hereditary diseases known is conceded. '

In attempting to ascertain the per cent of defectives comprising the population of the state reformatory, Dr. E. F. Green, institution physician, made, on October 1st, 1913, a report which I feel sure covers the subject under discussion very fully from the reformatory standpoint.

> "In an effort to determine to what extent mental weakness obtained in the population of the Minnesota State Reformatory, with a view to ascertaining so far as was possible what influence such defects exerted in producing the criminal, I have examined each inmate not disqualified by an inability to speak English, or otherwise, with the Binet-Simon scale.
>
> "It appeared to me that the result of this survey might be of some interest to those engaged in work similar to that in which I am, and for this reason I have prepared this monograph.
>
> "The result of this examination is given in the table on page 131, showing the mental ages as compared with the chronological ages of each inmate examined. Out of a population numbering 450, examinations of 370 were made. Of this number 189 were found to be mentally sub-normal and 181 were mentally average or above. By referring to the table it will be seen that the mentally sub-normal delinquents belong almost entirely to the Moron class, and this is what might logically be expected.
>
> "Idiots and low-grade imbeciles that can be readily recognized as such by the ordinary layman usually have custodial care which makes it difficult, or impossible, for them to become lawless, even though they may he so inclined. The lack of intelligence also, as it prevents them

from engaging in the ordinary pursuits of life, prevents an active criminal career. Assuming this to be the case then, we may consider the high-grade imbecile and moron as the types of feeble-mindedness to be found in that class of offenders usually designated as defective delinquents.

"It is not at all difficult to understand why an adult with the intelligence of a child finds it impossible to live in accordance with established custom and law. It is, however, a most perplexing problem to intelligently say what should be done with offenders of this class. The reformatory, as those with experience know, is certainly not the proper place for such unfortunates.

"I have no reason to believe that the population of the Minnesota State Reformatory differs mentally to any great extent from that of similar institutions in other states, and I presume that the matter of properly handling such cases in the reformatory, and after paroling, is not a problem confined to any state or institution. A condition so general, involving such a large percentage of the inmate population seems to me to be a subject that should command the earnest study of those to whom such cases are intrusted for custody and training.

"I have given considerable thought and study to this subject and as before stated I am convinced that the mentally sub-normal delinquents are improperly placed when committed to a reformatory. The training and discipline to which they are subjected at such institutions is a regimen formulated for those of average intelligence, theoretically to correct some moral aberration, and fit the individual, so that he may live in accordance with the accepted order of things. This being the case, it would seem (and experience proves it to be true) that little permanent benefit will accrue to the feeble-minded case by such treatment. The misdirected efforts of the state in attempting to do so is a useless waste of time and money. As the child needs the custodial care of a parent or guardian, so the adult with the intelligence of a child needs the custodial care of the state.

"In many cases it is questionable in my mind whether they are morally or legally responsible for the crime for which they are committed when the crime and mental defectiveness is taken into consideration. To incarcerate individuals of this kind in a reformatory or prison for a stipulated period of time does them no good, and it is a detriment to other inmates of higher intelligence. It is impracticable to confine cases of this class for any definite period, such detention should be absolutely indeterminate, depending upon improvement, and evidence of ability and disposition to live in accordance with the established customs and laws of society.

"To be able to care for such a large number as it appears from mental examinations belong to this class, it would he necessary to have a separate institution for defective delinquents. In such an institution, all criminals mentally subnormal or abnormal, and those suffering from physical defects not amenable to treatment, nor curable, might be detained.

"The advantages of separating inmates defective mentally from those of average intelligence is so universally admitted by those engaged in the work of reform that it would seem that any comment along this line would be useless. Classification and segregation on various bases are practiced in many reformatories, and primarily rest upon the basis of intelligence, whether this fact be recognized or not."

States that have established the State Custodial Institution for Feeble Minded, report that the expense of caring for those committed to their care is not so great as those cared for in hospitals for insane, prisons, reformatories and almshouses.

I am not informed whether or not reliable statistics are available showing the number of feeble-minded individuals in this state. Such information would be very useful.

The time is fast approaching when the feeble-minded will be carefully segregated into institutions particularly adapted for their treatment and care, as the wisdom of such a course is apparent to all who have given this subject careful thought.

Since this report has been made, since October 1st, 1913, there have been 300 inmates examined, and the subnormal class has been reduced from 51 per cent to 44 per cent.

Mrs. Morse: While the much popularized subject before us is in danger of being carried to an extreme that threatens us all as fit victims, the defective delinquent really is, and is one of our problems. You have it in your asylums for the insane and institutions for the feeble-minded we have it in our correctional institutions; it is found in every phase of society.

While nothing so reveals the existence of defectives as a definite attempt at constructive work, we of such institutions are in great danger of undoing the constructive feature of the work by an undue emphasis of the delinquent as the defective. While a distinct function of our School for Girls should be the observation and the culling out of the socially unfit, any element of hopelessness introduced would greatly interfere with the constructive side of our work. Should we make our first study of the girl that of her impossibilities rather than her possibilities, we would find ourselves unconsciously shutting the hopeful from our problem, with a resultant tearing down of our work. Whatever of wholesome atmosphere and whatever of success may characterize the work of this institution, lies in the fact that every girl has been studied with an eye to her potentialities and not to her defects; that she has not from the outset been studied as a case or as a type, but as a human being. Our perspective point is definite constructive work with that girl. Nothing, no side issues or exploitation, must interfere with that first motive. Ours is to fit her for living a practical community life. Her social rehabilitation is our preventive work. While there will be research and investigation sufficient to give us a background for our work with her, and as supplemental to our final disposal of the girl, any such process will be jealously guarded, lest mere exploitation as a science interfere with the practical and constructive work with that girl. If all the officers of this institution should become obsessed with the idea that every girl is defective, how long would the officer continue to exhaust every resource to build her for social fitness? Social con-

sideration should be the gauge in weighing efficiency. Every resource exhausted, if the girl fails to properly react in the institution, and more important in society, then on to the next thing.

I would not fail to recognize the opportunity and responsibility of this and every other state institution to make such returns in preventive investigation as shall best serve society and the state, but our first duty, as a •corrective and constructive institution, is to bend our energy to the making of the girl. The girl as a possible useful human being is our first and highest consideration.

It is a matter of pride rather than otherwise that a visitor to our school expressed disappointment that during his abbreviated call the girl as a normal being, her present wholesome environment, and her future, were discussed, rather than the girl as a type for scientific study. The motive of this institution is to fit for citizenship, and as such we should see in every girl a possible citizen. Let me repeat that not until every reaction has been tried should we name her as non-constructive material, unfit for society. Nor should any stereotyped or mechanical test for mentality be allowed to determine a person's right or fitness to contribute to social good. The much and over-exploited Binet test has yet to prove its infallibility in weighing human efficiency. As a gauge of mental status it has its place. It might be invaluable in grading in the public schools, but it does not test human capacity. I say this boldly, after years of observation, and some former years of close study of the application of mechanical tests vs. practical observation. I say it in the face of repeated tests of cases under observation at present in this school.

N. G., of a certain mental alertness and more than ordinary initiative, is so lacking in self-control and in the very elements of that control as to make her the greatest possible menace to society, and a menace because of defect. By the Binet test she is easily normal, but, by all the reactions that should determine social fitness, is totally unlit for community life.

R. G., the produce of a destandardized and mentally submerged group, by the Binet test falling below par, possesses that highest efficiency of brains in her fingers, a creative and executive ability, together with a self-control that promises her a valuable citizenship. She will bo. one of the doers. Our gauge should always be social efficiency; our discrimination between community and non-community cases, the socially fit and the socially unfit.

The first type because of a certain perversion coupled with lack of control, is a case for segregation and custodial care; the latter, because of her self-control and social efficiency, should he allowed to serve her large part in the community.

But with every means for constructive work exhausted, there remains today in this institution a by-product of three years' observation, covering about three hundred cases, about a dozen of these being the so-called defective delinquent. They are socially unfit; they are not definite cases for Dr. Rogers' institution; nor would a woman's reformatory solve their classification. They are in the border-line zone. In the community they would be far more dangerous than the low-grade imbecile. For protection to themselves and society, they should be segregated for custodial care. Nor does

this group represent a helpless, useless lot; many of them have highly developed points of efficiency. Were they able to exercise self-control, they would become self-supporting in the community. Destructive to society, properly segregated under custodial care, they might not only he made happy and safe, but valuable producers. Such adjustment of them should be made as to render them not only protection but self-support. This must be done under custodial institutional care. This state has resources peculiarly adapted to such provision.

There should be afforded that institutional custodial care which will give not only protection but employment and profit. Many of these non-community cases are able to become producers, some of them even experts in various pieces of industry. I would recommend for such an institution built on the community plan; a community with interests agricultural, industrial, and domestic; each inmate contributing to these interests, according to his or her special fitness. Such an institution should become nearly self-supporting. With the varying capacities and the long period of detention, the expansion of such a project would be almost unlimited, and could be done with not only great moral but economic profit to the state.

Mr. Pulton: Within the last few weeks I have been much interested in reading reports as to the conditions shown by institutions where the Binet test had been applied to the inmates. The desire obviously was to ascertain the number of defectives in each institution. I was surprised to observe the great disproportion in the reports. In some institutions for delinquent children seventy-five or eighty per cent were pronounced defective. In others the percentage was as low as forty or forty-five. It occurred to me that it is hardly fair to say that seventy-five per cent of the boys at Red Wing are defective and that such trouble as they have had is due to their defectiveness. The statistics gathered from the records of the institution reveal the fact that at least seventy-five per cent of the children committed to the training school develop into worthy citizens. Therefore, in so far as three-fourths of the children committed to this school are concerned, it would seem that no more needs to be done than is being clone for them. It would certainly be very wrong to shut these children away from society permanently.

On the other hand, as Mrs. Morse has stated with respect to the girls of the home school, we have at Red Wing about twenty boys, out of the two hundred there, who are clearly defective. It is reasonably certain that the delinquency of these boys is due to the fact that they are defective. It is reasonably certain that these children are in need of permanent supervision and care. From my point of view it is wrong to parole a hoy of this type, for, immediately upon being released from the school, the lad will blunder into trouble. Such children are the real defective delinquents, and the state cannot do a kinder or more just thing than to care for them, protecting them from themselves and protecting society from their contaminating influence. While I do not feel that I am entitled to speak with any authority, yet if I had personal control of the situation, it would not take me very long to decide that such children should not go out into society. I believe they should be kept in an institution. The number of defective delinquents requiring custodial care does not seem to he excep-

tionally large, and for some years to come such boys could be cared for in a cottage devoted to their use at the State Training School. With a little planning it is my conviction that their lives would be helped very greatly, that the children could be made comfortable, and that they could get out of life as much as or possibly more than they could get by being released and given a larger measure of freedom; so that the state, toy having a custodial care of these lads, would be serving them as well as serving the public and preserving the next generation from the certain consequences that result from a neglect of the defective delinquent.

Mr. Reed: For fear that my report may be misunderstood, neither Dr. Green nor I believe that the forty-four per cent are all fit subjects for a custodial institution, but the report indicates that there are that number of mental defectives either good, bad or indifferent. Anything less than normal is subnormal, and out of the forty-four per cent I wouldn't be prepared at this time to recommend what per cent of those should be placed in custodial care, but a number of them should. What is true of the reformatory, I think is probably true of almost every other institution of similar character. Those custodial institutions, it appears to me, are the proper place for young men, for instance, like the doctor has just suggested; also for girls and women. The report from New York shows that there are 15,000 being taken care of in the different state institutions, while possibly the state is taking care of 5,000 in the custodial institution. I think those are the correct figures. I shouldn't want to leave the impression that there are forty-four per cent in St. Cloud that should be in a custodial institution.

The Chairman: With all due respect to the committee, there is one name that I think might properly have been included in this symposium, that of Dr. Phelps, who has charge not only of the hospital for insane at St. Peter, but of the asylum for criminal insane. I will call on Dr. Phelps.

Dr. R. M. Phelps, St. Peter Hospital: This is kind of a surprise party. I haven't provided myself with special statements with regard to the criminal insane. Do you mean to confine me to that subject?

The' Chairman: I never intend to confine a superintendent to any subject.

Dr. Phelps: Much obliged. I am always impressed with the entanglements which are prominent in this attempt, or any attempt, to define in any accurate way the normal or abnormal mentality. I was at the St. Cloud Reformatory myself, some of you may remember, and looked the inmates over in a rather casual manner, spending about three-quarters of an hour to an hour with each inmate, and I think I figured out that about one out of six or seven showed more or less of a 'below-normal state.

There is going to be and always will be a certain amount of personal opinion enter into any decision. One has to make his standards as he goes along. What is normal? That was the hardest thing to start with. An imbecile may have a genius for music, or may have other great "efficiency" along some certain directions, yet he is distinctly abnormal or below-grade in something else. After you have made allowances for such symmetrical abilities as these, and perhaps disposed of the relations of genius to imbecility (or to insanity) on. your way, there is the farther idea of

allowing for moral deficiency (a lack of a full sense of moral obligation). Then farther is the allowing for deficiency in power of will. You have got to make a sort of jumbled-up average, made by allowing for each of these forms of deficiency. Your conclusion is arrived at by conversations and very largely by their past record.

Even then you have not gotten clearly defined decisions, because in making your normal you have got to use your judgment with regard to each case. Differences in resulting opinions will almost inevitaby occur, and considerable variations may occur in different persons making the judgment upon the same case. The differences may be very great at times. Still, with all these variables and indeterminates, we are all distinctly getting to recognize the idea that even in the public schools a certain percentage is abnormal; at first estimated at one or two per cent, now five or ten per cent perhaps. In New York State somebody tried to estimate how many public school children were below normal, but the per cent of abnormal all depends upon your normal. Undoubtedly there are some that are below normal.

The subject reminds me of a lawyer at Shakopee who tried to make me state that nobody was normal. He cited Lombroao and stated that everybody was subnormal, We have got to meet and explain all these quibbles, also.

I dislike to pay too much attention to the slighter degrees of abnormality. We can recognize them scientifically rather than by a gross name, for when we say a person is insane or imbecile, it does not mean the recognition of any little quibbling item or slight defect. A tipsy person is insane for the time being. It does not mean that there must be the attainment of a certain degree or intensity or chronicity which we, as the judges, have got to picture in our own minds before we name that person insane or imbecile. This degree, or intensity, or chronicity, has got to be taken into account as well as how much you are going to credit to what are called the moral deficiencies; and whether you are going to allow that not only the intellect can be defective, but also the will or the purpose. By judging all these elements, we obtain an opinion upon the general constitutional makeup of the person, or his mental makeup.

Now, about the criminal insane at St. Peter: I had not thought of saying anything about them. I will say that they are, most of them, simply ordinary insane people. Of the folks that came from the prison, say those who have committed murder, I suppose we have fifteen of them. I have known two or three murderers to go on parole and be trusted for years. We have one who was on parole at Rochester for five or six years. I saw him one day cutting cabbage with a big knife. He was trustworthy enough, and yet. with his record back of him, we ought not to trust him so much as other people. But the most of the murderers are not attempting murder, nor thinking of it at the present time, nor do they habitually think of it. In the last two years I don't think more than six or eight, or perhaps ten, of the patients have plotted mischief in a way that was at all dangerous. The rest of them 'are just ordinary insane people, and I don't think that, aside from two or three or four, I ever think of them as particularly dangerous in the way of violence toward the nurses or ourselves. It is a sur-

prisingly small proportion, when you come to think of it. The rest, ordinary insane people, are living there because their back records cnrried them there.

Of course you might also make this point, that very probably the crimes of twenty-five or fifty per cent of them grew out of their defectiveness. Defectiveness came first. It was not apparent enough at the trial to receive credence, or perhaps it may have developed to more prominence later. It was not apparent enough at the time to prevent his being convicted and sentenced, but it was present.

With regard to the defectiveness of those inmates mentioned at St. Cloud, I would assert that their lack of common sense was very striking and apparent at times and in special cases.

Dr. Rogers: With regard to this matter of mental tests, there perhaps has never been anything introduced in the study of children that has more value in the way of standardizing mental capacity than the Binet-Simon test; but, on the other hand, like other valuable things, it is dangerous if not handled properly and interpreted correctly. Psychologists have pointed out particularly the danger in examining the borderline cases by the Binet-Simon test. Speaking of it purely from the mathematical standpoint, you can see how easily errors would be made. For instance, we will say a child passes the ninth, misses one or two points in the tenth, several points in the eleventh and some in the twelfth. That will bring him down below twelve but above ten. If he goes on up to twelve and thirteen, and misses one or two in thirteen or one or two in twelve, there are no tests up above that to average with; consequently you are always making those borderline cases lower than they really are. So the interpretation of a trained psychologist is required in all those cases just purely from the standpoint of standardization itself.

There is obviously a large number of the borderland cases in our penal and reformatory institutions, and the examinations conducted in them should be governed by this possible error in interpretation. Some of the early examinations published were doubtless affected by this error, and as a result there were too many inmates classed as distinctly mental defectives.

I think the point Mrs. Morse speaks of is very important. I don't think we should ever dwell on the defective side first. It is so easy to do that. When a child does not react properly and naturally to the ordinary environments of child life, then we want the special test to assist in determining the actual condition. That is true in public schools. When a child drops out or behind in the grades, if the family conditions seem all right, and the child is well nourished, and there is no defective hearing or vision, or anything of that kind, to interfere with the proper acquirement of knowledge, you begin to wonder what the matter is. This is where the Binet-Simon test is so helpful. If there is an absolute dropping of two or three years, then one should seek more light on the history of the child, and in most cases the latter will confirm the former findings. I think Mrs. Morse is right in her position. We should never emphasize the defective side first. We should study the individual and get everything out of the individual we can. I think she referred to the case of a girl who I examined

myself who passed the thirteenth test, and yet does not react normally to good environment. She does not get along when placed out in a good family. 1 may say she is a feeble-minded girl, lacking on the moral side. Such persons are mentally but not intellectually defective. There are undoubtedly these two types of defectives. The laboratory testing is helping to separate these groups so they can be studied separately. The Binet-Simon test is a valuable help but does not tell all about the child. The child must be studied from a great many standpoints besides.

Now, 1 have been very much interested to hear what the speakers have had to say with regard to defective delinquents under their respective care. I do not believe that the institution at Faribault ought to take the defective delinquents who have really become criminal to any great extent —adults who have had definite criminal experiences. I believe it is its function to take mentally deficient children and raise them and protect them for life.

The spirit of the institution for feeble-minded promotes the open door as much as possible, and insists upon as little mechanical restraint and restriction as possible. Such restraint is necesary once in a while, but our work isn't a success if we have to do very much of it. We must exercise patience and affection for the children that we have under our care. We can't get along with them any other way, and the amount of discipline that we have to use by restraint is really very small.

Another thing: We have had twelve boys from St. Cloud who were defective delinquents. They were defective mentally, and the first reaction that has come to those boys has been that of the sense of freedom, the possibility of doing anything they wanted to do, and they overdid it. The opportunity to run away was too much for them. Some we got back; some we didn't. I think out of that twelve there are two that have been placed out, and I understand the Board of Parole has already released, or will release, them entirely. Those two have made good records and are all right. We have either two or three with us now, and the others have disappeared absolutely; we can get no trace of them. If we are to take such boys, we shall have to change our methods and have a department entirely for that class. Of course the thing they need is exactly the thing we are giving the other boys, farm work and a variety of occupations. They need the same kind of supervision except that it has got to be more strict. What has been said of boys would be equally true of girls, I think.

Is it to be the policy of the state to have departments for defective delinquents in the penal and correctional institutions, each taking care of the class that it now takes care of, and, in addition, the non-reformable defective delinquents; or will there be an institution for defective delinquents as such; or will Faribault have other departments? That is the question. We shall understand that as time goes on and more attention is given to the elimination of the defectives who would not become delinquent except in a very minor way, there will be less of them in the institutions for adults. The elimination is already beginning, and that very elimination is also raising the question as to what is to be done with the large number that is left; but that is another story.