

SECTION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

Thursday, May 19, 1910.

MORNING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Morris D. Waldman, of New York, in the absence of Dr. L. B. Bernstein, the regular chairman for the meeting, and he announced that the chair would be taken by S. Wolfenstein, of Cleveland, O. He regretted to say that Dr. Bernstein was unavoidably detained by sickness.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: I have been requested to preside at this Conference this morning, and I can only express my regret at the absence of the President of this organization.

The first on the program this morning is a paper, entitled "A Special Study of the Problem of Boarding out Jewish Children and of Pensioning Widowed Mothers."

The paper was to be read by Mr. Lowenstein, but he is absent, and I understand that Mr. Bressler will read the paper.

A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF BOARDING OUT JEWISH CHILDREN AND OF PENSIONING WIDOWED MOTHERS.

Based upon the work of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum and the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society of New York City in boarding out, and of the co-operative work of these two Orphan Asylums and the United Hebrew Charities in subsidizing widowed mothers.

By SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN,
Superintendent of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum,
NEW YORK, N. Y.

[Owing to his absence from the sessions of the Conference, the writer of the paper desires to state that it is not, in any fair sense, to be considered a committee report, but rather an expression of individual judgment. Owing to Dr. Bernstein's serious illness, no

attempt was made to have any committee meeting at which the subject could be discussed or a plan of treatment worked out. Apart from the statements of fact, contained in the statistical portions of the paper, which were based upon the replies received to the questionnaire, the writer alone must be held responsible.]

This paper does not aim to be a final statement of the questions at issue. It pretends to be nothing more than an introductory investigation, preliminary to a thorough discussion of the various problems involved. Despite the attacks that, at various times, have been made upon the institutional method of caring for children, we may assume that, at this Jewish Conference, there will be general agreement, irrespective of personal preference, in the statement that the majority of Jewish children requiring public care will, for a long time, be cared for in institutions, and that it is, therefore, our duty to maintain our institutions at the high plane of efficiency which they have hitherto occupied, and to adapt to their various needs all progressive improvements in institutional management. The institutional end of this discussion may, therefore, be passed without further comment.

Two other methods of treatment of dependent children have, however, been advocated, both in this Conference and in other forums of philanthropic discussion, culminating in the Conference on Child-caring, called by ex-President Roosevelt, in Washington, in January, 1909. The boarding of dependent children in private homes and the pensioning of mothers to enable them to maintain their children at home, after the father's death, were both advocated by this Conference, and in New York City, during the past year, a new organization has been formed for the specific purpose of attempting this latter work.

Among Jewish child-caring institutions, the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, succeeding to the work of the Joint Committee on Dependent Children of New York City (which work has been discussed at our Philadelphia Conference in 1906), and the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, starting somewhat later, have both organized and conducted for several years bureaus for placing children in board. The Hebrew Orphan Asylum, for several years, and the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, during the past year, have

likewise assisted in the care of dependent children in their mothers' homes, spending for this purpose sums approximating \$30,000 and \$3,000 annually. The work of these two organizations, in this department, has been performed largely in co-operation with the United Hebrew Charities of New York City—a rough division of the work, describing it with fair accuracy, involving the payment of rent and the furnishing of clothing and fuel by the Charities and the granting of an allowance for living expenses, to supplement the Charities' pension, and any internal resources of the family, by the child-caring institutions.

With this brief introduction, we may proceed to an examination of the work performed in the two classes:

BOARDING OUT.

It may be in order to state, first, the methods employed in this work. Homes are secured, primarily, in response to advertisements in the daily newspapers—English, German and Yiddish. Families are referred to the institution from various private sources; for example, by lodges, charitable individuals and families already having children in board. All such applications are carefully investigated by a special agent, giving his entire time to this work. This results in the rejection of the overwhelming majority of the applications received. During the past fiscal year 50 of 148 applications were accepted by the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society; 80 out of 603 by the Hebrew Orphan Asylum. In addition to the inspection by the institutions, all homes, found satisfactory by them, must be reported to the Board of Health of the City of New York, which rigorously investigates and determines whether the home is satisfactory for the placement of children and, at the same time, limits the number that may be so placed, in accordance with the size of the rooms, sanitary accommodations, number of persons in applicant's family and character of furniture. No children are ever boarded by either institution until the Board of Health permit has been secured. Speaking for the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, I may state, in this connection, that no home, recommended by our inspector, has ever been rejected by the Board of Health, and I am confident that a similar assertion

might be made on behalf of the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society.

It is required that, in all cases, the family applying shall have sources of income other than that received for the care of children. All applicants must furnish at least five references, not related to them, who must testify in writing, on supplied forms, to a list of questions, designed to secure information as to the financial, social, religious and moral responsibility of the persons applying for the care of children. Children are placed in Jewish families only, and never in families where there are small children who will require the attention of the mother and divert it from the boarded children.

All boarded children attend the public schools, and report cards of their progress must be shown to the investigator of the institution each month, when issued. Children in board are entered at the nearest religious school, when there is one at an accessible distance. In a number of instances special payments are made for this purpose.

The health of the children is carefully supervised by means of regular examinations by the institutional physicians and, in the case of the children placed by the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, by a visiting nurse. All children are regularly weighed and measured and, naturally, receive special treatment in cases of acute illness.

All clothing is furnished by the institutions and, likewise, all incidental expenses, apart from board, are met.

This work is supervised by the State Board of Charities, which, in New York State, is a very efficient body. Boarding homes are visited and office records examined by a special investigator of the State Board of Charities. During the past year the work of both institutions in this department has been placed in Class I, the highest rating of the State Board. In view of the fact that some of the most efficient agencies for placing children have their headquarters in New York City, this rating is a source of just pride to the institutions.

In order that the work of supervision may be thoroughgoing additional investigators are employed for this purpose, who investigate and visit the homes in which children have been placed

at least once a month in all cases, and in many cases semi-monthly. The children themselves make frequent visits to the institution for the purposes of obtaining clothing, to have shoes repaired, to visit the physician and to be advised concerning their work in school, when this is necessary. They are thus under constant observation, and are free to report concerning their homes, so that whenever it appears advisable children may be transferred to another home in case the one already found should for any reason prove undesirable. Statistics of the work conducted by the two institutions at the present time are as follows:

	Hebrew Orphan Asylum.		Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society.
Number of children in board at the present time.....	Boys	138	251
	Girls	119	
Number of children discharged during present year.....	Boys	70	200
	Girls	54	
		— 124	
Total number of boarding homes at the present time..		135	150
Geographical distribution of these homes:			
East Side to 100th Street.		19	44
Harlem.....	East	33	35
	West	21	
		— 54	
Washington Heights and Upper West Side.....		10	16
Bronx.....		35	35
Brooklyn.....		7	14
Suburban and country homes.....		10	6
		— 135	— 150
Amount spent on boarding de- partment during the past year.....		\$26,694.36	\$36,402.91

During the past year an attack upon the work of boarding out Jewish children in New York City was made by Dr. S. Wolfenstein, of the Cleveland Orphan Asylum, after a visit to New York and an investigation of a few homes. We believe, with all due respect to Dr. Wolfenstein's judgment, that he was grossly mis-

taken in his estimate of this work. In connection with this report an independent investigation of homes in which children have been placed by the two institutions was made by Messrs. M. D. Waldman, of the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, and D. M. Bressler, of the Industrial Removal Office. These gentlemen visited homes of their own selection in various parts of the city. No notification of these visits had been given to the boarding mothers, and the homes were visited by them under the same conditions as those in which they were accessible to Dr. Wolfenstein, to whom likewise a full list of the homes of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum had been furnished upon his visit to New York. The writer does not believe that he can enter, with any impartiality, into this discussion, and he prefers, therefore, to leave this matter to be presented to the Conference by the two gentlemen mentioned, as part of the discussion upon this paper.

I would, however, present the following points in resumé of this portion of the topic. The children placed in good boarding homes receive, in general, more individual attention and, in the great majority of cases, more individual affection than is possible in the best institution. They are kept clean, both as regards their bodies and their clothing. They live in a type of home far better, in most instances, than those from which they had been taken, and as good as those occupied by the great majority of the self-respecting, independent working class of New York's Jewish population. They are living, some of them, in the far better neighborhoods of New York; most in the newer parts of the city, and many in houses of a type of construction definitely better than were the homes of New York's Jewish population at a time when the present generation of well-to-do Jews of New York were children. There need be no fear that these children are being placed in improper homes. It is true that, at times, the right personal adjustment is not always secured at the first placement, and subsequent transfers may be necessary. In other cases women, whose homes have been found satisfactory, have proved unsatisfactory because of personal characteristics, which make them ineligible to continue in charge of children. Such homes must be abandoned, but the percentage of such failures is small and does not militate against the general

value of this method of care. But, beyond such general argument in its favor as a means of caring for all kinds of children that come to us, we may definitely assert that it has decided advantages over the institutional method in at least three classes of cases:

First—The child, under seven or eight years of age, really has no proper place in a large congregate institution. Such children thrive much better, both physically and mentally, in the small private home, and should be boarded out, whenever possible.

Second—Every institution has its share of children who are abnormal or atypical, either socially or intellectually. They may be unduly precocious or abnormally dull, without having sunk to the level of feeble-mindedness. They may be unfit, by reason of undue timidity or undue assertiveness, for life in the crowded institutional ranks. The well-selected boarding home is far better than the institution for such cases.

Third—The class of physical defectives; children having heart trouble, crippled children or those suffering from any other physical ailment, requiring hospital treatment, are ineligible for admission to most institutions, but can easily be cared for in a good private home.

For another class the boarding home is often preferable. I refer to those half-orphans, who are motherless. The father is often able and anxious to live with his children, and very often the boarding home provides this means. Often, though the father cannot live in the same home with his children, the boarding home is, in many instances, preferred by him because of the frequency with which he may visit the children and the oversight that he can bestow upon them. The Hebrew Orphan Asylum makes it a rule never to place fatherless half-orphans in board unless the mother is incapable of caring for her own children by reason of physical or moral disqualifications.

The one great question that the boarding-out system has yet to answer and which, at least in the case of the Jewish institution, it cannot yet answer because of its comparative newness, is what effect will it have upon the children as they become older, and what can it give in the way of future training. With regard to the latter, I see no reason why the institution cannot give its

boarding-out children the same advantages as it offers to those brought up within its walls. The answer to the former is more dubious, and can be determined only when the future shall have given us more material upon which to base our judgment.

PENSIONING OF WIDOWS.

*To enable the investigation to proceed upon some lines of definite information it was decided that, for the purpose of this work, 100 cases should be chosen, distributed as follows: United Hebrew Charities, 45 cases; Hebrew Orphan Asylum, 45 cases; Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, 10 cases. It was the original intention that the cases of the United Hebrew Charities should be such as received assistance from no other organization. A few cases, however, were submitted in which additional assistance was given, but not in sufficient numbers to change the general result of the examination. Both the Orphan Asylum and the Sheltering Guardian cases are necessarily those in which the United Hebrew Charities co-operated. To secure uniform results a list of questions was prepared, and each of the three organizations was to have answered upon blanks made in this fashion. The 10 Sheltering Guardian Society cases, however, were not reported in accordance with this method and the results in these cases are, therefore, not absolutely uniform. The differences, however, are not in essential matters. The following is a copy of the items of information requested with relation to each case:

- Name of family?
- Address?
- Number of rooms occupied?
- Number of windows per room?
- Number of beds, cots or other articles used for sleeping purposes?
- Has the apartment a private toilet? A private bathroom?

*One Hebrew Orphan Asylum reply has been lost. Its figures, therefore, treat of only forty-four cases, reducing the total number considered to ninety-nine. The Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society cases are, of course, too few in number to permit of any general conclusions being drawn from their figures alone.

Is it an old or new style tenement?

What uses are made of the various rooms?

Amount of rent paid?

Is the head of the family a widow or a deserted woman?

Number of persons in family—

(a) Adults? Married? Single?

(b) Children above working age?

(c) Children below working age, but of school age?

(d) Children below school age?

Are there boarders or lodgers in the family? If so, what amount do they pay?

Does the mother perform other work than household duties? If so, what, and how much does she earn?

Occupations and wages of working members of the family?

Are there any physical defects in any members of the family?

Is there any chronic disease in any member of the family, particularly tuberculosis, and, if so, what attention is given to invalid?

Do the children attend school regularly?

What educational training do the children receive outside of public school, viz., in religious schools, settlements, etc?

How do the children spend their time outside of school, particularly on Saturday and Sunday?

What are their means of recreation; theatre, settlement clubs or classes, moving picture shows, street play, etc.?

Have any of the children ever been arrested? If so, for what?

Are any of the children away from home; in institutions and otherwise? If so, why and where?

What charitable assistance has the family received? Include under this all forms of assistance, whether from public or private sources; whether in cash, coal or supplies.

The information secured from the analysis of the replies thus received shows the following results:

U. H. C.	H. O. A.	H. S. G. S.
	NUMBER OF CASES.	
45	44	10
	LOCATION.	
45 downtown	24 downtown 20 uptown	10 downtown
	HEAD OF FAMILY.	
34 widows 11 deserted women	33 widows 9 deserted women 2 cases—husband living (1 insane; 1 blind)	10 widows
	SIZE OF HOMES AND FAMILIES.	
	1 family 5 rooms. 1 family 8 persons	
5 families 4 rooms.	16 families 4 rooms.	
1 family 10 persons	1 family 10 persons	
1 family 6 persons	2 families 9 persons	
1 family 4 persons	1 family 8 persons	
2 families 3 persons	5 families 7 persons	
	3 families 6 persons	
	2 families 5 persons	
	2 families 4 persons	
26 persons	107 persons	
average per room 1.3	average per room 1.6+	
	22 families 3 rooms.	19 families 3 rooms.
	1 family 12 persons	1 family 9 persons
	1 family 8 persons	4 families 7 persons
	5 families 7 persons	3 families 6 persons
	2 families 6 persons	6 families 5 persons
	7 families 5 persons	3 families 4 persons
	4 families 4 persons	2 families 3 persons
	2 families 3 persons	
124 persons	103 persons	43 persons
average per room 1.8+	average per room 1.8	average per room 2.0+
	17 families 2 rooms.	8 families 2 rooms.
	2 families 7 persons	1 family 7 persons
	2 families 6 persons	1 family 6 persons
	1 family 5 persons	1 family 5 persons
	6 families 4 persons	3 families 4 persons
	6 families 3 persons	2 families 3 persons
73 persons	36 persons	17 persons
average per room 2.1+	average per room 2.25	average per room 2.8+
	1 family 1 room.	
	1 family 3 persons	

U. H. C.

H. O. A.

H. S. G. S.

RENTALS.

5 room apartments.

5 rooms \$15.00
average \$3.00 per room

4 room apartments.

1 apartment \$18.00
1 apartment \$17.00
1 apartment \$15.00
1 apartment \$13.50
1 apartment \$12.00

4 room apartments.

2 apartments \$17.00
1 apartment \$16.00
1 apartment \$15.00
1 apartment \$14.50
2 apartments \$14.00
1 apartment \$13.50
1 apartment \$13.00
1 apartment \$12.50
2 apartments \$12.00
1 apartment \$11.00
2 apartments \$10.00
1 apartment \$ 8.00

average per room \$3.77½ average per room \$3.27½

3 room apartments.

1 apartment \$15.00
1 apartment \$14.00
3 apartments \$13.00
2 apartments \$12.50
3 apartments \$12.00
1 apartment \$11.50
6 apartments \$11.00
5 apartments \$10.00

3 room apartments.

1 apartment \$13.50
2 apartments \$13.00
2 apartments \$12.00
1 apartment \$11.00
5 apartments \$10.00
2 apartments \$ 9.50
1 apartment \$ 9.00
3 apartments \$ 8.00
2 janitresses—free

average per room \$3.88½ average per room \$3.46 average per room \$3.75

2 room apartments.

1 apartment \$12.00
1 apartment \$11.00
3 apartments \$10.00
2 apartments \$ 9.50
2 apartments \$ 9.00
2 apartments \$ 8.50
5 apartments \$ 8.00
1 apartment \$ 7.50

2 room apartments.

1 apartment \$12.00
1 apartment \$11.00
1 apartment \$10.00
1 apartment \$ 9.50
2 apartments \$ 9.00
1 apartment \$ 8.00
1 apartment \$ 6.50

average per room \$4.54½ average per room \$4.68½ average per room \$4.83½

1 room apartment.

1 apartment \$ 5.00

GENERAL AVERAGE RENT PER ROOM FOR ALL CLASSES.

\$4.06 1-5 \$3.50 \$3.99

AVERAGE RENTAL PER FAMILY.

\$12.18 \$11.20 \$10.77

HOUSING STATISTICS.

45 families 226 persons 121 rooms	44 families 254 persons 142 rooms	10 families 60 persons 27 rooms
average persons per family 5.0+	average persons per family 5.7+	average persons per family 6.
about 2½ rooms per family	3.2+rooms per family	2.7 rooms per family
1.8 persons per room	1.7+persons per room	2.2 persons per room

FAMILY AGE STATISTICS—FAMILY CONDITIONS.

226 persons 58 adults 23 working children 113 children—school age 32 below school age	254 persons 48 adults 34 working children 134 children—school age 38 below school age	60 persons 10 adults 4 working children 28 children—school age 18 below school age
---	---	--

LODGERS IN FAMILIES AND AMOUNTS PAID.

17 families with lodgers 26 lodgers \$81.50	11 families with lodgers 2 grandmothers 1 brother-in-law, \$5 mth. 9 lodgers \$27.00	No lodgers
average \$3.13 per mth.	average \$3.00 per mth.	

OCCUPATIONS AND EARNINGS OF MOTHERS EMPLOYED AT WORK OTHER THAN CARING FOR HOME.

28 mothers employed 14 washing 1 candy store 6 meals for boarders 4 sewing 2 odd jobs 3 peddlers (2 of these served meals in in addition to other work)	20 mothers employed 4 washing 9 sewing 4 peddlers 2 odd jobs 2 janitresses 1 cooks meals (2 of these served meals in addition to other work)	2 mothers employed 1 washing \$1.20 per wk. 1 occasional sewing
Earnings from \$5 to \$6 per week	Earnings from \$1 to \$6 per week	

These figures speak for themselves. With relation to the housing conditions, the following general remarks may be added:

It is impossible, in most cases, to give definite names for uses of rooms. With families of the sizes given, living in such restricted quarters, it is obvious that there can be no such thing as a room used only to receive visitors and for other family social activities. Though each family claims parlor and dining-room, wherever the number of rooms is sufficient to justify such aristocratic preten-

tions, none the less it cannot be doubted that all rooms, when the day is ended, must serve alike as sleeping quarters. The reports on the Hebrew Orphan Asylum cases indicate that, in a somewhat larger percentage than in the others, the claim was made that the kitchen was not used for sleeping purposes; all the other rooms, however, are frankly admitted to be used as bedrooms. Likewise, it is difficult to state with exactness concerning the articles used for beds. These, according to the replies, were, generally speaking, sufficient in number, but they included not only ordinary bedsteads, but folding beds, folding cots of types peculiar to New York City, couches and even chairs. In one case a mother and three children were reported as occupying one bed. Windowless rooms, one of the horrors of old-style tenements, were found in twelve United Hebrew Charities rooms and six Orphan Asylum rooms.

The following figures also relate to housing conditions:

U. H. C.	H. O. A.	H. S. G. S.
TYPE OF TENEMENT.		
10 new-style tenements	11 new-style tenements	2 new-style tenements
7 remodelled old tenements	33 old-style tenements	8 old-style tenements
28 old-style tenements		
SANITARY ACCOMMODATIONS.		
2 private toilets	17 private toilets	no dark rooms
1 private bath	6 private baths	no private toilets
		no baths

[Note in connection with these figures that, under existing regulations, no child is ever placed in a boarding home without private bath and toilet.]

It is difficult to get exact or definite statements concerning the employment of the children. Suffice it to say that those reported were employed in the usual shop, factory and office occupations, at wages ranging from \$3.00 to \$7.00 per week.

With reference to the health of the families, a number of women in each class complained of anæmia, neurasthenia, weak hearts, defective eyesight and various internal disorders, or defects of

the special senses. The only diseases present which might have possible adverse effect upon the children maintained in these homes were five cases of tuberculosis among United Hebrew Charities families, and one Hebrew Orphan Asylum case. It is interesting to note, however, that all these cases are receiving medical treatment from some form of medical charity. In no case was a private physician reported.

Recreation of the children is but ill provided for. Playing on the streets is the usual reply. Settlement clubs, when present in the neighborhood, are somewhat used, and the library is generally popular. The form of recreation most frequently mentioned is an occasional visit to the moving picture show. School attendance, in all cases, is reported as regular, with a single exception, among the United Hebrew Charities cases. Hebrew instruction is the object of much solicitude. Figures for the United Hebrew Charities, Hebrew Orphan Asylum and Sheltering Guardian Society are 28, 30 and 4 families, respectively, in which this branch receives attention, frequently at financial cost.

Delinquency is rare. Among the United Hebrew Charities cases 3 arrests are reported—1 of a husband for forgery, 1 of a boy for stealing, 1 of a boy peddling without a license. In the Hebrew Orphan Asylum cases 2 boys were arrested for peddling without licenses and 1 for jumping on a street car while in motion.

Relief statistics are as follows:

U. H. C.	H. O. A.	H. S. G. S.
Pensions.....\$554.86	U. H. C.....\$337.60	H. S. G. S.... \$178.00
Average per family... 12.33	H. O. A..... 595.50	U. H. C..... 108.20
Other sources... 156.00	Other sources... 31.00	Other sources... 5.00
Total asst....\$710.86	\$964.10	\$288.20
average per family about \$15.79	average per family \$21.91	average per family \$28.82
average rent per family \$10.80	average rent per family \$11.20	average rent per family \$10.77

(In all these cases clothing, fuel and Passover supplies are furnished by the United Hebrew Charities to pensioners in addition to the pension).

These figures indicate that those pensioned are not being adequately supported; that they are living in quarters congested altogether beyond the dictates of health, morality and decency; that they are being compelled to eke out a living far inferior to that required by a normal standard. The amount of relief given beyond the earnings of mothers and children, where there are any such, is, in the cases assisted by the United Hebrew Charities alone, barely sufficient to cover the rent, and, in other cases, where co-operative effort prevails, the amount of relief is very meagre, compared with the average size of the family.

This is by no means to say that the policy of attempting to maintain homes intact is unwise. Given a good mother there is no reason, as has been stated frequently on the platform of this Conference, why she should be compelled to add the distress of breaking up her home to the grief occasioned by the loss of her husband, but, if the community has wisely decided to assist her to do this, it must, at the same time, determine that its support shall be adequate. It must give generously and not with niggardly hand. The mother ought not to be compelled to engage in work that will call her away from her own home, nor be forced, in her own home, to perform so large a quantity of work as to cause her to neglect her children, nor should her work be of such character as to impair her own health or that of her offspring. Above all, the keeping of lodgers, other than those related by blood ties to the family, should be prohibited absolutely. The family should not be allowed to remain in the poorer overcrowded neighborhoods of the city, but inasmuch as, in most cases, the majority of the children are below the legal working age, they should be required to move out into suburban or less closely settled neighborhoods, where the opportunities for fresh air and healthful play are unrestricted. The relief granted should be sufficient to enable the child, in addition to remaining at home, to have at least a fair share of the recreative opportunities that are afforded to his fellow in the institution. But, for the proper working out of this class of cases, a much greater degree of supervision must be provided than is furnished by any of the existing New York agencies. This is not work for the salaried employe. It is pre-eminently the task of the friendly

visitor; of the good woman who feels that in large organized charity there is no place provided for her personal service. Too often the mother is not competent to spend wisely the amount of money that may be necessary to give her adequate relief. The friendly visitor, sympathetic, tactful, with a knowledge of good housekeeping, can be of invaluable service to her. In addition to assisting in the expenditure of funds and the management of the family budget, she may find work to do in advice concerning the preparation of foods and the foods to be used; the cleanliness of the children, their schooling and amusement. With proper supervision, I believe this kind of work can become extremely valuable; without it, I am convinced that it can result only in failure.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: According to the program, you will notice that I was to discuss this paper, but I decline to do so. I received the paper yesterday, which was sent to me by mail, and I have been so busy I have just looked over it and just read it today. But even if I had had it before I would decline to discuss it here today, as long as I am now here presiding, and also I do not think I need to discuss it. I have published my views on the subject, and I think they are well known, and I have not changed them after the paper was read.

DISCUSSION.

By HENRY MAUSER,
Superintendent Pacific Orphan Asylum,
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

It is unfortunate that the members of the committee were not able to complete their report, and this with a more complete decision of the members of the committee.

The paper presented here this morning is to some extent contradictory, and practically places in the hands of its opponents the weapons of argument.

The idea of placing out our children to board is not a new one; it is practically as old as civilization, but with us it dates back to to city almshouse, where peripatetic travelers would be put away,

leaving children to be taken care of by the town; and even in those days they were unable to find proper homes for these children, and they were placed in the almshouse, there to be kept until they were able to start out to work, which, in those days, was at a very youthful period, and they were made veritable slaves.

The paper presented seems to be more typical of New York City than any other place. Perhaps the congestion is so great there, the problem is so large, that other methods besides housing children in orphanages must be taken, and I grant you such children should be put in homes proper for their care.

The theory that the private home is best for the child is beyond argument. But the problem of finding practical homes is beset with great, almost insurmountable, obstacles, that have not been overcome up to the present time, and the attempts so far have been merely experimental. It will take years before a definite decision as to the method can be arrived at.

I want to ask these questions: What called into being settlement work? What has called into activity the social service worker? The alleviating, the educating, the refining and the uplifting of our co-religionists who require their services?

In seeking homes for the children, to whom are you looking to place them? To whom have you looked to place the children who have been placed? Those whom you and I would like to care for our children would we pick the very class whom we are called on to educate and refine? Are those the homes in which you would place children who have already been punished by being bereft of parents? Are they who have homes and education and refinement willing to take a child? No; consequently you will have to look to the very class who require unlifting.

I claim the movement stultifies itself. If you cannot find homes with equal refinement, equally as well-equipped as a well-equipped orphan asylum, you have not found the proper solution of this problem, nor have you found the proper homes for the children.

I must approach reverently the city of New York. We who live in small communities, who have not the congestion to contend with, who have not the problems to fight against that New York has, we find that in the small institution family affection, education and

refinement and the affection between the children and those in charge can be had and is had.

In New York you have a disproportion of defective children, who are most probably detrimental to the mass of children, and for them it is absolutely necessary to find homes on the outside, and with that idea I am heartily in accord.

With reference to the question of pensioning widows, after ten years of advocacy of the cause with the board of directors of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, they did not deem it wise to enter into that at that time, but they are on the eve of doing so.

According to another report today, which we are also discussing, you can see how difficult and enormous a task confronts us to place children even with their own mothers. How many of these women are capable of taking care of their own children and of doing for them the tithe of what is done for them in the orphan asylum? How many of these women are already the object of charity? How many of these women know how to carry on their household, much less rear children they have brought into the world?

It is a great subject, and I am heartily in favor of pensioning a widow for taking care of her children. The fact is a widow would much rather get paid for taking care of her child than to have it put out in an orphan asylum. Not only should she receive ample assistance, but every assistance that she requires.

But I think the greatest care should be taken as into whose hands the children are placed, mothers or anyone else. There is no one, I am sure, who hates more than I the idea of taking children away from their parents. But when the parent is not properly equipped that sentiment should have no place. We owe the duty not alone to the mother, but we owe the duty to the country and the community in which we live, and no sentiment should intervene to prevent us from taking the proper course to rear these children, to make them good citizens.

Now I contend that if the difficulty is so great in placing children with their own mothers, how undesirable it would be to place them with strangers if those who take them take them not because they care for them, but simply for the stipend that is given for

their care, in order to eke out their existence. For this reason a family of children can be better taken care of in institutions under wise people skilled in their care. They can receive just as much parental affection as they can from strange women, and until this question is properly adjusted, until there is the proper amount of other income to warrant these people in taking these children and educating them, and not needing the stipend for their own support, I claim those in charge of institutions should see to it that the children are placed in their institutions, where they may receive all they are entitled to, the asylum taking the place of the parents whom God has taken away from them.

DISCUSSION—(Continued).

By ARMAND WYLE,

Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum,

NEWARK, N. J.

Unfortunately, no copy of Mr. Lowenstein's report was received by me prior to my departure for this Conference, and only a superficial reading of it was possible when it finally reached me. The only conclusion that seems possible to be drawn from it is that the boarding-out system, described by Mr. Lowenstein as being practiced by the two New York orphan asylums, is being conducted with every possible precaution to safeguard the integrity of the children placed out by them; therefore, some generalizations made in my paper might be modified so far as these agencies are concerned. Should such care be taken by all agencies engaged in this phase of the work, no adverse comment could be entertained. However, dangers *do* exist, as under other systems, and it is with these dangers that my paper has to deal. That all methods of child-caring have their merits is *also* true, and in view of the great number of children to be considered all *tried* systems should play a complementary part in child-welfare work.

The keynote of the White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children was expressed in these words: "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. Children should not be deprived of it, except for urgent and compelling reasons."

The committee on resolutions of the Conference in reporting its conclusions to President Roosevelt sounds the danger note of this

summary in recommending that prospective homes should be most carefully investigated by thoroughly competent persons, and that after placement these homes should be intelligently visited; finally, it says: "Unless and until such homes are found, the use of institutions is necessary." If this program should in all cases be carried out, it is my belief that "urgent and compelling reasons" would very often be found why children should continue to be maintained in institutions. Home life is truly the ideal one for children, but good homes are difficult to discover—homes where the standard is as high as is that demanded of institutions. The Conference also recommends State supervision of all methods of child-caring agencies, public or private. If this is done by honest and thoroughly competent persons, any method will prove effective, the community itself being the best judge of the policy to be maintained.

Mr. James E. West, Secretary of the White House Conference, in a personal letter to me stated that among 10,000 applications made to a magazine interested in home finding for children a fair proportion were found unworthy, and among the worthy ones two Jewish families were given Jewish children with unsatisfactory results. He admits the danger of exploitation, improper supervision, insufficient guardianship of health, safety, morals, religion and education, though he maintains that thousands of homes offered were found to be ideal places for children, but that institutions in our large cities are unwilling to release their children. This is in itself significant, for no institution managed on broad lines would reject such opportunities if the system were found satisfactory. Mr. West further says that some institutions are making arrangements to transfer children to the Middle West, of which he apparently approves; but Texas, for one, is remonstrating, on the ground that the shipping has been carelessly managed and the children have frequently fallen into the care of irresponsible persons. (See *New York Times*, May 2, 1910, editorial page.)

Such tests as those recently essayed in New York by Dr. Wolfenstein and the committee sent out to refute his conclusions are misleading and by no means conclusive. It is universally acknowledged that Dr. Wolfenstein has had eminent success with a con-

gregate institution for children, but this very success may, in a measure, account for his attitude toward the homes he so inauspiciously visited. (See editorial, *American Hebrew*, March 11, 1910.) On the other hand, the persons interested were aware of the intended visits of the investigating committee from the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, and these calls were made on succeeding Saturdays, when Jewish homes are in Shabbas order and children in holiday condition and attire.

The committee above mentioned stated that the inspector made sufficiently frequent visits, this being as definite a statement of this important feature as I had seen before reading Mr. Lowenstein's report, and is decidedly inconclusive. Inspectors' visits are not in all agencies likely to be frequent, and may be controlled by personal interest, though this interest is not necessarily induced by anything more than the attractive personality of a child. The time of an inspectors' visits can easily be gauged, if they be irregular; a child may be afraid to tell of its ill treatment even if it is able to do so, or may exaggerate its wrongs; petty discrimination may be shown in favor of the family's own children and cause much misery to the others.

Now a word as to these homes. Judge William H. DeLacy, of the Washington, D. C., Juvenile Court, says that 85% of the children in court are there because of home conditions. Ernest K. Coulter, Clerk of New York Children's Court, says that he figures 101,000 rooms in Manhattan are without windows and that 300,000 persons exist in them. The New York Child Welfare Committee says there is in New York less than one square foot of playground for each child. It is estimated that 95% of the children quit school before 14 years old. Dr. Reeder says that "The attempt to escape their God-given responsibility by many parents nowadays is the chief cause of juvenile delinquency, of well-filled protectories, reformatories and so-called industrial schools." It is among tenement homes that compulsory attendance at public school is most frequently imposed; that truant officers are oftenest seen; that the school doctor and nurse are most needed. How much more carefully can one expect foster-parents to care for children placed in their charge, than do parents for their own

flesh and blood? Will foster-parents send fewer children to make up Judge DeLacey's 85%? May some not live in a house where one or more of Mr. Coulter's 101,000 windowless rooms are located? One foot of playground per child is negligible as compared to the spacious grounds of most institutions, and is fraught with grave danger if the crossing of car tracks and automobile-driven streets to gain access to them be alone considered, to say nothing of streets and forbidden premises used as playgrounds. These homes may or may not be religious. They may or may not have any moral influence upon the children. A little girl having several times violated the sanctity of a settlement house, by swearing, was finally excluded until her father should bring her back. When they returned he was told that his little girl had sworn at a boy. "Well, it was only my brother," said she, and the father replied: "Where did you think you was—at home?" Twenty-five thousand delinquent children from private homes are in institutions. What amazement is caused by the discovery of an orphan asylum child in such an institution; it happens fortunately but in rare instances.

Over thirty years ago the society which I represent adopted the policy of placing children in private families, and with some success. In 1887, however, the trustees found it desirable to maintain an orphan asylum because of the impossibility of finding suitable homes, and today they believe as do many others, that selfish motives alone induce those families that will consent to take children for a monetary consideration, to undertake the care of them. They further believe that such families are not capable of maintaining a proper intellectual, moral or spiritual standard for these children, for they do not maintain one for their own children.

Dr. Reeder in his book, "How 200 Children Live and Learn," says: "Any need that is easily observed and apparent to everyone is pretty sure to be well looked after in children's institutions. . . . How capricious and accidental is the dietary of children in a majority of American homes. They eat anything and everything they want with little regulation as to time, quantity or quality. They sleep when nature forces it against the odds of high tension amusements of all sorts and play without leadership

or reference to what is best for the development of mind or body." This arraignment would surely include the homes where children are placed; in institutions of the better type these matters are all carefully considered.

Every institution has a competent medical staff at hand to intercept any encroachment of disease. My institution has an eye, ear, nose and throat specialist, who keeps constant watch over the children. A dentist in the neighborhood gives immediate attention to our children and examines and treats them semi-annually. The investigating committee from the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society found a number of instances in which the teeth of the children required attention. This would not be likely to happen in an institution.

We feel that in our small orphan asylum we have some advantages of the cottage system as well as the congregate, for, after all, the latter has some compensations. Besides this our society gives relief to needy families and is often able to keep the family intact by aiding the parent to help the child without having recourse to any system, the natural home being the best. If it is true as Dr. Wolfenstein suggests, that New York should have ten more small orphan asylums the inmates could be more finely classified into homogeneous groups, one of which, for instance, could be an atypical one. Furthermore, the expense of maintaining these various institutions, would be less than an adequate cottage system to care for all children in need of protection.

The best that can be said of the placing-out system is that the child may come into close contact with an attractive personality, and that is not impossible in institutions of the cottage type—or even congregate systems. The system is not so important as the director of it, though the director of a cottage system has better opportunities than the others. That instead of a Wolfenstein, a Bernstein, or a Lowenstein, we sometimes find a Frankenstein, need not disparage an entire system. New systems are not so much needed as improvements on the old, and, above all, sincere, efficient workers who look not so much for a job as for the welfare of the children with whom they come in contact.

I believe that what is possible in a poor or mediocre foster home can be attained in a good institution, and more. It has been said of the New York Orphanage that "social workers committed to the conclusion that a good home is always better than an institution, will see that homes wherein children have a better opportunity than is afforded them in such a orphanage as this are few." What can be done in an ideal home is most decidedly more than is possible in the best conducted orphan asylum that ever existed.

In conclusion, I would say that where no institution exists for their particular needs, atypical children, of all grades, may, under present conditions, be advantageously, if only temporarily, placed in boarding homes, since their presence in the institution is a menace to normal children and constitutes the so-called institutional type so rapidly disappearing from our institutions. To these I would add children under school age. For other normal children, however, in view of the dangers connected with the placing-out system, which have been indicated in this discussion, if it came to adopting this system exclusively by a new child-caring agency, as against that of the cottage or congregate plans, I would emphatically urge the adoption of the cottage system, and until the dangers of the home-finding plan are removed the congregate system can be made to serve as a fairly good alternative.

MR. WALDMAN, New York: I will ask the Chairman to let me say a word or two in explanation of any possible misunderstanding. When Dr. Wolfenstein recently came to New York I very gladly accompanied him, at his request, to the homes of pensioned widows, and I am very frank to confess at this time, as I was at that time, and in very strong terms indeed, that I was very much dissatisfied with the homes I saw. I do not believe that these homes were in any sense ideal homes; in fact, in my opinion, they were injurious to the children who lived in them. There is no doubt, in my mind, and I believe that all will agree in this, that the mother's home under normal conditions is the best possible home for a child. It is not a new theory, though it has been recently more strongly emphasized. But in New York the situation is peculiar. There exists a condition of congestion that is not duplicated in any of the other cities in this country. Further-

more, the income of the charities has always been very limited, with the result that we have been unable to give adequate allowances for the care of dependent children. The community there does not seem to have been educated to a realization of the fact that children should be as carefully nurtured in their mothers' homes as they are in the orphan asylums. In our report of 1908 we call the attention of the Jewish community to the advantages which institutional children had as against the children who were kept in their mothers' homes. Because of these conditions, I believe that a great many children would be better off in the orphan asylums than where they are at the present time. Recently an examination was made in Chicago, Boston and New York of the children of tuberculous parents—in Chicago by Dr. Sachs, in Boston by Drs. Floyd and Bowditch and in New York by Drs. Miller and Woodruff, and, as a result, the remarkable coincidence has shown that from 50 to 53 per cent. of the children of such parents were suffering from active tuberculosis. We have in the city of New York, conservatively speaking, about 5,000 Jewish consumptives. The records of the United Hebrew Charities show that there are on an average of 300 families treated month by month, in which one or both the parents are consumptive. It is only fair to assume that if an examination were made of the children in these families similar results would be shown. Of the 1,500 children admitted and discharged from the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society in the last five or six years only 5 children developed tuberculosis, in spite of the fact that over 30 per cent. of the parents of the children admitted to that institution had died or were suffering from the disease. In the face of such information, our theories on the question of child-caring must be qualified by the conditions we find in each different community.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: The paper is now open for discussion.

MR. CHESTER J. TELLER, New Orleans: The paper submitted this morning has, I believe, been among the most important papers contributed to this Conference, treating of the subject, as it does, in a scientific manner, based upon facts rather than upon guesses and opinions.

In judging the paper and its contents, two points ought to be especially stressed. Firstly, we must consider conditions as they exist in the various communities. The conditions of living, the problem of the dependent child, the financial resources of a community like New York are all one thing. In other communities we find very different conditions. Hence our conclusions would necessarily be quite different.

Secondly, we must remember that the homes used by the New York societies—I refer now to the boarding homes—are used for two special classes of dependent children, not for the ordinary dependent child, but for the exceptional dependent child. Under this head we refer to children under six years of age, because, unfortunately, the conditions of New York City today do not allow the admission of all such young children to institutions.

The second class of children that are cared for in the boarding homes of New York, under the supervision of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum and the Hebrew Guardian Society, are exceptional children. They are children who are abnormal or subnormal, either from the standpoint of their physical or their mental development.

Now I believe that this is the strongest argument that can be used in favor of this particular method, because it is a recognition for the first time—at least that has been expressed in this Conference—of the needs of the exceptional child.

Heretofore we have either refused admission to that child in institutions or else we have cared for the child in institutions without a special plan.

But this is a recognition that the children who are coming to the Jewish child-caring institutions of the community are in many cases exceptional children—subnormal, abnormal, defective—and that they have special needs and that they are being cared for in special ways, and I believe that a fair judgment of the advantages of the boarding-out system can only be had when we bear that fact in mind.

MR. SAUL DRUCKER, Chicago: A very peculiar city is New York. The problems there seem to be more difficult to solve than in a smaller community.

The idea of keeping children with their own mothers is that which would appeal mostly to a humanitarian. From the report here, it appears that they abstain as much as they can from placing children with their own mothers.

I heard a story once of a Jew in Russia, who had a boy about fourteen years of age. The boy's birth was never recorded in the city government, and the father being anxious to have a record made of it asked a friend's advice whether to record the age as sixteen or twelve. The friend said: "Why wouldn't it be more advisable to record fourteen years, the correct age?" The answer was: "This is something I never thought of."

This may serve as an illustration of the various child-caring agencies, which have devised every possible means for the proper care-taking of children, excepting the idea of keeping children with the mother, which, apparently, is something they never thought of.

The modern methods practiced in institutions may be compared to the work of the incubator, with the mother hen as a model. The incubator was invented after scientists observed the way the hen treated the eggs, while hatching the chicks. The correct temperature was taken, and having found out the work of the hen in every particular the incubator came about, following and imitating exactly the doings of the mother hen, with the result that it is now an improvement on the mother. The same thing is true with good institutions. We have certain institutions, so well and systematically arranged, and perfectly conducted, that they are an improvement on some private homes. In fact, the institution, when doing its proper work, not only cares for the child, but also is a guide to the mother—how to properly and scientifically train a child. For instance, the Marks Nathan Jewish Orphan Home of Chicago allows the mothers to make frequent visits to the children, permitting them to observe our training and management in every detail, so that when later the mother and children are reunited the former can follow out the principles instilled, without difficulty, and prevent friction. The little difficulties that may arise when a child is returned to the mother may be illustrated by the following: A mother came to me grievously

complaining that she could not get along with her boy; he absolutely refused to use the towel she gave him. Upon investigation, I found that the lad insisted upon having a towel for himself, and would not tolerate the one in common family use. Of course, this the mother couldn't understand.

Now, about the boarding-out system, or the hiring of professional stepmothers, New York seems to be lucky in the finding of proper Jewish homes for dependent children, but smaller communities are certainly not so fortunate. The Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago was forced to give Jewish children into non-Jewish homes, because it could not find sufficient Jewish homes, where the love for strange children was so developed, that a child would be given other than stepmotherly care.

We cannot adopt the boarding-out plan till we succeed in educating the Jewish woman to develop a love for strange children and treat them as her own.

MRS. HENRY SOLOMON, Chicago: If the Chairman would call on some women. I want to call attention to the fact that the problem so far has been discussed by men that, some of them possibly, are unmarried. The subject has been discussed by the bachelors. I do think some women have some opinions on the subject and some have experience in work that ought to be told here. Personally, I don't believe in incubators as an improvement on the mother. If it had been I think the Lord Almighty would have invented incubators instead of mothers. The element of maternal love cannot be overlooked.

Every good theory ought to work out in fact, and there can be no question that the home is the proper place for a child.

It doesn't seem fair to me to compare the good institution with the bad home any more than the bad institution with the good home.

I have had experience in both directions. There are very great evils in institutions, evils that are not often touched upon before a general audience. I am perfectly willing to admit that we have some in which there are no evils and which are well conducted, and in which everything is good. But putting side by side the good home and the good institution there is no question but that the home is better, and putting side by side the bad institution

and the bad home there is no question but that the bad home is the better.

We have at home women who have had experience in home finding work, who are present, and can speak of facts. I believe it is difficult to find enough homes to go around, but they can be found.

A gentleman—I don't know whether he is a bachelor or not—said the question of sentiment didn't play any part. I think it plays a big part when it comes to children. I don't think you can educate without sentiment, because sentiment has so much to do with proper bringing up of children.

I call to mind a very young woman who refused to go to the hospital because she feared she couldn't get her children back. She was assured she would get them. She insisted upon bringing up her own children. I met her some weeks ago; I couldn't remember the incident, but she did, and told me that she and her children had never been separated, and now they were caring for her. That is not sentiment; that is a fact.

The separating of mother and children and putting the children in institutions in many instances is most cruel. I personally feel that there is no argument that can be brought in favor of institutions as against the good home.

It is very often a question of the support of the mother. This method is no experiment; the institution is an experiment, and very often it is not a successful experiment.

I hope the Conference will go on record as in favor of the more modern plan of boarding in the homes. Much might be said for and against these stepmothers, but I do hope the people in cities where it has been tried may say a word about it.

MISS MINNIE F. LOW, Chicago: A statement has been made this morning by our friend from Chicago, Mr. Drucker, so uncalled for and unwarranted, that we must, in justice to ourselves, refute it. I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago. We have been accused of placing Jewish children in non-Jewish homes. The only occasions on which we do this is when we have young infants afflicted with

infectious diseases. Most of these infants are sick from the time of their birth, and are in need of such special care and nursing as the few non-Jewish women we have on our list can give them. Three of these women are practical nurses, qualified to care for delicate infants.

There is no phase of philanthropic endeavor fraught with greater responsibility than that of child-placing. To raise money from a charitably inclined public, and to spend it wisely, is indeed a great social trust. This trust, however, grows insignificant in the face of one directly responsible for the well-being of little children, and for their physical, moral, mental and spiritual development.

We have all heard of the unsatisfactory effects of insufficient relief-giving. We give our widows and deserted women a small pension, never enough; a little clothing now and then, never enough; we make of the 365 days of a year a continuous struggle for existence, and yet we expect these women to bring up their children properly, and we expect the children to grow up into the best type of citizenship.

I believe in the home for a child every time, but it must be the right sort of home, and in the right neighborhood. In Chicago we insist that the widows whom we compensate move into the better neighborhoods. We do not give them \$15.00 per month, as the relief agencies now give them, but we give them as much as \$50.00 per month, the amount depending upon the size of the family. In one case we are allowing a widow with four children \$50.00. We saw her last week, and she expressed herself as being "the happiest mother in Chicago." The principal of the school, which the children attend, wrote us a letter, unsolicited, speaking of the splendid condition in which the children are kept, and saying that the Home Finding Society was doing for this family what all the institutions in the world could not do—giving the mother the benefit of her children's love and society, and giving the children a mother's devotion and care.

We do not permit our compensated mothers to go out to work. They can supplement their incomes by doing some work in their homes, especially while the children are at school, but further than

this it is a condition imposed upon them that they do not leave the home nor the children to add to their incomes.

We find it is after all not the best plan to separate a mother from her children even temporarily. The mother, being relieved of the care of a home and children grows timid about reassuming the burden and responsibility. One woman, whose children had been in the institution for nearly two years, when told she must remove them and establish a home with compensation of \$35.00 per month, said: "I can't take care of my children; I am afraid to try it. If you had offered me this amount when my husband first died, when for days I walked about the building in which my children were put, just to see the place that held them, I would have been a very happy mother, but now my courage is gone." It took weeks of coaxing before this mother made up her mind to take her children.

In the matter of boarding homes, we also pay sufficient to get the right kind of homes, in the better quarters of the city. We pay on an average of \$15.00 per month for older children and \$12.00 per month for the younger children. Our homes are all neat, attractive and well kept. The women who have charge of our children are motherly, and are intensely interested in their little charges.

We have placed thirty-five children for adoption in splendid homes. Some of these are in homes of affluence, others in the more humble abodes. Dr. Wolfenstein, who visited us last week in Chicago, and saw some of our boarding and permanent homes, expressed himself as well satisfied with our selections.

We intend to go slow but sure in Chicago. There is a movement on foot to remove children from the Orphans' Home, and to permit their mothers to care for them. What can be done in the city of Chicago can doubtlessly be done in smaller communities. We cannot speak of the Chicago work and the New York work in the same breath. New York has problems so overwhelming that we are not justified in drawing comparisons.

MR. JACOB BASHEIN, New York: When I came to the National Conference it was with the intention of listening particularly to the discussion of the subject of "Boarding and Placing Out

Jewish Dependent Children With Private Families." My desire was to find out the best method of caring for children under the age of nine years. Considerable has already been said against the method of boarding children with private families, and so far I am not convinced that institutions on the congregate plan are the proper places for young children.

It strikes me as odd that the gentlemen who are so strongly in favor of the congregate plan admit that they have no personal knowledge of the boarding method, excepting what they have learned from an article by Dr. Wolfenstein. The arguments in this article have since been refuted by Dr. Bernstein, who, unfortunately, owing to illness, is unable to be with us today. Had the advocates of the congregate plan taken the trouble to investigate and study the problem of the boarding system for young children they would, I am sure, stand here today as advocates of the boarding-out plan, instead of opposing it.

Some people referred to the boarding method as an experiment, but you will permit me, ladies and gentlemen, to tell you that so far as the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society is concerned—who, by the way, conduct the largest Boarding Bureau for Jewish Dependent Children in this country—it has long passed the experimental stage. This will best be illustrated by the fact that during the Bureau's existence for the short period of five years nearly 1,100 children were taken care of to great advantage. Among these were a great number of children who were formerly in Jewish and non-Jewish institutions on the congregate plan, but who failed to thrive. Many of these children improved considerably after a brief stay in a private home.

I am sorry I have not with me some data of the weights and measurements taken by our physician, Dr. Gershel, pointing out the enormous gains that the children have made within brief periods in the private home.

I feel it would be underestimating the intelligence of the delegates were I to describe the advantages of the private home and the necessity of individual care for young children. Who will dispute the fact that the private home, which is the nearest to the parent's home, is not the proper place for a young child? The

affection and the tender care even in the poorest home gives the necessary sunshine for the growth of the child. No congregated institution—even Dr. Wolfenstein's—can give the individual attention to a child which the same child will receive in a private home. But the opponents of the boarding method say: How can you find desirable homes in fine localities, like cottages in the outlying districts, etc., for the insignificant sum of \$2.00 per week? My answer to this is that we really cannot find very wealthy families who will take children in board, nor can we find many families living in private cottages, but we do find many good Jewish homes located in light and sanitary quarters in the less congested sections in New York City. The following table will show the large number of applications which the society had to select from:

Applications received since July, 1905.....	1,572
Of this number received offering free homes there were....	192
Of this number received offering boarding homes there were..	1,380
Of this number for free homes, rejected.....	127
Of this number for boarding homes, rejected.....	1,100

The above applications are on file with this society.

The reason that this vast number of applications were rejected was not because of undesirability, but rather for the reason that the number of children that our society places in boarding homes is for the present time limited to 300, an arrangement which is entirely dependent on material circumstances.

The calibre of our mothers as was clearly pointed out to you by Messrs. Bressler and Waldman, who made a careful and exhaustive study of our homes, is equal to the best Jewish mother; every one of our homes is a better home than the one from which the child has come. Our homes are regularly supervised by agents and a trained nurse; the children are frequently examined by our physician; our homes are open at all times to the inspection of the city officials and to the public.

Our loss by death during the past five years was three children, and the illness in the homes is proportionately small.

The reason why most of our applicants apply for a child is a desire for the companionship of such child. Some have never had

any children of their own and others have lost their children. In these families instead of the child becoming a burden it brings sunshine and happiness to the home.

If you, ladies and gentlemen, will make an effort to learn more about the advantages and value of the boarding method you will, I am sure, establish similar agencies in your own cities and so avoid the necessity of transporting children hundreds of miles away to an orphan asylum in a distant city; this always entails the separation of the child from its relatives, with its subsequent hardships.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: Kindly excuse me for taking up about two minutes of your time in this discussion. I did not want to do it, but there has been a statement made by a lady from Chicago that most of the institutions are bad, and I deny that most emphatically. There is no Jewish orphan asylum in this country that is bad.

There was another statement made to the effect that the orphan asylum is an experiment, that to place the child in the home is the proper thing. I want to say that is wrong. The work of the orphan asylum is no experiment. The results of the orphan asylum are complete for the last fifty years; their work stands out prominently. In the paper read it has been acknowledged that there was no certainty about the outcome of the boarding-out plan of orphans. This is an admission that the same is considered an experiment. I say to you that there is no man in the world who has a right to experiment with a child.

MRS. SOLOMON: I did not mean to say that the orphan asylums were bad, but that the good home was better than the best orphan asylum.

DR. MAX LANDSBERG, Rochester: I say the same thing. I am in full sympathy with the ladies from Chicago.

Those who are managers of institutions are generally opposed to boarding out children. I was, therefore, particularly pleased to hear Dr. Bernstein take up the cause of placing children in homes. I am not influenced by either one or the other considera-

tion, but I have studied this question for years, year after year, not only theoretically, but practically. I have long been closely connected with orphan asylums, and I have always held, and always succeed in persuading my committee wherever it was possible to assist a widowed mother so lavishly that she could well take care of her own children.

Now there is only one thing I want to ask the gentleman from San Francisco: He says the women are not competent to bring up their children. Were they more competent when their husbands were alive?

Would you approve of sending into every household in the community an inspector to find out whether the father and mother are fit to take care of their children? It is certainly true that many well-to-do fathers and mothers are less competent to take care of their children than the poorest.

I want now to give an experience in placing children of widowed mothers in orphan asylums, which we have done in a number of instances.

These children were well cared for. They had much better places than they have in their mothers' homes. They had much better food. These children had been taken care of for six, seven or eight years, and when they came out of the institutions they refused to live with the mother because she could not give them the same beautiful accommodations they had enjoyed at the orphan asylum.

I claim the time will come, in less than twenty-five years, when orphan asylums will not cease to exist, but when orphan asylums will not be a boarding school, as considered by many people, but when they will be a temporary abode, and as soon as a good home is found the child will be taken out of the orphan asylum and put into the home. It is my experience that it is only a question of money. If you pay enough you can always find good homes.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: The Chair declares this discussion closed, and calls upon Mr. Teller to read his paper.

SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR JEWISH DEPENDENT CHILDREN WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING.

By CHESTER JACOB TELLER,
Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum,
NEW ORLEANS, LA.

It is no vague thesis in general education that we are asked to unfold this morning. It is to the instruction, the special instruction, of the Jewish dependent child that this paper is addressed, more particularly to that phase of Jewish orphan education which is nowadays termed industrial training.

We venture at the very outset to raise the question: "Why should there be any special education of the Jewish orphan child?" Why is not general educational theory valid for all children alike? The answer to such questions is this: The problem of the education of the Jewish dependent child is a special problem, because, firstly, he is a Jewish child and Jewish education is always a matter of special study; secondly, the unnatural fact of his being orphaned or dependent early in life usually means, when analyzed, that he is the offspring of a weak or weakened physical stock, and, thirdly, the fact that he is dependent usually means, when analyzed, that he will not have the average opportunity of being gradually introduced to the realities of modern life, an opportunity which comes to most children of normal parentage; but that he will suddenly be placed upon his own resources, usually at about the age of 16 years, expected to meet the responsibilities which real life in a world of men imposes. For these three reasons, then, because he is a Jew, because he is usually physically weak or subnormal, because his preparation for independence must be crowded into a maximum of 10 years, we have in the education of the Jewish dependent child a special problem in education.

These are not theories, but facts, and facts which must be faced as they are. The fact that our children are in every case Jews and that we are of the same faith when translated into educational need means that we are dealing with the definite problem of Jewish