

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.

4. The Hebrew Orphan Asylum, on property that it owns and on which it was to have built its new plant, is providing limited facilities for the care of adolescent, mentally defective girl. This is, in New York, a new departure, and though it cannot be said that this piece of work comes as a direct result of the study, it does in a way come as a result of the consequent liberation of energy on the part of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum.

5. The efforts of all persons connected with the Child Care Institutions who have been working for a more complete and more scientific child care program, have been materially strengthened.

It was a most pleasurable experience to find in the course of this study, that we had the active and generous support of both the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society and the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, the Home for Hebrew Infants, as well as the director and committees of the Federation. The Bureau was enabled to finish the study with a reputation of having been so non-partisan and dispassionate in its work, that the findings could be accepted with a reasonable degree of good-will on the part of all who were concerned.

I am going to tell you of the findings with regard to the two Orphan Asylums only. The report on the Home for Hebrew Infants has not yet been submitted, and I shall therefore not give it any attention in this very brief summary. It is also to be emphasized that the findings indicate in the main, merely tendencies in view of the sampling process pursued and therefore cannot be said to indicate results that are definitive to the last detail.

The outline of the study was decided upon after consultation with the superintendents of the organizations and with the Committee of Five appointed through the Child Care Committee of Federation. The Bureau attempted to make an absolutely independent study of the children concerned, their families, their homes, and their records. It attempted to set standards for the conduct of the child care work based on the experience of child care workers throughout the country, based on all available literature on the subject, and ultimately evolved principles based on the facts which the study brought to light.

The Bureau feels that sufficient data have been collected, on the basis of the 600 children who were sampled, to show very definite trends in the care of children and symptoms with regard to certain specific pieces of work which have been either poorly or well done. The results of the Bureau's study have been the following general recommendations.

1. That there should be a Central Boarding-out System instead of the two systems, a conclusion which was arrived at in a prior survey made by the Bureau, and which had been arrived at by the Child Care Committee of Federation in April, 1920.

2. That there is necessity for institutional care for only about 900 children. This is a figure considerably larger than the logical figure which might be based on the statistics which the Bureau has gathered, but is a figure which we feel we ought to announce, in order to leave sufficient leeway for error and also for adjustment between the Bureau estimates and such estimates as the U. H. C. and the child

care institutions may arrive at, in view of their settled policies, or in view of necessary changes in policies. There were about 2100 in the three institutions at the time of the study.

3. That there should be a well-organized Clearing Bureau with facilities for temporary shelter, and with its own well-equipped investigating staff, and that this Clearing Bureau should not only make all preliminary investigations at the time children are committed, but should also make all investigations prior to discharge of children, as well as investigations of the homes of children during their stay at the institutions. It is well-known, of course, that a Clearing Bureau had already been established and is at work.

4. That there should be correlation of the child care work and the family care work of the community. Just how far this can be done will depend on how the Clearing Bureau develops. If there is a well-organized functioning Clearing Bureau, that Bureau and the U. H. C. ought to be very closely associated in all the work that deals with children. A well organized U. H. C. or other family care agency that conducts its work so that a minimum number of families is broken up will tend to reduce the institutional or foster care population. On the other hand, a family care agency that consciously or unconsciously increases such a minimum number will increase the burden of the child care agencies and frustrate the development of good child care work. The Bureau has suggested and, as a matter of fact, this suggestion had been anticipated by Miss Taussig, that the cases of such children as we recommend for return with subsidy be studied and experimented with one by one by a joint committee of the U. H. C., Clearing Bureau and the major child care organizations, that careful case histories be kept of the experiment so that methods of procedure might be generally arrived at.

5. That out of such a correlation will probably grow the necessity for granting additional funds to the U. H. C. in order that it might give sufficient subsidies to families to keep them together. The sum of \$115,000 was recommended for this purpose.

The children were divided as follows:

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN STUDIED

HOA	273
HSGS	142
HHI	90
Boarding Bureau of HOA and HSGS.....	120
Total	625

Principles Used in Allocating Children to Various Types of Care

Agreement must be had initially on the general principle that no child is to be taken from its own home, unless there is absolute necessity for its removal after every recourse has been had through every possible agency in the community for keeping the child with its own family. The family care agencies must develop, if they have it not now, a technique for training parenthood and must not shirk respon-

sibilities of real problems in family life by permitting a single unnecessary commitment of any child. It must be recognized that the child's own family and own mother, except under the most extraordinary circumstances are the natural means for the rearing of children, and that foster care agencies and institutions, no matter how well-managed, are but artificial substitutes. A good family care agency acts upon this general principle and is the most vital force for the preserving of decent childhood and the minimizing of the child care problem of the community.

The following classification, then, with which Mr. Simmonds and Dr. Goldrich expressed themselves in full agreement, was adopted:

1. Children who should remain in institutions were:
 2. Children who should be returned to their own homes.
 3. Children who should be boarded in foster homes.
 4. Children who should be sent to other institutions.
1. Children who should remain in institutions were:
 - a. Children requiring temporary care only.
 - b. Children who, if boarded out, might become estranged from their mothers.
 - c. Children ten years of age or over at the time of commitment.
 - d. Pre-delinquents.
 - e. Border-line cases or retarded cases.
 - f. Children approaching the age of discharge.
2. Children who ought to be returned to their own homes were:
 - a. Children whose home conditions have changed for the better since commitment. The family being self-supporting, etc.
 - b. Children who can be cared for at home, provided a subsidy is granted.
 - c. Children who can be cared for at home if both a City pension and a subsidy are granted.
3. Children who should be boarded out were:
 - a. Children whose mothers are dead or, if surviving, are willing to have their children boarded out.
 - b. Children originally boarded out with a good boarding history but later placed in the institutions.
4. Children who should be sent to other institutions are such children as are definitely defective physically or mentally or both.

Allocation of Children According to These Principles

Of the total number of children studied, we have concluded that in the case of the H. O. A. only 19% are or should be purely institutional cases, and that in the H. S. G. S. 22% are purely institutional cases. If, however, such special factors as children who are practically of an age for discharge or nearing the age of discharge, children who had been boarded out and later transferred to the institution, children who should have been boarded out who were sent to the institution, children who should never have been committed to child care institutions are taken into consideration, the total number of children who

are now in the institution and might remain, because of these factors of age, adolescence, etc., in the case of the H. O. A. is 44% and in the case of the H. S. G. S. 50%.

Children who can and should be returned to their own homes, we found, totalled, in the case of the H. O. A. 44% of the children studied, and in the case of the H. S. G. S. 41%. This, of course, includes children in the categories of those who can be returned without subsidy or pension, with a pension, with a subsidy, or with both pension and subsidy, as well as such children whose families are now in need of subsidy, but who originally should not have been committed.

Of the total number of children studied who are now in the institutions but should be boarded out in foster homes, we find 13% in the H. O. A. and in the H. S. G. S. 8%. Of the total number of children whose cases were studied who, we believe, had the families received further and better attention from the family care agencies, would not or should not have been committed, 28% of the children are in the H. O. A., 22% in the H. S. G. S.

In passing, should be mentioned a study of the physical development of children conducted for the Bureau by Dr. Franz Boas of Columbia University brings out the fact that dependent children in foster homes seem to show better physical development than those in institutions. Dr. Boas came to the conclusion, in this and previous studies, that children in their own homes even children with dependent mothers develop better physically than in foster homes or in institutions.

In a general way, it might be said that all the statistical data gathered by the Bureau bears out the general principles and general conclusions that have been indicated above. It has been demonstrated time and again in our analysis of the information that a real coöperation of the family-care work and child-care work is necessary, that many children were committed who should not have been committed, that many children can be boarded out who are now in the institutions, that boarding homes are available. Attention should be called to the fact that excellent progress has been made by each of the two institutions in boarding of children.

Foster Home Care

Practically no foster home that could be rated as "bad" was found among either those of the H. O. A. or those of the H. S. G. S. On the contrary, the investigated homes averaged better than "good." In the majority of instances, they were homes of self-supporting law-abiding citizens much interested in their wards and endeavoring to give them not only good physical care, but educational, recreational and religious opportunities.

If, as a result of this study or as a result rather of the community's deliberations, it were to be decided that the foster care of children be increased, the community has sufficient valuable and valid data on hand to act as a basis for such a decision. The foster care of children, so far as we can judge it, on the basis of the children we have investigated, has proved not only feasible but desirable for the types of children who are eligible for foster care.

General Factors to be Considered with regard to Future Institutional Population

It has been difficult to trace any direct relationship in any of these cases between the Widows' Pension Law, Workmen's Compensation Laws and such other social legislation, and the child institutional population. In determining future plans, it should be remembered that the total number of commitments to the larger Jewish institutions such as the H. O. A., H. S. G. S., H. H. I. and B. H. O. A., has decreased 45% since 1914. Court commitments of normal Jewish children have shown an increase from 120 in 1915 to 190 in 1921. Total commitments of Jewish children were in 1912—1,445 and in 1921—814.

Statistics seem to indicate that the majority of Jewish dependents become so after they have been in the United States at least five years. Practically all the children in the two orphan asylums are native born. The Jewish immigration to the United States in the three years prior to 1914 averaged 90,000; in 1921—114,000. Under the Three Per Cent Quota Law, for the year ending June 30, 1922 only 50,000 Jews were admitted. If restrictive immigration legislation persists, it is probable that about 50,000 Jews will be the maximum number in any one year. This reduction will in time reduce the number of new dependent children.

Additional Funds to U. H. C.

We found that out of the total number of children studied, 102 in the H. O. A. and H. S. G. S. together might be returned to their own homes provided a subsidy were given to the home by the community. In some instances this subsidy would be supplemental to the pension given by the City to widows. In other instances, the subsidy would be given directly and completely by the U. H. C. or Widowed Mothers' Fund Association; in other words, by the family-care agencies affiliated with Federation. These 102 children form approximately one-quarter of the number of children studied and, in a general way, we would estimate that, if one-quarter of the children be returned, they could be returned provided that Federation gave the family-care agencies approximately \$115,000 additional the first year. This includes the additional cost of supervision. This figure, however, is, of course, a rough estimate. It has been based upon the minimum, that is the normal budget of the U. H. C. for families under care.

To sum up the allocation of the children—the tendencies shown by our study of the numbers of children sampled, would indicate that there should remain under institutional care approximately 675 children; that approximately 650 of the total number now in the institutions can, and should be returned to their own homes; that approximately 340 now in the institutions should be boarded out in Foster homes; that approximately 390 children now in the institutions should never have been committed, that is, the families of which these children were members should have received further and perhaps better attention on the part of the family-care agencies.

There is some duplication in these figures. Certain adolescent children have been figured twice, in addition to which the general number of children who should never have been committed, include a number who have been, by our study, allocated to various types of care.

We feel that we have indicated to New York City and to some other communities, a type of study which they may well follow, and we feel above all, that a more scientific spirit will prevail in our own city with regard to the care of dependent children.

It has been gratifying to us to learn from Child Care Workers who have read the study, including a number of Non-Jewish workers, that they have found it of considerable utility.

DR. LEON W. GOLDRICH (Pleasantville, N. Y.): I would like to emphasize an important point. I hope that all the delegates have been impressed with the findings of the survey made in New York City. The survey has conclusively proven that more than one-half of the Jewish children in our institutions in New York City should never have been committed or should not be there today. The time is coming in New York City and I hope very soon when the institutional child population will be reduced to its logical, scientific and social minimum so as to permit us to do the kind of effective differentiated and specialized type of work that ought to be done for children who cannot be cared for in any other way than in institutions.

I hope that this report will give you all sufficient inspiration to have similar surveys made of the institutional population in your cities. I have every reason to believe that the institutional population of dependent children throughout the country can be reduced at least fifty per cent.

If we can go back to our various cities carrying with us the conviction of the facts and findings of this survey recently made in New York City, I think that we shall strike a long delayed blow at a vicious feature of child care work throughout the United States, and that is, breaking up families, performing unsocial work for the child and overloading institutions for the care of children merely for the sake of keeping down per capita costs. I hope that we will go back with the feeling that our family case work must be extended and improved so that no child will be placed in an institution who can properly be left with his own mother, and if not with his own mother then with the best possible foster mother that can be found for him.

MR. JACOB KEPECS (Baltimore, Md.): I have some questions to ask of Mr. Goldsmith. I would like to know on what the principles of allocation are based. Are they opinions, are they expert opinions or are they based on facts?

Is not the ten year limit or the age of ten years an arbitrary age to say that a child of ten years should go to an institution and one under ten should go to a foster home? On what is that based?

I would also like to know whether the survey has included a study of what institutional training should be, what should be the program of institutional training? Should the institution merely continue as a substitute for a home for children over ten or should it be a training school for the treatment of certain types of children? And if it should be a training school for the treatment of certain types of children, what type of training school should an institution be?

MR. SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH: I remember the last question best so I will answer that first. We did not go into the curricularizing of an institution. We did not go into that, so I can't answer a question on that.

With regard to the first question, we arrived at the principles of allocation, as I indicated in my very brief summary in this way: First we tried to get the expert opinions and found it was only opinion, there were no facts. Secondly, we consulted experts, including Mr. Kepecs, and got the same thing. We read the literature and got the same thing and we finally simply had to discuss the facts which we then arrived at with Mr. Carstens, Dr. Reeder, Dr. Bernstein, Dr. Goldrich, Mr. Simmonds, Mr. Kepecs and all the others and evolved our principles.

We evolved the principles ultimately as a result then of a mass of facts which had been presented later to people who were experts. I want to say this too, that if you read the study itself in the form in which we are going to present it again—we are rearranging the material to make it clearer—you will find, I think, it will be very clear, and that these principles, on which careful child care workers have been working for some time represent nothing new. On the other hand to a man like Dr. Reeder, who I understand—and I am not a child care worker as you know—was the best institutional expert and the best institutional manager, and the best man in charge of children in institutions, to Dr. Reeder this report represented the first attempt to actually bring together the facts.

Now of course, I don't know whether that is so or not. I know that Dr. Reeder sent a hurry call for this report when he was doing some work for a group in Ohio, he couldn't get any material at the Russell Sage Foundation, nor could we.

Now as to the ten-year problem, that is arbitrary. That age was absolutely arbitrarily set after we had discussed the problems of adolescence with people in New York. I think if I remember correctly, both Mr. Simmonds and Dr. Goldrich agreed to that age group, for that age as the limit for the beginning of foster home or boarding out care.

It was arbitrarily set because in discussing the problem of adolescence, insofar as it related to the care of children in boarding homes, with people who had been handling boarding children, I mean who were the leaders of boarding bureaus, Jews and non-Jews, we found that they had not yet developed to their own satisfaction a technique with which they were satisfied with regard to children who were in the adolescent stage, if they got them at the beginning or during the adolescent stage.

For that reason, in order to be safe—and remember we were handling a purely practical problem to some extent—to be safe we set the age at ten, but it was set arbitrarily.

DR. LEON W. GOLDRICH: I ought to say that the Roosevelt Conference on its minimum age standard for children to be committed to institutions also set the age of ten, so that the age of limit of ten was not as arbitrarily set as Mr. Goldsmith indicates.

I also wish to say the other opinions given were based on the minimum child welfare standards approved by the National Conference of Social Workers called by President Roosevelt at Washington in 1909.

MR. L. J. SIMMOND: (New York City): I think it should be mentioned that this study did not include the Borough of Brooklyn, which also has an institutional population of 800.

Also, all commitments at the present time are those coming through the Juvenile Court and not through the Department of Public Welfare only. I know, speaking for the orphan asylum, the number of court commitments are always greater than those coming from the Department of

Welfare, and that those children coming from the courts generally remain in the institution for longer periods of time than those coming through the Department of Public Welfare.

CHAIRMAN HOLLANDER: We would be glad to hear now from any of the Boarding Home Departments in the way of a criticism of this report or seeking further information.

Personally, I want to say to Mr. Goldsmith that in Baltimore we have tried to follow the plan of eliminating any arbitrary age limit for either boarding home or institutional cases. We have tried to understand as well as we could just what type of training boarding homes offered and what type of training and advantages institutions offered and if a child after its study and examination seemed to show that it needed institutional care or boarding home care, we assigned it to a boarding home or an institution regardless of whether it was eight, ten or twelve or any such age. We adopted no arbitrary age but simply considered the needs of the child.

MR. SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH: Of course, I agree with you and every one agrees with you, Mr. Hollander, that each case has to be judged on its own merits and that you may find children of an older age whom you can board out. We were, however, concerned with the problem of trying to determine the future child care population of the institutions.

MISS I. SHARAGRODSKY (Baltimore, Md.): Won't Mr. Goldsmith tell us what is the plan for the mentally defective girl. Is she to be held there just to the age of sixteen or is she to be tided over until she is much older?

MR. SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH: You mean of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum? Mr. Simmonds can tell you about any new departure since our study was made.

MR. L. J. SIMMONDS: We are not going to handle the definite mentally defective girl. We are taking the seriously retarded girl, and on the property which we purchased on which to erect our new building, we are remodeling at the expense of almost forty thousand dollars that house, and we are going to provide for about twenty of these children and there will be no talk of the matter of discharge. We hope to keep the children there until we feel definitely that they

have been so trained that they can find their proper place in society, and then to round out that program we have a tentative promise of a home for working girls of that type, so that when they do leave and go to work they will be able to get a proper amount of supervision.

That, I think, will round out the program for the ungraded, adolescent girl, and if that works out well we hope with the help of Federations, we may be able to put up a building to take care of a limited number of what we call mal-adjustment or problem cases.

MR. MICHAEL SHARLITT (Cleveland, Ohio): I would like to address a plea to New York City. Ordinarily a report of this kind should be monumental. It involved considerable research activity and I take it, involved the expenditure of some moneys, and the seat of the research was the leading city of the country holding perhaps one-half of American Jewry, and also including from one-third to one-half of the finances of American Jewry.

For the last seventy years New York City has been institutionalizing its children. The family home method of caring for children is close to seventy years old in America, not on the Jewish side, of course, but on the non-Jewish side.

And I address my plea to New York City, because I feel that while a report of this kind should have had a dramatic influence on a group such as we have today, I am not so sure that it has for two reasons: First, if I may be permitted an idiom, a colloquialism, it is stating in figures and statistically old stuff, twenty and thirty years old. And also because other communities waiting for New York—and that is the point I make—other communities waiting for New York, following the beaten path set by New York, have given up in despair the leadership of New York and have broken away and have undertaken work, originally, individually on their own.

Now I say to New York—and I am a New Yorker by birth and by education—that New York has a definite responsibility in this kind of work. It should, if the statements of Dr. Goldrich have any bearing today—those remarks should have been heard twenty years ago, certainly fifteen years ago and there would have been a tremendous

difference throughout the country. The rest of the country has followed blindly, whether it has been in the social organizations established everywhere or in the specialized institutions. And New York has an obligation with one-half of the Jewry and from one-third to one-half of the moneys of the country and New York must not be satisfied to do a commonplace job. It must constantly be in the lead.

MR. FRED M. BUTZEL (Detroit, Mich.): Supplementing what Mr. Sharlitt says, I wish to give this practical suggestion, that the rest of the country, especially we who are trying to preserve the method which has been recommended here in New York, do its best to give this very wide popular publicity, especially in the Yiddish Press.

MR. MORRIS D. WALDMAN (Brooklyn, N. Y.): The financial side of this report was not emphasized by the speaker, but I think it should be emphasized if new workers are going to carry the message home to the directors in their cities.

I notice that the speaker said that the family welfare agency will require an additional grant of \$125,000 per annum. He also said that this program will save a present building expenditure of \$3,000,000 or more. Five per cent of \$3,000,000 is considerably in excess of \$125,000 per annum, so tell your directors that this new program is an economical program in dollars, the directors like to hear that.

MR. SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN (New York City): I don't think I would have risen to speak despite Mr. Sharlitt's plea if it hadn't been for the interesting arithmetic the preceding speaker evidenced. Unfortunately it doesn't work out so easily. A good deal of that \$3,000,000 hasn't been collected.

In the second place, as it was evidenced by Mr. Goldsmith's paper, the City of New York does a large part of the financing of the care of children in institutions, so that the net cost to the Jewish community is going to be considerable, but I don't believe that that is going to be the factor that is going to affect the program.

Now as long as I am on my feet I would like to know in just what way Mr. Sharlitt wants New York to take the

leadership. Seriously, it is a long time since we have had in this Conference these various city discussions and I am glad that they are ended. New York has its share of failures and mistakes and backwardness, but on any consideration of this child care question it seems to me that New York has just been about equal to, perhaps even a little bit ahead of the other cities on that particular subject. I am not claiming any particular credit, it was our job to do it, but as a matter of fact, those who have been at conferences for many years will recall that the entire movement in this country for boarding out was largely, among Jews, by the New York representatives in the Conference.

It was first tried out in New York and there have been ever since large numbers of children boarded out, and today there are over 650 children boarded by the two larger institutions. The Home for Hebrew Infants has not yet boarded out the children, but they are probably going to do so in the near future.

New York also had the first Jewish cottage institution, I think, in the country, and while we haven't had and I don't believe have even yet so efficient a Children's Bureau as has been illustrated here this morning—and I want to say it was a most illuminating meeting—still we do have a Bureau that has come about under great difficulties, and I think it is going to mark an epoch in the child care problem in New York.

I want to say that because our problem is so large, so complex, it has been exceedingly difficult to bring together the various elements interested in child care, Jewish child care in New York, but I think that the time is very soon coming when we are going to see a very much closer cooperation than we have ever had before, and I think that so far as child care is concerned, people are not going to talk about it in the terms of "my institution," whether it is the Hebrew Orphan or the Hebrew Sheltering or the Hebrew Infant Home, but will come together to consider the question of child care as a whole. I think some day we are going to have at least a unified management of all the child caring activities in New York.

DR. L. B. BERNSTEIN (Pittsburgh, Pa.): I think that all of us who have studied the findings of the New York Re-

search Bureau must feel very sympathetically that New York is certainly progressing rapidly in the field of child care. But it seems to me that the Research Bureau would have rendered a still greater service if in addition to making a study by way of sampling of the New York institutions and of the boarding bureaus, it would undertake a sampling process of the largest, the most major, if I may say so, agency for the care of dependent children, namely, of family welfare organizations. Every one of us knows that the number of dependent children in our dependent families is possibly ten or fifteen times as large as is the number of our dependent children in the institutions or in the foster homes.

We all take it for granted that a home is a home. Now we all know at the same time that a home may be a very excellent home, may be a good home, may be a poor home, may be an apology of a home and may be a miserable home. Now we would like to know, if the whole problem of child caring is truly to be rounded out, what is really the kind of child care given in our dependent families in terms of child care, in terms of child welfare, without depending necessarily upon terms like "good case work." We want to know a little more than merely the results of good case work. We want to know what is being done for the most hopeful part of the recipients of philanthropy in America.

MISS JULIA FELSENTHAL (Chicago): I should like to ask Mr. Goldsmith a question. He stated that the physical care of children taken care of by their mothers was far superior than that of those in foster homes. Now we can't select our parents, but you can select foster homes and it rather surprised me, because both have the same supervision and it would seem, all other things being equal, that the physical care in the foster homes would excel that of those with their own mothers.

MR. SAMUEL A. GOLDSMITH: There are two things you took for granted that I don't believe you can. One is, the same degree of supervision which you can't generally take for granted. That has to be ascertained.

The other matter was a matter of standards. I want to say that the study contains a report made by Professor Boaz. This is based on a study begun by Dr. Boaz when

Dr. Bernstein was in the Bureau and continued later. It concerns the physical development of children in East Side families, children that came from a better economic environment, children in the boarding homes of the H. S. G. S. and children in the H. O. A. institution.

Dr. Boaz's statistics are rather definitive on the subject. Mr. Sharlitt wrote me at one time on the matter and asked whether the case was absolutely proved and closed, and I said I didn't think so from a purely laboratory standpoint, that perhaps they would have to experiment with the same group of children or children very much alike under different types of care, but the tendency is indicated.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 P.M.