Dr. COUGHLIN: Deaf girls, yes. They didn't do local operating. They used a keyboard; and the work was very expert because a great many messages were sent in code, and they had to take those off correctly, or otherwise there would have been some big business transactions twisted up. Two of them were counted among the most successful operators they had in Toronto.

SIXTH SESSION: *Thursday Afternoon, January 17, 1924.*

The Conference was reconvened at 3:05 o'clock in the Hotel Cordova Annex to the Alcazar Hotel.

Mr. BJORLEE read a paper on:

BUSINESS ETHICS AS APPLIED TO OUR PROFESSION

We hear the term "Business Ethics" discussed freely in our day, but the men and women of our profession usually find that after careful attention to addresses on the subject, or after a searching investigation of written material, there is very little of value to be derived from such discussions. Very little of what is said seems applicable to our field of endeavor. Almost invariably the discussion centers itself upon financial matters, a subject which has been the bone of contention in the business world since the early days of trade by barter. Fortunately there appears to be one ray of light which is destined to dispel the gloom, and that is the endeavor to make of the employee not merely on inanimate pawn, to be shifted hither and thither as the immediate gain of the employer may dictate, but rather a human factor whose best interests, if cultivated, will ultimately result in the best interest of the employer.

The rise, from a social point of view, of the employee has marked a distinct improvement in our social condition.

Unfortunately, however, the pendulum has had a tendency to swing entirely too far in the opposite direction, to the end that unskilled labor in many cases has secured the upper hand, and, through the unscrupulous methods advocated by labor union propagandists, the condition has at times threatened to wreck our whole industrial system.

At first sight there might seem to be little connection between labor unions and our institutional problems. Still we have felt ourselves at various times seized in the clutches of misdirected fanatics who, shielded by powerful organizations, have manifestly brought hardships and injustices to those for whom they are expected to serve and from whom they are in many cases receiving far more remuneration than their preparation, training or application deserves. Every one present could draw from personal experiences illustrations to substantiate this statement. Let one or two illlustrations suffice to make the meaning clear.

First let us consider for a moment a condition which the labor union involving railroad employees has fostered. The simple operation of removing a nozzle from the front of a locomotive may be cited. Formerly a practical mechanic in the railroad yards performed this operation single-handed in a brief period of time and in a manner perfectly satisfactory to everyone concerned. Let us watch this operation as it is performed to-day in a union locomotive yard. First it becomes necessary to send for a boilermaker to open the door of the boiler. As a union man will not work without a helper, the presence of such a second man is also required. A pipe man must be called in to remove the blower pipe, for the boiler man would be censured by the strict rules of his union if he were to place his wrench upon a pipe, and of course the pipe man must have a helper to hand him his tools. A machinist with helper must then remove the nozzle tip, the other four men for the time standing by waiting their turn to replace the pipe

and close the boiler door. Here we see three mechanics and three helpers doing the work formerly accomplished in approximately the same length of time by a single man serving for the wages of one helper. Obviously no wealth is produced and no service to humanity rendered by the five additional men, who draw their salaries at the ultimate expense of the patrons of the railroad without contributing in any particular to the welfare or the comfort of such patrons.

To some the above instance might seem overdrawn. Permit me then to cite an illustration which came under my observation at the Maryland School during the summer of 1922. A force of approximately twenty plumbers and electricians were employed, under contract, to overhaul the heating apparatus and cold water system of the institution and to make extensive repairs and alterations to the wiring system. According to contract this work should have been completed by the first day of September, while as a matter of fact workmen were still on the job as late as the latter part of November, the firm holding the contract being losers to the extent of several thousand dollars, which of course is another matter. This shows what inefficiency has been brought into the labor world through the domination of unbusiness-like methods and non-ethical laborers. I had previously contracted with a firm that had recently installed a cold storage plant at the school, to overhaul the same prior to the opening of school. As stated, the men who were overhauling the plumbing system were, contrary to expectations, still at work, and as the time for opening school drew near the skilled mechanic was sent for to inspect the refrigerating plant. Information spread among the men to the effect that such an individual was coming. The foreman came to my office and very politely informed me that, while of course it made no particular difference to him personally, he feared that his force would walk off the job if this non-union man were to come into

the building while they were still at work. I explained fully my position; according to contract their work should have been completed; it was time for the re-opening of school and the refrigeration plant must be overhauled and set in readiness; to all of which he replied that they had men on their force who were competent to do this work for me. Accordingly a second contract was drawn up and their mechanic authorized to do the work. I was absent from the city for a few days and upon my return found not only a mechanic but also a helper still engaged in the so-called work of overhauling the ice machine. An operation which one man had originally agreed to do in three days' time was, at the end of five days, with two men employed, still not completed. The foreman was called and notified that the plant must be turned over to our engineer that evening whether the work be finished or not. To summarize, an arbitrary ruling by the labor union made it necessary for the state of Maryland to employ two men for five days to do approximately three-fourths of what one man had agreed to do in three days. And not that alone, for the original contract provided that the institution's engineer be given a thorough course of instruction during the process of overhauling. This factor was entirely lost as the men who experimented on the plant seemed themselves to be novices. Had they been permitted to continue their work uninterrupted the figures would have stood somewhat as follows: Two men in eight days would have done the work of one man in three days.

To illustrate further. One of New York's most famous soap-box orators made the following plea night after night in the heart of the factory district: "Do as little as you can for as much as you can get." This was in the spring of 1919, and the orator's name was James Larkin. His eloquence was fruitful of results and here is the outcome as achieved by this propounder of a new form of ethics. Formerly one of the largest garment industries in New York

had a weekly output of 37,000 garments, at a weekly wage of $1,800. This output was reduced to 20,000 garments, and that at a weekly wage of $7,000. In other words, a wage increase of approximately 300% actually reduced the amount of production by nearly 50%. And the consuming public suffered in similar proportion. This included the garment workers themselves, for the laying of a boycott resulted, and it was estimated by social workers that more garment makers were put out of employment than had been the case at any time during the previous twenty-five years.

The above is not intended as a tirade against all forms of labor unions. Injustices also prevailed while capital had supreme control and many of these conditions have been remedied. But certain it is that to maintain the support of serious thinking men the laborers of to-day must to a large extent modify their demands.

Fortunately for the superintendents of such institutions as ours, we do not have in our employ a staff of union laborers to contend with. We would, however, be deceiving ourselves if we failed to realize that the influence of such conditions which foster flagrant injustice also have a subtle influence upon the ethical standards of men in all professions.

At the present time capital is being looked upon in a different light. Formerly it made little difference how money was earned provided a certain amount of it was spent for benevolent purposes. A familiar slogan often heard in the business realm was: "My son, get money, honestly if you can, but get money." A man's business ethics and home ethics were entirely separate and distinct, one from the other. Our concern to-day is not so much how a man spends his money, but how he has acquired it. If he has gained wealth and fortune through honest business methods we are little disposed to question his method of disbursing what has been gained. In other words, a man who has taken out of his community more in money than he has

returned in services is considered to be a grafter. What if a Henry Ford should increase his fortune by a million dollars a week, if during that same period he has added five million dollars to the wealth of the world? He must be considered a benefactor. On the other hand, if a teacher merely *keeps school* for a hundred hours a month at a salary of one thousand dollars a year, he or she would be a grafter; and the word might be spelled with a capital "G," for in reality a living wage is being exacted from a community and nothing of value is being given in return.

In the matter of ethics the profession in general appears to have advanced with great strides since the time of its inception. We read of the days when the methods employed by various institutions were jealously guarded, and teachers were required to sign agreements promising never to divulge the methods employed. Contrast this with our present day, when literature is being broadcasted throughout the entire world, bearing helpful suggestions and offering new ideas which are still in their experimental stage, without thought of remuneration or particular credit.

For the sake of convenience, let us divide the subject as follows: the relation, from an ethical standpoint, of the superintendent to his co-workers, and; secondly, the relation of one superintendent toward the head of a similar institution. The employment of high-sounding phrases embodying ethical theories not practical to our profession will be eliminated, for nothing that may be said will be of real value unless it can strike a sympathetic chord and tend toward the removing of some condition which at present is felt to be not strictly ethical. Ethics should not be left as an idealistic proposition, to be dreamed of and philosophized over, or read about in leisure moments, but should be made applicable to daily habits and conditions of daily life.

What, after all, is ethical conduct save the carrying out of the Golden Rule: "All things whatsoever ye would that

men should do to you, do ye even so unto them"? As between superintendent and staff, what of more value can be accomplished than to enthuse a body of workers with the above principle? Fill them with the spirit of the Golden Rule and they will work out their own ways and means; the practical application would become a small matter.

Business ethics in the commercial world during the past few years has striven to build up a system wherein the employer or business head endeavors to inculcate in the minds of his associates, from office boy to foreman, the true spirit of service. The partnership idea is encouraged; the employee is taken into the confidence of the firm and is made to feel that he is a part of it; the doling out of gifts like charity at periodical intervals is being discontinued, and the mechanic is being taught that gilt-edged reward for service comes only through the acquiring of a feeling of satisfaction at having done something really worth while for the benefit of others. The instilling of this spirit into the minds of fellow workers is a slow process, but it is probably the only solution to the misleading scheme of regulating all actions of life by rules or legislative measures, or by union-imposed formulas.

We frequently pride ourselves upon stating that the members of our teaching profession look upon themselves as social workers in a highly specialized and particular field of labor. Is this statement as true in 1924 as it was in 1900? Is our profession, because of its specialized nature, becoming somewhat commercialized? If so, should we not strive to make it clear that as superintendents we are endeavoring, to the best of our ability, to bring about an equitable financial remuneration for those who have entered into the service? And also let us dwell more particularly upon the social debt which a teacher owes to the community in return for the remuneration which she is receiving. Will not the idea of a debt to society tend toward creating in the mind of the teacher a desire to render more efficient service in return for adequate compensation received?

Confidence in self should be instilled in the minds of the members of the staff. Too rigid a supervision or too dictatorial an attitude may decrease efficiency by lessening the determination to give voluntarily the best service one has to render. May not the lessening of efficiency be considered an ethical problem?

The worthiness of our occupation should become a reality to us. Unless we ourselves feel that the work of educating the deaf requires at our hands the very best thought and effort of which we are capable, and unless we can create an atmosphere which carries with it this spirit, it will be difficult indeed to secure at the hands of the staff the type of service which will produce the most good.

Let us watch our respective staffs with a critical eye toward the individual who is ever prone to belittle the efforts of others, to suppress rather than encourage enthusiasm, or who fails to respond when others applaud. Such a one lacks loyality, and the institution will be better off with his or her name eliminated from the roll.

What is the ideal held out for our teachers? It is an inborn characteristic of the race to be eternally reaching out for something higher and better, and to desire the establishment of a mark in life which shall for all time be remembered. Nothing is quite so abhorrent to us as the thought of absolute oblivion. This being true, we must then agree that it is our ambition to be remembered in a kindly manner. Service, and service alone, can bring about this condition. Can we not, upon our return to our respective schools, foster the growth of this spirit among the members of our staff? Read back, if you will, over the annals of our profession and you find that the goal achieved by those whose names are still remembered was the acquiring of admiration and love from the stream of pupils which came and went through the classroom doors where those sainted individuals presided.

Loyalty, coöperation, and service must not be preached so much as practised in the presence of the staff, provided best results are to be obtained. I believe it true, as has been stated, that relatively few people are rendering more than fifty per cent of the service of which they are capable. May we then take home with us this thought, and take an inventory of stock so to speak. Then, through the application of practical ethics, perhaps we can increase the efficiency of our institutions by ten, fifteen, or even twenty-five per cent. Would not such a proposition be worthy of earnest consideration?

We should welcome competition as between schools. The keener the competition, if wholesome, the greater should be the glory at achieving success. Success must be founded upon justice, and yet not upon justice alone for there may be no particular virtue in justice. A man may be just simply because he dares not be otherwise; and furthermore every legal phase of justice may be satisfied and still a man may have shown no charity, sympathy, or true spirit of service in his dealings. Justice must then be tempered with a kindred feeling of moral obligation. Then, and then only, will business ethics be followed out to a logical conclusion.

In following out the theme of competition, our thought is centered upon the periodical scramble to fill staff vacancies with competent instructors who have had a thorough course of training in our highly specialized line of work. Is there such a thing as an open and a closed season for employing teachers? I refer, of course, to a season when it is felt that practically all members of the profession are available and may, without injustice to anyone, be induced to accept positions elsewhere, whether the inducement be promotion, financial or social gain, or any of the other numerous advantages which may be set forth. If the above may be termed an open season, then we must accept the existence also of a closed season, or a period of time during

which a superintendent has a right to assume that members of his staff will not be urged to accept for that year other positions without his being first consulted in the matter.

In other words, we stand face to face with the problem of teachers and contracts. As previously stated, we are in our profession to-day influenced in large measure by an unsettled condition in the labor world, and it is certain that to some extent this subtle influence is undermining the attitude of our workers. On every hand we are warned that the teaching profession has not escaped the taint of this tendency. A superintendent recently wrote an editorial on the question of "Transient Teachers," who are here to-day and there to-morrow, with thought centered more upon the itinerary of the trip than upon the better preparation or greater possiblity of service. The institution being served for the time being is looked upon merely as a stop-over place. Little consideration is then frequently given to fellow teachers, or to the superintendent. Certain it is that no thought of higher efficiency is seriously considered by such a teacher.

As superintendents we must give more thought to this increasing number of floating members of our profession, for if these same individuals might have been loyal, steady, staunch workers and we ourselves are responsible for their not being so, then the question is one for us to solve. Perhaps, through our ready acceptance without letter of recommendation and without regard for previous contract, we are responsible for permitting this frame of mind on the part of some of our teachers to grow. A more stable view would elevate the entire profession. I am sure all of us have had teachers under our observation at various times during the past five years whose attitude toward their work, their associates, and their superiors has not been desirable. I feel safe in stating that these same teachers would have made themselves more desirable and efficient

had they known that before securing a position elsewhere their year's record would be investigated and a recommendation requested.

The Maryland School has been singularly fortunate in retaining throughout the period of the war, and subsequent thereto, a full staff of specially trained teachers, but we have during this same period had the interesting experience of seeing teachers whom we could not conscientiously invite to return for another year being employed at a considerable increase of salary by a superintendent in another school who has later admitted his disappointment. These contracts were made in what might be termed the open season, hence no fault can be found upon that score. But how about the influence on the loyal, faithful members of a staff at the practical promotion of perhaps the least deserving individual at the close of an unsatisfactory year? We have also experienced the distressing situation of having members of our staff write us as late as the month of September stating that more lucrative positions were being urged upon them by superintendents from other schools, and could we not see our way clear to make an increase in the salary.

It seems to me that late in the summer we should assume that worth-while teachers have made written or verbal contracts for a specific salary binding them to serve at a certain institution, and that in the absence of further information it would be safe to assume that they were planning to return to the same institution where they had been employed the previous year. Would it not then serve the best interests of all parties concerned, in case a superintendent should immediately prior to or shortly after the opening of school be confronted with a vacancy in his staff, having in mind a suitable person for the filling of that vacancy, that he first write to the superintendent holding a contract with the view of ascertaining whether or not such a person might be conveniently released? Certain it is that unless we ad-

here more rigidly to some such rule we shall have ourselves to blame for contracts being considered merely as scraps of paper. This phase of the question was recently aired by us editorially in the *Maryland Bulletin* and, through a letter received, an argument was advanced to the effect that according to law there is no wrong without a remedy. If this be true, it would seem necessary to require of a teacher that she sign a contract, specifying on the one hand that if she relinquishes her position she would be expected to pay a specific sum of money, and that the institution on the other hand would be similarly bound in case a teacher be dismissed without cause. Some schools do actually require such a contract. It is not within the province of this paper to discuss the legal aspect of the proposition. We are concerned here with the ethical phase of it. In other words, we do not advocate the forcing of a teacher to remain in a school against her will; in fact we have grave doubts as to the advisability of so doing, for we feel that a teacher so retained would not give the best returns. Ethics might step in and say, remove from the teacher the temptation to go elsewhere during the closed season.

While we were preparing this paper an incident came to our attention which clearly illustrates the point in hand. A friend of a certain teacher now employed by us was induced to break her contract and accept a position elsewhere at an increase of salary. The young lady on our staff predicted that a teacher who would regard a contract so lightly would probably use the same liberty again; and at Christmas time of the second year the prediction did come true. A contract was again broken and in the middle of the year the young lady accepted another position at what was again an increase of salary. If this is not to be considered unethical, or at least absolutely commercial, then my conception of the topic is incorrect.

We doubt that any superintendent would stand in the way of a teacher who at any time of the year receives an offer to go elsewhere to assume a position that was a decided promotion, where her field of activity could be considered as manifestly broadened. Clearly, when the eye is focused upon the dollar and a teacher makes a break during the middle of the year, she is inflicting a hardship upon the superintendent and adding materially to what is already a heavy burden. She is crippling to some extent the institution to which she was in duty bound to render her services; she is lending her influence by lowering the standards of her fellow teachers; and she is finally not in any sense bettering her own condition. All of this may have been done in a more or less thoughtless vein, but should it not be frowned upon by those whose frowns would have a remedial effect? Under such conditions what becomes of service, social betterment, love of humanity, and the like, which we feel should characterize members of our staff.

A second thought relates to the prevalent misuse of phraseology. Of this the commercial world has an abundance of illustrations. I refer to the use of misleading names and phrases as applied to various commodities. Science itself is not altogether free from this taint. The centipede for instance has but thirty legs, and silk comes not from a worm but from a caterpillar. Why do we speak of India ink or India rubber, the former being made in China and the latter in South America? Camel's hair brushes are made from the tails of Russian squirrels. Briar pipes are not, as might be supposed, made of French briar but of heath root. Perhaps these misnomers are not harmful or injurious, but they make it easier to speak of silk hose when referring to articles make of wood fibre, or of woolen fabrics when the article in question really is made of a vegetable substance. Too frequently the furniture listed as mahogany is merely a veneer, leather goods but enameled canvas, and oak leather soles but pressed paper

under the influence of wear and moisture. When 100 feet of radiation is conceded to mean but 96 feet, and when a man is supposed to know that it required 16 one-inch boards to equal the width of a foot, then the terms become somewhat mischievous; and when we discover that Smithfield hams were cured in Kansas and Jersey milk produced on Durham farms, it is time to halt and call a spade a spade.

Let us turn upon ourselves the searchlight of investigation to see wherein a more definite nomenclature might enable us to be more clarly understood and leave us less liable to criticism for wilfully and intentionally misrepresenting.

The application of the term "deaf" would probably be the first to come under scrutiny. How frequently is a hard-of-hearing individual termed "deaf," while in the same breath a group of our children singing at a piano or playing in a brass band are called impostors because they have some hearing and hence are not to be thought of as deaf. To overcome this fallacy, some have fallen into another by terming children in our schools as "deaf and dumb" or "deaf-mutes." Neither expression is correct, especially so of the hard-of-hearing children or of the large class of pupils in our schools who have lost their hearing after the acquirement of considerable speech. We know of one school that began its existence with no less a name than the "Asylum for Deaf and Dumb Mutes." From such an expression it has taken more than a century to eradicate the use of "asylum"; and it will doubtless take another century to entirely eliminate the improper use of the terms "dumb" or "mute."

After all, what is in a name? If no particular harm be done, then why discuss the matter? In our judgment harm actually results from the use of these expressions. The word "dumb" among playmates results in the nickname "dummy," and I believe that 75% of the people

confronted with the name "deaf and dumb" imply in the last word not a physical but a mental deficiency. Dumbness has a relation to the condition of the dumb brute; muteness has attached to it an uncanny condition which still exists with some children who, because of mental condition or because of lateness in entering school have not received vocal training. Still the fact remains that the stigma should not be attached to the 90% in our schools who are in no sense of the term either "dumb" or "mute."

I shall not soon forget the statement made to me by a merchant in one of Minnesota's prosperous little towns when I announced to him that I intended to take the normal training course to become a teacher of the "deaf and dumb." His heated retort was in substance as follows: "Young man, I wish you to understand that deaf children are not dumb; I have a nephew who is deaf and he is as bright as any hearing child I ever knew." This expression has come to me in varied forms a number of times since, and I know you have all been confronted with it.

I have studiously endeavored to eradicate the use of these terms at our school and have been meeting with some success. Every form of communication that comes to us through the mail, whether it be an advertisement or a first-class letter, if the name be incorrect, has its wrapper removed and, after name is properly corrected, it is returned to the sender, with the result that practically every letter now received at the school bears our new legal name of simply "Maryland State School for the Deaf." No telephone communication is answered under the call of "D & D" or "Deaf and Dumb Asylum," without the following explanation: "No, this is not the asylum, this is the Maryland State School for the Deaf."

In the minds of the men who have grown up with the habitual use of the former name, it is a slow process of change, but we hope the present generation will use the proper term and that eventually we may be called what we

in reality are. Just why the deaf themselves persist in using the term "deaf-mute," it is difficult to understand. Some of our ablest deaf men, themselves users of splendid spoken language, persist in calling themselves "deaf-mutes," when as a matter of fact there is no interpretation of the term which can possibly include them. To retain the name "deaf and dumb" simply because there is a very small percentage of actually dumb children still among us, is in my mind as absurd as it would be to term ourselves an institution for the "deaf, dumb and blind" simply because we may have one or two children with the treble affliction on our roll.

We should encourage in the minds of the public the idea that within our schools there are a large number of children who have a remnant of hearing. The existence of bands and the demonstration of vocal exercises with the aid of the piano are doing much toward the eradication of this misconception; but we should strive to guard against the fallacy which is so apt to creep in when newspaper reporters record such events. Statements, for instance, expressing profound surprise that children who have never heard the sound of a human voice can produce such music, should be corrected, and no stone should be left unturned that might bring about a true impression concerning such feats. Even then there is sufficient glory to go around. A knowledge on the part of an employer concerning this latent hearing would prove a distinct aid to the securing of employment by so-called deaf persons. One otherwise unfamiliar with this fact would without further examination exclude one of our graduates, thinking of course that, being a product of a school of this nature, he must either be totally deaf or deaf and dumb.

If nothing worse, the term "deaf and dumb" implies to the majority of people that the child is absolutely devoid of hearing and speech, even though the individual using the term may not attach any idea of mental deficiency

thereto. To illustrate, we recently had an interview in the office of the Automobile Commissioner of our State, where there has for the past few years been a movement on foot to bar the deaf from receiving drivers' permits. As some of you probably know, there has been no automobile reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia; hence automobile drivers of the District are required to procure Maryland licenses in order to use Maryland roads. The Commissioner informed me that he had received a number of applications from students at Gallaudet College, but of course they had all been refused. I asked him if it was not a fact that permits were granted to those who, though hard of hearing could detect the sound of a shrill whistle, to which he replied in the affirmative. When I explained that at Gallaudet College there was a large percentage of students who could not only hear a shrill whistle but could hear the human voice, he expressed great surprise and stated: "Why, I thought that was a deaf and dumb institution." If, then, the deaf are unjustly discriminated against simply because of a misconception brought about by the use of a name, is it not our duty to strive to eradicate this by encouraging the use of a proper term?

A word in passing about the frequently over-worked term of "restoring the deaf normally to society." Has not this expression been used to such an extent that it has brought hardship and discouragement to fond parents, besides creating bitter feeling between parents and heads of other instutitions? In all fairness let me inquire as to the exact meaning of the term so frequently used. If it implies what is actually stated, that for instance a deaf child can be so educated that it will be practically impossible to detect his infirmity, then we must declare the statement a gross exaggeration, for when the totally congenitally deaf child is taken into consideration, we must admit that up to the present time no such child's training has been perfected, under any method whatsoever, to such an extent

that the casual listener could not detect something inherently wrong in the voice of the speaker. I have met a very few deaf persons who were so well versed in speech and lip-reading that we might for a time carry on a conversation with them and scarcely realize their deafness, but in every single such instance when the history of the case is known, the one spoken to is found to retain still a considerable amount of hearing or had acquired full command of speech prior to becoming deaf. If, then, we give the impression that all deaf children can be so trained as practically to exclude the detection of their infirmity, are we not ethically in error?

So, in our dealings with our fellowman let us place ourselves in his position and observe to the best of our judgment and ability the rule laid down for us in the Book of Books, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them."

Mr. F. H. MANNING: Several months ago, the usual letter came to me asking what subject I would like to have discussed at the Conference; and I said then that I hoped there would be a paper and a constructive discussion on the question of ethics; that I hoped the Conference would take some position as to ethics that should obtain between employers and employed, that is, between principals and teachers. I also expressed a hope that the question would be discussed entirely by prominent, outstanding members of the profession, knowing that if that had been adhered to, I would have escaped being called upon. The request was considered, however, in the matter of the choice of a paper. I shall try to take only a minute or two, on that part of the paper in regard to the business relations that should exist between superintendent and teacher.

I think the situation that has arisen as it is now, is largely the fault of principals. It has been a custom a long time for teachers employed in a school to enter into a contract to teach for a year, and then ask to be released

when they find something they like better. And principals have released them. I think that has grown, and I think it is a bad practice and a bad precedent. I think it has grown to be a troublesome practice. I think such a request should not be made except for very strong reasons, some unavoidable circumstance. Whenever I talk of this question, I can't help being reminded of my own experience in the recent past.

Last spring, for the first time, I think, since I have been principal of a school for the deaf, I had employed an entire faculty for the coming year. I accordingly looked forward to the convention in Canada with great pleasure; I could go up there without being on a hunt for teachers; I could go and enjoy the convention. And, lo and behold! when I returned from the convention I had three vacancies to fill. I immediately sent out a distress signal to almost every school in the country, asking if there was anybody that I could employ. And there came almost a rebuke from the dignified president of our college, saying "You should go hunting in the spring for teachers, and have your places filled before this time of the year." I said, "Well, bless your soul, I had been gunning and had mine full."

Dr. ROGERS: Somebody stole the game?

Mr. MANNING: The game was lost and I had to fill my bag again. That was my experience last spring and it ought not to have been. Those contracts were made and signed and filed, and those contracts last for only a year. In a year's time, the teacher has a chance to look elsewhere for a better place. I contend that after a contract has once been entered into, unless some unavoidable and unlooked-for circumstance arises, it should be adhered to. I very much hope that this Conference will put itself on record as at least frowning upon the custom of asking for and granting releases from contracts except on worthy grounds.

A report of the Committee on Credentials was presented by Mr. W. L. WALKER, naming the active and honorary

members of the Conference. (The names given appear at the beginning of this Report, *Annals* for March, 1924, pages 97, 98.)

The report of the Committee on Necrology, subsequently prepared by Dr. ROGERS, appears at the close of this Report, pages 292–6.

The Committee on Nominations presented the following report, which was adopted, and the persons named were declared elected to serve through the next regular meeting of the Conferenc:

President, AUGUSTUS ROGERS; Vice President, ALBERT H. WALKER; Secretary, A. C. MANNING; Members of the Executive Committee, J. W. JONES, N. F. WALKER, A. L. E. CROUTER, H. M. MCMANAWAY, and F. M. DRIGGS.

The following resolutions, approved by the Committee on Resolutions, which different members of the Conference offered, were unanimously adopted by vote of the Conference:

Resolved, That the warmest thanks of the Conference are due and are hereby tendered to Dr. and Mrs. A. H. Walker, the members of the State Board of Control, and all the other officers and teachers of the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind for their arrangements for the entertainment of the Conference, for the many courtesies received at their hands and for all their efforts to make the sojourn of the members of the Conference so pleasant and so profitable, and which have called forth our deep appreciation.

Resolved, That the thanks of the Conference be extended to Hon. P. R. Perry, Mayor of the city of St. Augustine, the Board of Trade, and all citizens of the city of St. Augustine for their cordial welcome and for all kindnesses received at their hands.

Resolved, That the thanks of the Conference be extended to the newspapers of the city of St. Augustine for their kind notices and splendid reports of the meetings of the Conference.

Resolved, That the thanks of the Conference be extended to Mr. William McAuliffe, manager of the Alcazar Hotel, for special rates, splendid service, and excellent arrangements for the convenience of the Conference. [Presented by Mr. FORRESTER.]

Whereas little deaf children, perhaps more than other children, need the elevating and ennobling influence of a mother's care and love, and