

JEWISH CHILDREN'S BUREAU OF BALTIMORE

The Meeting of the Jewish Children's Bureau of Baltimore was called to order at 11:25 A.M., May 16th, Mr. Sidney Hollander, Chairman of the Bureau presiding.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: The Children's Bureau of this city was one of the earliest organizations created in this country to serve the special needs of a community clearing house for children's cases. Like so many of the best things we have here, it came from the brain of Louis Levin. Prior to its inception there existed what might be called "benevolent chaos." You all know what I mean by that, many organizations handling Jewish children, each working with enthusiasm and blissfully indifferent to the fact that others were doing similar work, sometimes, unfortunately, the same work with similar cases, sometimes, unfortunately, the same cases. Boards were hostile, workers were suspicious, some functions were overlapping, others were neglected and the resources of the community were scarcely touched.

Out of this confusion Mr. Levin brought order. He brought together in one group all the agencies working with Jewish children here, the orphanages, the Family Welfare Society, the Hospital Social Service, the Settlement House, the Big Brother League, the Big Sister League, the Juvenile Court and the Home for Working Girls. That same group still constitutes our membership. Some of them have broadened their functions rather considerably as new needs were indicated, but the growth has been harmonious and logical. Our relations have been most amicable. In nearly eight years we hardly had a scrap that was worthy of the name. For weeks prior to the organization of the Children's Bureau, I know we met every day wrestling over a Constitution. Each organization was afraid to sign, to agree to anything or to sign any sort of an agreement because each was afraid that in some way his organization would be slighted and some other organization would be given additional powers. That was eight years ago. I don't think any of us have ever seen the Constitution since.

One of the important factors of our success, if success it may be called—Miss Berolzheimer will not agree that it may be called success—is due to its composition. Each agency is represented jointly by one of its trained workers and a member of its Board. We thus temper the intelligent enthusiasm of the workers with the financial agnosticism of the directors. It works very well, though. It keeps our heads from the clouds and keeps our feet from sinking too deeply into the clay. To this group is referred every case involving the possible removal of a child from its home. Discussions are unlimited, and when I say "unlimited" I mean unlimited. Decisions are unanimous.

We have our own psychiatrist by whom each child is studied before the case is presented. We have our Vocational Guidance Department which adjusts the child into industry according to its capacity and talents if it is considered a vocational case. Briefly stated, the results of our experiment to date may be summarized: First, a better placement of the child based upon investigation, study and deliberative discussions rather than upon appeals to sentiment. Second, coordination and cooperation between agencies, replacing all chaos and antagonism. Third, a saving to the community by reducing the number of children cared for outside of their own homes. This was accomplished by emphasizing intensive case work and helping parents to assume their proper responsibilities. Fourth, the development of boarding home care for dependent children of varied types. When the Bureau was organized only institutions were available. No funds were provided for any other types of care, but this obstacle was overcome by utilizing the contributions from parents and relatives of children entrusted to us. From a modest beginning this fund now averages nearly ten thousand dollars a year. Subsequently, when arrangements were possible, this boarding home branch of our work was turned over to the Children's Society. Fifth, the earliest possible restoration of children to their own families. This is accomplished by periodic investigations and re-investigations of all of the children whom we have under our care, and it would amaze you to know the very large proportion of them that were able to return to their families instead of caring for them by the community.

For the meeting today we have selected actual cases that have come before us very recently in which the decisions are pending. They will be presented to you in the regular course of procedure just as we present them at the Bureau, the only difference being that I have requested the workers to read their reports instead of giving them verbally for the sake of brevity.

I think you all have leaflets showing the cases that we are going to discuss. I need not tell you that the names are assumed. The first case that we will discuss is that of the Potash-Crook Family.

MRS. ADOLPH GUTTMACHER: The case is to be presented for the possible adoption of Ida and Ethel Crook and further plans for the care of the Potash children, David and Sarah.

The first report is by Miss Pasternak who represents the Family Welfare Organization.

MISS LILLIAN PASTERNAK: The Potash family, consisting of the man and woman and their three children became dependent on the Hebrew Benevolent Society nine years ago when it was reported by the Social Service Department of Johns Hopkins Hospital that Mrs. Potash, a highly nervous mother was suffering with tuberculosis, and that her husband who was working irregularly was unable to supply the proper diet for his wife.

It was learned that Mrs. Potash had recently arrived in America, leaving her relatives in the old country. She was unable to adjust herself here and desired to return. On account of her illness and discontent friction developed between husband and wife. This condition, coupled with the illness of Mr. Potash made the family life abnormal and the children therefore soon became problems. The father died at Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1916 and the mother, a neurotic, unbalanced, ignorant woman was unable to cope with the children. Shortly afterwards the children were referred to the Jewish Children's Bureau.

Two years after the death of Mr. Potash, Mrs. Potash went to live with a Mr. Crook, who, it was learned, had a wife and child residing in Russia. Two years after their union Mr. Crook was arrested on a non-support charge and was forced to marry Mrs. Potash. Mr. Crook had been arrested several times on charges of larceny and assault and

it was learned also that he mistreated his wife and her children. A few months ago upon the desertion of Mr. Crook the family again became dependent. Mrs. Crook at that time gave birth to a baby girl. After a period of intense suffering, Mrs. Crook died of cancer of the esophagus at Johns Hopkins Hospital.

A boarding home was found for Milly, the oldest child who is now vocationally well adjusted and self-supporting. She is living with her half sister Ida, five years of age, who is of normal intelligence and physically well. The baby, four months old, is a normal child and has been placed in a special boarding home by the Jewish Children's Society.

David and Sarah, children of the first marriage, who have been problems for several years, have been in the care of the Jewish Children's Bureau and the Jewish Children's Society. Through the cooperation of Mr. Crook's only brother who resides in Baltimore, the man was located after a five months' desertion. There are no other relatives who could assume any financial responsibility for the children of the second marriage. A number of the relatives of the Potash family are known to the Hebrew Benevolent Society and their homes are unsuitable for the care of the children. They are also unable to contribute financially towards their support.

The question of adoption of the two Crook children is held in abeyance at this time due to the fact that Mr. Crook, the father, has been located and we are awaiting his decision.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: You say that Molly and Ida are in a boarding home?

MISS LILLIAN PASTERNAK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Miss Lauer, will you report on Molly and Ida?

MISS EDITH LAUER: Molly is a girl of moderate intelligence and good character, well-adjusted vocationally. She and her half-sister, Ida, five years old, who is a normal, healthy child, are living together in a normal family home. Molly is self-supporting. Ida is supported by the Children's Society. There is a peculiar devotion between these two

children. The home in which they are living is that of a friend of Molly's, so that the situation is fairly satisfactory and pleasant. Both of them are doing well.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: The next child is David. Miss Rosner, do you know David? Please give a report on David.

MISS J. ROSNER: Though a weak, retarded boy, David is not vicious. He has always been a problem at home and in school and has a Juvenile Court record for petty offenses. He is a victim of surrounding circumstances, a poor home, a physically weak, neurotic mother, rather stupid and unable to properly care for her home and children. As he was a truant, David was placed in the Parental School at the age of ten and remained there for four months, when he was discharged. He evidently had not benefitted by his stay in the Parental School, nor were the conditions in the home improved, as David had to be removed from the home again. He was placed in the Hebrew Sheltering Home, one of our orphanages, when he was eleven years old. He became well-adjusted there and gave no indication of being incorrigible. David was returned to his home at the age of fourteen. It soon became apparent that the stepfather was not interested in the boy's welfare and made no effort to direct him. There was constant friction in the home between the man and the woman, and a definite conflict between David and his stepfather. The situation became intolerable and David ran away from the city. His mother swore out a warrant for his arrest in October of 1922. He was brought back to Baltimore and committed to St. Mary's Industrial School, a Catholic Correctional Institution.

In a recent interview with the Superintendent of this institution he stated that the boy was giving no trouble there and will be released as soon as the Jewish Children's Society can secure a good boarding home for him and also when he can be adjusted vocationally. Dr. Dunham, and consulting psychiatrist have examined the boy several times and he will report on David further.

DR. FRANCIS LEE DUNHAM: We attempt to make an examination of each case from the standpoint of the individual's intelligence, his character and his health, in order to decide what the general social efficiency of the individual may be. Mental examinations show that this individual has

a moderate mental capacity. His I. Q. is about 71. Many of your agencies would classify such an individual as feeble-minded. Our general plan has been to regard such people from the social standpoint as semi-dependent people, but not segregated individuals and actually feeble-minded. This boy's general intelligence then is moderate. He has no special abilities.

After our examination for general intelligence we undertake to determine if there are special aptitudes. This boy shows no special mechanical aptitude. He has a fair learning capacity, but not sufficient to make him a highly efficient person. And his general health is good.

His general character has a fair basis; in fact, a rather good basis, but is somewhat disorganized largely from his surroundings. We would say then we have a fairly intelligent boy, good material from the standpoint of organizing character, satisfactory health and under the proper surroundings should be an efficient worker.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Dr. Dunham, what type of work could this boy do?

DR. FRANCIS LEE DUNHAM: In going over the situation from the standpoint of the boy's interest and his capacity one finds the best job that we could arrange for him is something like an assistant on a truck, a truck helper, or a porter or simple work of that type. He is not fitted for work as a helper in our better department stores for the reason that he can't at present, he hasn't sufficient understanding to deal with the situation of delivering small packages. But on a large wholesale truck with a man over him who is able to deal with the general situation, he is able to do very good work.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Miss Kraus, what can you do in the way of adjusting him?

MISS KRAUS: David has been adjusted since last Monday, but I don't know how long it will keep up. Last Monday, he was placed as a helper on a truck as Dr. Dunham suggested. So far he is getting along very well.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: First I want to ask you whether you have a home that would be available for David, a home of the proper type?

MISS EDITH LAUER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next one of the children is Sarah. Miss Lauer, will you make a report of that?

MISS EDITH LAUER: Sarah is a feeble-minded, epileptic girl with a very poor character organization. Her physical and social handicaps manifested themselves very early, but she was not afforded the sympathetic and intelligent care that was necessary. On the contrary, she was the object of ridicule in the neighborhood. Her stepfather hated and scorned her. Her weak mother offered her scant protection against his ill treatment and she was the cause and witness of ill-treatment of her mother. Poverty, illness, domestic difficulties continually were her influences at home, combined with the unwholesome and sordid environment of the streets.

At the age of eight she became entirely unmanageable and classed as a neighborhood terror and was admitted to one of our Jewish orphanages. There she did very well, indeed. Her progress was remarkable. The epileptic attacks diminished in frequency and severity. She was able to make a good adjustment at school but when she was about eleven there was a recurrence of the old trouble and she became again the neighborhood terror. As an emergency she was tried out in the home of a relative but this was a failure. As a second trial she was placed in another orphanage. Here the contact with the other children was extremely unfortunate and the epileptic attacks recurred with alarming severity.

As another emergency she was placed in a family home. This time the home was of a superior type socially and physically. There were no other children in the home. The parents were experienced, sympathetic and extremely social-minded. At first, perhaps I could say for the first year or a little over a year, we were very much encouraged and felt that Sarah could become adjusted in the community. Through the constant vigilance of the boarding mother and the unusual coöperation secured from a high type school—it is a tribute to the school, the principal and the faculty, the entire faculty that the child remained there as long as she did!

Recently there was a relapse, and after weeks of futile effort the very coöperative boarding parents felt that they could take her no further, that they were not doing constructive work with her. There have been no recurrences of the epileptic attacks but the conduct has been serious. Sarah has been closely followed by Dr. Dunham and he and the consulting psychiatrist concur in the opinion that she can go no further in the community. Her mental age is eight and she is now almost fourteen. The conduct peculiarities are clearly manifestations of mental deterioration, which perhaps could be classified as epileptic equivalents, and upon this recommendation Sarah will be admitted to the State Training School for the Feeble-Minded.

We feel that we have given her every chance.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: We have already had a report on Ida. The next one of the children is Ethel. Do you have Ethel in a boarding home also, Miss Lauer?

MISS EDITH LAUER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Is she well-adjusted?

MISS EDITH LAUER: Ethel was two months old when her mother was admitted to the hospital in a very serious condition. It was necessary to effect weaning. This was done in a professional home, in charge of a graduate nurse and the baby now is normal and doing very well, indeed.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Now as I understand it, we are to consider this morning the desirability of having Ida and Ethel adopted. I would be glad to have opinions from any of the members of the Bureau on that.

MISS LILLIAN PASTERNAK: I reported in my summary before that we felt that that question should be held in abeyance inasmuch as we had located Mr. Crook and we would prefer hearing from him.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: The question comes up now—we have here before us a father, who deserted his family in Russia, came to this country, married again without having been previously divorced, deserted this wife, deserted his children, generally of a low type.

Now the family case worker states that we are waiting to find out what his pleasure is in regard to having these two children adopted. The Chairman feels that adoption proceedings should go on without waiting for the father's permission and consent. I think I am in the minority but I would be glad to hear from other members.

MR. ROTHSCHILD: I am with you heart and soul. I don't think that the father is worthy of any consideration whatsoever and I think we are in duty bound to see that these children are placed in the proper environment so as to give them a chance in life. I think they ought to be adopted.

MEMBER: We could have the children committed.

MEMBER: We can't do anything without the consent of the father.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: We could have the children committed as minors without proper care. Is there any other opinion?

MISS DOROTHY C. KAHN: I am theoretically in accord with the Chairman and Mr. Rothschild, but my experience teaches me there may be practical difficulties in the way of carrying out such a plan. Theoretically we have some justification for proceeding with the adoption of these children but I consider it extremely unwise to go ahead on that basis without further consultation with the father whose visit to Baltimore, we hope, is imminent.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: What complications do you refer to?

MISS DOROTHY C. KAHN: Possible objections on the part of the father, even though they may not be with great foundation, should he come to Baltimore and find this action has been taken without his consent.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: I suppose we could have the children first committed to us, then we would be the legal guardians and it would be within our power to have them adopted.

MISS DOROTHY C. KAHN: I question the wisdom of the procedure.

MRS. ADOLPH GUTTMACHER: I feel with Miss Kahn that after we get in touch with the father of these children his past interest or lack of interest proves that he will not oppose us in this, and I should much prefer waiting until we have his consent, which I am sure we will get, than to oppose him by having the children adopted without consulting him.

MR. PERLMAN: I know the man personally. He has been under my charge. It seems to me that you have a very delicate question as far as the father's consent is concerned. He deserted the children and is coming back now. If you can greet him when he comes back with the information that his children are not his any longer but they are in your care now to do as you decide, you have put over a telling point. If, however, you ask him for his consent he is going to feel that he has the power, and then even if you do tell him later that you are going to turn the children over for adoption, he can cause a lot of difficulty for the adopting parents and your own Bureau. I think you ought not to consider the father under the circumstances but proceed, providing you have the legal right to proceed.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: I would be glad to hear opinions from the audience now. A lot of you have had experience in this line.

MISS ETHEL DAVIS (Cleveland, Ohio): There is one question that has perplexed me for some time and that is this: What do we consider adoptable children? There are many children who, we feel, should be adopted. Now here is a question of a feeble-minded mother, a feeble-minded sister and brother and a child of tender years. Do you feel that we have a right at this time to decide whether these children should be placed for adoption or ought we to await developments?

MR. SAUL DRUCKER (Boston, Mass.): I think that sometimes we are too quick and ready to respond to the numerous calls that are made upon children's bureaus for children of adoption. We have so many. I know that in my case I am having at least 100 requests for one child that is sometimes found logical to adopt. The requests are such that we feel that we can't turn them down, they are so promising,

they are such fine homes, such wonderful opportunities, but have we a right to take them away from the other members of the family?

In this particular case Molly is attached to the baby. Why should we not foster this attachment and why not have provisions made that Molly should have connections with the baby all along? As far as the father is concerned, he has children in Europe that he hasn't been bothering about very much, and it isn't logical, I don't think that he would very much be molesting the children here.

MRS. E. P. MARKS (Erie, Pa.): Would the Bureau feel justified in asking a family to take children with such a background?

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: You mean for legal adoption?

Yes, but we in all cases where there is any question as to the family history we give the adopting parents the full record that we have and very often we have advised parents against adopting particular children because of the bad family history. In some cases they have insisted on overruling our objections saying they are perfectly willing to take the chance.

MRS. E. P. MARKS: If the children were legally adopted and the father returned would you tell him the name of the family that had adopted them?

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: No.

MR. JACOB KEPECS: I would suggest that this child be placed as a free case. I suggest that the Children's Bureau in the first place take steps to have the child committed to its custody so that the father will not have anything to say. Next, to place the child in a free home with the possibility of ultimate adoption if the child turns out to be all right.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: I think we will have to stop on that case without reaching any decision, because after all I am simply trying to show you the type of work and discussion we have at our meetings.

The second case will be the case of Gorden. The case is presented for the possible discharge of three children who

are at the orphanage in charge of Mr. Kepecs. Will you give a report on that question, Mr. Kepecs?

MR. JACOB KEPECS: We have had three boys of this family with us for a little over four years.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Which boys?

MR. JACOB KEPECS: The Gorden boys, Louis, Sam and William. Louis is a boy past sixteen years of age, Sam over fourteen and William twelve. All three are in a first-rate physical condition. The older boy is mentally retarded and the mother disclaims her responsibility for it, she puts it all on the father. He quit school about two months ago because he made very slow progress there. Another reason was he came home every day with a story that one teacher or the other fell in love with him. He was referred to the Vocational Bureau and he was finally placed in a job.

The second boy, who is fourteen years old, is a very fine boy, very intelligent, ambitious and has stood at the head of his class for several years. He has just entered the high school here where he is making good.

The third boy takes after his older brother. He is rather retarded. The older boy, in addition to being retarded, has at one time given trouble in the institution. He was a petty pilferer, but he has straightened out in the last year or two.

The three boys, as far as I could observe, as far as their relation to their own mother is concerned, are very much attached to the mother and are very anxious to return home.

As far as I can tell I would recommend that the children be returned to their mother as they do not require institutional care any longer.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Providing the mother is the proper person to receive them.

Miss Rosner, why were the children taken away in the first place and sent to the institution?

MISS J. ROSNER: In 1918 Mr. Gorden requested the Children's Bureau to place Louis, Sam and William as they were fast becoming delinquents. Mr. Gorden is a good-

natured, stupid person, with no conception of proper discipline of the boys and little real affection for them. He had just secured a divorce from Mrs. Gorden on the grounds of adultery and the three boys were awarded to the custody of the father. The youngest child, Isidore, remained with his mother as Mr. Gorden disclaimed the paternity of this child.

Mrs. Gorden is an attractive woman, far superior to her husband in every way. She loved her children, yet they were taken from her without any consideration as to this sentiment and with no regard as to their desire to remain with her. Mrs. Gorden had been married off by parents in Russia when quite young to this man of whom she knew little and for whom she never cared. He could not understand her superiority and perhaps resented it, thus causing much friction.

Mr. Gorden came to America to seek his fortune and several years later Mrs. Gorden joined him. On the steamer to America she met Mr. Sandler, a man equal to her in every respect. There was a strong attraction one for the other, which continued after they arrived in Baltimore. This alliance was the basis upon which Mr. Gorden secured his divorce. Mrs. Gorden hoped eventually to become the wife of Mr. Sandler and then she learned that Mr. Sandler had a wife and family in Russia and that the family was being brought to Baltimore by a brother of Mr. Sandler.

She was crushed by this unexpected blow and realizing that she had only her children to live for gave up this man. She was determined to conduct herself in such a manner that her children would be returned to her when discharged from the orphanage. In the meantime Mr. Gorden had remarried. He was frequently approached to take the children into his home but always refused.

Mr. Gorden is willing to have the boys placed with their mother if the Children's Bureau finds this advisable, and I am informed by our legal adviser that this is perfectly legal, but with the suggestion that we have the boys committed to the Children's Bureau so that Mr. Gorden cannot in the future, when the boys become of working age and an asset rather than a liability, come back and say that he

wants them under his care. The boys were never anxious to live with their father as they always felt that he was the cause of their mother's unhappiness.

Isidore has continued to live with his mother and he is an example of a well-trained, properly cared for child.

When the case was to be discussed for the discharge of the boys from the institution of the Jewish Children's Society, the Hebrew Benevolent Society was requested to investigate the home of Mrs. Gorden and re-establish it if it was found advisable to discharge Louis, Sam and William to their mother.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Miss Hanken, have you investigated the home conditions and what are your recommendations?

MISS HANKEN: Mrs. Gorden was home with Sam and Isidore at the time of my visit, anxiously awaiting me because they were eager to be together again. The home was clean and delightfully cozy. Mrs. Gorden said that she had been earning a living for herself and Isidore by dressmaking. Mrs. Gorden frankly admitted her relations with Mr. Sandler saying she thought he was going to marry her. When she heard his wife and children were coming to America she ordered him out of her home. Eight months ago she saw him on the street with his wife but would not look at him because, she said, he had fooled and made her an object of shame. The neighbors know Mrs. Gorden's history and do not seem able to forget it, and accuse Mrs. Gorden of almost killing Mr. Sandler's wife because they say, she still continues to live with him. The first time I visited Mrs. Gorden she was out and Mr. Sandler was out. Quickly a neighbor ran to the corner to meet me, saying that Mr. Gorden was out, Mrs. Gorden was out and Mr. Sandler was out and surely they must be out together, despite the fact that the visitor knew that Mrs. Gorden was at the moving pictures with her son.

Mr. Sandler came to the office to see me. I could easily see he was frightened and evinced much surprise that he had been consulted regarding Mrs. Gorden. He insisted again and again that he had a wife and children of whom he was very proud and must support them. Moreover he

was very eager to see the Gorden children returned to their mother because he feels keenly that Mrs. Gorden has been persecuted and maligned.

I should like to give a short history of the Gorden children when they were with their mother. All school records show clearly that their behavior and conduct were excellent. They were well-mannered and well-behaved when with their mother. On the contrary, when they were with their father they were uncontrollable and played truant constantly. I should like to say too, that Mr. Gorden, the father, is quite ready to give the money to the mother which he has been contributing for the children to the Children's Bureau.

On the face of the information received, I recommend that Mrs. Gorden be moved to another part of the city where they will not be the victims of the meddlesome gossip of the neighbors, preferably to the Southwestern Jewish Center, as the children can be more closely observed by the worker; that the family then be re-established and that the Hebrew Benevolent Society supplement the income if necessary.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: I think you said that Louis was of working age in your report. Has Louis been placed, Miss Kraus?

MISS KRAUS: Louis has been placed. He is a boy of moderate intelligence, easy-going, well-balanced and friendly. He is a rather pleasing sort of boy, although not particularly bright. He had no interest, no particular aptitudes and he was only characterized by a decided want in mechanical ability, so we couldn't place him as an apprentice in the trade. He was placed last March in one of our large department stores here in the city, in the Delivery Department, and he also is getting along very well.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: Of course, you can see the problem here is one of questioning the advisability of returning the children to the mother. The children were removed first, as you have heard, because of the supposed immorality of the mother, but after thorough investigation we felt that the immorality as it existed was not of such a character as to make it undesirable to have the children returned, particularly since the relations between this woman and man

had been broken off. There is no question of general promiscuity on the part of the woman and in view of the strong affection she has for the children and the children have for her, I imagine it would be the opinion of the Bureau that the children be returned to her under supervision, as recommended.

MR. GOLDSMITH: The subject on which I have been asked to briefly summarize our study—the study itself represents a very complete, possibly not so accurate, but a complete summarization of tons of material—is the result of the child care survey made in New York City by the Research Bureau on behalf of the New York Federation and the United Building Fund of the Federation. I say “of the Federation.” It is really a separate organization, but the people at large generally connect them together.

MR. GOLDSMITH then read the following report:

RESULTS OF CHILD CARE STUDY IN NEW YORK CITY

I assume that the subject of this brief paper indicates two types of results:

1. The findings of the study which the Bureau made last year of the situation with regard to the care of dependent Jewish children in the institutions affiliated with the New York Federation.
2. The practical results in organization for better child care work that have come and are coming, because of the study.

It would perhaps be interesting to note the second type of results first. Very briefly, the practical results of the study have been these:

1. That the Hebrew Orphan Asylum which had intended originally to build a structure to care for over 1200 children and to cost approximately \$4,000,000, has decided, for the time being at least, to dispense with such a new institution and to spend the sum of \$800,000 renovating its present structure. In this present structure, the Hebrew Orphan Asylum hopes to care for a reduced number of children, exclusive of the children boarded out.
2. The study has pointed out clearly the need for a Central Boarding Bureau. Steps are being taken by the director of the New York Federation and the Child Care Committee to bring this about.
3. There has been an appreciable increase in the number of children boarded, particularly in the case of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum.