

for nearly a year, this being prior to the establishment of the sanitarium of the Home. The farmer has a wife and four children at home and could easily accommodate one or two more. A widow who has but her grandson of ten living with her, expressed her willingness to take care of additional boys. A farmer of long residence in the colony, who lives with his wife and one boy, said he could give accommodation to others. Another old resident farmer living with his wife and two daughters (13 and 17 years of age, respectively) could also make adequate provision for additional inmates of his house.

The statements that I have made as the result of personal interviews and observation should be sufficient to convince the skeptic that if there is any real desire to put children with private families and let them grow up in salubrious surroundings, it would be worth while investigating the possibilities of the two colonies to which I have referred, and others adjacent to them.

Rosenhayn is not far distant from Norma and Alliance; and from information I have received I feel confident inquiry would show that there were equal possibilities there. I was told of one boy from New York City, who, because of misbehavior, was sent by his parents to this colony and placed in the care of a private family, that he was attending school and giving a good account of himself.

Carmel is another colony in the vicinity with a similar group of settlers, and an experiment would doubtless include it among the places to which children might be sent.

A small start in boarding-out has actually been made by the Young Women's Union of Philadelphia in the placing of two (2) children that had come into its custody through the Juvenile Court. They have been put with families in the colony of Woodbine, N. J. They have been there so short a time that it would hardly be fair to make much of an inference as to the result. One of the children, who was said to be incorrigible, has not done as well as the other, who has given satisfaction. Perhaps it would be expecting too much of a boy charged with being incorrigible to be suddenly transformed into a thoroughly well-behaved person simply because he was placed in Woodbine Colony. If, however, children charged with delinquency give fair satisfaction to families in New Jersey colonies, may we not give desti-

tute and neglected children at least a chance? The inquiries set afoot by the Young Women's Union at Woodbine, have developed the fact that places could be found for additional children. It will doubtless be necessary for this organization, to which the duty of looking after delinquent children accused in the Juvenile Court, has been assigned, to make further provisions for the maintenance of such whose home surroundings are in the opinion of the judges not proper, and for whom there appears to be no place in existing Jewish institutions.

According to the experience of other agencies it would be unwise to place a large number of children in any one vicinity. So the Jersey colonies would merely be an outlet for a limited number at best. It would, however, be well worth while setting in operation the necessary machinery to try an experiment with these colonies. Undoubtedly, those who want to find difficulties and obstacles to placing-out or boarding-out will be afforded plenty of opportunities for criticism, especially at the outset, for it will take knowledge, experience, energy and tact to put such a system into practice and carefully maintain it. The question of caring for Jewish children should be met in a broad spirit. Why not devise measures to ascertain good homes, arrange to place a small number of children, appoint a competent official to look after them from time to time, and if the results warrant, considering the difficulties of introducing a new system, proceed to develop the plan on a larger scale? Then we shall be in a position to know whether we can not, among Jews, establish and maintain a plan which has given satisfaction among non-Jews.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND PROBATION OFFICERS.

Mrs. HANNAH SOLOMON, CHICAGO.

In presenting the subject of Delinquency I speak of a comparatively new field in Jewish philanthropy. This work is one that is not only new, but unpopular; and in order to establish itself those interested must be willing to overcome a very strong prejudice on the part of the older workers in charity as well as the indifference of the community at large toward those whom they regard as enemies to society, whether they are children or adults. What I shall say is largely the result of experience gained in the Bureau of Personal Service of the Ninth Ward of Chicago, the

locality in which reside most of the Jews of our city, requiring help.

[This bureau was established five years ago, when the Hebrew Charities of our city were somewhat disorganized, and upon the supposition that an agency was required in the district, which, with a small outlay, could assist in many ways outside of relief, having paid employes to do systematically the work which was done in a haphazard, hit-and-miss style by volunteers. Our very first winter demonstrated the need for assistance to dependents, defectives and delinquents, especially among women and children.

All of the Juvenile Court work for Jews has been in our hands, as well as the free legal aid. We have steadily had to meet antagonism on the part of our Jewish Charities, which, however, is not discouraging, since we know that it is a natural attitude of Jews in general. We Jews have grown so accustomed to the idea that there are no Jews in the penitentiaries and no Jewish girls in houses of ill-repute, and these suppositions create such a comfortable attitude of mind that the Jewish public clings to it. New York knows better; Chicago ought to know better and the rest of the country will know better unless agencies are created to combat the growing evils.]

The Juvenile Court is now established in Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and New York. Its idea is to benefit the child rather than to carry out the old idea of punishment or of removing the evil-doer for the benefit of the community. The Juvenile Court of Illinois is one of the foremost in the work for delinquent children. The act establishing this Court says that the law is to be liberally construed, so that its purpose may be carried out, which is that the child may receive the "care, custody and discipline which it would have under its parents." Children are kept from criminal contact and contagion; they may not be left in jails or police stations while awaiting trial. The cases are tried in a separate court-room by one judge, chosen for that purpose. The city is districted, and each division placed in charge of a probation officer, who either alone or with assistance watches the child. By the establishment of this court the delinquent and dependent child is placed on a par with property, which has always been more carefully guarded by the state than the child; and it aims to make the state the guardian when the natural guardians are unable or unfit.

Some are of the opinion that the bureau officers, representing the Jews in the Juvenile Court, are going about with spy glasses and a police officer like the bogie man, catching children. The reports are ridiculous, because every case must proceed according to the due process of the law, and the child can not be committed to an institution upon our demand. I need only say to you that, after strenuous work, out of 100 delinquent Jewish children paroled to us, we have at present only two Jewish children in the John Worthy school, five in the Habitual Truant school, the only places for delinquent children; that in over three months not one Jewish child has been tried for delinquency in the Court. From this you can see how absurd such a proposition is. During this time we have broken up a number of gangs, organized for stealing and lawlessness generally, have had a number of convictions against owners of slot machines and other gambling devices, and made arrests for the purchasing of junk and stolen goods.

Through this Court youthful criminals are separated from adults. The children are made the wards of probation officers, interested men and women, who bring to bear knowledge and experience and who make most careful investigations, which they report to the Court, and for which they are held responsible. They cooperate with every good force, and try to ward off all evil influences. In Chicago there were five hundred and seventy-five boys committed annually to the Cook County jail; in the past two years there were just twelve. All the rest were cared for by the parole system and were kept out of institutions wherever possible.

Cases are disposed of as follows: For a first offense the child is paroled to a probation officer, is left at home if it is a fit one, and only after a second or third offense or a serious one, is he sent to some institution. These, for boys, are: Glenwood, an industrial farm school, established on the cottage plan, for dependents and those having unfit homes, as well as for those guilty of slight offenses; a Parental School, which is a new home on the double cottage plan, for habitual truants; the John Worthy School, which is the children's jail, and to which no child under ten may be committed; and the Reformatory, our state penitentiary for boys, to which none under sixteen may be committed, except for a serious crime. Money for a Delinquent Rural home is being collected, and that will give our state a complete system

for caring for delinquent boys. For delinquent girls we have, the Erring Woman's Home and the Geneva State Training School. The latter is a home admirable in every respect. All girls leaving seem to have learned to know the right from the wrong, and if they can only be kept from evil associates, will remain good.

The causes for juvenile crime are largely the same all over. In a general way, children similiarly situated think and act alike as to morals, and environment can account for the greater part of crime. Heredity, of course, plays a part. Physical defects can account for much. Children of inebriates and degenerates are not normal. Yet these, given proper care and removed from evil surroundings, may become useful citizens. Causes for crime are the inability of parents to properly care for their children on account of their poverty, the size of the family, and their lack of power to cope with the evil forces, the great freedom existing in our country, and the difficulty in co-operating with the schools. The size of the family makes it impossible to provide properly for each child or to give it proper supervision. The houses are too small to permit of any sociability in the home or any suitable care for the body; the children are forced upon the streets for play and recreation; the authority of the parents is not recognized after a short acquaintance with bad associates. Added to all this are improper feeding and clothing, the ill-advised methods of punishment or lack of all discipline, and the early age at which they are put to work, removing them from parental care. No supervision is exercised over their play, and in many instances they do not know how to play. The parents are uneducated. In many cases one or the other parent is missing by death or desertion. By statistics of crime it was shown that the average number of children in the families was five, ranging from one to fifteen years of age; that of 50 percent of these children the father was dead or absent, of 55 percent the mother, and of 33 percent, both. The average age of the marriage of the mother was sixteen.

Lack of care for the dependent child often causes delinquency. The crime with which most of our boys are charged is stealing, sometimes from stores, oftentimes of junk or lead pipe, etc. Sometimes they work in gangs under the supervision of an older confederate. One of the causes for their stealing is that it is

easy for them to dispose of their stolen stuff. Employers of children often tell us that they frequently remove children from departments where they are tempted, to another where they are perfectly trustworthy. Teachers complain constantly of the theft by young children in the schools. We know that, even in the best colleges, there is constant pilfering, because the demands are so great, and there is no other way of doing what others do. The motives of children are not the same as those of older people. Children do not realize poverty. They only know that some one else has something which they want. They sometimes begin by being truants, falling in with others older than themselves and what begins in mischief ends in crime. Time forbids my citing cases, interesting as they are and powerful in presenting the actual conditions. The Juvenile Court has created the fear of detection; not the seriousness of the punishment, but its certainty, has become a strong deterrent.

The work for wayward girls is not altogether woman's work. The attitude of men and women toward prostitution is the same. It is legitimized if not legalized. Brutal as it is, it is recognized as an established institution of our society, and, therefore, some of our girls must be sacrificed. The percentage of Jewish girls is smaller than might be expected. One of the first accusations against them is ill temper. They become utterly unmanageable, they have the anger of the criminal against the man whom he has wronged. Our Bureau, which is doing the work in Chicago, makes no attempt to lessen the evil as an institution, but solely to encourage those who are victims, to come to us of their own accord, or to act in those cases in which parents or relatives invoke our assistance. Against the atrocities that prevail men are as earnest in their opposition as are women. I know of many cases where the judge and lawyers on both sides, the jury and witnesses would all have had a good cry, had they not been ashamed before the women, whose familiarity with the cases made them bear them with equanimity, and when the only grain of pity for the culprits was in the hearts of the prosecutors. In our congested districts the girls of fifteen, for that is the average age, must be closely watched to keep them out of the clutches of the procuress and the professional seducer. The subject is not one easily spoken of before you, but very young

girls are subject to temptations in stores, offices and factories, which we would do well to learn and to remove. I do not believe that poverty and low wages are the prime cause of immorality. It is rather the love of pleasure and ease, love of society and luxury, and, most of all, the absence of proper maternal care. Workers have not been taught to find pleasure in the performance of their duty and their work. I do not believe that immorality is more rampant among the very poor than others. Could we with impunity investigate the avenues as we do the slums, we might also be startled. However, the young girls are more carefully guarded.

The average age of our delinquent boys is twelve, of girls fourteen. The Probation Officer is, of course, the powerful agent for reform. She supplements the home and school, becomes a friend to the child, whose confidence she at once gains, instills respect for the parents or guardians, which the child has lost. She must study the conditions of the home and of the school, and be in constant communication with them. The child learns that there is a law which he is bound to respect. The early years are those which count the most, and the home should be the main factor in building character. The school and the Probation Officer can only counteract the influence of a bad home by supplying more affection and friendship, by creating sympathy and by giving solicitous care.

A few general suggestions might be given. We have made a great advance by having the Juvenile Court. We should now have a laboratory, where scientific investigations of causes and results can be carried on. We would undoubtedly find many badly balanced minds as well as weak physiques. Children should be kept out of all courts unless actually required, especially police courts, where they swarm, if they know the prisoner on trial, or if a suit is going on and they know one of the parties. To place a child on the stand and ask him to take an oath is also unwise. He will no more tell the truth under oath than if not sworn, just as other witnesses do, and to have children present when others are testifying under oath to what the children know to be false, is most pernicious. Our public schools must take into account the disadvantages of the underfed and badly housed children. They must teach self-control and subjugation to the will

of the majority. Our boys should be given industrial training from the beginning of their school life, and we should have domestic science for our girls. Women are doing too much of the industrial work. We should be training more girls for domestic service, fewer for factories and stores and school teaching, for which so many are unfit.

They would have better homes when they marry and would be better able to do all their work, as so many of them are compelled to do. The work in a well regulated home is better for them, and they would make healthier, happier and better mothers. We are in need of a good class of servants, and we can supply them as well as others. The tendency of our educational philanthropic institutions is to encourage our boys and girls to believe that they can be in the foremost ranks of society, instead of showing them that they can be such a man's equal even in the humblest walks of life. It takes the university man and the college woman to have that philosophy and outlook. We give too little of the humanities, too much of the practical and utilitarian. If immigration continues, these two are the fields we should cultivate for the boys and girls. The methods of recreation for the poor must be changed. Dances under respectable conditions, instead of the dreadful pestilential dance halls with wine rooms, carried on by the liquor interests; better theaters, instead of the vaudeville attachments to beer saloons, and plays with moral tendencies, instead of those where the imagination of the children is educated to deeds of daring and lawlessness. Since the homes can not be made social centers, our public buildings and churches should be made to serve the purpose. We should have parks and public playgrounds, with caretakers in the crowded districts. Outdoor games would be healthier and would permit the desire for freedom to have its proper outlet. They develop physical power and stimulate mental activities, as well as supply the social needs. And we Jews need education along the line of duties toward our delinquents, a change of attitude toward those discharged or convicted. It is almost impossible to get work with a Jewish firm for a delinquent Jewish boy discharged from an institution, just as it is difficult to find boards of charitable organizations willing to assume charge of such children. No investigations are made as to the cause or conditions. A child who is paroled on the first

offense has the right of asylum somewhere, but the mighty meddlers in Jewish charity politics make it almost impossible to place him. They overlook the fact that the majority of their wards may be of the same nature and have been living under the same conditions, that a little surveillance and care and love may be all that the lonely little charge needs, that the court is always ready to remove the unmanageable child. We do not need separate institutions for Jewish delinquents, but require provisions to admit them to those we already have.

We need better legislation in some lines. A law that children may not sell certain kinds of goods and no junk whatever. In some states men are burned for what in others it is almost impossible to secure conviction, and small wonder if we see the sort of men compelled to do jury service, since so many good men never will. We should have trained officials in all institutions, which will only be possible with proper civil service laws. In our own state we have seen two able members of the State Board of Charities resign because of a political appointment for the executive officer of that board, and ever since these honest, capable appointees have been made the butt of personal attack and their honesty stigmatized as political action. The recent Republican convention has put a civil service plank into its platform which is an insult to the intelligence of the people of our state. What can we hope for our penal institutions when those for dependents are made the footballs of politics?

Our reformatories, as a rule, do not reform. The use to which the human faculties are put depends upon the surroundings, and, evidently, these are not such as to call forth the best. Work is carried on with the idea of profit to the institution rather than for the individual, while the punishments do not increase self-respect. Nearly every penal institution has a senseless and disgraceful system of punishment quite in line with the treatment of prisoners in the Philippines. Most inadequate conditions exist to develop the moral and aesthetic sense. The idea of preparing the culprit for usefulness to society is not thought of sufficiently.

Finally, Jews especially need societies which will help the boys and girls to good, useful lives, as against the many who stand eager to lure them to destruction. Economic conditions are not the only nor the main causes of crime. A prisoner who

was arrested, almost immediately after being released, wrote us, "It seems so easy to do the wrong, so hard to do the right." Children sin because of an undeveloped moral sense, just as the adult does from atrophy of the moral will. The children are suffering because they have been removed from a locality where disobedience was a crime against both the religious and political system, and have come into contact with freedom beyond their conception or power of adaptability. They need the teaching of positive religious truths, of a system of ethics, and a training in civics by our schools and churches. They need to hear in trumpet tones the voice of Sinai proclaiming the "Thou shalt nots," as the law, both of God and man, which they must respect, and to which they must conform. And we must teach them that the Lord made this covenant with us, even us, "who are all of us here alive this day."

Mr. Heymann.—Mr. President and friends, I congratulate you on having added a section on Child Saving to the conference. It seems to me that charity to children is our first duty; it appeals to every one. Jewish Child Saving was the subject of my paper in 1897 before the National Conference of Charities and Corrections. I gave there my opinion, but probably very few of you have read it, so I will present in a few words my conclusions. We have orphans, half orphans, children of poor parents in our own asylum. We have made it a rule not to admit any children whose parents are living, and we have made rules to exclude children whose surviving parent has later remarried, but those rules are generally broken. We take all classes of children. The non-sectarian societies are all favoring the placing out of children. They succeed in the northern states. I do not believe that Jewish children can find homes, although the chairman of our committee recommends the placing out, and the gentlemen from Cincinnati are all in favor of it, but find it more or less impossible. In Philadelphia, where they have the oldest society for placing out children, they have still a very flourishing orphan asylum. My opinion of orphan asylums is to have them out of the large cities. I am not in favor of having orphan asylums in cities.

A Delegate.—Are you in favor of manual training?

Mr. Heymann.—I am in favor of a manual training school in

connection with a regular school, if the proper conditions could be obtained. If we could have an orphan asylum in the country, have the children taught farming, manual training, even extended to trade schools, that would be the ideal of child raising. We are accustomed to take a child as soon as it can be sent to an asylum. It is the only way. We have fallen into the habit of our Christian brethren, of sending them into families when it can be done. I acknowledge that at home where I live we have no Jewish farmers, and I do not see the possibility of so placing them and the chairman of the Educational League is of the same opinion. We cannot find proper families for the children. The good families do not want them; and we do not want those who wish to make money out of them. The best way is to keep them ourselves. The only way to place out children is to place them with their mothers, and that sometimes is not very good. In New Orleans we have tried to have the board erect a fine manual training school, and if we can not do all, we can do this: every one of our children will be trained in such a way that, on leaving us, he will make a living. I am sure we do the best we can in the Orphan Asylum. I am sure we do not fail in our duties. I have seen orphan asylums here and in Europe; and while we take care of our orphan children as of our own, we are sending out the majority of them to drift in the world. (Applause.) Now I will answer any question that is asked me.

Mr. Meyer.—How do your children succeed? Have you any professional men?

Mr. Heymann.—Yes; perhaps we have sent out a doctor or a lawyer in the 45 years of our existence, perhaps two or three Rabbis. One of our men is a rich man down in Mississippi. Perhaps 10 percent are thus successful. What becomes of the other 90 percent? I do not know, neither do you know. They have to fight a hard battle. So it becomes our duty to make our orphan asylum as perfect as we can so that the children can go out and make a living. The only orphan asylum which answers all these requirements is that at London. They keep all their children, boys and girls; do not give them any better education than that obtained in the grammar schools, and then they apprentice them at the age of 14, giving them in charge of the officers of institutions until they know their trades. Let us do the same. Keep the child until that child

can earn a living, boys and girls. We can find out how it can be done if we remain in session, and I am sure we will succeed if we keep up that section.

Rev. Wolfenstein.—I have read the report of the chairman, and I told him I was perfectly satisfied with every word of it. The matter has been brought before us, not because we are not taking care of our orphans, but, as has been said, we are to learn how other managers are placing out their children. I have been asked by Christian and non-Jewish charity organizations to tell them how Jews take care of their poor. I have not been able to learn how to take care of our orphans; they are placing out their orphans because they are compelled to do so. Their numbers are large and they can not help themselves. But let me say to you what, perhaps, is not known to you, that the State of Ohio is placing out children in families broadcast, and it has not been satisfactory, and in the 88 counties of the State of Ohio there are at present 54 children's homes which have been organized during the last 15 or 20 years, and every one of them has been sending delegates to ask us how we are taking care of our children. There is one matter which has not been mentioned in the excellent report of the chairman of this committee, that refers to the mortality of children, which in my opinion ought also to have been mentioned. The mortality of children raised in orphan asylums is, as is known, very small. The mortality of our children in Cleveland has been a little less than one percent. That is to say, we have had, since our existence, about 2,300 children in our institution, while, during the 34 years of its existence, 22 have died in the asylum. It has been mentioned here that there is a tendency in these institutions to have the children taught that they are born to something higher. Permit me to say that it is not so. We study each child, and it is our effort to find that place for which it is best adapted. We want every one of the children to be on the level of every child living. I have raised Rabbis, doctors, lawyers, drummers, teachers, and even cowboys and artists on the stage. But I have drifted from what I started to say. I have made the observation that of the 1,100 that I have raised, 44 have died, and of the 44, three have died in the service of the country as soldiers in Cuba and in the Philippines. It has been observed here that the orphan asylums

have been trying to do their work well and to do honor to their constituents, but at the same time the thought seems to have crept in that perhaps these children are not sufficiently and fully developed. It would be almost impossible that we should not make a mistake once in a while, but we profit by mistakes. I am ready to say that I would prefer to see a boy and girl with its own mother, if that mother were able to take care of the child and educate him. And if it be possible to take care of the mother and to allow her to keep the child, it would be the better way of doing. The children should be left with the mothers and not estranged from the mothers, if only in order that the mothers themselves may be taught. This is one of our special efforts. We desire to raise these children for their poor mother's or their sick father's sake. It is our effort to elevate these children that they may elevate their mothers and their fathers, and we have been very successful in that. We have seen mothers that have been for years the proteges of charity, but as soon as their children came home from the orphan asylum, these children have taken care of their mothers, and would not allow them to be pensioners any longer on the society. It is perhaps not generally known that the orphan asylums, through these children, are relieving the communities from their pensioners. One of our girls who had been a teacher with me, and afterwards married, wrote to me of the blessings she received in the orphan asylum, and these, she said, will be far better known, perhaps unconsciously so, by my children.

[*Dr. Landsberg.*—Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman does not understand the question under consideration. It seems to me that conditions, since the last generation, have changed so very materially in this country, that while I will admit for the sake of the argument, everything he advances in plea of education in orphan asylums is true, it will be no longer so in the next generation. He says our orphan asylums relieve the communities. So they do—but it seems to me that as soon as you make it easy to dispose of a case of charity, you can almost always depend upon it that it is not the best way to dispose of it. It is the most easy way if there be a mother left with four or five children, to take those children to the orphan asylums; it is a remarkably easy way of disposing of them. It relieves the community and those who should be responsible for

them. There are a great many mothers who send two or three children and after those children come out, they send the next two, and after those come out, the next two, the youngest. They not only consider our orphan asylums as boarding schools, but they say so, and when the children come out they are under great obligations for having been brought up in such a beautiful boarding school. [Now I have been impressed by nothing more in the report of our chairman today than by this: the trifling number in proportion of full orphans among those in the orphan asylum. In reality, orphan asylums are founded, not to give orphans better education than the mothers and fathers could give; they have been founded to give them a home and shelter and nourishment, and a possibility to live, when otherwise they could not, and had nobody to take care of them. Orphan asylums were founded for full orphans. And it seems to me that the solution of the question of the housing of children and placing them out would be made much easier if every community would enable the mother and sometimes a father, as we have done for many years, to take care of children until they are old enough to help themselves, or until they become self-supporting. The children would have the benefit of home life. They would have the love of the mother or father which can be obtained nowhere else, and the community is relieved from the certainty that those young widows or widowers will marry again within a year. I have known a woman who had children in three different orphan asylums—one child in Baltimore, one in New York, and one in Cleveland.]

[Now our orphan asylums were never intended to house a thousand children. How would you like it, if you should live with 500 or 600 or a thousand in the manner in which our orphans are housed in these large casements, in which they are held together like soldiers, in which they have to pray by the bell, in which they have to eat by the bell, in which they have to rise in the morning by the bell, and go to bed by the bell—I ask you how you would like it under the most comfortable and under the most beautiful conditions?

Therefore, it seems to me that every one of us should go home with the determination to do his best to enable the fathers and especially the mothers to take care of their own children, and

see to it that only full orphans, if possible, are sent to orphan asylums. My idea of an orphan asylum is that it is a temporary home in which you are most liberal in accepting the children, not with the idea that they are to stay there until 14 or 15, or even 18 or 20, or, as I hear from the report in Philadelphia, until they get married. I do not deny that they are well educated, but better for them and better for the community if they should be educated in the homes from which they are taken.

Dr. Leucht.—Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen: Whenever conditions are created by men and mistakes are made, I think man is capable of correcting them; but when conditions are made beyond the powers of men I do not think it is my duty to correct them in a hurry. We are not responsible, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, that we have orphan children. The natural thing would be to put every child with its father and mother until he is able to make a living. Providence steps in and takes the father away in one way or another, and we are confronted with facts, which, in our limited understanding, we must try to correct. Now, I am of the opinion that at the present moment there is no better method of rearing orphans than in asylums. And why? Because we do not know anything better.

Rev. A. R. Levy.—Mr. Chairman, some years ago when we were about to erect an orphan asylum in Chicago, I collected some statistics. I cannot recall them; I took the orphan asylum reports from all the institutions in the United States, and I found that in the Philadelphia orphan asylum the maintenance of each child was \$182 a year, while in one of our asylums it was \$113. It proved to me the fact that the world at large would favor the placing of children in homes. I found the reason that the cost per capita in the Philadelphia institution was the highest, was because the superintendent and the board of the asylum endeavored to imitate and make it a home. They have had the smallest number of children. We have an institution in Chicago, but I know this: that in one single case where a father died and left three children the mother was given \$25 a month, and she raised the three children. But, we cannot find the homes, and all mothers are not capable of taking care of their children. It is a sad, but true fact that some children would be better off if they had no mother. We know such conditions, and I sincerely trust—yes, I know, that,

since the National Conference of Jewish Charities has come into life, it will be no longer possible in the United States to build an orphan asylum upon the old foundations. . . . I stood upon the floor in Chicago when they were advocating the erection of an orphan asylum, and I said to them: You are about to buy a lot for \$38,000, which is given to you for half price, in the heart of the city, when you can go out further for five cents, the cost of a street-car fare, and buy 20 acres of land for \$20,000. The motion I made to prevent the purchase was carried, and for two years I was able to keep back that movement, but the asylum was ultimately built in one of the finest thoroughfares in Chicago. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have high assurance that whenever there will be need to erect asylums, those who are here will not permit them to be built up in the centers of cities.

Mr. Herzberg.—I simply want to call attention to the very suggestive paper of Dr. Bernheimer in connection with the possibilities of placing children in farm colonies in New Jersey. There are there, I should say, roughly speaking, perhaps six or seven or eight hundred households, and I have no doubt that many of those children could be placed in the country, and at the same time in a community such that they could be brought up under Jewish environments and Jewish surroundings, and, on the other hand, on farms with the possibility of developing in them the farming instincts. It seems to me that nothing better in the direction of placing-out Jewish children could possibly be done than could be done in these colonies, if arrangements could be made; and I therefore wish to put it before you, and I hope you will give special attention to the possibilities of the Jewish colony in New Jersey.

Mrs. Pisko.—I do not believe that all our children will be cared for in orphan asylums; and I know all of our children can not be placed out in proper homes. There are certain evils in connection with both systems; and the thing for us to do is to go ahead and try to correct these evils. Let us try to do away with military discipline in orphan asylums. I think it is cruel to send the children out uniformed to the public schools.

Dr. Berkowitz.—I rise to say a word in regard to Dr.

Bernheimer's paper and the presentation he made to you of a very valuable work that has been carried on slowly and surely in Philadelphia in the way of taking care of orphans in their home. At the same time, Philadelphia has been in evidence in this discussion as possessing an orphans' home which does more to do away with the evils of institutionalism perhaps than any other institution of like kind that we have. Consequently, you have here both systems at work in one city for almost half a century. I have been identified or rather affiliated with both of them for nearly ten years, and am able to give the testimony of personal observation and experience to the exceedingly valuable work which has been done in both directions. As Dr. Leucht has well said, when Providence steps in she often creates a problem which it is not possible for human power to absolutely solve. This is such a problem. No patent system can be invented to meet the conditions. And I put before you the labors of the Philadelphia society as an evidence of the fact that the good in both should be sought. We can not do without orphan asylums; they are, unfortunately, a necessity; but there is no reason why we should not learn wherever we may, anything that will help us in this difficult task which devolves upon us. As one of the guardians connected with the Orphan's Guardian Society I have had under my personal charge, together with my wife, two children, and I am glad to testify to the fact that the system has worked admirably in both cases, where the children have been left at home and we have been permitted to be friends to that mother in the rearing of those children. Now, Dr. Bernheimer has raised the question which I desire to put before you: Why has not the work of the orphans' asylum grown; why is it so apparently insignificant? The answer is very simple. It has been put before you by these gentlemen who have pointed out that the public needs something tangible. It wants a building; it wants a parade; it wants a uniform. It must have something to see or else you can not make an appeal to it; and hence the movement of getting homes has nothing tangible to show. They publish a report that nobody ever reads, except a few earnest people like yourselves, who come here in conference to think about these things; but the general public knows nothing, and where they don't know they can not be expected to become interested.

Rev. Julius Meyer.—I simply want to ask the question: How

do you secure, or how do you bring the children before the Juvenile Court? How do you get permission? Can you secure the children before the court, if some police officer refuses to do it? In the second place, what constitutes evidence before this Juvenile Court?

Miss Low.—The first question is one, of course, which any lawyer will answer. You bring the child before the Court in the same manner as you bring any transgressor before the court. Children are brought before the Juvenile Court in the city of Chicago in this manner: anybody who wants to arrest a child in the police court can go there and swear out a warrant before the police magistrate. The child is brought into court, and if the magistrate find him guilty, or if there is probable cause, as he has no jurisdiction himself, he is compelled to hold him over to the Juvenile Court. If he thinks the child has not done anything he can discharge the child. When the child is sent to the police station (and in every station there are several police probation officers, men who are kind and gentle and who have been picked out for their special work) these police probation officers prepare the papers and bring the child before the Juvenile Court. If, upon the hearing, the child is paroled he is paroled from the district. The second question as to what constitutes evidence in these cases: According to the Juvenile Court law a delinquent child is one that violates any law of the state or any village ordinance, or any child that is incorrigible or any child giving himself up to idleness entirely, or crime, or who associates with vicious persons or thieves, or any child that is found in policy shops or other like places. If I had been instrumental in forming this law most of these children would come under the head of dependents and not delinquents. Seventy-five percent of all the children sent to reform schools have no business there. They are not primarily delinquent; they are dependent only, and that simply through lack of care and attention.

Rev. Julius Meyer.—I would like to ask where the children are sent pending judgment.

Miss Low.—We have a Juvenile Home where the children are sent. It is against the law to keep any child over night in the police station. A child is sent right from the police station to the Juvenile Home, where he stays until his case is heard in the Juvenile Court.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

The Conference opened with Mrs. Pisko in the chair, who introduced Mr. Samuel Grabfelder, of Denver.

Mr. Samuel Grabfelder.—Ladies and Gentlemen, when I was requested by your presiding officer to write a paper on the National Jewish Hospital at Denver, I wrote a paper as well as I knew how, dealing with generalities. I find after coming here yesterday and listening to the papers and the addresses, that you want more facts and figures about an institution of that character, and for that reason I thought perhaps I might refrain from reading my paper at all and give you some ideas of the work of the National Hospital for Consumptives. I desire to say that when the Denver hospital was taken up in the year 1898 in the second district of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, they passed a resolution appointing a committee of five to take charge of that institution and if possible to put it on a basis where it might be opened and to take charge of such patients as might desire admission. The hospital proper, I believe, was erected some fifteen years ago by the Jewish citizens of Denver, Colo., for the purpose of taking charge of such coreligionists as visited Colorado for the purpose of being cured of consumption. About the time the building was erected the crisis of 1893 came along, and the Jewish citizens of Denver were unable to open its doors for the purpose for which it was intended, and so it was left unfinished until the district Grand Lodge No. 2 took up the question and appointed a committee, as I stated before. They did me the honor of appointing me a member of that committee, and when that committee met in Cleveland the following July, 1898, they selected me as chairman, and I reluctantly accepted the position.

I will say, as a great many of us will, in accepting a position as a member upon a committee with the expectation of doing no work or a little work, I knew nothing about that work. Up to that time, I am sorry to say, I had very little interest in it; but I was persuaded to act as chairman and we raised a sufficient amount of money to open the doors of the hospital in December, 1899. From the day I accepted the chairmanship I studied the subject of consumption, and the more I studied the more interested I became, and the more I found the necessity of an in-

stitution of that character, especially among our people. I went to Denver a week or so before the hospital was opened, and I found a condition of affairs among the poor Jews who immigrated to that city, which to my mind, was perfectly horrible. A Jewish doctor, by the name of Robert Levi, who was quite a prominent physician in that town, took me to the different public institutions of Denver, and among them he took me to a little frame place they called the Dispensary. Mind you, that was in December. I went with him in the morning, and there was a line of people of at least fifty; and out of those fifty, forty were Jews; men and women, dressed in thin garments, came there to receive a little medicine and to go back into the slums and take care of themselves the best they could, because the city of Denver was so overcrowded with poor Jews that it was a physical and financial impossibility to take care of them at all. There were two Catholic institutions in Denver, one of them conducted by German nuns.

The longer I stayed in Denver the more I found it necessary that a hospital of that character should be opened. The hospital was opened a little over two years ago, and we have treated in that hospital, up to date, about 310 patients; 60 percent of these patients have been cured and a great many of them have been sent back to their homes and families as bread winners. The majority of these patients, however, have found employment in and around Denver and a great many have sent for their families, and are living out there now. You understand, these people who have been cured and are still out in that territory have relieved your different communities from just that many paupers and that many consumptives. There they are and are able to make a living. When I say that we have so far cured 60 percent of the patients that have been sent out there, you must remember that during the first six or eight months that the hospital was open, its rules were very imperfect. We admitted patients in the hospital that had no right there, for the simple reason that they were in the last stages of consumption and incurable. I am confident, and what I am stating is by the advice of experts and doctors in Denver, that of the patients we take into the hospital under our rules, we can cure from 75 to 80 percent.

We treat these patients every day. Our superintendent, who is a physician, gives them an hour's address about how to prevent the disease, how to take care of themselves, when they leave the hospital and go back to their homes. I had a letter the other day from a patient who came from Louisville, Ky., sent out to us in such a condition that he was barely able to travel and had to stop in St. Louis for two days before he could continue his journey. He stayed nine months at the hospital and left cured. He went from there to Houston, Tex., and I have a letter in my pocket in which he tells me that he never enjoyed as good health in his life and sent me money to buy a ticket for his wife and two children to Houston, Tex.; that he is self-sustaining and perfectly cured of consumption. A gentleman from New York donated a short time ago \$30,000 to build a pavilion. This pavilion will be filled within the next few months; as soon as completed we will be able to take care of 80 or 100 patients at one time. You will understand when I say we can take care of about 80 or 100 patients at a time, that we can treat at our hospital each year at least 300 patients, because patients we take charge of will, on an average, only require four to five months to cure. Now, this pavilion will be completed within the next three or four months. One great problem that has been to my mind a stumbling block to making a national Jewish hospital for consumption at Denver a great success is that we find, after the patient has been cured as well as we can cure him, he ought to stay in that climate at least from six to twelve months. That is quite a problem we have not been able to solve, because we have not the financial support. But when I was in Denver last, the manager of the Young Men's Christian Association, a particular and old personal friend of mine, and I were talking on the subject, and I gave him an idea; he started out at once to raise \$100,000 to buy a farm within a few miles of Denver, Colo., what we call in that territory a truck farm, on which to raise vegetables for the market of Denver. He writes me in a letter received this week, sending me one of his pamphlets, that he has succeeded in raising sufficient money to buy this farm and build small cottages on it, and he tells me the patients they will take care of will be self-sustaining and will earn some money. He further tells me the patients

we discharge from the hospital as cured will be taken on their farm without any charge to us or to themselves, and made self-sustaining. (Applause). Now, that being obviated which was the great stumbling-block in the way of making the Denver hospital a success, the Denver hospital should receive the moral support of every Jew in the United States. There is no reason why it should not, and I wish to say right here I want it understood that the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives at Denver can not take care of every poor Jew that has consumption; we can not take care of ten percent of them, but we will perhaps take charge of and care for, if we have the proper support, between three and four hundred patients a year; but I believe from all statistics there are today amongst the poor Jews in this country at least from three to five thousand suffering from that disease. There is plenty of room, not only for the National Jewish Hospital at Denver and for the Bedford Station Hospital at New York and for every other institution you may desire to establish in Louisiana or any other state. You can not raise sufficient money to take care of all these people, but one thing is sure: I will guarantee you that if the Denver Hospital will receive the proper support or the support it has received up to date, that we will cure for you from three to four hundred poor Jews every year. Outside of the question of putting these people on a farm after they are discharged from the hospital and keeping them there from six to twelve months, or longer if necessary, there is another movement I have considered: I have employed a young man out at Denver for the purpose of getting into communication with every Jewish congregation or Jewish lodge or Jewish community throughout Colorado, throughout New Mexico, throughout Arizona, throughout southern California and all that entire section where the air is pure, to secure some employment for these people after they are discharged from the hospital out in that territory where they not alone can support themselves, but can send for their families, whether it be from Detroit or New York or Cincinnati, and take them away from their surroundings to a climate where they can be self-sustaining and cure themselves or their families of any trouble of that character.

When I was in Denver last, Dr. Lindsey, who is the leading physician of that city, and by the way a Jew, said: "Mr. Grabfelder, do you know that the patients at that hospital have a better chance of being cured of consumption than you would have if you were to come out here, than any millionaire in the United States would have?" "No, I would not imagine that is the case." He replied: "I will explain. When a patient is sent to our hospital, Dr. Levy, within twelve hours from the time he arrives and has proper rest, goes and examines that patient thoroughly. He tells me there are more species of consumption than of any other disease, and in the city of Denver they have specialists upon all the different species of consumption. As soon as the patient is examined by him and he finds what treatment is required he puts him immediately under the charge of that physician who is a specialist on his case. Now if you were to come to Denver with consumption you would perhaps come to me or another doctor, and you may have a species of that disease which is not a specialty with me, but as a matter of fact, of course, I would take it up and do the best I can for you; but the patients at the hospital receive better treatment and have a better chance of recovery than those who are treated outside of the hospital in Denver." On that medical staff we have the leading physicians in Denver, and they are enthusiastic on the subject of the National Jewish Hospital. They give us their service free of charge. We have never paid one cent to doctors in Denver. They are there a certain hour every day and will come when they are sent for, and for that reason there is not a hospital in this country that has the same facilities in regard to medical attention as that hospital. I do not care to detain you on the subject any further. I told you at the start that the Denver hospital was no creation of my own. I was forced into it. I accepted that trust and did for it what I could. But I am earnest in the work, because I believe there is not an institution in this or in any other country that can actually accomplish the same amount of good that the National Jewish Hospital can for consumptives in Denver. There is not an institution in this or in any other country so broad and so grand. There is not an institution established by the Jews that will reflect as much honor on them as will that institution in the course of time.

I believe that it is the sweetest flower in the bouquet of all the charities committed to your care; I believe honestly it is the crowning glory of the Jews of America. (Applause.)

THE MONTEFIORE HOME COUNTRY SANITARIUM FOR CONSUMPTIVES, AT BEDFORD STATION, N. Y.

DR. HENRY HERBERT.

The problem of the care of consumptives is a very difficult one; and the difficulties of the problem are enhanced when the disease is associated with poverty; yet this terrible combination is found to be of such alarming frequency that the aid of state and municipal authorities, as well as of private societies, must be invoked to check the evil. It is gratifying, as a result of such aid, to note that, according to the statistics, the death rate from consumption has been decreasing for the last ten years in cities where energetic prophylactic and hygienic measures have been taken. The recently published statistics of the board of health of New York City shows a decrease of 37 percent in the mortality of consumption during the last thirty-five years. Favorable results of this kind are reported also in Germany, England, France and other countries.

But, in spite of the reduced mortality from tuberculosis, it must be admitted that consumption is still a great scourge to humanity. It may be safely stated that the state of New York alone loses yearly more than 14,000 of its population from this disease. To how great an extent our coreligionists help to swell these figures has not been exactly ascertained. In 1900, Dr. Lee K. Frankel, manager of the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, read before your association an excellent paper, entitled, "Tuberculosis as Affecting Charity Organizations," in which he covered that subject exhaustively; the article which I have the honor to present to you may be considered a sequel to his paper. According to Dr. Frankel's researches the disease is on the increase among our coreligionists; the number of Hebrew consumptives who applied for charity being over 3 percent, against 2 percent of the preceding year. He gives a most appalling and vivid description of the distressing combination of consumption with poverty among them, and if his estimate that the Hebrew population in New York