



SECOND

New Jersey State Conference of
Charities and Corrections

HELD IN

The Assembly Room of the State House,
Trenton

February 19th and 20th

1903

TRENTON, N. J.
MACCRELLISH & QUIGLEY, STATE PRINTERS.

1903.

SECOND

New Jersey State Conference of Charities and Corrections

HELD IN

The Assembly Room of the State House,
Trenton

February 19th and 20th

1903

TRENTON, N. J.
MACCRELLISH & QUIGLEY, STATE PRINTERS.
1903.

You Are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library

The Third Annual Conference, 1903-1904

Will be held next winter, the exact time and place to be announced later. At a recent meeting of the executive committee the following program was suggested :

1. State and County Institutions for Defectives.
MR. E. R. JOHNSTONE, Chairman.
2. County and Municipal Charities.
MR. CHAS. F. CURRIE, Chairman.
3. Treatment of the Criminal.
MISS MARY LINTON LEWIS, Chairman.
4. Private Charities.
REV. F. A. FOY, Chairman.

In addition to these section meetings there will be the general evening sessions, where matters of universal interest will be discussed.

PROCEEDINGS.

The Conference was called to order at 2:30 P. M., Thursday, February 19th, 1903, with the President, Mrs. E. E. Williamson, in the chair.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Walter Reid Hunt, First Unitarian Church, Orange, N. J.

GREETING FROM TRENTON COMMITTEE.

BY FRANCIS B. LEE.

Mrs. Chairwoman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

But one year has passed since we met within this hall to encourage a movement which, within the short period of its existence, has done as much as any one line of organized effort ever accomplished in the State of New Jersey. Trenton, realizing this fact, and realizing that that she is, to a large extent, the centre of the activities of this State, social, political and economic, welcomes you to-day, proud to be your hostess and proud that her guests have been able to accomplish so much within such a short period of time. If within the next year we shall accomplish as much as in the past twelve months, Trenton will be all the more willing to extend to you a welcome.

On behalf of the Committee I desire to extend to you greeting.

RESPONSE—THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONFERENCE.

REV. J. R. ATKINSON, TRINITY CHURCH, Elizabeth.

Madam Chairman, Members of the Conference, Mr. Lee:

We thank you. We are glad to be here. We remember with pleasure our profitable visit to Trenton last year, and you are the

man more than any other who should voice the welcome of this historic town, because you are no less distinguished as a historian of its past than a useful actor in the present affairs of this State. Therefore, we accept your greeting cordially, and promise to behave ourselves discreetly and we hope usefully.

It is significant that this Conference started last year. I know some of those who had a large part in starting the Conference a year ago, and I know the efforts made and the serious battle and strenuous energy needed. I am reminded of the Yankee, who came twenty miles from the country to town, and saw a tiny little engine hitched to a train of cars. "You will never start it," he said. "You can't do it!" Finally the engine began to steam up with a chew, chew, chew, chew! Still he said, "You will never start her." Then it started going and kept going, faster and faster. Then he said, "You will never stop her." So I hope it will be with us. Once started, I hope we shall go on forever.

Looking at the program you will see that the Conference divides itself into three parts: First, the treatment of children; second, the reformation question, of a reformatory for women. Third, work for men. We shall use our best efforts to rouse interest in the project to form a State Board to supervise corrections and charities. These are problems upon which we hope to throw light.

It is unfortunate that we have to use technical terms in referring to those who need our care. We speak of the defective, the delinquent and the dependent. To deal with these I propose that we bring three other d's into the consideration and that we defend, deliver and develop our wards. We want these children to be protected. There is such a thing as wasted development; we believe in assisted development. It is the aim of this Conference to provide beneficent environment, conditions which will bring about a better life, for the child, the erring woman, the weak, spiritless man.

We hope to bring into the light, discuss and fully define what the duties of the probation officer shall be; that we may show to the legislature that we need these things, so that they will extend the work of these probation officers. This point may be contem-

plated, and that is, the probation officer shall be brought by law in relation with that excellent institution, the Rahway reformatory, so that, when boys come out of that institution they shall be in the care of probation officers, and be led back to righteousness, virtue and honor. Probation should be applied to the twelve counties that have not adopted it, and the law governing the probation officer should be amended and enlarged as the bill now before the legislature provides.

Let us fix our minds and hearts on these three things: (1) Wider scope and greater power for the probation system; (2) united efforts for the Reformatory for Women; (3) wise, calm and careful consideration of the system of State supervision and control.

CHILD-SAVING AND THE DEFAULTING PARENT.

REV. HENRY COLLIN MINTON, D.D., LL.D., Trenton.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Conference:

I must confess I have been troubled to know why I should be invited to speak to this Conference this afternoon. I am such a recent comer to your benevolent commonwealth and such a stranger to local conditions and methods, and my own personal experience, unhappily, has been so limited in connection with the line of work about to be considered at this moment, that I have questioned the wisdom of being here this afternoon. Still, I am very glad to have this opportunity to express my hearty sympathy with the good work you are undertaking to accomplish.

The problems proposed by this Conference for consideration and discussion are not local ones merely; they are common to all the States of the Union. They are the problems of Christian civilization. All homes of patriotic people should be enlisted in this work.

The topic which stands first on the program, the first in importance, is the home. The home is the heart of society. Any heart failure, any disease or weakness at the heart, soon tells on the life of the whole social system. The subject is a double one; child evil and defaulting parent. I suppose the defaulting parent

may be regarded as the cause, and the defaulted child, the child that is lost and needs to be saved, the effect. If I were an alarmist, which I am not, I should regard with the greatest apprehension the outlook of the home in our American life. I believe there are certain subtle forces that stir a large proportion of the American human circle. Certainly the whole order changes; that which has been is not that which is now. The number of childless homes is alarmingly large. Where there is a childless home it is an occasion for genuine pity; they suffer misfortune or sadness of heart, or there is capital crime against humanity. There are homes of those who will live their lives through alone, childless for reasons which providence alone is responsible or for the kingdom of God's sake. Yet it is nevertheless true that the home which bars, deliberately bars, out little children because they constitute incumbrances against social pleasures or public engagements, is blighted with its own mildew; is cursed with its own curse, and chargeable with high treason against the great laws of God and man. (Applause.)

But it is true that many who are blessed with children are absolutely unfit for the responsibility which the blessing gives. The relations between the parents are not the desirable kind; they have no character, they have no real object in life. Their children are handicapped from the very start. Thousands of parents depend on the Sunday or Common School, or the Church, or the study. These things are all well enough in their place, but no substitute for the parent or the home. There is no substitute under Heaven for the home. There can be none.

The divorce question is a very large question. If divorces were made less easy marriages would be more carefully considered, and bonds entered into more seriously. A uniform interstate divorce law is the supreme need in this country to-day. The wife-deserter is a criminal, a damnable coward. If the wife-deserter is a coward, the child-deserter is a brute, for the brute has no parental instinct. I cannot see why the child-deserter who sets at naught the laws of God should not be held as a criminal, nor why, if he is bent upon abrogating the responsibility and honor of the true parent, he should not be held wherever he goes, in any city or State, wherever he may take up his sneak-

ing abode. Such a law, making desertion a felonious, extraditable offense, would then overtake fugitives from justice. It would result in a largely diminished number of waifs of society; the number of objects of public charity; the number of criminals in the country. I believe such a law should be imperative by the supreme power in the different States of the Union.

The work of bringing the homeless child into the childless home is Christ-like. It blesses the child; it blesses the home with the prattle and promise of childhood, without which, a magnificent gilded palace is not a home but only a house. It blesses the children, reunites them which God hath joined together, but whom some ruthless hand has torn aside. The Bible does not give us very great light on this subject. St. James tells us "The son of man is come to seek and to save the lost"—not lost souls only; lost men, lost women, lost boys, lost girls; and he did not come to save them simply for some far-away future home or heaven, but an aching heart, a kingdom of righteousness, a kingdom of purity, a kingdom of clean man, a kingdom of pure, modest woman. I say God bless the child-saving servants, who plan largely, who plan wisely, and who accomplish something for the perpetuation of the American home, for the purity of the American family and for the restoration of the lost.

THE SUBSTITUTION OF FAMILY CARE FOR INSTITUTIONAL CARE FOR CHILDREN.

MR. SHERMAN C. KINGSLEY, GENERAL SECRETARY BOSTON CHILDREN'S FRIEND SOCIETY.

The Boston Children's Friend Society was established in 1833. It is a private organization, and is the oldest child-helping society in Boston, caring for both boys and girls. It is supported entirely by voluntary contributions. Children are received only on application from parents, friends or interested persons, never on commitment from courts, overseers of the poor or from public officials of any kind.

The average daily number of children cared for from 1833 to 1848 was between forty and fifty, from 1848 to 1900 about ninety-two. The average age on admission was about seven years, the average length of stay a little less than three years, and the average age of all children about ten years. From 1833 to 1900 the children were cared for in institutions. Since August, 1900, they have been cared for entirely in private families, under the oversight of paid agents of the Society.

I have been asked to tell you—

First: Why the change was made.

Second: How it was accomplished.

Third: What results have followed.

First of all, then, why was the change made? A perusal of the sixty-eighth annual reports throws much light on the question. In the main, the reports are encouraging and mark progress. But there are many mentions of whooping-cough and measles, scarlet fever and mumps, diphtheria and typhoid fever, and one mention of "a tedious and distressing illness of obscure origin and varied developments which for a few weeks turned the Home into a hospital." There is also this item: "In 1849, when cholera was scourging the whole country, there was not one case in the Home."

One finds that four changes of location were made in the sixty-eight years. Quarters were outgrown, other buildings sprang up in too near proximity, buildings wore out and became unsanitary. One finds, also, that the Treasurers' reports show an almost never-failing item of repairs of considerable size, and with every few years there was something worthy of a special title, new plumbing, a fire-escape, a modern heating plant, a hospital ward, a new roof or some like item which sent the Treasurer borrowing and made an added tax on the energies and devotion of the Managers.

Food for reflection may be found in these reports for the individual or group of persons anxious to identify himself, or themselves, with "some visible, tangible scheme, such as would be represented by a building or group of buildings that all might have a hand in." Here is an extract from the history of a society which voices this very desire: "The dearest wish of the

officers and friends of the society was to erect a building expressly planned and adapted to meet their needs, where they could be permanently placed and where their work could go forward unhindered by lack of room. All their efforts for years were to this end. In 1848 they had the satisfaction of seeing the children comfortably and suitably accommodated in the present institution." This building was calculated to accommodate one hundred children. It was well planned and admirably built. The wish seemed to have been answered just as it would be to-day were many a scheme now in embryo carried out, and some visible, tangible institution stood with open door waiting for the fifty or one hundred children.

Institutions were the anticipation, and, indeed, the realization for a number of years. But here is the retrospect. Quoting again: "Rutland street was in the very outskirts of the city when the Home was built. There was plenty of space about it, and few near neighbors to be disturbed if the windows were open and the children were noisy. But thirty-five years have changed the whole character of its surroundings, and in summer, particularly, while they grow pale and languid for lack of the fresh air and greater freedom of the country, it is very hard to restrain seventy or eighty boys and girls so completely that no neighbor shall have just cause of complaint. About five years ago the force of these objections began to be felt, and some of the Managers cast about for a way of getting as many of the children as possible, especially the smaller ones, out into the country in the summer, where they could be out of doors and grow brown and rosy like real little country children." One result of this condition was the establishment of a Home for Boys on a beautiful estate of eight acres in a near suburb. Here were apple and pear orchards, beautiful shade trees and a fine house admirably adapted to the purposes of a Home. Something visible and tangible had again been secured. This was in 1885. In 1887 a committee was appointed on "repairs, improvement and enlargement." The enlargement was not to accommodate any more than the thirty boys originally planned for, but to make it suitable for them. But, in spite of healthful surroundings, contagious diseases would appear. Here is an item: "Early in

December scarlet fever broke out in this Home. This was a trying time in many ways for the matrons. They at least knew where the sick boys were, but it was more difficult to be quite certain what was occupying the attention of the twenty or more well boys, who, of course, could not attend public schools while the fever lasted." This suggests another difficulty. It is quite a tax on the schools of a town to accommodate thirty or more children coming from all quarters and at any time of the year. The town where the Home was located responded nobly, but the difficulties were real and added to the general problem. Conducting a school in the institution had its drawbacks as well. I quote again from the report of the Girls' Home, where school was carried on in the building: "The difficulties in the way of a systematic course of study are as apparent as they are inevitable. The classes are subject to frequent changes, owing to the withdrawal of the children by their parents and the frequent arrival of newcomers. The standard of attainment is kept comparatively low by the fact that so many of the children come to the Home having had little or no previous teaching, and the great variety of age makes the classes small and numerous."

These are experiences common to institutional management so far as I have observed. The ambition and desire of the promoters of this Society as expressed in the first report was, "To render it, as nearly as possible, like a well-regulated family of brothers and sisters, under the care and guidance of wise and affectionate parents." Now, this is the very tap-root of difficulties, this task of properly knowing and mothering a family of fifty or a hundred children. But whether this appeals to Managers or not, quarantines do. While they are on there is not only no ministrations to the distress of children who daily apply, but there is, on the other hand, enforced exposure, confinement and nervous strain on those already admitted. The presence of nurses, calls from the doctor, the ambulance backed up to the door and some playmate borne out on a stretcher, such incidents afford lively material for childish imaginations.

Now for the second question: How was the change from institutions to private family care brought about? A committee was appointed—not to make the change, but to look up

a new site, to get the institution once more into the country. They looked at real estate, received many letters and circulars picturing ideal locations. The final outcome was due to the suggestion of one of Boston's practical philanthropists. It was pushed to completion by a keen and far-sighted business man. He reasoned that if a change of location were made, the new institution would be overtaken by the same fate that had overtaken its predecessors.

The family plan was considered. Mr. Charles W. Birtwell, of the Children's Aid Society, was asked to meet the managers and explain the method. And just here I want to pay a personal tribute to Mr. Birtwell for his great service to needy childhood, in perfecting the placing-out system and demonstrating its power to minister to sick and well, wayward or normal—giving the needy little one what Jacob A. Riis says is one of the rights of childhood—the right of a mother's arms about its neck.

The first move in the new plan was the employment of a General Secretary. He began his services in August, 1900. At that time the governing body was composed of a Board of Managers, all women, and an Advisory Board of men. There were many conservative persons among them. Many had served over thirty years, others had succeeded mothers or friends, perhaps deceased, who had long been devoted to the interests of the Society. Those who have toiled and sacrificed to erect a building, or to furnish a room, know something of the sacredness of such objects, especially, when a sainted mother, sister, or husband toiled for it or gave money. They also appreciate what is represented in this passage, from one of the reports—"No one who has seen it will ever forget that large pleasant room with its comfortable furnishings, the plants in its sunny windows, and the generous supply of toys, the ten little white cribs, the ten diminutive arm-chairs, and the ten clean, happy, and comfortable little masters and mistresses of this small domain."

It was no easy matter for these devoted people to see the children depart, the furnishings sold at auction and the real estate, the Homes, placed upon the market. And this, let me say, is the hardest task in the closing of an institution—this convincing people that placing out is no experiment, that excellent

families exist and can be found and that children receive warm and loving welcome and care.

Now, right here, let me tell you how the children are cared for. They are placed, under oversight of a paid agent, in private families, carefully selected, in suburban towns and in the country. For a majority of the children we pay board at the rate of \$2.00 per week, clothing and all incidentals extra. We also place for adoption when there is no possibility of reconstruction of the family. Then for boys and girls, twelve and over we expect to find free homes, where in return for services, consistent with their strength and age, they live as a member of the family and go to school. Still older children receive wages.

The new work had to be built up from the foundation. We did not know of a single family to take a child. Placing-out societies gave us a few; advertisements were put in local papers. In this way a number of places were secured. The first year two hundred and thirty different families applied for children; the second, three hundred and ninety-seven. After careful investigation, we find that about one in eight is approved. Each applicant is required to give three or four references, not relations. Then as many letters are sent to leading people in their community whose names are gained independently. These letters state that the family does not know that we are writing and calls for the rugged truth regarding all members of the family. Our practice is to let not more than three months pass without a visit to each child. In many cases the visits are much more frequent, sometimes as often as once a week. Letters are received from teachers, Sunday School teachers and the children.

Now let me tell you briefly about some of the results of this change of method. One is the greater elasticity of the family plan. Housing a large number under one roof seems to make certain rules governing admission necessary. A child must be of a certain age, or sex, must be in good health, able to walk, must have been vaccinated, must be morally normal—some such rules are necessary. This society had them. They have been abolished. The youngest child admitted under the new plan was two weeks and two days old; the next youngest, a little over three weeks; the oldest was sixteen years old. We have ad-

mitted children suffering with whooping-cough, with eczema in most aggravated form, children whose mother had died of smallpox and the children exposed, a child convalescing from diphtheria, a little boy from a blind asylum, another from a deaf and dumb school, a little girl threatened with St. Vitus dance, another suffering with Potts disease of the spine; and then children with moral difficulties quite as grave as any of these; the roots of which disorders reach their very souls and the contagion of which is quite as dangerous as mere bodily disease. You can vaccinate for smallpox, give anti-toxin for diphtheria and isolate scarlet fever, but no scientific discovery has afforded any such immunity from the effects of moral contagion. Its secret and subtle developments are more dangerous than fevers and eruptions of the skin. But such children need care. The family plan affords it, and saves from moral contagion the other children in your charge. The capacity of the two Homes was 100. Our largest number this year was 125.

We keep brothers and sisters together, unless physical or moral disorder calls for separation. We have five families of four brothers and sisters placed together, six of three, and twelve of two. Six brothers and sisters went together for a summer outing. The widest range in age in these families was from two and a half to thirteen years. We have never been obliged to cease admitting because of contagion, either moral or physical (and never shall), nor because beds were full. Now every case is dealt with. Last year there were two hundred and fifty-nine cases involving four hundred and twenty children. Investigation, writing to and visiting relatives, securing assistance of doctors, lawyers, dentists, employment agencies, churches, other societies—such effort found a way out of difficulties otherwise than by placing in homes for a larger number than were so placed, and we found homes for one hundred and eleven. This is, to our minds, one of the best parts of the work. It protects subscribers and the community, it keeps responsibility where it belongs, keeps children with kindred who are fit guardians—and helps restore the unfit. It is the right attitude for a society, right educationally and sound economically.

Now, as to economy. When the buildings are sold and the proceeds invested, this plan will save the treasury from three to five thousand dollars per year in caring for an equal number of children. The properties are assessed at sixty-nine thousand dollars. Now some desks and chairs, book-cases, etc., costing about three hundred dollars supply our needs. We use one of the buildings as headquarters, and this saves office rent. But putting this rent item at eight hundred dollars, the outside figure, you can see that, if we realize anything like the cost of the plant, the proceeds invested should yield at least fifteen hundred dollars yearly over office rent. Before there was a constant drain for repairs. Our expenses last year for the same average number of children were two thousand dollars less than the average of eleven years before the change. Eighteen persons were employed in taking care of the children in the Homes. Their wages were about the same as the salaries of the present office staff, consisting of myself and three women assistants. However, the eighteen persons had to be housed and fed and laundered in addition. Collections from parents have averaged two thousand dollars per year more than under the old system. This is due to more careful investigation, to a closer study of financial ability of parents and friends and to more persistent effort. It is a part of the work of the staff, and is another example of the fruit of effort applied in the right direction. As our children graduate towards self-support the showing will be even better. At first the proportion of boarded children to those in free homes and homes with wages was seven to one. Now it is not quite five to one. The average age of our one hundred and thirteen children is a little under seven years.

Greatest of all advantages is the effect of wholesome family life upon these children. The weak in body almost invariably respond to wholesome food, fresh air and sunshine and well-ordered life. Distorted minds and imaginations and child hearts, tainted by the sin of an older generation, are sweetened through the loving ministrations of Christian women who tactfully guide the little ones through wholesome activity to better habits and to purer desires. We have seen the boy who played truant do so no more, the lad who bore the reputation of being a bad boy—given him by a stepmother who was sent to the House of Correction for

drunkenness—become the favorite of the neighborhood where we sent him; little girls with minds so tainted that they saw an evil meaning to nearly every remark they heard—have seen them grow to really love that which is sweet and pure. Does any one question the value of this larger life out in the country, in families? One needs only to go back to childhood for the answer. The family fireside, with its interests and friends; the conversation with the family at table about the price of coal, of eggs and rubber boots which are cheaper at the next town or at another man's store; the mingling with their little fellow-citizens in the normal relations of childhood—the church, the school; a fair chance to make friends. Compare these advantages with a building and a yard, marching to church in battalions and to and from meals single or double file at the promptings of a bell. The child needs a chance to know the first flower of spring, to have pets, to learn the notes of the blue bird and the robin and where violets and pussy-willows grow, to know the feel of the grass to his feet and to see through tree-tops the glory of the western skies at sunset. If these things do not belong to childhood, why do they afford men and women who knew them as children their sweetest pictures when weary eyes are closed and the mind would rest? To be sure not all children have them, but we can and do give it to those who need our care.

Do they appreciate it? "The birds sing every morning and the frogs every night," wrote one of our lads.

"I like the country; there is always a nice breeze in the air," is the poetic outburst of another.

"Yesterday I was walking the road and some pussy-willows growing along the road, pussy-willows were not growing on trees but they were on little shrubs—spring has come when you see them out."

"We are all well and happy I am glad it was a farm we have 11 cows 2 pigs 2 horses 100 hens and 1 dog and we have all the milk we want—and we have some lovely red apples and we have 4 cats." This is from a little girl, one of a family of four.

Another lad who went to the country for his health writes:

"It is beautiful out here the trees, hens, grass and flowers are all very pretty. The fresh air smells very nice."

“They have a cute little pig out here, and when they feed him he stands right in the trough and sucks his food through his nose. I fed the horse who is called Tony. The road is 2 miles long. I have had 5 rides on it in the buggy.”

Here is one from a boy who has made use of certain articles which are supposed to go with each outfit:

“I have read Black beauty. I think it is a very nice book. It teaches you to take care of horses and how to treat them. I have to clean my teeth every day and read a chapter of the bible you gave me, every morning.”

Another little girl writes:

“I like here very much;—we have quite a number of dollies I have a kitten all my own her name is pansy. I have two baby doves and they are very pretty they are almost all white. I like my school teacher, her name is Miss Putny. And my Sunday School teacher’s name is Miss Fitts. I like our minister. We have a lot of nuts to pick write in our side yard.”

Someone may say all this is very well for a society whose children do not come through courts or overseers. Then let me point you to the State of Massachusetts, with her over 1,886 children at board and 1,814 in families without board, children coming from just such sources. Can they get families? Yes; they have more than 100 waiting for children this minute. The State would not go back to institutional care. Again, the city of Boston has 1,200 children and more in families, and its report of last year says this on the subject: “Nor can anyone doubt who sees the boys and girls in country homes that their lives are happier, their health better and their training of more value than when they were in the Marcella street home.”

But you can come nearer home. What better proof does anyone need than the splendid work of your own Board of Children’s Guardians? Hundreds of little ones now breathe the air of freedom and know the blessing of family life. The report just issued is most inspiring. Read the splendid account of its work in the excellent reports of Mr. Fox, Mrs. Williamson and of the Superintendent, Mr. Stone. And this suggests something which the citizens can do in New Jersey—just as we in Massachusetts can and need to do—and that is try to see to it that our legislators

appropriate money enough to supply visitors and to give these children the chance which they have not yet had. You can't hold the man to very strict account unless the boy has had a fair chance.

Boston's oldest private institution, over 100 years old, is trying to sell its buildings and will place the children out. Another Home in Massachusetts has sent its children out and is to adopt the family plan. Their children are now all placed in families. The matron is a noble woman, loved dearly, both by the children and her Directors. Let me tell you what she says of institution life. I quote from a recent letter received from her: "Managers cannot know the true inwardness of the situation—only one who has lived years in the Home can know. I was passing the day in a family where we have children and went out into the yard to look about. A little girl of five took my hand and looking up into my face in the most triumphant manner said: 'there aint no fences around this house,' and led me out into the street and across the way seeming to glory in the fact that she was free in a way she had not known when in the Home. Another little girl said 'We shan't be poor any more, but you and Mrs. B, will, because you will have to stay in the Home.'" Then the matron adds: "Poor little children, we gave them love and good care, but we were obliged to deny them so much that really belonged to their lives as children. Young as most of them are, they know and appreciate the advantages of the new way far better than we older ones."

If our society had a gift of a whole million of dollars, I should not advocate the spending of one cent in even the most temporary sort of Home. Good families are waiting for children. The fire is burning, there is oil in the lamp, there is a place to play in the yard, there are vines or gardens, an apple tree or a lilac bush to give delight and to help to distinguish the seasons. And there are loving Christian men and women who will welcome children. It should not seem strange that this is true. The family must be the nation's salvation. Yes, just as truly as the sculptor sees the angel in the unseemly stone or the artist discerns a masterpiece in some musty, time-stained canvas in attic or cellar, the heart of Christian motherhood sees the image of God in these

neglected, needy little ones, and that image is restored through their loving workmanship.

DISCUSSION.

Rev. FR. THOMAS J. MORAN (Sacred Heart Industrial School, Arlington, N. J.)—The placing-out system is at last receiving the appreciation it deserves. Well-organized branches of this charity, such as the New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians and the Catholic Home Bureau, New York, are working wonders in the way of securing good homes for their wards. On the other hand, there is a promising increase in the number of worthy families who are willing to accept destitute children for sweet charity's sake.

Not that there was ever lacking an abundance of applicants for the care of these unfortunate little ones, but their motives were generally selfish. It was not the helpless infant, but the grown-up boy or girl that was sought, and half the time the child was returned to the institution a physical wreck from overwork and abuse. Indeed, this class of miscreants delayed for years the introduction of a system that heart and mind proclaimed to be better for the child and less burden to the supporters of charitable institutions.

It must be admitted that the placing-out system never had a fair trial until it was made a distinctive branch of child-saving work. Those in charge of institutions are too much occupied in the task of providing for the children under them to properly investigate the homes offered, much less to follow up each case by frequent visits. Yet these are essentials without which more harm than good may be expected.

Now that agencies are established, with the one purpose of placing children in desirable homes, we may look for glorious results. Even their few years of experience has taught those in charge of the work to be cautious, and while the requirements of their system of investigation may seem severe, they are none the less necessary for the protection of the children. Their questions to applicants are interminable, and the reference they demand must be the best. They withhold all information as to whence the child comes, or whither it goes, and—the greatest blessing of all—they refuse to place children over twelve years of age.

It is quite evident from even these few rules that the child is protected in every way both now and hereafter. The home it is sent to is proved worthy, and the purpose of the applicant shown to be purely charitable before the child is surrendered. Again, it diminishes the crime of abandonment by giving the relatives no hope of later securing possession of the child when it is reared.

When this system is properly developed it will bring a needed relief to institutions. At present we might double our orphanages, and still they would be overcrowded. This is in a great measure owing to the facility with which children are admitted, and the ignorance of relatives regarding the advantages of home surroundings over institution life. Many are base enough to throw children on charity when they could care for them themselves, while others are deluded by the idea that the institution is better than the home for even the normal child. If the reverend clergy would appreciate the value of family

life in shaping the character of a child, and instruct the people accordingly, the institution would always have place for deserving cases.

But neither the placing-out system nor the diminishing of commitments will obviate the need of institutions. The orphan asylum will still have the care of the half orphan whose remaining parent lacks energy enough to hold the family together, yet deserves the custody of the child when it is reared. The Protectory will find an equally responsible duty in reforming the wayward by a discipline that the home could not offer. Neither of these classes are proper subjects for the placing-out method, and there will be certainly enough in each to make these institutions a necessity. The great benefit will be that all dependent and delinquent children can be cared for, each according to its needs.

JOHN E. TAYLOR, ESQ. (Morris County Children's Home)—For twenty years the Morris County Children's Home has been a favorite charity of Morris county. Its property consists of a large house and some twenty-five acres of land at the village of Parsippany, about seven miles from Morristown.

It was acquired by public subscription. It is supported by a stipend of \$1.50 a week given by the county for each of its wards and by offerings from friends throughout the county. The house staff consists of a matron and two assistants, a teacher and an outside instructor for boys. Children are received in the Home at three years of age and discharged at sixteen.

There were about twenty children sent to us from the poor-house twenty years ago; now the average for some years has been about sixty. There are more boys than girls in our care.

The boys are taught, as far as practicable, something of carpentering, gardening, etc., and the girls are taught, out of school hours, sewing and house work.

Our association consists of a Boards of Directors and a Board of Women Managers. Each township in the county is represented by one or more women, and through them donations are solicited. The general business of the Home is done by an Executive Committee, consisting of five members of each of the two boards, and holds its meetings monthly.

Our records show that for twenty years up to April last about 420 children, wards of the county, came under the control of the Home. Of these about 180 have been taken away by relatives.

Homes within the State of New Jersey have been found for 134, and many of these children are now working for themselves and some have returned to their parents. Nineteen were provided with homes outside of the State; most of these were children who could not or would not give satisfaction in homes in this State and were returned to us as incorrigible.

Our records, however, show that most of them are doing well in the West, some being independent and quite able to help themselves.

It is to be remembered that but few of our children are put out in homes before they are ten or eleven years of age, as our experience goes to show that they get a much better early training and schooling with us than if placed in the average homes we can procure for them in the country.

Thirteen children were placed in institutions, mostly for the insane or weak-minded.

Fourteen children died, five ran away, and eight, having attained the age of sixteen years, were discharged, and most, if not all of them, are earning their living as respectable members of the community.

Of the sixty children or thereabouts in the Home now, with the exception of some cripples and defectives, more than three-fourths are children under eight years of age, some twenty odd being under five years of age.

Of the children placed out in homes, several have been indentured and a few adopted.

The system of visitation by our Board of Women Managers among the children placed out keeps us in touch with such children, and we are glad to say that very many of them remember with gratitude and affection that period of their lives spent at the Morris County Children's Home.

HIS EXCELLENCY GOVERNOR MURPHY was then asked to say a few words of welcome to the Conference, and spoke as follows:

Mrs. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I came, not to say a word, but simply to listen. I hoped that I might remain undisturbed without interrupting your business. I want to say personally, and for the State, that I am very much interested in your work. It is the kind of work no other agency has taken up, but which, if pursued, will be very useful to the State. I think the institutions of the State and the people of the State cannot help but be benefited by your interest. As Governor of the State I am interested in what you are doing and what you want to do. I am highly pleased to see you in Trenton, and if we can serve you in any way, we shall be very glad to do it.

MRS. E. E. WILLIAMSON (President)—I am very glad to have the Governor assure us of his interest in our work. We can now go on in better spirit and feeling with the discussion of the important question of child-saving.

DISCUSSION (CONTINUED).

MRS. F. L. BENNETT—I think that a large number of us must feel that the child receives training during institution life which unfits him for life afterwards. He is obliged to readjust his methods of life after leaving the institution. Those who are local workers realize, I think, that the hardest problem is to know how to educate the child. I hope we will receive some light along that line.

MRS. GEO. W. BLACKWELL (East Orange)—I wish to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts. When the home assumes the care of the

children that are placed in private care, does the State pay those homes for the care of that child?

MR. KINGSLEY—We pay \$2.00 a week for the care of each child, for clothing, doctor's care, etc.

Q. Do you find that subscriptions continue for the support of the child?

A. There is no difficulty in that direction.

Q. Do you have waiting lists—people who have applied to you for children?

A. Yes; we put advertising in "The Congregationalist" and also a few locals, and have had as many as five applicants for one child. The second year we had 397 applications, and to-day we have families on the waiting list.

MR. HUGH F. FOX (Bayonne)—Is it not the experience of the Children's Home Society that the placing of a child in a family proves the best advertisement, the best missionary enterprise in securing other families? Is not the child itself the best missionary?

REV. M. T. LAMB (Trenton)—I think that a child placed in a good home becomes an advertisement in that locality for other children. Applications will be made from neighbors which have learned of a child in a family and want one like it.

I want to say that I think Mr. Kingsley's paper was a magnificent one. I was pleased with the descriptions which he gave. It seemed to me exceedingly clear.

I wonder why our friends in the East and West, and a good many other places, have not learned that it is not necessary to pay board for children. We [the Children's Home Society] have placed in New Jersey some eight hundred children who have come to our care, and we never take board except when they are left here temporarily. We never take board in families. Of course there are children we do not handle; we could not handle all classes of children. We have no difficulty in finding free homes for every homeless child, and the secret we shall be very glad, of course, to communicate to those who pay large sums of money for board.

H. L. SABSOVICH (Woodbine Colony)—We have children who were abandoned by parents and those who never had a home, orphans who had been taken care of by some orphans' asylum, and abandoned children in the streets.

We take care of these children for three years, when they are sent out in the world to take care of themselves. Children brought up in these institutions are about as competent as a newly born child. When we sent a number to Philadelphia to take the train for Lancaster they were crying like babies.

We have come to the conclusion that while the institution is a necessity to train boys in certain professions, we have made up our minds to keep boys one year, and for the second summer to send them away; let him go and get a chance at life and hustle for himself. We shall try that this summer. We are shortening our course from three years to one year. We will give protection to boys and girls for one year instead of three and let them hustle afterwards. We shall look after their work nevertheless, but it will not be institution life, but rather home influence.

Mr. Fox—Education to the State applies to education by the State. It is time that our educational system should be looked into. More stress should be laid upon the physical and moral education of the child. That implies physical examination of all children in the public schools; it implies greater facilities in the way of recreation, amusement, organized athletics, etc.

Mr. KINGSLEY—I hope that this assembly will not get the impression that I think caring for children is easy. I think anybody who has a child in the home is conscious of the fact. The problem varies, but it is a problem of responsibility from beginning to end. We have admitted several boys and girls whom they would not admit to any institution in the State; they were too bad, but we are going to save every one of them.

In regard to paying board. When we pay board the reason is this: there are children who can never be taken in families. In the family of one child the father is now in Colorado, ill with consumption. His boy was brought to us. We told the father as soon as he came back his boy would be waiting for him. When the man gets well he will come back. He has been gone for six months. No woman can properly mother a hundred children, but the heart can.

THE NEED OF A SEPARATE PLACE FOR DETAINING JUVENILES AWAITING TRIAL.

REV. WILLIAM AIKMAN, D.D., PROBATION OFFICER, ATLANTIC CITY.

(Read by title.)

WORK FOR NEGLECTED CHILDREN.

REV. FR. F. A. FOY, ORGANIZED AID ASSOCIATION, JERSEY CITY.

The various systems of charities and corrections in this country took their rise in the early half of the nineteenth century. As soon as men found themselves comparatively secure in their political rights, they opened their eyes to the evils affecting society from poverty, disease and crime. Poverty came in for the first attention, and not until the century was well on the wane were the two other sources of evil, disease and crime, studied and treated seriously.

The opening of the century found the English poor law system transplanted here, and how to improve that system on the lines already established was the chief concern. As for children,

there was no classification, and neglected children were simply regarded as destitutes and were treated in the same manner as destitute adults.

Gradually, however, there crept into the law a recognition of neglect as a cause for dependency in children, and in addition to houses of refuge and reformatories, many private and public child-saving agencies grew up for the rescue and care of neglected as well as destitute children. The last quarter of the nineteenth century was rich in development of such work.

Still, we have neglected children with us, and probably they are now more numerous than ever before. It was the work of the nineteenth century to have created institutions and organizations, both public and private, for the rescue and care of the neglected child. But it has remained for the twentieth century to go down deeper into the subject; to attack the causes producing this class of children, and to deal with the subject from the preventive as well as correctional side.

Before endeavoring to treat the matter on these lines, however, let us understand what is meant by neglected children. Within the meaning of this address a neglected child is one who is deprived of the care and training which a good home should supply, to such an extent that his future career becomes a menace to the community. It therefore includes a child abandoned by parents or guardians; a child permitted to pursue a wayward or criminal bent; the child of intemperate or vicious parents; a child cruelly treated so as to diminish his moral or physical powers; a child allowed to grow up in ignorance and in neglect of school facilities; a child put at labor or allowed to go to labor unsuitable to its years, or that may be detrimental to its physical or moral well being.

Now, all these types of the neglected child exist among us. Take the case of abandonment: It generally involves the desertion of the father, oftentimes leaving the mother and children destitute. Whether it is because the notion of the marriage tie is losing its sanctity, or for other reasons, the cases of desertion on the part of husbands are becoming entirely too frequent, and some more drastic remedy would seem to be necessary than that supplied by our present laws. Our State Board of Childrens'

Guardians has used the existing legal remedies with good effect in many cases; and yet, as you will see by his report, the President of the Board feels compelled to ask that desertion of such a character should be made a felony, and certainly the suggestion is worthy of serious consideration. There is also the case of the stay-at-home deserter, or the husband who is able but not willing to work.

Morally he is also a deserter, and worse than his companion type, since he insists on imposing his own keep on his afflicted family. New York has organized a sort of Klondyke system, by which this class of delinquents is compelled to use the pick and shovel for a stated time, in order to revive their taste for work. We should look with interest upon this experiment.

Under this title of neglected children comes up the whole subject of child labor, which has been receiving so much deserved attention for the past few years; and certainly those who are familiar with the facts developed in this State through the efforts of the President of our State Board of Childrens' Guardians, and have also read the recommendations of our Governor on the subject, must realize the stern necessity of more vigorous preventive and corrective measures affecting child labor. But we have not done with the subject of child labor when we have passed a factory inspection law.

There are children, and their name is legion, not working in factories, who command our attention. New York has taken the lead in an investigation which shows that thousands of children of tender years are subjected to a life quite as hard and far more degrading than that of the factory children, and attention has been called to the large number of children employed by bakeries and laundries in lifting and carrying loads from house to house, and to the army of newsboys, bootblacks, peddlers, office boys, messengers and telegraph boys, and those who deliver for the express companies.

There are children, it is said, boys and girls, who work before and after school, cleaning the hallways and basements of the poorer flats and hotels and washing dishes in the kitchens of restaurants. And it is further shown that a large number of these children are working without any family necessity, and in fact in

many cases for a few pennies in order to free themselves from parental authority; and that in many other cases parents are grinding the lives out of these little ones without a pretext of justification. And think you, my friends, that such conditions do not exist also in New Jersey?

Depraved human nature is a constant factor, and, given the same conditions, will also produce the same result. Not very long ago I met a boy at midnight on a street in Jersey City. On questioning him I found he was returning from work, and had been from 7 o'clock in the morning until this late hour employed by a bottler on a delivery wagon. He was about 10 years old and his wages were \$3 a week. What of the newsboys, boot-blacks and waifs of every description who people our streets every day? Here is a very good field for study and work on the part of those who are interested in neglected children. I hear someone say that there may be a case perhaps of a poor widow with small children, who is compelled to have her boy, though he be young indeed, work in such a manner. But my answer is that while such may be the case, and will palliate to some extent the evils of a situation, nevertheless it is the duty of society to seek out that widow and relieve her condition of destitution rather than have the laws of nature and humanity subverted. The rule would seem to be this: The family which can support itself without child labor must do so, and the family which cannot support itself without child labor is truly destitute and must be helped by society.

Again, there is the child of intemperate or vicious parents, or whose home surroundings are immoral. Such a child is surely neglected and often causes the greatest perplexity for child-caring agencies. Where the evil conditions are very pronounced, the police power of the State can be invoked with good effect to attack such conditions and bring the guilty parties to justice; but what is of the most concern is the right to the custody of a child so as to remove it from a bad home and to secure to it a good home in an institution or family of its own religious faith. The first question is always of course whether the home can be purified and the child saved without removal; but if it cannot, and this is made manifest to a committing judge, then there should be

the power of awarding the custody of the child to a society for the prevention of cruelty to children, or to some organization exercising the same rights under the law. In this State a charity organization, such as the Organized Aid Association of Jersey City, has all the powers and rights of a society for the prevention of cruelty to children, and may take and place out a child where there is a case of cruelty. But cruelty is a term which the courts are inclined to interpret strictly, and for this reason there does not seem to be adequate provision in our law for the protection of a child such as we have referred to, whose case is not so much one of physical maltreatment as it is of subjection to immoral and debasing influences at home.

The State Board of Children's Guardians has jurisdiction only over destitute children received from the almshouse, and cruelty protection societies and organized aid associations engaged in such work can attend to only those cases where there is cruelty in the legal sense of the word. Here, then, is a large class of cases to which the protection of child-caring agencies should be extended and for which there does not appear to be the requisite legal provision.

A further class of neglected children are those whose education is entirely ignored and who are not compelled by parental or public authority to take advantage of our school systems. It is appalling the extent to which this duty making for good citizenship is evaded. Apart from cases of child labor which have been considered, the number of children neglecting school in our large cities where there is no regular system against truancy is amazing. We have truancy laws, but they are for the most part a dead letter, and not until penalties are visited on parents and guardians and truant officers are appointed and made to perform their duty, shall we have done justice to this class of neglected children.

There are before the Legislature of New York at the present time, four bills (copies of which I hold in my hand) drawn to meet the exigencies of the child labor situation in that State—to more thoroughly regulate the employment of children in factories and mercantile establishments, and to make provision also for

office boys, delivery and express boys, as well as boys engaged in street work, to wit, newsboys, bootblacks, etc.

These bills are based upon a careful study of the subject of child labor and suggestions are drawn from the laws of other States. A very important feature of this newly proposed legislation is the effort to harmonize the regulation of child labor and street trades with compulsory education. A moment's thought will tell us that the subjects of education and child labor are closely related, and that the regulation of one should be made to harmonize most thoroughly with the regulation of the other.

These bills attempt this task, and boards of health, school teachers, school officers and the police department are made to co-operate in a system (not at all complicated) that promises the very best results for the proper restriction and regulation of child labor. Would it not be well for us to make use of these suggestions from a neighboring State which is dealing with conditions very similar to our own?

These conference addresses cannot be exhaustive, but only suggestive, and I can only hope to have pointed out a few directions in which we may all bend our energies in behalf of neglected children.

HOW SHOULD OUR PROBATION LAW BE AMENDED?

HON. ALFRED F. SKINNER, COUNTY JUDGE, ESSEX COUNTY, NEW
JERSEY.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I confess to having been so interested in the papers already heard this afternoon that I feel that I shall not be able to introduce you to any new subjects. The care of children in institutions or in families is a subject of special interest to me because I happen to know of an institution, which has been referred to by Mrs. Williamson, conducted by Father Moran, have seen the children and the good work done there, and have been indebted to him for assistance outside of the county line supposed to bound his work. I feel like saying a good word for him.

The subject assigned to me, however, is "How Should our Probation Law be Amended?" I do not propose to discuss the probation law itself, as I realize that I am not addressing a body made up of people who have not given the subject study or that have not a full conception of it. I do not have to explain what the probation system is. It is not an old system with us, but has been in use long enough for its splendid influence, its large function in penal discipline, to have been fully realized. In Essex county, where it has been tried for three years, every one who has had to do with it is in favor of its continuance, and grateful for its existence. We would not know how to get along without it. It is working well there. Probably very few of the communities know how well, because the work is quietly done, and for the most part, behind the scenes. I could tell you many things if I had the time.

I would like to speak specially of the work being done with the boys by the Assistant Probation Officer, Miss Mary Philbrook, who has been giving her service, without pay, her time, energy and her heart to the work; how she has taken these boys and met them every Monday. I can see the quick response that they make to the work. I can see how easily the transition is from the bad boy to the good boy, or at least to the reasonably good boy, because we do not have to get them where we can call them good. I do not believe much in the existence of good boys. There are boys and there are bad boys. But we can see how easy it is to kindle in the hearts of those boys the fire of ambition, and the spirit of self-respect, two qualities which lay the foundation for all humanity, and how easy it is to instill in the idler and street Arab the spirit of industry. I am not talking about hopes, prospects, expectations; I am talking about tangible, practical results under my eye as introduced in Essex county.

We, in Essex, want to introduce some changes in methods that have possibly already been anticipated in other counties that require no change in the law. The probation system imposes certain conditions on the boy; he must pay some small weekly stipend; he must work, and in default upon his part, a punishment of the law comes down upon him as it would have done under the old plan had there been no probation system. There

is another side to that, involved in the suggestion made by Miss Philbrook not long ago; the present law simply imposes upon the boy certain conditions, a certain consequence if he failed to meet these conditions, but does not include anything of reward for good conduct if he does meet the condition; thus leaving out the element of hope for reward. Her suggestion was that we should have a rule, by which, should he conform to the condition imposed upon him, he should be reported to the agent who placed him on probation, and be relieved of some of the conditions that had been imposed upon him, as, for example, if his term is three years, or that he should pay the county the sum of fifty cents a month for a time, or that he should report weekly to the probation officer if at the end of six months his conduct had been such as in his opinion to justify it, the probation officer can recommend that so much be taken off his time of probation, or that he be relieved of, part, if not part, all the remaining fine to be paid, or be told, instead of reporting weekly, monthly, thus lifting that much of the burden of the probation law kept on him for his restraint. To accomplish that no change in the probation law is needed. The power that the law gives to the county judge to make rules and regulations for the government of the probation officers and those under his care and fix the time or term is ample, probably, and believing that it is, we have framed, in Essex county, two additional rules which say: the probationer shall at the end of his term be discharged if the probation officer shall report to the judge that his conduct has been such as is in compliance with the conditions imposed upon him. The other rule is, if at any time the probation officer reports recommending that he be relieved of so much of the burden put upon him, as part of the term of probation, it be done. We can extend the system. What we want is not a change in the law, but an extension of the law. It is a system enforced in the county, and we want to see it extended to every police magistrate, every municipality in the State, and in townships to justices of the peace. You will see at once that it would be difficult to accomplish this extension if it was left to the municipality to appoint a probation officer maintained by the treasury of the State or town or township

where they would perhaps think they could not afford it. The system would be slow and it would probably take years to reach some parts of the State. For that reason it seems to be best and proper to draft it upon the county system now in force. Such a bill has been prepared and was I believe yesterday introduced in the Legislature by Mr. Boyd, of Essex county. It provides that the police, justices of the peace, recorder, or whatever his name may be, any magistrate in any municipality in this state, may, when a boy is convicted of crime, or of being disorderly, in addition to the power that he now has, and instead of pronouncing some sentence, suspend sentence and impose a condition upon suspension of sentence, including committing to the probation officer of the county for a length of time as the judge may decide. Then, in order to effect the transfer of that offender from the municipal court to the county system, the bill provides that the police magistrate shall send the child to the county probation officer, together with a copy of the complaint upon which the boy, girl or offender, whether juvenile or not, was convicted, together with such statement of the history and antecedents as may be taken. The offender is told to report to that probation officer, and from that time is under the care of the county probation officer, and subject to all rules and regulations as though committed to the probation officer by the county judge. The reasons in favor of the county probation system are several. One of them is, that when a police judge tries a man for crime, he sends the offender to the county jail, and the county probation system is only a substitute for the jail, a substitute in most cases vastly superior to the original article, so there is every propriety in putting upon the county system an additional branch for those offenders who are tried in the police courts, and the county ought not to pay the courts. The city should not, because it is done at county expense, and the county ought not. The probation system wherever tried in this State has been found to be substantial. All probationers committed from the police court if not sent to the county probation officer would go to the county jail, there to be kept at the county's expense, a much larger expense than if in the hands of probation officers. There seems to be every reason for economy for this institution of the county

system to the police courts without providing a separate probation sentence. I trust that this bill will be freely urged by every person here. Unless I am mistaken, when this bill is passed you will have a probation system working by a method which has been felt would be practical, enforced in every court, big or little, in this State, where any offender, juvenile or otherwise, is brought for trial. You will find also that if this bill is extended to disorderly persons it will be practicable. As the law now stands it is not applicable except to those charged with crime. The courts of Ohio prohibit disorderly conduct and other things a person is not supposed to do applying to disorderly conduct. Many persons are brought before a police magistrate and the charge is not crime, but another one of these many offenses that come under the head of disorderly conduct, and he cannot commit to the probation officer.

I know of no other changes in the probation law, unless it is one that is included in the juvenile court act, a bill for the establishment of a juvenile court that is now before the Legislature of this State. It is Senate bill No. 168. I can only refer to it in the time I have in so far as it affects the probation system. This bill gives to the county judge the power of committing to the probation officer those who are brought before him charged with habitual vagrancy, habitual truancy, and incorrigibility, girls as well as boys.

If a child is brought before the police judge, he commits the offender, if under sixteen years of age, to the county jail, and then sends a copy of the complaint to the county judge, and this judge institutes a sort of fraternal inquiry into the general character of the boy, whether he is a fit subject for the home, and if he thinks he is, he sends him to the State Home for Boys or the State Home for Girls. If he thinks he or she is not a fit subject for the State Home he has no power to do anything else. Now, this act gives to the county judge that power of sending to the probation officer juvenile offenders charged with vagrancy, habitual truancy or incorrigibility. This juvenile court act is intended to make more definite the efforts we have been making in Essex county to have juvenile care. This effort has been possible only through the assistance and co-operation of a young man in

the county, an attorney, Mr. William H. Parry, one of those quiet workers, of whom there are so many, but so many less than we wish there were, doing work of this kind without appearing in the public eye. He reforms all the boys and girls brought to him, conducting their trials and investigating their cases. He has also prepared this juvenile bill, which is the one now before the Legislature.

Without being able, then, to suggest any changes in the probation system, and calling your attention to these suggestions that are now proposed to be embodied in the law, it remains for me to say that other workers in this field have had experience, and now is the time, the very acceptable time, for the making of suggestions. In the discussion which may follow the suggestions may be embodied in the bill that I have referred to as now pending. We may get all the changes we think or suggest.

I want to say, in closing, sometimes you will hear this probation system, sometimes other phases of the work here discussed, spoken of as the work of sentimentalists. That is a kind of a name that is easy. It is not after all a bad name. The presence of wholesome sentiment in a public movement is good, because we can hardly conceive of any large public movement without sentiment.

I want to say that this probation system commends itself on the score of economy, dollars and cents; hard-headedness as distinguished from soft-heartedness. It is the most economical division in the administration of the criminal law that, to my knowledge, has ever been devised. In fact, it is only within recent years that there has been any division, any improved condition, that could be said to be in the direction of economy. Most of our methods have been costly. This one is in the direction of economy. It can commend itself to the hard-headed citizen because it stands for and is the best result, the best effort, of enlightened self-interest, self-interest to be sure, but self-interest that is enlightened by the spirit of humanity. It stands for the old phrase "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." It is cheaper, better to save the boy of to-day, than it is to care for the criminal of the future. It is the first substantial step in the direction of dealing with the problem of crime at the fountain-

head at the time when criminal impulse has begun, when criminal habits are first formed. It has taken its place, and within a short time, within the next five years of the system, we shall have in every county in the State a method of dealing with offenders, particularly juvenile offenders, which will be, that if complaint is made against a boy or girl his or her conditions and act will be catalogued. It should not be called crime. In a crime or any other case it should be called juvenile delinquency, juvenile disorderly conduct, or whatever term may be proper, and not crime, so that the boy or girl may be started up in life not with the record of a criminal.

DISCUSSION.

HON. C. V. D. JOLINE (County Judge, Camden)—The subject to be discussed is one of the most serious that can engross public minds. It is needless to say that society craves for peace, respect for rights of others, and observance of law. It is just as needless to say that infractions of law must be punished. But the question that vexes the penologists and legislators is how to punish. The old way was in a manner that would hurt, that would sting, degrade. But the evolution of morals and the study of heredity have proved this to be wrong, and now punishment has a double purpose: first, punitive; second, corrective. The criminal must feel the reproof of the law. But it must be given in such a way that you will not make of him a worse criminal, a confirmed criminal. Those of tender mind, in the formative period of life, and those who have committed a first offense, should not be placed in contact with debased, abandoned criminals. The law as a general thing confers upon the judge the discretionary power of either sending to jail or of imposing a fine, with the injunction that the criminal shall be committed to jail until the fine is paid. To one who has no means, or who is eking out a precarious existence by daily toil, this latter is equivalent to imprisonment. It is true that in the Criminal Procedure Act there is power given to the Board of Freeholders to remit one day of every six, or to remit the fine with the advice of the judge. While the latter may be exercised, it will be observed that the criminal may have lost his position, his means of livelihood, and may have become a cynic, a misanthrope, a candidate for state prison in the future.

Herein the probation law may serve a good purpose. The probation officer is a creature of statute, his powers and duties are defined by statute, and neither he nor the court can exceed them. They are now twofold: First, to inquire into the antecedents, character and offense of every one arrested for crime; second, to assume the care of a convicted person for such time and upon such conditions as the court shall determine and subject to its established rules and regulations. The courts may, if the interests of justice require, impose the penalty provided by law.

The act has, I think, worked well in Camden county. Mr. White, the probation officer, has hardly had time to reduce his work to a system, but will, with more time and ampler experience, do so.

There are several amendments which suggest themselves to me. First, probation for parties awaiting trial; second, for parties fined and in jail, power to commit to probation officers upon giving obligation to pay fine; third, power in the first instance to commit to probation officer upon giving obligation to pay fine; fourth, power to remit time for good behavior.

C. H. EDMOND (Probation Officer, Mercer county)—An amendment that should be made to the probation law is, that when a girl or boy under the age of sixteen years is charged and convicted, or pleads guilty to a crime for the first time, their name should not be entered on the criminal record of the county, providing that the said boy or girl is put on probation.

It is the duty of the probation officer to assist the juvenile offender to become a good citizen, and in many cases his labor is not in vain.

I have the names of thirty-three boys on my book who are under sixteen years. These boys have all been before the court once, but may never commit another crime, and we hope that they never will. They may grow up to be honorable men, but that does not alter the fact that their names are recorded in the criminal record of Mercer county. You may say that a record must be kept. In answer I would say that it need not be a criminal record. The probation officer has a record in which he enters the name of every person placed in probation, and in the case of a juvenile that should be a sufficient record.

MOORE WHITE (Probation Officer, Camden county)—In Camden county those who furnish freehold security for the amount of fine and cost are let go, and they earn their fines and cost and pay to the probation officer as the judge deems necessary; under \$50, one dollar per week; over \$50, two dollars per week; over \$100, the judge makes a special rate, according to the man's or woman's earning capacity.

PROBATION IN CAMDEN COUNTY.

MOORE WHITE, PROBATION OFFICER.

A Probation Officer was appointed by Hon. Charles V. D. Joline, Judge of the Common Pleas, Quarter Sessions and Orphans' Courts of the county of Camden, New Jersey, on September sixteenth, nineteen hundred and two. Since that time twenty-eight probationers have been placed in our charge, and entered upon the record-book up to and including the sixteenth of February, 1903, as follows:

Adults, males, 12; females, 3. Boys, 16 to 21, inclusive, 7; boys, 12 to 16, inclusive, 6. Arrested on new charges, 2. Total under our charge to date, 26.

The number on record may seem small in comparison to some of the counties in the State having Probation Officers, but so are the re-arrests, and it must be taken into consideration that probation in Camden county is but in its embryotic state, yet working advantageously to the offender and beneficially to society, having the endorsement of our best citizens who have offered every assistance within their power to further the work of probation. So far, letters have been written and personal visits made by some of our citizens for the purpose of encouraging persons who are now probationers.

In the foregoing report you can readily see that our Judge is fully in accord with the "Act" under which we are operating; and as it is generally conceded that he is a good judge of human nature as well as of the law, his hearty co-operation goes far towards popularizing the work of the probation system.

We have many interesting cases in our charge, one in particular, a young man twenty-four years of age, whom the prosecuting witness informed the Judge would not be able to obtain employment with their company; but the said offender was sentenced to pay the costs of prosecution and placed in charge of the Probation Officer. The next day after he was given his liberty, through the efforts of the Probation Officer, obtained employment with a company in the same line of business, and has been regularly paying the costs so imposed in stated weekly payments, and conducting himself in a very commendable manner, and in accordance with the rules of probation.

Our efficient Prosecutor, Hon. F. T. Lloyd, and his able assistant, F. Morse Archer, Esq., fully endorse the work of probation. They contend, and justly, that there should be a chance given those who are not innately bad, to become good citizens and a benefit to the community. Therefore, we must differentiate if possible, and we know of no better way than through the Court, by placing them on their honor, under the supervision of the Probation Officer.

As to its financial benefit to the county, we need but briefly call attention to one case now in our charge.

After conviction the Court imposed a fine of \$50.00 and costs of prosecution, \$43.50, making a total of \$93.50, and placed the

offender in our charge, which fine and costs are now being paid to the Probation Officer in weekly payments. If this person had been committed to jail, being unable to pay the fine and costs at once, would serve one day for each dollar of said fine and costs, which would be 94 days, or or 13 weeks and 3 days, less one day per week for good conduct, leaving 81 days, or 11 weeks and 4 days, to serve. The price for board of prisoners in Camden county jail being fixed by the Board of Freeholders at \$2.50 per week, which would amount to \$28.93; to this add fine and costs, \$93.50, and you have a total of \$122.43. This shows that not only the individual is benefited by having his liberty and an opportunity to provide for himself and family, but the county is also benefited financially. This is not the chief end of probation in our judgment, but goes to show natural results arising under the system.

The case of a boy thirteen years of age who pleads guilty to a charge of larceny; on account of this offence and his prior conduct in the school which he had been attending, his father was determined to have his son placed in the Reform School. Instead, the boy was placed in charge of the Probation Officer, who, with the consent of the superintendent and a principal of our public schools, was enabled to change the boy to a different school, where he has been for three weeks, and not a complaint from school or parent has been received by the Probation Officer, the boy reporting regularly once each week. We are forced to conclude that much fault is to be placed with the parents in cases of this character.

Under the supervision of the Judge and Prosecutor, we have adopted a system which works well, and will be of great benefit to all those engaged in dispensing justice to the offenders against the laws within the State of New Jersey, but time will not be allowed us to enter into further statements of the successful operation of the probation system.

We feel under many obligations to Mrs. Emily E. Williamson, the president of this Conference, for the valuable advice and information given us on the work of probation, and for the formulation of books and printed blanks to be used in the work.

NEW JERSEY'S NEED FOR A REFORATORY FOR
OLDER GIRLS AND WOMEN.

MRS. GEO. W. BLACKWELL, CHARITIES CONFERENCE OF THE
ORANGES.

About a year ago a committee was formed in the Charities Conference of the Oranges to work for a "State Reformatory for Women."

Its first object was to secure statistics as to the number, age and general character of the women and girls annually committed as prisoners. It was impossible to have these absolutely exact, owing to the imperfect character of many of the records kept, but they show over sixteen hundred arrests, and not less than one hundred and fifty constantly present in the jails and penitentiaries, a not insignificant number. A large portion of them are under thirty years of age, and are confined for drunkenness or disorderly conduct, not for serious crime coming from vicious propensities.

How does our State Government, and therefore how do we, provide for them under the present system? There is, first, the police station, where detention is always short, not more than two or three days at the most. Even here, at the outset, wrong conditions prevail, when, as I have myself seen to be the case, the officer in charge is compelled to place women and men in adjoining cells whose doors are open grating. After the police station comes the jail, where those are held who are awaiting trial, or are required as witnesses, or are serving sentences, and, last, the penitentiary or State prison. There is this difference between the jail and the penitentiary, the one provides employment and the other does not, and a sentence to jail is a sentence to a life of idleness.

We know that a lack of regular employment is a cause of wrong-doing, yet we do not insist that this cause shall be at once removed when the wrong-doer passes into the care of the State. Though work is not provided, exercise is necessary to maintain health, therefore, the freedom of the corridor upon which the cells

are located is given to a certain extent. In the Newark jails two hours in the morning and three hours in the afternoon are allowed for walking in the corridor, and old and young, "repeaters" and first offenders, are promiscuously thrown together in these promenades, with opportunity for conversation and full exchange of experience, so that the term of imprisonment becomes a term in what may be called a school of sin, and the prisoner leaves the place provided for the safety of society a more dangerous social unit than when he went in.

When to this we add that not only the guilty women, but women held for trial who may be shown to be innocent, and others held solely as witnesses are subjected to these associates, we cannot but feel that the moral character of the community is threatened at the very point where we are most entitled to look for protection.

Besides the certainty of corrupting association between prisoners of the same sex in the jail, there is a lack of complete separation of the sexes. It is often possible for men and women who are prisoners to see each other and to talk together from their respective corridors, and sometimes for both to talk to persons outside who come to visit the jail. The Middlesex county prosecutor recently wrote to the freeholders with regard to the jail in New Brunswick that "the compartments for men and women are so located that indecencies are handed back and forth, and liquor is passed from the outside and prisoners become drunk in the very jail to which they are sent for drunkenness."

Imagine the effect upon a girl arrested for some comparatively slight offence of the vile conversation that she cannot escape hearing, or the effect upon a woman wishing to lead a decent life being recognized by a man to whom she has become known as a fellow-prisoner.

Consider, too, the fact that the only influence from her own sex that is felt by the woman prisoner is that of other prisoners. Only five jails out of twenty-one in New Jersey have a matron or woman official, and in three of the five the woman employed has so many other duties that she cannot attend to the prisoners. Elsewhere the daily service of the cells is performed by men. The attendants who have the keys day and night are men. In one

case which came to the observation of the committee a man prisoner was deputed to perform certain offices in the woman's department.

The older thought has been that prisons and the sentences of the law were chiefly for punishment. We are coming now to a higher view of them, that they should be, first, for the protection of society, and, second, for the reform of offenders, and these two are one, for society is better protected by making its bad citizens into good ones than in any other way. Since the offences of the women in our prisons are largely due to youth, weakness and ignorance, there is a strong reason for the belief that through the influence of a reformatory, with wise restraint, employment and instruction under the care of good women, very many of them will become respected members of the community. This has been found to be true in other States. At the Sherborn Reformatory (Massachusetts) the women are allowed, within certain limits, to leave on probation before the expiration of sentence to take places as domestic servants, and there is always a waiting list of employers desiring such service, which is generally satisfactory after the training in the reformatory.

What can the members of this Conference do to help toward this better care of our prisoners? They can speed the knowledge of the need of it; they can watch for the report of the commission, which, we believe, will be appointed by the Governor, and if a bill for a reformatory is presented after the commission has reported, they can make their opinion felt in the legislature.

One word more, though it has no direct bearing upon the reformatory: Will you not go home and look to the police station in your own town? It may be that you will find it as good as is required by an enlightened sense of the duty of the civil government toward offenders, or you may find that you wish to start a home movement for reform without waiting for a commission.

DISCUSSION.

REV. WALTER REID HUNT (President Orange Conference)—You have heard from a member of the Committee on State Reformatory for Women (Mrs. Blackwell) some account of the conditions which exist in our State, necessary parts perhaps of the present system. But you have not heard the whole

story. We little realize to what a life our courts are to-day condemning a woman who is convicted of crime. If time permitted the members of the Reformatory Committee could tell stories, which could easily be verified, which would shame the citizens of our State in whose name and with whose sanction the prisons and penitentiaries of this State are built and maintained.

A few nights ago, in one of the hardest rainstorms of the winter, a little girl came to my door, wet to the skin, asking for money and something to eat. Money was refused her; food given. When I asked her why she was out on the streets begging at that time and in the storm, she told me the story so familiar to you all—sick father, mother without work, two sisters, a brother, all living in a house without light, no fire, nothing to eat. The city in which I live was suffering, as the whole country has suffered, from that terrible fight for which the selfishness of man is responsible, and the story seemed to call for heroic treatment. I went out with her into the cold and wet, to the place where she said her home was. The house was not there. The girl had lied. I took her to the police station, and, after an hour's questioning, the chief found out that her home was in a neighboring city; that her father was healthy, strong, but lazy, and had sent the child out to beg while he remained at home.

Now, I told this story to my people a few days after it happened, and they said it was shocking. It was, but not in the way that they thought. The records of the Bureau of Associated Charities showed that this same girl, for four years, from the time she was eight to the time she was twelve, had begged from door to door, by day and by night, that her father might loaf and drink from the proceeds of her work. That was the shocking part of it, that the man should allow or demand it, or that the good people of that city should encourage and sustain it; the city created day by day a demand for child-labor; the father, inhuman but shrewd, supplied the demand, and four years of childhood paid the price.

Ignorance becomes criminal ignorance when it helps to increase crime or fails to try to stop it. Ignorance on the part of the public spoiled the life of that little girl, and ignorance in regard to the conditions of punishment of female offenders is spoiling hundreds of lives of girls and women in our jails and prisons to-day.

The committee having this matter in charge have prepared no radical step, no leap in the dark. They have asked the Legislature to give to the Governor of this State the power to appoint a commission of five, two of whom shall be women, and to appropriate one thousand dollars to pay the necessary expenses of such commission, that the people of this State may know how they are treating the unfortunate women who have not had the home influence, the moral training and the helpful hand which have kept so many of us from falling. Surely this is a reasonable request, that we, the taxpayers, know the facts. I have on my desk the names of three hundred men, prominent men, from different parts of the State, who ask that this information be given to them in this way. I hope there is not a man within the sound of my voice who will not be willing and anxious to join us in this request to the Legislature.

I have talked with the Governor and with many members of both branches of the Legislature, and have no doubt that the authority will be given and

the commission appointed. But, ladies and gentlemen of the Conference, the work of the citizens of the State does not end here. We must obtain the report of that commission, study its findings, learn the facts, and then, so far as the facts demand and the recommendations seem reasonable and sufficient, help the commission with our influence and our vote to carry out its recommendations.

I should like, in closing, to speak of two objections which have some currency among those who have given little thought to the matter, two objections to the change in our system from the prison and penitentiary to the reformatory.

First: It is said that these women cannot be reformed. I call your attention to the fact that the reformatory system is now used in this State in dealing with men and boys and with girls under sixteen, and it is in use successfully. Other States have for years extended this principle to women of mature years, and have done it successfully. The Matron of the Massachusetts Reformatory at Sherborn gives the highest testimony as to the results accomplished there, and says she cannot begin to supply the calls made to her for domestic servants. The testimony of many institutions might be cited to show not merely that it can be done, but exactly what has been done and what is being done every day. Of this thing, however, we may be sure: we cannot do it under our present—I will not say methods, because they are not methods; we cannot do it unless we try.

Second (the cost of reformatory): It is said the State cannot afford it. I ask you, Can this State, or any State, afford anything else? Have you ever read the account of the Jukes family, which first appeared some thirty years ago in one of the annual reports of the Prison Association of New York? Twelve hundred criminals were traced to the motherhood of an abandoned woman. It cost the community \$1,250,000 to care for this family. There are at present 150 such possible mothers in our jails and prisons. It is an easy problem in mathematics to figure the cost which the State may be called upon to assume.

There is a careless impression which obtains in some quarters that unless the State builds an expensive reformatory it will be under no cost to care for these unfortunates. Friends, they must be clothed and fed; they must be watched and cared for. We can't knock them on the head with a bludgeon and bury them in the potter's field. They are women, they are human. Our neglect may have contributed in part to make them what they are. It is not a question of cost or no cost. The price must be paid in any case. The question is, simply, Shall the money which we must spend for their care, for our own protection, be spent scientifically or carelessly? I recommend the report of this committee to your careful and earnest consideration.

WHAT TYPE OF REFORMATORY SHOULD NEW
NEW JERSEY BUILD?

MRS. C. B. ALEXANDER.

In answering the question which forms the subject allotted to me I cannot do better than to quote from the report sent on the 31st of January to Governor Murphy by our committee, jointly with the committee formed for the same purpose in Orange.

Asking for the appointment of a commission, the report says: "We believe that such a commission will recommend the building of a reformatory for women on the cottage plan in a healthy country district. The estimated number of women and girls (one hundred and fifty) would not justify a separate institution for girls over sixteen, so that a reformatory with cottages costing from sixteen to twenty thousand dollars each would probably be advised."

With the kind assistance of the Governor, the joint resolution asking for the appointment of this commission has since been passed by the House, and it has become of the greatest importance that we should know what we want and use every means possible to secure it.

We must continue the work already so well done by the Orange women, with women as officers and attendants, and in another keep on our side the public opinion thus formed by proposing so reasonable a plan that it will appeal to all.

The ideal way would be to have a prison reformatory for women, with women as officers and attendants, and in another location a reformatory for the younger and less hardened women. But this would make the plan far more expensive and might defeat it altogether. There are two alternatives; one will soon be exemplified at the Lancaster, Massachusetts, Reformatory, where a cottage is now being built a mile and a half from those now in use for the care of those who show no sign of a desire to improve and who are now transferred to Sherburn. The other plan would be to allow the incorrigible cases to remain in the Women's Department of our State Prison, which would be in

line with the request made in the latest report of the Bedford, New York, Reformatory, to have this class of inmates removed to Auburn. There seems to be a precedent for either course of action.

But this need not materially affect our central idea of cottages built in one of the beautiful spots which abound in New Jersey. The cottage plan seems to be so generally adopted in all modern institutions of this kind that it is hardly necessary to argue that point.

We may mention one striking advantage noticed in the cottages at Bedford and Lancaster over the older and larger buildings at Sherburn, that the work of the household in laundry and kitchen is done as it would be done in an ordinary household, and not by steam or machinery. The added educational value of this system to girls who will later become household servants is self-evident. The additional cost of building and maintaining cottages is more than justified on the practical side as well as in the advantages of classification and of the essential home atmosphere, impossible in a large building.

We were much impressed at Lancaster and Bedford by the use made of the helpful influences of the beautiful country in which the reformatories are situated. The girls are much out of doors, both in winter and summer, and this part of the work is considered of the greatest importance.

In the New Jersey of to-day a girl is accused of breaking the law and is taken to the nearest jail. Her trial comes. If she is acquitted, she returns to her former life, but never to her former self, for even a few days in one of our jails cannot fail to have a contaminating influence. If she is convicted and has passed her seventeenth birthday the best thing that can happen to her is to be sent to State Prison, where she will receive systematic teaching and training and the benefit of the merit system. Failing this, she can hope for one of the penitentiaries, where there are also opportunities for regular work. But her fate is more likely to be the county jail, where thirty, sixty or ninety days are spent in the idleness and companionship which every arrangement there makes it impossible to prevent. She leaves at the end

of her sentence and no one knows or cares what becomes of her, except the friends she has made at the jail.

In the New Jersey, which we hope and expect to see, this same girl would be taken to the jail, now used only for its proper function, the detention of persons awaiting their trial. If she was acquitted, the harm done would be reduced to a minimum. If she was convicted, she would immediately be taken to the Woman's Reformatory, where she would enter the Probationer's Group. She would have a long talk with the superintendent; her former history, education, occupation, etc., would all be carefully noted and a few simple rules explained to her. She would soon realize that the length of her stay and the enjoyment of many privileges and comparative liberty depended entirely on herself and on her efforts to improve. Every incentive, every motive, very influence would be brought to bear, and, unless she proved an unusually difficult subject, she would soon be promoted to the next higher grade. And thus she would rise, step by step, until she earned her right to the highest division, from which she would go out to a position in the outside world carefully chosen for her and still under the supervision of the superintendent, for this girl would have found real friends.

To put the matter in a concrete form, I will close with the estimate of cost submitted to Governor Murphy:

ESTIMATED COST WOMEN'S REFORMATORY.

Four cottages, at \$18,000 each,	\$72,000
Superintendent's house,	6,000
Farmer's house,	1,500
Stable, barns, etc.,	3,000
Sewerage, water, etc.,	5,000
Land, 150 acres, at \$50 an acre,	7,500
Furnishing,	15,000
Contingencies and expenses,	10,000
	<hr/>
Total estimated cost,	\$120,000

Each cottage ought to accommodate from twenty-five to thirty inmates, a matron, housekeeper, and teacher.

The cottage could be built gradually, and only women under 30 taken at first.

The yearly per capita cost ought not to be more than \$250, or for 120 inmates, \$30,000.

JUDGE SKINNER—As I look at it from the standpoint of the legislator it seems to me a great difficulty will be experienced by the Conference in securing this measure. The legislator looks at it from the standpoint of tribute to justice. The criminal, he says, is a person who must be censured in order to bring him to his senses. From that view the problem is largely a question of feeding him and clothing him at as small an expense as possible.

EVENING SESSION.

Prayer was offered by the Rev. J. R. Atkinson.

The President announced that the Rt. Rev. Bishop McFaul, of Trenton, had been expected to extend a welcome on behalf of the city of Trenton, but, not being able to be present, had named Chancellor Norris to represent him.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

CHANCELLOR J. W. NORRIS, TRENTON.

Madame President, Your Excellency, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The honor of greeting your distinguished assembly this evening in the name of the Right Reverend Bishop McFaul, includes for me the pleasant privilege of conveying to you his assurance of sympathy in the noble object of your Conference, and of expressing to you his hopes that lasting results will follow these deliberations. Coming together as you do from different centres of unselfish activity and from different spheres of fraternal light to this benevolent mart of friendly exchange, you bring treasures of mind, of heart, and of experience wrapped up in forms and in methods of work, plans for their future development and in rich effects, the product of earnest toil, that their values may be appreciated and their practical work measured according to the common standard of an exalted charity whose diffusion as we well know is rapidly exploiting new fields of beneficence.

Happily this flame which lights up so many darkened periods of history is not waning in these days of material advancement.

Our country and its great heart throbs with the composition of charity and generous response on all occasions when appeals come to us from over the seas, from scenes of disaster and every degree of famine. And our own people of all classes know the value of charity. They are charity-loving people, and they identify themselves with its work and carry on its beneficent undertakings under auspices so favorable that charity, the characteristic virtue of the American people, is rapidly extending to every agency in the religious, in the civil, in the social and in the private world, subserving its needs, administering to its wants. Charity for us is the common pathway along the Master's journey in Rome. Ah, beneficence! what a beautiful scene it is to look on the great roadway of mercy and love, and see it frequented with contributors ranging in position and station and in wealth, from the widow and her mite, to this vast, gigantic organized system of charity which curtains the security and permanence of that great virtue in lasting institutions for the infirm, the homeless and unfortunate. This consoling condition fills us with joy. It tells us that progress is advancing in the right direction in our country. This condition is the index of that progress; this condition is the measure of our civilization; not that civilization that is veneered with glitter, but with refinement; not that civilization that is upheld by despotism and manipulated by evils, but that true, that genuine civilization which is embodied in the imperishable conduct of man and cemented by his own personal responsibilities, whose superstructure is reared on and fostered by those lasting social rules which bind us one to another, from which are born duties and rights and whose supreme adornment is advancement, the perfection of these rules in the harmony of a cemented action.

The further man gets from self, from the personal interests which too often contract his vision, and the more he avails himself of the principles which truth, justice and love place at his disposal, the more effectively do those social ties that bind us, weave man's interests, his feelings, his sympathy for the common welfare of all. Self is the great enemy. Self is the mightiest foe in life. Crushed self, shattered with self-abandonment; that is the proof of a true hero. Conquer self, the mightiest foe,

then thou needest fear no man. Self is the enemy of our work; self stops its advancement. Self directs its energy upon those firm resolves, shatters those strong determinations. But fortunately, men are rapidly forsaking selfish interests and abandoning pursuits of greed, and throwing aside those impulses which congeal the heart; men are growing to love one another. Men are growing to identify themselves with the welfare of their fellow-beings. Men are growing out of narrow confines of self, and rising above the low bed upon which nature placed them, to the higher, nobler spheres of their better self. In isolation, therefore, man cannot utilize the finer elements of his soul. It is in harmony and in union that these finer instincts are brought out. True happiness comes from self-sacrifice, and is the reward of all that we lay down for the welfare and for the uplifting and for the benefit of all fellow-men. Ah, with so many gifts from that Giver of all good things, and our souls equipped with the faculties for their wondrous development, with ourselves rest the obligations imposed by the great giver, God, and now we spend the energies of our lives, not in selfish pursuits, not in the greed for selfish things, but in self-amendments and in those nobler works, those purer, sublimer ideas realized in heroic actions which speak the true character.

From these pure considerations we will turn for a few moments to that great system of beneficence that has come down from the ages. This is the work in which you are engaged, the noble work that you take upon yourselves, and as you go about it I almost hear within, another voice saying, "Lead and follow me." You leave your pursuits, your business interests, your families, your homes, and come together and further the progress of this great work. Why say a word of welcome to such distinguished, such noble workers? Ah, the word welcome is in a measure mighty poor. The words of any man cannot bid you welcome. The welcome that you receive in this splendid undertaking is the blessing of Him who gathered the little ones around and blessed them. May the reward of your efforts redound to the glory of that great benefactor along whose journey we all strive to follow.

GOVERNOR MURPHY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have to add my word of welcome to the very elegant address that you have just listened to, and I feel, after that very interesting and happy address, that you need but little from me.

As I understand it, this meeting is composed of delegations from charitable societies throughout the State, who meet at least once a year to exchange experiences and views on their work, and to gather from these exchanges the experience of others or some suggestions to help them in their work chosen by themselves. I do not suppose there is anything finer in the world, to-day, than that these intelligent men and women come together so that they can aid and help those not so fortunate in life as they. I am very sure that the State of New Jersey is proud that it has so many societies engaged in this useful work, and I feel it a very great pleasure and privilege to welcome you to Trenton and to say that anything I can do officially or personally to help you in that which interests this Conference, I will do with great pleasure.

Of course, I suppose problems are never all quite solved. They present new phases from time to time, just as human nature does. Just as human thoughts differ, so your work differs. So I believe your work will go on and on, blessing those who do it and blessing those who receive it. Helping not alone those whom you desire to help, but helping some of us who are beset with the same troubles and problems that beset you, problems that come up in official life; how to take care of the sick, the sick in mind as well as in body, the sick in soul and in spirit. Some you can cure, some you can perhaps bring into convalescing stages, and some I fear you must always regard as hopeless invalids, and yet that is all the more reason why the State should receive the attention, the thought of just such men and women as are engaged in the State of New Jersey in the work which interests you. So I say, on behalf of the State of New Jersey, I welcome you here to this Capitol, and I think that I may say, on behalf of the Governor of the State, not alone as representing all the executive, but as representing all of the branches of the

government, that you are doing as much perhaps as any other force in the State for everything that is noble and healthful to the State.

I must not keep you from the address which you are to listen to. I am glad to see you here and hope this will be a beneficial Conference to you all and others.

ANNUAL ADDRESS.

BY MRS. E. E. WILLIAMSON, PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE.

This Conference is the annual meeting with each other of the representatives of all our charitable and correctional institutions and societies—State, county and private. Its purpose, to enable the officers and members of administrative boards to broaden their outlook and to qualify themselves for better work in the field in which it is their duty to labor, to educate and create a wise public opinion upon all the questions connected with the care of the dependent, defective and delinquent, to disseminate a knowledge of conditions in our State, a knowledge of the methods in use elsewhere under similar conditions, and the value of such knowledge. With a Conference such as this there can be no excuse for ignorance of the condition of the dependent, defective and delinquent in our State.

In studying the history of New Jersey I have found that the questions which have been agitating us were subjects of grave consideration to the early settlers. The "tramp" was a problem in those days, and the cure was compulsory work—not to be escaped. The care of dependent children exercised the minds and stirred the hearts of all, and from the agitation came a number of our best private charities for the care of children—a revolt against almshouse care. Our State prison was the subject of much thought and consideration, which resulted in legislation to better the condition of its inmates. A noble woman passed away not long ago who battled for a State home for girls. Her efforts resulted in the erection of the present institution designed for the noble work of reclaiming and reforming.

The first State hospital for the insane was built in response to an acute public sentiment led by Dr. Lyman A. Smith, of Essex, Dr. Lewis Conditt, of Morris, and the eminent philanthropist, Miss Dorothea Dix—noble spirits who laid the foundation for our two great hospitals for the insane. Twenty years later the State provided a State home for wayward boys under sixteen. Then came the building of the school for deaf-mutes, an institution which is now a part of the public school system, and which is open to all the deaf-mute residents of the State between the ages of eight and twenty-one. The most advanced methods are taught and the good done is incalculable.

The care and training of the feeble-minded next became a consideration, a movement which owes its origin to a philanthropist who has passed away, but who has left a monument which will endure. The two institutions, situated in Vineland, are under able management, and are both training and caring for the feeble-minded in a scientific way and with a humanitarian spirit.

The State village for epileptics, situated in Somerset county, is gradually opening its doors to the class of defectives for whose care it was created, and no doubt will, in a short time, take care of all the State's epileptic.

The State needs a home for the blind, and it is to be regretted that the beautiful farm offered six years ago as a gift to the State was not accepted. It is a necessity, and we hope in a few years to see within the borders of our own State an institution for the care and education of the blind. It is expensive and unwise for New Jersey to board her blind in institutions in other States.

The Legislature, from time to time, has given the Governor power to appoint commissions to consider the advisability of certain measures which have later taken shape. The State Reformatory at Rahway, which receives prisoners between the ages of sixteen and twenty-eight years, is the result of one such investigation. Sentences to this institution are under the indeterminate sentence (maximum limit) act with the power of parole in the hands of the commissioners who administer the institution. The best principles known to penologists inspire its management. Each inmate is supposed to be employed and so instructed that he can be self-supporting when released. Each is encouraged to

learn and is helped to recover his self-respect. The institution has a great mission to perform, and we believe that its managers are impressed with the great responsibility that rests upon them. There has been a great deal of criticism of the expense of building the reformatory, but from the standpoint of the needs of such an institution we may feel sure that every dollar spent for the reformation of this class of delinquents is a saving to the State in dollars as well as in morals. The commission includes among its members noted specialists who will safeguard the interests of the inmates. In the management and care of the delinquents in our State prison great things have been accomplished. The recent abolishment of the lock-step and the proposed gradual doing away with stripes, except for bad behavior, are the most recent evidences of progress.

In the care of its dependent children New Jersey has the best system that is yet known—State administration with county co-operation and support for the children; a complete system of investigation and supervision which demands the co-operation of the priest or pastor and school teacher. Among the notable features of the work are the re-uniting of families with the help of private societies who give temporary relief, and the finding of relatives who are glad and anxious to care for the little ones. This guardianship of dependent children occasionally brings to light property that belongs to children whose identity has been lost in almshouses. No children in the almshouse; all the dependents of proper age at school; all who need medical or surgical treatment receiving it; over one hundred fathers and mothers re-united to their children, and the prevention of commitment to almshouses in a large number of cases; these are some of the things accomplished by the system.

The law creating a system of probation for the courts of common pleas was a most notable event. It has been put in practice by nine county judges, among these the three large counties of Essex, Hudson and Camden. The history of its introduction and passage by the Legislature is well known, but the wonderful results are as yet known only to a few. It has passed beyond the experimental stage. The reports of the probation officers, which will be presented and printed, show startling results in the saving

to the counties as well as in the prevention of crime and the stigma that comes from incarceration in jail or prison. "Suspension of sentence, probation without supervision, places the discharged prisoner back in the old environment and subjects him to the temptations to which he must assuredly fall victim again." Probation provides supervision, and, at the same time, creates a friend on whom the unfortunate may depend at all times. And again, the saving to the taxpayer is enormous. One of the great values of the system is that it "teaches the criminal the new attitude of society toward crime, and that it gives him, through the probation officer, a cumulative moral support." "Finally, law assumes a new dignity in the eyes of the judge, magistrate, policeman, father, teacher, offender and neighborhood."

The united charities of the Oranges have started an organized movement for the proper care of delinquent and disorderly women over sixteen. The State as yet provides no means for their reformation. In our county jails will be found an average of 150 females over sixteen. The State has given liberally for the reformation and training of its boys and girls under sixteen, and the Rahway Reformatory for boys and men over sixteen, but nothing has been done for the wayward girl over sixteen, or the poor alcoholic victim who is classed as a "rounder" in our county jails. The committee of the Orange conference, with a committee from the State Charities Aid Association, visited institutions in New York and Massachusetts, and, in their appeal for a commission to be appointed by the Governor to report upon the whole subject, have given a most interesting account of the great work done in other States.

As it is at present, women, after serving a short sentence in the county jail, return to their old haunts and to the men and women who inspired them to crime. From a reformatory they would go on parole to work found for them by the State, with a chance to earn an honest living, in a respectable environment, with the friendly help of the managers of the reformatory always ready to assist them over the dark places.

The need for juvenile courts has been placed before the Legislature in a bill prepared by an eminent jurist of Essex county. Let us give it our support in every way possible.

In this hasty retrospect and brief outline I have been obliged to pass over or treat superficially many things that have been done well in New Jersey, but I cannot close without doing honor to our many noble private charities. The best men and women have given time and thought and means to the management and care of institutions which have done most excellent work. Enough cannot be said of the devotion of individual members of our State, county and private charity boards.

There has been a great uplift in public sentiment during the last ten years. Our churches are recognizing their responsibility to the commonwealth, sociological problems are discussed from their pulpits. The women's clubs are alive to their responsibility and are putting themselves on record in all great public movements for the betterment of humanity. Our newspapers are taking a large and intelligent interest in the public welfare from a humanitarian and sociological standpoint, inviting discussion and giving editorial notice to all important measures. Our judiciary have given their sanction and have used their influence in behalf of probation, juvenile courts and indeterminate sentence.

We are all workers and students here to-day in the realm of charity, each conscious of a mutual need with a single purpose, needing wisdom which, when guided from on high, seeks the noblest ambitions of life. Surely this is an alliance full of potency for present good and full of promise of better things.

THE NEED AND BEST METHODS OF STATE SUPERVISION OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

CHARLTON T. LEWIS, LL.D., PRESIDENT STATE CHARITIES AID ASSOCIATION.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The subject which has been announced and on which I am asked to address you, is not of my choosing. We are accustomed, sometimes in our Conferences of this character, to take up subjects which make very earnest appeals to our feelings, which stir our sympathies, and which are the occasions, justly,

for some expressions of emotion, and I am not going to object to such subjects as this, for I think the sympathies they arouse, the emotions they stir, are not only an important stimulant in charity work, but are really a valuable part of its reward. But this particular subject to-night is one which does not call for any expression of feeling or emotion, but does demand of us careful and impartial study, intellectual investigation, and to some extent abstract thought, because if we would reach any solution of this question which would be satisfactory not only to us but to our State, we should achieve an important measure of constructive statesmanship. The subject is a burning question here and in many States of the Union. I do not assume to present a definite solution of it. All earnest students of it will, I think, be ready to admit that it can be finally solved only by profounder investigation and after wider experience than any to which we can as yet appeal. It would be easy to offer a plausible and lively argument for one or another view, but it seems to me more becoming in us, who have come together for inquiry and conference, to try to understand the actual conditions of the problem, to define its exact nature and the considerations which must determine the decision. Perhaps in the end this course will be also more useful; with these clearly before us, the way will be prepared for discussion and for definite conclusions.

The need for State supervision of all penal and charitable institutions will impress itself strongly on us if we look at the present situation in New Jersey. Indeed, the experience of generations has shown that no satisfactory administration in these departments can be permanently secured without constant, watchful, and even jealous supervision. Even without experience this would seem to be obvious. It lies in the nature of mankind. These institutions hold multitudes of dependents—children of tender age, invalids in body, invalids in mind, offenders under restraint—all helpless to protect themselves and in need of confinement, guardianship, protection, various forms of service. They must be in charge of men and women whose business it is to care for, control, restrain them; to regulate their food and work, their occupations, their leisure, their sleep. They are in the power of these guardians, and without the critical supervision of

impartial minds and sympathizing hearts are wholly at their mercy. Human nature is so constituted that it cannot safely be put in charge of helpless dependents where interest or inclination may perpetually conflict with duty. The keeper who may profit by giving his wards poor diet or by making exactions from them or on their account; the keeper who can only obtain ease or leisure by neglecting his wards cannot be trusted with irresponsible power over them; the keeper who is "a little lower than the angels" must not be trusted with authority to punish their offenses, to show by favor his preference for one over another, or even to keep accounts of their maintenance, without constant, rigorous and critical inspection and audit. Where any such powers are irresponsibly held scandals will sooner or later arise, and enormous mischiefs, cruelties and oppressions, such as it would curdle your blood to hear, have multiplied under such systems. Institutions managed without enlightened supervision have always been the dark places of earth, full of the habitations of cruelty.

Some three generations ago public institutions for the helpless and needy classes were little known, but the State housed offenders in jails, such as Newgate and the Fleet, where the keeper was supreme and irresponsible, and the horrors which prevailed in them are commonplaces of our knowledge. Why have they ceased, to a large extent? Because the voluntary labors of John Howard, Elizabeth Frey and their peers let light into the dungeons. Here was the beginning of supervision. There was always official power of visitation in the courts and in grand juries, but not a word was spoken, not a step taken, to clean out these mouths of hell, until volunteer visitors explored them and exposed the truth. These visitors were without authority save that of love and courage, but it proved potent: it opened at once the doors of the jails and the hearts of men. Gradually a public opinion grew up which, in enlightened communities, made such institutions impossible.

Administration by an executive head with concentrated power is essential in every such institution. From its nature, this must be professional, official, armed with force and perpetually at hand. It must needs be vested in men who live by the work, whose lives are occupied in it and who make their profit in it. But

there must also be close supervision by minds with broader views, in touch with the world of thought and practice, bent on the higher social aims in view, interested not only in the direct profits and economies of management, but in the protection of the community and its future welfare. Every step forward which has been made in a hundred years in penal law and prison discipline, in the prevention of crime, in the rescue and reformation of offenders, and thus in the protection of society against its enemies, has had its origin and main support, not in those who make a business and a living by enforcing penal laws and managing prisons, but in the representatives of a growing humanity, a progressive spirit of reform, and public opinion gradually seizing upon broader and higher principles of dealing with crime.

This line of progress in prison management contrasts most strikingly with the line of progress in charitable work. Public charities have almost wholly grown up within the last century. They have largely been developed from private institutions and foundations. The State has gradually come to recognize its responsibility for the defective and helpless classes, and has more and more assumed the wardship of them. But this field of activity has been treated in a spirit widely different from that of penal administration. Rarely have public charities been kept like prisons, under exclusively official administration, whether founded and supported wholly by voluntary gifts or simply aided by local or State governments, or wholly created and sustained by public funds, they have frequently been under the management, to a large extent, of private citizens, of unpaid and volunteer boards. Thus the public charitable institutions have followed and imitated the private ones. In recent years reformatories for first offenders have been founded and have taken the same course. The modern spirit is thus to be the reverse of the governmental and official spirit, which still generally prevails in the control of prisons and of local jails.

Thus to-day we find the administration of charities and reformatories largely in private and volunteer hands, while that of prisons has continuously been in those of paid officials. But the need of supervision is as real, I do not say as great, but as real in the one case as in the other. If there is less danger of peculation,

of violence, of tyranny, of cruelty, with private control, there is perhaps greater danger of neglect, and with less business responsibility a stronger tendency to extravagant expenditure. Indeed, these two difficulties are sometimes thought inherent in volunteer boards. Men who have their own engrossing affairs and whose leisure is limited cannot easily give the great amount of time and labor which such management requires. Sometimes the exactions of business seem imperative, and the sacrifice required for this work would be excessive, perhaps just at the time when the institution needs their attention most.

Again, the men who are most useful in such work and most likely to be selected for it are enthusiasts in it. They naturally magnify the needs of the cases under their own eyes and in their own charge. They see distress which can be relieved, and naturally think no effort or expense too great for this end. Thus they often outrun in their expenditure for it the support of public opinion, or even the reasonable ability of the public treasury. That is, they have not the full sense of proportion. The State cannot by taxation attempt to relieve all suffering and to remove all want; it must, taking a comprehensive view, distribute its charitable appropriations so that the limited aggregate shall do the most good. Those who see only part of the need, and do not realize how little a part it is of the whole, will demand too much for their own branch of the work.

It is plain for these two reasons that volunteer boards in charge of charities need supervision; and just as official State management has made its progress under the impartial criticism and supervision of volunteer citizens and associations, so, on the other hand, public charities managed by volunteer boards have been kept in check by official supervision and criticism. In an enlightened community public opinion does much. Its pressure upon such management is invaluable, when it is guided by an independent and intelligent press and inspired by sympathy with the highest aims of the work itself. But criticism to be adequate must have a knowledge of details and expert acquaintance with methods, and persistency and constancy which are never found in the general public. It has often been found useful that such supervision be exercised by the State itself, through professional

experts and officers. Voluntary association with chartered powers has done much good work in this direction; with popular support they can in some States render the greatest service. Yet, for the distribution, management and accounting of public funds, it is consistent with the whole policy of our institutions that there be a definite central authority, and this can hardly be dispensed with.

Thus there have grown up by two distinct systems of administration for public institutions—that by central official control, with such supervision and criticism as can be afforded by private volunteer inspection, or private and chartered but voluntary association, and secondly, administration by local voluntary control, with the supervision of paid and professional State officers. Each of these is a logical and consistent system for which plausible and even strong reasons may be adduced. Each has been tried in several States of the Union, and we shall doubtless have much information to-morrow as to the comparative results. But we have neither system fully developed in our own State. Nearly all our penal institutions, including the State prisons and the county and city jails, are purely official in their control and administration, and the only supervision or independent criticism exercised over them in any systematic way is that of the voluntary society known as the State Charities Aid Association, chartered for the purpose. It has inadequate powers and deficient resources. On the other hand, the reformatory, the reform school and many of the charitable institutions are governed by unpaid boards, and no regular and efficient supervision is provided for them by law except so far as the disbursements of public moneys for them are made by the proper State officers. The highest function of such supervision, to criticise conduct and stimulate efficiency, is not really vested in anyone. The laws place upon the governor a vast responsibility for these institutions, and it would require omniscience itself to fill his office satisfactorily in this respect.

It is, then, the plain duty of the State to provide for efficient and independent supervision of its penal and charitable institutions. How, and by whom, shall such supervision be exercised? If left to the doubtful, sporadic action of volunteer citizens, how can it be sustained and adequate? It must be organized, persist-

ent, systematic. The State must provide for its organization. It must be one which shall have breadth enough to comprehend the needs of all the wards of the State, and intelligence enough to keep in touch with everything that is thought and learned throughout the world of active charity for their benefit. It must be patient in examining details, sympathizing towards the working staff and its work, inspiring and helpful in guiding, and encouraging them, and wholly independent of all influences save the aim to fulfill the great purposes of the system. And above all, it must be supervision, not control; that is to say, the critical and visiting authority must not be confounded or associated with the managing or administrative authority.

It is fundamental in democratic institutions that the business of the community shall be conducted with publicity and responsibility. Every high officer of State is supposed to fulfill his office in the sunlight, the people's eye. It is the constant aim of true constructive statesmanship to simplify the work of such offices, so that it may be understood by the body of the people. The supervision exercised over such officers is that of the voters, to whom they are responsible; but the detailed administration of charities and corrections is a business of extreme complexity. The public at large is conscious of its incompetence to criticise it. Hence, the absolute need of expert supervision. The qualifications for this supervision are wholly different from those required for executive work. To unite the two functions in the same persons is always ruinous and intolerable. It is the extinction of real responsibility and a sacrifice of fundamental principles, and with it of all the progress that has been made in two generations.

Hitherto we have spoken only of supervision, but the problem of supervision cannot be separated from that of management. Until we have fixed the methods of control we cannot determine the best methods for the oversight of it, and the public mind is to-day entirely unsettled as to the foundations of charitable organization. A movement has begun of late which aims to sweep away the partnership of the enlightened and charitable public with its government in this vast work, and would vest the entire management in governmental officers. In five or six States, boards

of control have already been established, in whose hands are centered the detailed administration and the general supervision of the whole State system of charities and corrections. The reasons avowed for advocating this plan are almost exclusively the two arguments which I have already adduced in favor of the supervision of voluntary boards of management; namely, the danger of neglect for want of leisure, and the danger of extravagance growing out of enthusiasm. If these arguments have the weight which some able men give them, the conclusion that official boards of control are needed seems unavoidable.

But considerations are not wanting on the other side. We must not permit the advantages which experience has shown voluntary boards to possess to vanish from our sight. What are they? The first of these is that the best service is obtained in such a work from men who are inspired with love of the work itself. Those who will serve from devotion to the cause, and not for the sake of pay, are apt to be peculiarly and lastingly efficient. The management of such institutions requires broad knowledge, scientific method, a spirit of progress, and at the same time contact and communion with the world of thought and beneficence. These are not readily found in officialism, but rather in those who care enough for the work to consecrate themselves to it for its own sake.

Again, it is absolutely essential to the permanent success of such administration that it be free from the taint of politics. Can this freedom be attained under our form of government by a purely official service? Experience seems to show that it is impossible. Instances which prove this already abound in the short history of such boards of control. The latest of them, for example, the Minnesota board of control, after one year of experience, in its recent report, which may be regarded as a shout of triumph over the great reform which the new system has wrought, is compelled to say: "The most determined pressure was brought to bear upon the board, both individually and collectively, by partisans in different parts of the State, with the evident expectation that we would accede to importunities." This board eagerly, and with endless reiteration, proclaims that it has not yet yielded in any degree to such pressure. But how long will its resist-

ance last? Can it be relied on for all the future? Other States which took similar measures a little earlier have had an experience which seems to show that it is only a question of time when such boards will yield. The entire administration in some of these States has sadly degenerated, and the boards of control have become notorious agencies for the reward of partisanship and the promotion of political interests.

Further, a system of voluntary boards opens a field for the energies and capacities of citizens with charitable impulse, which would otherwise be lost to the community. Men of leisure, with an earnest desire to use their means for good, increase in numbers with the increase of wealth and with the progress of civilization. In a community like this it grows easier every year to secure their aid, but this is not obtained by appointing them to offices whose pay is insignificant. Service upon such boards is itself an education in knowledge and in power. A body of citizens is built up by this service whose value to the State cannot easily be overestimated.

Perhaps, however—I will not say perhaps, but assuredly—the highest value of such a system is in the educational work done by such managers with the general public. The example of such disinterested labor and sacrifice is in itself precious, and attracts the attention, the thoughts, the respect of citizens at large, as official service for pay can never do. The thoughts and experiences of the men engaged in the work reach their friends and society around them and interest the people. By their aid the community is educated in the principles and methods of charitable work, and learns even better how to deal with its wards.

Whatever form of supervision or control is adopted must have the preservation of these advantages in view. In some States of the Union this end has been in a large measure attained by entrusting administration in all its details to local boards, and by constituting a general board of charities and corrections with supervisory powers. Such a State board properly represents the public. In addition to the other benefits which it confers upon the community, it does the great work of collecting information, compiling statistics and providing in all institutions uniform methods of record and accounts. To do this work well it must have no

administrative functions, no appointments to make, no contracts to execute, no moneys to disburse. Its function is higher than that of mere administration; it is the intellect and heart of the best charitable elements in the community, standing between the mass of the people whose best intelligence it represents and the work which the community requires to be done. Hitherto such boards as this seem to me to have accomplished more in the direction of improving these great branches of public administration than any other organizations which have been devised.

There are now before our Legislature two bills which have attracted much attention, each of them proposing an official paid board of control for the institutions of the State. Doubtless both of these bills have been introduced by gentlemen of public spirit and of large intelligence. But no detailed criticism of them is required to-night, because it is impossible to read them without perceiving that the purpose of their authors in bringing them forward cannot be to secure their enactment, but to provoke inquiry and discussion. If literally adopted and enforced the Senate bill would sweep away all existing boards suddenly, and leave three men, political appointees, whose entire time and energies for the year would be repaid by the sum of \$2,500 each, bewildered and overwhelmed with a mass of details in widely separated parts of the State, such that no ten men could give them proper attention, and would, moreover, be charged with the broad and general supervision of the entire State system of dealing with its dependents and its offenders. The Assembly bill would confer all the powers of the existing boards and many more on a single board of five members, and yet makes no provision whatever for the existing authorities of these institutions. Similar action by the Legislature of Minnesota less than two years ago led to distressing legal complications and litigation which threatened the educational interests of the State. But, entirely apart from these defects of form or detail, each of these bills violates a fundamental principle of our republican institutions. It confounds powers and functions which are essentially and radically different. The duties of a board constituted under either of them would be at once legislative, executive and judicial.

It would hold powers and perform duties which are utterly incompatible.

Let us, then, accept these propositions for what they are in substance—proofs of interest on the part of thinking men in these important branches of the State's service and of a healthy determination to make progress in them. It must certainly be a satisfaction to every enlightened student of our institutions to see that the Governor of the State has asked for the reference of the entire problem to an intelligent and impartial commission. The time is ripe for its study and probably for its solution, with larger knowledge and better insight than has yet been attained. At the last session of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections an expert committee was appointed to investigate this problem and report at its next meeting. At the last session of the International Prison Congress a committee of the ablest experts in the United States was appointed for the same purpose, and its report will be made at Indianapolis at the next Congress. The State of New York and several other important States in the Union are struggling with the same problem. The Legislatures, with the benefit of advice and counsel from the most experienced and eminent students of social reform, are striving to develop a system of control and supervision which shall unite the best features of the various systems now in use. Each of the plans already known is under experiment in one or more of our sister States, and the results are rapidly coming to light. Let us hope that our own State will find a way to utilize the best results of all this inquiry and experience, and apply them in a form best adapted to our own needs.

Whatever the immediate result of the present agitation, the friends of public beneficence, the representatives of social charity, who are gathered in this Conference, have every reason to look to the future with hope and confidence. I see around me a large number of citizens who, under circumstances of grave difficulty and at much personal sacrifice, have labored for years to protect the defenseless of this State, to relieve the wretched, to reform the erring, and who already find their sufficient reward in a vast awakening of the public conscience to the duty of the community and in precious beginnings of true reform in the management

of our institutions. The gifts of the public through the State and throughout its localities to purely benevolent purposes are vastly larger, and the burdens more cheerfully borne, than at any earlier period in our history. The support which is given to such efforts by the mass of the people is more hearty and general, and the evidence is clear to us that only better and more widely diffused knowledge is necessary to make this support practically unanimous. Let us go on, then, more cheerfully than ever, with the good work, inspired not only by the assurances we have of a cheering degree of success to-day, but by our ever-growing hopes for the better future of our commonwealth, not forgetting that remoter future when the balance-sheet of all such work shall be cast; for then—

“While valor’s haughty champions wait
Till all their scars are shown,
Love walks unchallenged through the gate,
To sit beside the throne.”

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION, FEBRUARY 20, 1903.

The Conference was called to order at 9:30 o'clock, Friday morning, February 20th, 1903, with Mrs. E. E. Williamson, President, in the chair.

Chairman Hugh F. Fox, of the Nominating Committee, presented the following unanimous report:

President, HON. BENJAMIN F. LEE, Trenton, President Board of Managers State Institution for Feeble-minded Women and Girls.

Treasurer, ROBERT L. FLEMMING, Jersey City, Organized Aid.

Secretary, REV. WALTER REID HUNT, East Orange, President Orange Conference.

Vice-Presidents:

BLEECKER VAN WAGENEN, South Orange, president Bureau of Associated Charities.

CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Morristown, President State Charities Aid Association; Chairman Parole Committee, Rahway Reformatory.

RT. REV. BISHOP McFAUL, Trenton.

HON. E. C. STOKES, Trustee Training School for Feeble-minded Boys and Girls.

MRS. C. B. ALEXANDER, Hoboken, State Charities Aid Association.

Executive Committee:

FRANCIS B. LEE, Trenton, member Penal Commission 1895.

PROF. J. H. FINLEY, Princeton, State Charities Aid Association.

MRS. LABAN DENNIS, Newark, Bureau of Associated Charities.

CHARLES F. CURRIE, Blackwood, Superintendent Camden County Hospital for Insane.

A. M. HESTON, Atlantic City, Comptroller.

REV. FR. F. A. FOY, Jersey City, Chairman, Committee on Neglected Children.

MRS. E. E. WILLIAMSON, Elizabeth, Probation Officer, Union County.

T. L. McCONNELL, Smith Landing, Superintendent Atlantic County Hospital for Insane.

MARY LINTON LEWIS, Morristown, State Charities Aid Association.

HUGH F. FOX, Bayonne, President State Board of Children's Guardians.

HOWELL C. STULL, Trenton, Trustee State Home for Girls.

E. R. JOHNSTON, Vineland, Superintendent Training School for Feeble-minded Boys and Girls.

Assistant Secretaries:

SARAH M. VAN BOSKERCK, Plainfield, Secretary Organized Aid Association.

CAPT. C. W. IRWIN, Elizabeth, Agent of Probation Officer.

HARRY L. BARCK, JR., Hoboken.

MR. FOX—I think that we ought to have a perfectly clear understanding and appreciation of the work which has been done for this Conference and to whom so largely the success of the Conference is due. Conferences of this kind do not simply make themselves and grow themselves. There has to be an immense amount of work done in order to interest people and interest the members and bring about the harmonious action of the different conferences which make such a gathering as this. It requires a great deal of expenditure of time, thought and care. I do not think our President has spared herself in any of these respects, and she has had the co-operation of the interests of the Executive Committee and the Secretary. But some of us were a little timorous as to whether we had reached the point where this Conference could go on without a strong hand to support us. We feel, however, that we are fully launched and the time has now come to spread out, and as much as we would like to have Mrs. Williamson in the office of President, we feel that it was wise that there should be at the very beginning of things a principle established of rotation, and we are satisfied that in the gentleman whom we have nominated and elected as President the confidence of the community will be assured. He is a man of standing throughout the State, a man whose character and opinions are worthy, a man of integrity and ability, a man worthy of the utmost respect and confidence.

METHODS OF SUPERVISING PENAL AND CHARIT-
ABLE INSTITUTIONS.

F. H. WINES, LL.D., FORMER SECRETARY ILLINOIS BOARD OF
CHARITIES.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

This question is said to be a live one in New Jersey. It is something like a live wire; I am afraid to take hold of it. Not being a citizen of the State of New Jersey, I must disclaim at the outset any intention or purpose of attempting to influence legislative action here. I appear before you in no sense as an advocate, but simply as a witness, and I feel it advisable to confine my remarks mainly to the experience of a supervising board and to abstain from any criticism of the methods of work of boards in other States.

The State Board of Charities of Illinois was the fourth in order among those which have been created in this country, of which there are now, I think, at least twenty-four. The first was the Massachusetts Board. The Illinois Board takes the place of what is known in this State as the Board of Children's Guardians. It has the charge of dependent children in the State; places them out and supervises their care. A great majority of the boards in this country are remiss on some general principles. They are generally supervisory boards with few if any institutional powers. There are three general principles possible under which the State institutions of any State can be organized and managed. Each institution may be placed in charge of a board of local managers, directors or trustees, as variously called, and then this board has a title to all property beonging to the institution, is the custodian of the funds and disburses them according to its discretion under instruction of the law. It appoints all of the subordinate officers, including the superintendents. It makes the rules and regulations. It admits and discharges inmates, and is limited in its powers only by the nature of the statute from which it derives its authority. This was the common system all over the United

States. But it was found that these boards were rendering unsatisfactory service in many respects. Some were found to be inefficient, some were incompetent, while some were conducting affairs in such a way that more or less friction, irritation and scandal was growing out of the management, and it was thought wise that the system of State charities and corrections would be better administered if it were placed under the supervision of a central State authority, officers created for this purpose, just as inspectors in the army are appointed for the purpose of going around and seeing the condition of things, and reporting to the officers who have power to issue orders, where the inspectors have no such powers. There was never an army that could be carried on successfully without inspection. It is necessary in the management.

I had occasion to visit the Washington Hospital for the Insane in the District of Columbia when Dr. Nichols was in charge. He showed me a watch-clock on which the workmen had to report every hour in the night where they were. The record was made upon it. This clock bore this inscription, "*Quis custodet custodum?*" "Who shall watch the watchman?" Every cent of money spent in this institution is expected to be accounted for. It is not hard to do this if the man is honest.

Now, the second system to which I refer is that under which the management of the State institution is still vested in a local board of trustees with the same executive powers, and are subject to the visitation and inspection and criticism of a central board, which has no direct responsibility for their management, which is disinterested, cannot be questioned, which has no method for concealing anything, but whose official interest is rather found in the fullness and accuracy of its reports, and which can perform a great many services to the State which cannot be performed by the local boards. Our board was a board of that character, and my experience is under that system.

The third system, which has been growing in favor to some extent in this county for some years, is that of abolishing both the local board of trustees and the central board of supervision, and substituting in the management of the institution one central board of control, in which all of the property of the institutions

shall be held in their name. They shall appoint all of the superintendents, subordinates, and shall have charge of all the funds and expend them under the statute, and they shall make all the rules and regulations for the government of all the institutions, officers and employees and inmates. That is what I mean by a State Board of Control.

If the State of New Jersey, as I understand it is, is thinking of modifying its system of charitable institutions, it must take one or the other of these two tracks. It must establish a central board of supervision or it must establish a board of control, with complete executive power over all institutions, removing all trustees and substituting a new board for them. I do not stand here to advise you. I stand here to tell what our experience is, and I shall try to be brief.

We instituted and put into operation a uniform system of accounts. Some of our institutions kept no accounts, except vouchers and a bank-book. Some institutions kept records on loose paper, no ledger, journal or book of accounts could be found in the institutions. The effect of the investigation was to bring the institutions to uniformity. This was work which we did with great care, and we succeeded in reducing the per capita cost materially, and succeeded in cutting off a great many so-called improvements, which were unnecessary, injudicious. We had the power to examine into all of the plans for such improvements and architectural drawings, to criticise them and to make suggestions as to alterations in them, and the savings effected to the State treasury of Illinois by our intervention in this matter, during the thirty years of my experience as secretary, amounted to, I would say, I do not know how much, but would suggest anywhere between one and three millions of dollars. The per capita cost steadily fell without detriment to the institution or its inmates. Our policy was to suppose that they were managed right until we found otherwise, and if found wrong, our policy was not to create a sensation or a public charge of incompetency, but we would quietly remedy the wrong.

With regard to the county institutions, the condition of the jails and almshouses throughout the country where there is no regular official inspection is deplorable in the extreme. If the

jails of the United States could be collected at some great central point, like the World's Fair in Chicago, and exhibited to the people of the United States, the condition of the interiors of the jails in this country would not last longer than necessary for the people of the United States to replace them, and the condition of the almshouses is in many cases terrible. The lack of inspections, of any methods, lack of discipline, would be found. The county officials are doing the best they know how. They are doing the best they can under the conditions, but they know nothing about the business of carrying on such institutions, and they have no opportunity to learn. Nobody in the county feels an interest in the condition of these unfortunates. The people of the county do not know what is going on in these almshouses and jails. It would be a great thing to have State officials and turn in the light. You have probably seen a great deal about a Swedish physician treating disease by light alone. The great remedy is to turn light into these institutions. Getting evidence, getting the will of the managers, talking to the editors of the local papers, getting some good men and women of the vicinity to see the condition for themselves, and you have instituted local opinion. By this plan we brought about a great reform in the management of institutions. Many abuses were stopped. A great many of them were persuaded to improve their farms or buy new ones and put up proper buildings.

With regard to the private institutions we had no direct power of responsibility. There can, of course, be no State supervision with private interests. But we were welcome at all of them. We visited them in a friendly way, and we were in touch with them and their work in and out of Chicago, and the board came, of course, to be recognized and its influence felt. The work of such a board is educational in its character. I think that no greater single step has been taken in modern beneficence than in this State. Supervisory boards educate public opinion. They get the information upon which to form a correct and sound judgment with regard to the methods of public and private charity, and they are able to communicate these impressions and conclusions to the public in an authoritative way.

It is the custom for such boards to publish a monthly or quarterly bulletin in the nature of a journal, which is widely circulated, and this imparts information to the press and to the public regarding these matters. Then these boards are apt to call to their aid citizens, open-minded, benevolent citizens, of the State in these conferences. Besides, the State boards have very commonly the power of appointing local committees to conduct the visitation of county jails and almshouses, and there is a center in every county which is in direct touch with the board which is authorized by law and appointed under State authority and has a certain spirit of semi-official character. This brings the official and the non-official element in sympathy and co-operation with each other and vastly extends the influence of this board.

Then I may point out the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, which is the great center of this whole movement in the United States. Out of that has grown this whole movement, which is the glory of the latter half of the nineteenth century, and its influence has spread throughout the whole civilized world.

Now, the question is, as I understand it, that you wish me to address myself to, practically is, whether the central supervisory or the board of control is the better method of securing results at which we are all aiming—greater economy, greater efficiency, greater management in the administration of county and municipal charities.

Now, there are arguments which can be advanced, and which are undoubtedly valued arguments, in favor of the central board. These arguments will, I suppose, be presented by the gentleman who succeeds me. It is said that many of our trustees are mere figure-heads; that they do not take any real interest in the work being done; know practically nothing about it. They are merely ciphers at the right hand of the superintendent. That may be true.

One instance I recall in the hospital for insane in the State of Alabama. When it was under the management of Dr. Bryce, the doctor told me that the board of trustees met at his institution once a year and had dinner with him. They went through the building, looked at his report and went away. Dr. Bryce was a

man who could be trusted anywhere. It did not make any difference about the trustees being there. Not all superintendents are so honest or so capable. Where a man needs supervision it is an excellent thing to have a board of trustees to look after him and the administration of the affairs of the institution. If the superintendent is a man who cannot be trusted he must be removed.

It is said that the whole tendency of modern business is in concentration and in consolidation. The purchases can be made more economical when made all at one time. There are various business arguments in favor of a central board of control. There are two objections to it which I think are fatal. The first is, that the method which underlies its creation is pretty apt to be political. The intention in creating it is not the only intention, but the intention is to convert the State institution into an attachment to the political machine, as the money currency by virtue of which exchanges are made and bargained for before the delivery of votes, these depending very often for their execution on the control of the patronage and the power of making appointments on the one hand, and the power of making purchases and giving contracts for supplies to favored individuals on the other. Whether that is the purpose or not it is the result. It is for that reason that the sentiment of the better class of citizens object to boards of control. I think that none of the ends which it is proposed to accomplish by their creation are dependent upon the accomplishment upon such creation, and that they can be accomplished in other ways. Certainly the end sought in the creation of the State boards of public charities, the supervision of the work of the institutions and their trustees is absolutely divided, because these boards of control, supposed to be political, are actuated by the political and selfish motives, the politician being paid in this way for the service rendered in the campaign. Abuses can creep in under other systems, but they do not continue for long periods without detection.

There is much more I should like to say and to the point, but I bow to the decision of the President, as I know she has much to do. I will not add anything to what I have said.

WHAT TYPE OF SUPERVISION DOES NEW JERSEY
NEED?

MR. JAMES HEG, FORMERLY MEMBER OF THE WISCONSIN BOARD
OF CONTROL.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Some weeks ago I was asked to prepare a paper on the question "What Type of Supervision Does New Jersey Need?" for the Conference. I said I would do it provided I did not have to go away, and supposed that that left me out. A few days ago, however, I received a telegram that I was expected here, and must be here. I had no intimation then as to who else was to speak or what was to be said on this subject. I find, however, while I have gone into the subject very considerable, nearly everything I have to say has been said better by other speakers. I therefore decided that I would eliminate almost all of the address and only present the conclusions I came to in regard to a board for New Jersey. In the first place, I favor a Board of Charities. It is not needful in a State to have anything but a Board of Charities unless the conditions are so bad. In the State of Wisconsin the institutions had become rather in bad shape. The boards were very extravagant, very careless. The central board organized very quickly and had a bill passed by the Legislature to set aside all local boards. I do not believe the people would go back to the local boards. There are a great many arguments in favor of a central board. There was only one argument that I heard against it, and that I heard Dr. Wines speak of. It does get into politics. Not that it puts politics into the institution, but the board gets into it. That is one objection to it. It is getting worse and worse in every State where we have boards of control, in that the political machine attempts to perpetuate the party then in power. It may do this legitimately, but it does it.

The second point I have against a board of control is that it has too much power. I suppose there is no body of men in the

world that has as much power as the board of control of Wisconsin. They assume the power to do anything allowed by law.

The third reason that I object to a board of control is, that the board assumes the duty of superintendents. After I was a member of the board I became superintendent of an institution. The board had supervision over all the duties. If I did anything wrong or out of the way, I had to take the blame. If anything was done very nicely, they took the credit. I find they assume too much. A superintendent is simply a hired man to do certain work set down for him by a board of control.

DISCUSSION.

For the Lay Public, WILLIAM H. ALLEN, Ph.D., General Secretary.

If I may represent the lay public, then it is for about two millions of people I am supposed to speak. It seems to me that it is but right to ask for supervision for the protection of the lay public, for the ninety-nine per cent. who are outside of institutions, rather than the one per cent. who are inside of institutions.

This whole question of supervision is new in our State. We have had three addresses directed against the Board of Control idea. On behalf of the lay public, I wish to raise a few points, not for the sake of argument, but to bring out replies to the reasons which have been urged through the press for a board of control.

Those who advocate a board of control say that we do not have adequate attention from voluntary boards of managers. As a matter of fact, five men giving their entire time to the work of inspection and management, five men, three hundred days in the year, devote fifteen hundred days to the problem, whereas, in the present system, seventy-two men go once a month to the institutions, giving in all but 864 days. Their service can be but perfunctory, for they have dinner, leaving little time after dinner to discuss the needs of the institution or to learn its methods. You cannot have the intelligent interest in this way which you can have from men who visit the institutions over and over again in a year and give expert advice. A committee of experts can apply expert methods to investigating conditions, where volunteers are hopeless and helpless.

The supporters of the board of control idea deny that the demand for centralization and concentration originated in partisan politics. On the contrary, it originated in theoretical discussions, and almost without exception the people in this State are in favor of the centralization of the power.

The point was also made that the board of control assumes the duty of superintendents. In this county, Camden, we have the board of freeholders, which is a board of control. They are freehanded. We have institutions which cannot be supervised, county institutions in rural districts which cannot be supervised in any State. It is not a question of system, but of personality.

One other point I wish to urge, which comes rather from an academic circle than from our own.

The board of control is not incompatible with volunteer supervision. It is impossible to have supervision from a board of control. Everybody will admit that the board of control could not possibly supervise itself. There should be a power outside of that board. It can be outside of that board. Mr. Blue maintains that the ideal system is one where you have a single centralized, localized board of control, which runs the institutions on a business basis, which runs the institution as a large corporation would run its work, so far as matters of the institution pertain to business. Then have parallel with that a single voluntary organization.

I want to leave this as a final question to be discussed by those who are thoroughly convinced and who will convince us that we should not have a board of control composed of from three to five men on whom you can lay the responsibility.

I hope these questions will be discussed and answered, assuming that my spirit is that of questioning.

MR. SMITH—I want to be emphatic as to the fact that Mr. Allen has thrown the gauntlet down for a proper discussion of the whole question when the time comes. I am not, however, prepared to discuss the subject.

FOR CITY AND COUNTY ALMSHOUSES.

DR. JOS. S. SUTPHEN, NEWARK CITY COUNCIL.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am sorry to say that by an omission of the mail, or my own carelessness, I was not informed of this discussion. So the article which I have to present is simply on an ideal almshouse. I submit it as it is.

The care of the poor of the human race has for centuries enlisted the sympathy of and awakened the intelligent thought of this as well as other and older countries than ours tending toward the most humane and truly charitable methods of caring for these unfortunates.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, one of England's most fortunate and illustrious of modern sovereigns, who ascended the throne in 1558, the poor law read as follows:

“Every person who is old, lame, blind, sick, decrepit, impotent, or in any other way disabled or enfeebled so as to be unable by his work to maintain himself, shall be maintained by the county or town in which he may be.”

The queen's lawmakers, hoping by this measure to put an end to beggary, which flogging, drowning, hanging and burning were not able to diminish, they sought the opposite extreme, of feeding and providing the beggar with a home and punishing those who would not pay for his support.

Thus the almshouse, as the law provided, became the home of the unfortunate, the cripple, the sick, the indolent, the vicious, the beggar, the blind, the dissolute, the insane and of young children.

What a congregation of disease and crime, and a promising place for children to imitate their older companions in language and aspirations! And the poorhouse was looked upon as a place of shelter, housing those whose conditions needed individual and intelligent care and treatment, inviting increased knowledge of the means of treating disease, and, with the growing appreciation of the need and value of preventive work, has led to specialization in the care and treatment of the various classes once sheltered under one roof.

The unfortunate are now cared for; the cripple has the advantage of orthopedic surgery; the sick have intelligent medical attention and proper nursing and skillfully prepared food; the vicious are restrained or separated from others by moral suasion or mechanical restraint; the beggar is removed from the streets, and, if physically able, is made to do some work to keep himself; the blind are cared for in institutions adapted to and in charge of physicians competent to perform the most difficult and sensitive operations; the deaf and dumb are taught the sign language used both by the eye and also the supersensitive fingers; the insane are cared for in palatial institutions, and receive considerate care by experienced physicians and nurses trained for special care and human consideration; the dissolute are attracting the attention of the moral and charitable, and soon this class will be in State reformatories in addition to those now established and sustained by Christian liberality and legislation; the drunkard will in the future be treated and cared for as a diseased person, with the hope of a physical and moral reformation; the epileptics are cared for in the village constructed and maintained by the State; the reformatories, the State Home for Boys at James-

burg, State Home for Girls at Trenton, the Home for Blind and Feeble-minded Women, the School for Manual Training and Industrial Work for Colored Youth, the Home for Feeble-minded Children, the School for the Deaf, as well as the "State Board of Children's Guardians," whose noble work will have a lasting effect for good among those children who, without its beneficent work, would be compelled to remain in the almshouse, associating with the older, indigent and pauper element and imbibing and imitating habits of idleness and unhealthy habits and conversation.

The various homes and institutions established by our State and also by those with charitable instincts and liberality looking toward the betterment of the poor and afflicted has been the outgrowth of the almshouse of old. Yet without the former system I doubt the wonderful impulse imparted to the consideration of these homes, and can feel that the statute passed by Elizabeth's parliament laid the foundation for all these benefits and blessings to the poor and afflicted.

As to the financial results, I quote from the report of Superintendent Sharwell, of the Newark Almshouse, for the year 1900: The total number of inmates for the year was 227, and the total cost of maintenance, except the interest on money invested in the grounds and buildings, was \$24,710.17, or \$108.81 per each inmate per year, or \$2.09 $\frac{1}{3}$ per week. The inmates are furnished three meals daily of nourishing, well-cooked food, prepared under the critical eye of the matron (Mrs. Sharwell), and fairly and equally distributed to each one, including butter, milk, tea and coffee, and milk to the sick. On Thanksgiving and Christmas they are given bountiful turkey dinners, the women and children gratified upon the receipt of an orange and the sterner set a cigar, thus reminding them that they are enjoying these festive seasons as of old.

When we review the work done in our almshouse of to-day, taking into consideration the cleanliness of the rooms and closets in all the buildings, the bedding uniform in appearance in consequence of soft mattresses covered by clean, white spreads, the attention paid to the temperature and ventilation, the critical eye of the superintendent over the reception of desirable supplies,

the discipline of the institution, the oversight of the matron to the purchasing of suitable material for clothing and distributing the same, as well as the preparing suitable food for the sick or those on prescribed diet, the kind and intelligent care of the physician to the sick, and the distributing to the hospital or other institutions, where they can and do receive special treatment, we are led to thank our Heavenly Father for man's kindness to man, and are encouraged to continue in our work for the betterment of the poor and giving the best of medical skill to those afflicted and pinched by poverty. "Inasmuch as you did it unto the least of these, you did it unto me."

FOR STATE INSTITUTIONS.

MR. PATRICK FARRELLY, OF RAHWAY AND MORRIS PLAINS BOARDS
OF MANAGERS.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am sorry that I did not come to this meeting with a paper prepared. I did not know, however, until last week that I was expected to be here except as an observer and member of your organization. The Secretary sent me notice about a month ago that I would be expected to say something. Unfortunately I was away from home, and in some way in re-addressing the letter from one place to another it was mislaid and did not come to my hands.

I see by the program that I am down to say a few words for State Institutions. I have only been connected with three, and I can speak of these three from actual knowledge. One of these institutions was the Jamesburg Reformatory School, with which I was connected for eight years, another the State Reformatory at Rahway, and the third the Morris Plains Hospital. It seems that the principal subject-matter to be considered, or which has been under consideration by this body, is the fact as to whether we should or should not have supervision of State institutions. I feel agreed with everything that was said yesterday evening by Dr. Lewis.

6 Char

I want to say that it could not and can not now be said of the boards with which I have been connected that they did not know what was going on in their institutions. You cannot get any board of control, no matter how much you pay them, to devote the intelligent attention to the management and control of these institutions which is now given by the philanthropists on our voluntary boards, who now devote at least from one to two days every month looking over details of State institutions, familiarizing themselves with every branch of the business from beginning to end. That, in my judgment, cannot be had by any board of control or by any person who simply labors for his salary, and who has no desire to benefit the public-at-large. There is not a dollar spent or an act done in these institutions with which I am familiar that is not accounted for by every member.

It has been said these boards are mere figure-heads. I simply say for the State institutions of New Jersey, I name one more, the State Hospital for the Insane at Trenton, that the boards of control of these several institutions, so far as I know, never have been and are not now mere figure-heads. The managing boards have supervisory power to-day because every improvement that we make must be sanctioned by the board according to the by-laws of the institution. Therefore, all the institutions of the State are under supervisory power. Accounts are furthermore supervised by the controller. If existing managers can be relieved of their duties by having a voluntary body empowered to enter into State institutions and examine their affairs and to report to the Governor or the Legislature, I feel satisfied that there is not a single member of the board of management of any of our institutions but would be pleased at such an investigation.

I thank you for allowing me to speak these few words in behalf of State institutions, and hope that the members of the State Charities Aid Association will, in the near future, visit these institutions and make such criticisms and suggestions as they deem proper. I can assure you that the management will be only too pleased to accommodate you and strive to do everything possible to better the management.

FOR COUNTY COURTS AND JAILS.

PROSECUTOR JOHN S. VOORHEES, MIDDLESEX.

Madame President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am not sure that the County Prosecutor is a proper person to respond to this subdivision of your question; one whose duty it is to send men to jail and then help keep them there, and then to decry the institution to which his duty requires him to send the unfortunate prisoner. But your presiding officer has put me under sentence to speak, and I find that when Mrs. Williamson says anything it must be.

Tolstoi has divided criminals into various classes. There are those who commit crime only when under some provocation or under violent temptation. There are those who commit crime because society by its treatment of them has led them into it. There are those who commit crime when under peculiar condition, as intoxication. There are those who are habitual, persistent, intentional, willful criminals. It is the duty of the county courts to determine, first, whether the individual who has appeared before it is guilty of the crime for which he stands charged, and if it finds he is, punishment is imposed upon him as the court may deem adequate to the crime committed. Punishment in these days is not for retaliation, it is not punishment for punishment's sake. The law of *Æstimatio Capitis* is no longer in force except for that highest crime, willful, deliberate murder. The rule to be applied in punishment is to impose such a degree of punishment as will best protect society, and as will lead to the reformation of the criminal. When a man is convicted of crime and comes before the court for punishment, the court, for the most part, knows nothing of his past career. In some cases the judge may know, but in most cases the judge knows nothing of the past life of the criminal before him. He may be in one or the other of these various classes, and it is curious, perhaps not curious, but it is true, that often the most hardened criminal is the best actor when before the court. The judge cannot look into his life; he cannot look into his character, and he

cannot tell in advance what effect the punishment he may inflict will have on his character. A punishment may be inadequate for one character and excessive in another character of life. One man will turn away with a smile of innocence which would break down another. Men who are convicted of crime and sentenced to imprisonment are no longer a danger to society so long as they remain in prison. How can the court tell when it imposes a penalty how long that person will remain dangerous to society—one year, six months or five years? And yet, he is supposed to know when a man is no longer dangerous, when he can go forth among respectable citizens, free from imprisonment.

Judges differ very greatly in their estimate of crime. One will be severe. Another judge is spoken of as the mild judge. Persons plead guilty in one court, whereas in another jurisdiction they would fight conviction to the end for fear of sentence which may follow the conviction before a severe judge. Thus it is that the sentences imposed by our courts are often excessive when they should be mild, and mild when they should be severe.

Virginia has sought to remedy this, and some States, I believe, leave it to the jury to determine what the sentence should be after they have determined the person guilty, but this certainly does not produce uniformity in imposing sentence. Indeed, juries having no experience are less likely to impose the proper sentence than an experienced judge. We have sought in New Jersey to remedy this in part by permitting our judges, in imposing sentence upon those who are between sixteen and thirty years of age, and who are undergoing sentence for the first time, to impose upon such criminals an indeterminate sentence. But the difficulty lies not simply with those undergoing sentence for the first time and who may chance to be within the limits of this age, the difficulty is to read criminals who come before our courts at any time. The judge cannot tell the effect upon a man of a sentence where he must fix the period of confinement. There seems to be but one remedy for this, and that is to have supervisory power which shall follow the effect of the sentence upon the man, which shall see whether the effect of the sentence is to help and strengthen and make a man of him, or whether he grows sullen and remains dangerous to society; one who shall

not be turned at large any more than you would turn loose among people a dangerous animal. Many of the men convicted of crime are sent to our county jails to suffer there the penalty of their offense.

About a year ago I sent a circular letter to the sheriffs of the counties in the State to obtain information about the condition of jails, the number of persons they had confined in them at that time, and the numbers have not greatly changed at this time. There were between five and six hundred persons confined in our county jails. I could not get the numbers exactly, as in some cases I did not get any response. In all there were about two hundred undergoing sentences for crime. In these jails were not only men and women who were convicted of crime, but with them men and women who were charged with crime awaiting indictment and freedom. Also many insane, tramps, and disorderly persons, and persons committed for drunkenness and State's witnesses, mature men and women, boys and girls, old and young, white and colored, innocent and guilty, sane and insane, diseased and healthy, and for the most part there was no separation of one class from another except the division of sexes, and in some instances there was not even a department for children. The children and all the rest were huddled, in most of them, in a common corridor and only separated at night by locking them in separate cells, and sometimes three or four in a single cell. I know of one jail in which there are about sixty persons to-day and only three cells that cannot be unlocked by persons or boys by wire, and in the corridors of this prison the clean and unclean mix together, the healthy and diseased, criminals and innocent men. Here the innocent get their first lessons in crime; here plots are hatched for the commission of crimes when the terms of imprisonment shall end. Here men contract diseases which go with them for life. I know one man in our county jails who contracted a disease which took his life before imprisonment was over. What is the remedy for this? There is no State supervision over these county jails. They are left to the care of whoever may chance to be sheriff, men without training. They are fair, average citizens at least, but the system is wrong, and the conditions are such that they cannot change them. There is no

supervision, except a perfunctory one, a board of freeholders who, in most instances, see nothing of what goes on behind the doors. What is the remedy? I have suggested it on a former occasion, that our county jails should not be places of confinement for persons convicted of crime. The State is small and we should reform them by building one or two reformatories in which all persons convicted of crime and undergoing sentence, which now would be carried out in the county jails, where all such persons might be confined in institutions where the rules and regulations would be such as to produce, in the conditions which I have described, a reformation of character. There ought at least to be some State supervision over the State institutions, and if there was, and then, if this condition continued, you would know upon whom to put your finger as the responsible party tolerating such conditions, for which every citizen of New Jersey ought to blush.

There is just one suggestion more I would like to make. The State ought, I think, to take steps at once to devise a plan by which those who are habitual criminals may be known from the others who are not. It is so easy for a man to change his place of residence, his place of living. He commits crime here to-day and is in another county to-morrow. You cannot tell what his past life has been. So, should we not take measurements, under Bertillon's system? Why should not these measurements be printed by themselves? There are experts in most of our prisons and reformatories. Why should they not be printed and sent to each county and kept there under the card-system, so that, when a person is about to be sentenced we could turn to his record on those cards? In a few moments you can tell men who are most steeped in crime and are those who appear most innocent when they come before the court for sentence.

I simply wish to say that I thoroughly believe there should be some supervision over prisoners sentenced by our county courts, and there should be a correction of the conditions found in our county jails.

DISCUSSION FROM THE FLOOR.

DR. JOS. S. SUTPHEN—In regard to the jail in Essex county, contradictory to the gentleman who last spoke, I would say that they have about 240 inmates—men and women, boys and girls. The sheriff of the county has made an effort to separate them, and practically succeeds in separating them, the boys and girls detained as witnesses and those detained waiting sentence. The corridors are used for exercising in by the male prisoners. You may remember that the county board of freeholders attempted to retain the control of the jail, but the decision of the Supreme Court was that the sheriff is the legal officer.

C. C. CONSTANCE—I do not see why there should be a State board of control or why there should be a legally-appointed volunteer board; that is, a voluntary board appointed by the Governor. I think in civic experiences it has been found that the voluntary boards have done better work. In New York, for instance, that association does a great deal more work acting entirely outside of any appointment, acting on its own responsibility completely. It does more good for the city of New York than if a board were appointed by the Governor.

I think that the present system or some system could be devised by a conference such as this, by which a board of supervision might be arranged for entirely outside of any law or any appointed body.

MR. VAN WAGENEN—I heard it said that the board of managers as now instituted did not give the attention to the business of their institutions; that they come once or twice a month, take dinner, and go away feeling that everything is right. I think it is very rare when any board can be found where some members are not assiduous in their attention to the institutions. If they only visit them once or twice a month, it does not follow that they are not in touch with them.

DR. CHARLTON T. LEWIS—The Rahway Reformatory has for its object the reforming of young men; taking them in when they have gone wrong, educating them and determining when they ought to be free, and finding places for them in the world. If you take a board of control which is selected for its business capacity to cut down expenses, and selected as a political reward for services, a reward for the votes, how are they going to do this moral work and establish them in society?

MR. FOX—I would like to ask Mr. Allen, whether he has himself any convictions as to the kind of a board would be best for New Jersey, and what they are?

MR. WM. H. ALLEN, Ph.D.—That is a question that a lawyer friend of mine would call irrelevant in character.

I have convictions as to what a board of control should be. I feel, if I could have my own way and appoint a board, I should say that we ought to have separate boards for our prisons, for our twenty-five or thirty penal

institutions and reformatories; another separate board for our almshouses, and still another board or commission for the insane and county hospital or two insane hospitals, and for the two institutions for the feeble-minded and epileptics. In other words, I have strong convictions in favor of the Massachusetts subdivision system.

MR. FOX—I wish to state that the gentleman from Essex who introduced the bill has withdrawn it and is going to introduce a resolution creating a commission, as the Governor has requested.

MR. JAMES HEG—I want to say a word in regard to Dr. Lewis' remarks, and I think that covers the entire subject of the Board of Managers, and that is, educating these young men so they can go out in the world. A board does not take the proper care of the people's money. They don't think of that. They don't think the taxpayers are to be considered. If some body of men could be appointed to take care of this money and see that the money is not spent injudiciously, not extravagantly, the demand would not appear for a board of control. I think that the cause of all dissatisfaction in every State that the boards do not scrutinize closely enough.

DR. F. H. WINES—The practical men of the world and men of experience do not pay much attention to academic and theoretical considerations, and when they come from men studying for a degree in a university through influences and ideas second-hand, and from those who present such conclusions with the object of winning applause and gaining a degree, I do not see any weight whatever attaches to it or authority of that sort. The great question is, What does experience teach with regard to the conduct of institutions? Experience teaches that you cannot, under the best circumstances, disperse politics from their management, and when you have consolidated a board of control you have political interference in its worst form. The political machine takes hold of it and utilizes it to the advantages of the ring. It is like two horses pulling in opposite directions; the institutions and their inmates fall to the ground. Nobody can make anybody believe it is a good system in its workings, no matter what the imagination is.

Another thing I want to say is about paid and unpaid boards. When I was made secretary of the Illinois Board, way back in 1869, it has been so long ago that I had almost forgotten the date, the board found that the attention to their duties took a great deal of time. They were busy men in active professional pursuits, and could not well spare the time. They said they should be paid, that they ought to have five dollars a day or \$1,500 a year as settlement in full, and they said that I could get it from the legislature. One day they went in the governor's office and expressed this view. "Why, gentlemen," he said, "if the legislature should pass the bill, when it came to me for signing I should veto it. Why, I have difficulty enough as it is. So long as there is no compensation attached to the offices I can find suitable men who will serve on these boards. But the very instant there is salary attached, the men who have been active and the moment the party is in it will give these positions as rewards for services rendered in the campaign. I prefer the present arrangement and will veto the bill."

I would like to ask in regard to the matter of inspection. If you go down to the Waldorf-Astoria and register and take a room there you know whether it is a good hotel or not. Do you know whether the food is good until you have been down in the kitchen and seen it prepared? When you repose your form beneath the sheets do you want to see the chambermaid? Is it necessary to know what sort of a looking girl she is? I can go into any hotel and inside of five minutes I can tell how it is managed. I do not have to see anybody except the institution itself. A man's training and experience in jails, almshouse or State institutions tells him just as well whether they are managed well or not as if he stayed in them for a year. He may not know so much, but he has a correct judgment.

Mr. Allen said that a paid board will devote more time to investigating the affairs of the institution. That is the very objection that Mr. Heg tells us about. The board cannot earn its salary unless it discharges the duties of the superintendents. Then you have conflicting authority. There is no necessity for the number of hours as specified for a paid board. It makes trouble all around, interferes with the efficiency, the excellence of the management and the results which you are aiming to accomplish.

The first thing I noticed on going to Wisconsin was the deterioration in the quality of the superintendents of the institutions. That was before Mr. Heg knew anything about these questions. I saw the deterioration of the quality of superintendents. Then the next thing I noticed was that the State Conferences of Charities were less interesting, were not so well attended; the public were no longer in touch as before. Then we established the National Conference of Charities. Where Wisconsin was the best represented State in the Union at first, Wisconsin did not come any more. The State Board of Control did not care to have the public interested in the management of institutions, and the next thing we knew the State of Wisconsin invited us to come up there and hold our Conference at Milwaukee. A committee from the Conference went up to Milwaukee to make the necessary arrangements, and they repudiated the invitation, and we had to go to hunt up another place, so the Conference was changed from Milwaukee to Detroit. This was all due to loss of interest in consequence of the establishment of a board of control.

DR. CHARLTON T. LEWIS—I agree with every word Dr. Wines has said, and emphasize all but one point, and that is, it is impossible to keep politics out under any system of management. We differ in New Jersey. We do not allow politics to interfere with our duties. I have served for fifteen years in three different boards in connection with our penal institutions of New Jersey, and to-day it would be utterly impossible for me to tell you my associates' politics. In the pursuance of our duties we do not know what their political relations are, and I do not believe I would know if I served fifty years. We have been deluged with letters from politicians, I will say, in different parts of the State, whenever an appointment is to be made, requesting us to consider the claims of this, that and the other who has claims to patronage. No attention was ever paid to such letters only to throw them in the wastebasket. There is not a member on that board, if politics should enter it, who would serve another minute in that capacity, believing it would be impossible to do good, efficient work.

The great basis of these institutions is the moral basis, which requires attention, labor, thought, knowledge and experience. If you are going to build a building which is to be useful for its purposes, perfectly adapted to them, you want a good foundation. No architect would be satisfied that his duty had ended when that foundation is laid. There must be adaptation to its purposes, in the rooms, divisions, apartments and its appearance before the community, and the financial basis upon which it rests must be made water-tight.

We do not want to have control of the finances of the institutions. We would very much rather be relieved of it. If you can find a way of relieving us without impairing the institutions do it by all means. That the business management of the institutions should be vested by law with the powers of the managers, with the moral responsibilities, for the efficiency of the institution, seems to us to be nothing but going backward to the dark ages and abandoning what progress has been made by generations of study and experience. Mark my words, if you vest this power in a single board of control of New Jersey it will push us backward fifty years in the progress which we have been making, which was actuated by public interest and supervision, and introduce politics, making the management a machine for political reward; New Jersey will be a degenerate State.

MR. FOX—The first superintendent of the institution for the training of feeble-minded women and girls was a Philadelphia woman. The first superintendent of the Rahway Reformatory was a Wisconsin man. The first superintendent of the State Board of Children's Guardians was a Boston man. The first superintendent of the Vineland Training School for Boys and Girls was an Indiana man. I believe they were all very satisfactory, because New Jersey wanted the best it could get.

DR. WINES—The best State superintendent that the Illinois Insane Asylum ever had, and the one who had the confidence of the people, was a New Jersey man.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

Under the head of unfinished business, a paper by Mr. White was read by Mr. Currie, of Blackwood, N. J.

WHAT TYPE OF INSTITUTION SHOULD NEW JERSEY ADOPT?

In consequence of lack of time, Mrs. C. B. Alexander's paper on "What Type of Institution Should New Jersey Adopt?" was read by title, and ordered to be placed in the proceedings.

Mr. Fox moved that the following votes of thanks be adopted, which were unanimously carried:

(1.) *Resolved*, That a vote of thanks be extended to the Governor and the Legislature and custodians of the State House, for the use of the Assembly Chamber for the meetings of the Conference.

(2.) *Resolved*, That the thanks of the Conference be extended to the press for the very full and fair notices given of the proceedings of the Conference.

A communication was then presented from the Chief of Police of Jersey City, which was ordered to be read, with an expression of regret that he could not be present.

On motion, it was ordered that the recommendations contained therein be adopted.

Mrs. E. E. Williamson, the President, presented a communication from Mr. James Buckley, in regard to State supervision of county and State institutions. It was ordered that the communication be embodied in the minutes of the Conference and published in the annual report.

The meeting then, on motion, adjourned *sine die*.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.

WILLIAM AIKMAN, ATLANTIC CITY.

(*Read by Title.*)

I have been asked to discuss the problem of the care of juvenile delinquents between the time of their arrest and their commitment either to some reformatory institution or to the care of the Probation Officer.

By the word *juvenile* is usually understood a class of delinquents under the age of sixteen or thereabouts. It is also understood that this class of children is made up of those who have been or may be convicted of a crime or misdemeanor as a *first* offence.

With these two things—*youth* and a *first* delinquency—kept sharply in mind the question will easily shape itself to a more or less satisfactory answer.

It is taken for granted that these young persons are really *delinquents*, that they have broken law and are amenable to its penalties. This must not for a moment be lost sight of. Sympathy for childhood and tenderness for its mistakes or misfortunes may easily obscure the fact of criminality; but for it to pass out of mind or even to go into obscurity will inevitably lead not only into error and mistaken judgment, but to dangerous action. I refer not so much to the bias which may be given by such mistaken judgment on the part of the court or the parties concerned in the prosecution of the case, but especially as it touches the juvenile offender himself, and its bearing upon his life and character.

No proceedings or treatment must permit the painful fact of moral delinquency to drop out of the mind of the child. He must understand and be deeply impressed with the truth that he has broken the law and has come under its penalties.

The practical working of the Probation Office has impressed this upon me. I have observed that it is a very easy thing for a delinquent young person, in the novelty of being brought before a lenient Judge or a kind Probation Officer, to lose the sharp sense of the fact that an offence, perhaps a crime, has been committed, and to look upon the situation as a matter of curious interest, if not of pastime. I have met this so often that I now take the culprit strictly alone and, by serious words and manner, endeavor to impress him with the fact that he is in the hands of the law, that it is not a matter of curious interest or simply a new and unusual but on the whole a pleasant experience.

The Hon. Judge Endicott, of the Quarter Sessions of Atlantic county, has been impressed in the same way. When perhaps a half dozen young persons have come before him half-amused by their mutual comradeship, they were inclined to be even hilarious in the novel situation where they were attracting so much attention. He has found it necessary to have them brought before him one by one so as to make them understand the real signifi-

cance of the situation in which they find themselves—that they have been breakers of law and are liable to its penalties.

I might turn aside for a moment—it shall be but a moment—to remark that this bears upon what are called *children's courts*. Here, if I mistake not, may be one of the dangers which may confront them. I have seen somewhere, either in magazine or newspaper, an illustration of one of these courts. In the picture the youngsters seem to be holding a levee, while kindly and benevolent looking ladies are attentively waiting upon them.

The importance of sober and intelligent views are important at this point. These young persons *are accused and they are under arrest; they are in the hands of the law*. It is absolutely necessary that they should have a real apprehension of this fact.

One of the ways in which this can, at least partially, be done is by committing them to prison or to a house of penal detention, jail or whatever the institution may be called. The delinquent *is* a delinquent and must naturally and of necessity be put where delinquents belong.

An ordinary home with no air of penalty about it will not do. Extraordinary surroundings must environ him in accordance with the truth of things. This being clearly understood, we are confronted with the other fact in the case of the youthful delinquent—*it is a first offence*.

It may have come, as usually it does, out of bad surroundings; it may have been the result of evil companionships; it may have been a mere sudden and childish impulse or a thoughtless indiscretion. In such a case it is simply monstrous to put this young person among older criminals, or where there is any possibility of his coming in even the slightest contact with them. One day, even one hour of such contact may work an irreparable injury, blighting a whole life. It may be a question whether a court which so commits a juvenile delinquent has not itself committed a crime.

The conclusion which easily follows is this—a place must be provided for the juvenile delinquent which *is at once penal and at the same time morally safe*.

This place of detention may be in the jail itself, totally isolated

from the common prison; or it may be in a building entirely separate and devoted to this purpose alone.

The latter—a separate building—is, it seems to me, impracticable. In perhaps all our counties the class of which we are speaking is so limited that an edifice erected or used for this sole purpose would be an expense so useless that no board of officials would allow it, even were it possible to make it a real detaining home, such as, in the eye of a broken law, it would be.

The case is admirably, though imperfectly, met in Bergen county. Mrs. C. J. Burnett, of Englewood, tells me “there is no place where children may be detained for trial except in the county jail. But there the children are kept in separate departments where they neither see nor hear adult prisoners. These departments are on the second floor and are in good condition.”

The report of Miss Van Meter, of Salem county, says there is but one place in Salem county for children awaiting trial—the county jail, with its medley of character. When not in use for the sick they are put in the hospital, a large, light and pleasant room over the woman’s department.

This report of Miss Van Meter incidentally corroborates the point which I have endeavored to make, of the necessity of never allowing the impression of violated law to drop out of mind. Miss Van Meter says: “A wayward girl of fourteen years, with the usual weeping mother. The State Home for Girls was suggested. Expostulations and suggestions were of no avail to reach her, but in a roundabout way the liability of her being sent to jail did the work. She realized the consequence of her previous behavior, turned about and began a new life of industry and obedience. In this case a pleasant and unsuggestive detaining-home, with no idea of penalty attached to it, would have failed entirely of a good result.

A report of Mrs. A. M. Hughes informs me that in Morris county there is “no place of detention other than the common jail. The children are, however, placed in a large room away from ordinary prisoners, several boys being in the same room when necessary, and frequently occupying the same bed.”

Mr. John S. Voorhees, of Middlesex county, reports: “Children are confined in the witness department of the jail. We

rarely permit children to stay any length of time in the jail. They are either admitted to bail or, if it cannot be furnished, are paroled in the care of an officer."

Mr. C. H. Edmunds, of Mercer county, reports: "We have very little method at present, as our county building will not be finished for about one year. We have no juvenile department in our present jail. Judge Rellstab has given orders that when a child is committed to jail, he is to be notified, and he liberates the child in the care of parent or guardian."

Mr. J. Moore White, Probation Officer of Camden county, informs me that "in the county of Camden we have at present no other place than the jails for the detention of persons waiting the action of the grand jury. All provisions, however, have been made for the construction of a new court house and when completed it will be a model building, with all jail conveniences, provision having been made for offenders against the State, each class to be separated distinctly, and particularly the juveniles and females."

Mr. Ellis H. Parker, Probation Officer of Burlington county, tells me that "persons under the age of eighteen years are, as a rule, by the justice of peace, put under the charge of their parents or guardians on their own recognizance for their appearance at court. We very rarely lock up any one under the above age. When there is no one to look after them, we commit them to the county almshouse, where they are reported to the State School for Children, located at Jersey City."

These are all the reports with which I have been favored. This convention will, I am sure, be impressed with the solicitude of the writers and will see what earnest efforts are made to meet a very painful exigency. The juvenile offender is detained, he must be kept away from hardened and even ordinary criminals, but it is done, in every instance, only by some more or less clumsy contrivance.

Atlantic county has so far made no adequate provision for the care of juvenile delinquents, though it is understood that the sheriff shall make at least an attempt at the isolation of those committed to his charge.

It is well, in the consideration of this matter, to remember that it is largely one that has but recently been placed before the public thought and therefore demands patience from those who have been compelled actively to confront it. Its claims are so obvious that it would seem that a quick and energetic presentation of it to the proper authorities and to the general community would soon result in an adequate provision for the care of this interesting and even pathetic class of young persons.

NON-SUPPORT AND ABANDONMENT.

HARRY L. BARCK, JR., HOBOKEN.

(Read by Title.)

There is very little question that the laws concerning cases of non-support and abandonment fail to adapt themselves fully to the needs of this class of offenders.

In the first place, the laws are not stringent enough; in the second place, the committing judge has very little choice in the matter of grading punishment; and, in the third place, there is a large class which escapes punishment altogether by leaving the State and which cannot be reached under existing laws. The refusal of a man to care for his family may be due to one or more of a number of causes, such as drunkenness, youthful marriage, forced marriage, second marriage, drugs, laziness, incompatibility of temper, or the presence of a boarder in the family, and others, but men who deliberately abandon their wives and children are as bad as criminals in many ways, and the law cannot be made too stringent for their punishment.

The present law calls for a bond, or, in default of a bond, imprisonment for one year. This is inadequate, because ninety-five per cent. of those who have been committed and who have served their term in jail refuse to further live with their wives. This leads to separation rather than to co-operation on the part of husband and wife, and leads often to final and complete desertion on the part of the husband.

Further, the magistrate has but limited jurisdiction. He must either commit the delinquent or let him go under a bond. If no bond can be furnished he must commit him to the full term or let him go freely.

The husband who deserts his wife and children and leaves the State has immunity from punishment, desertion and abandonment not being extraditable offenses.

This might be remedied if the order of the court could be as severe in such cases as the order of the chancellor is in his cases; that is, that the delinquent should be committed indefinitely or until he has satisfied the magistrate and the overseer of the poor that he will provide properly for his family. A probationary system could be instituted by which a delinquent may be held to his duty by fear of commitment. Under this the judge could put the offender on parole, and should he break his word he could be taken up and committed without new proceeding or further delay.

There should also be legislation in the different States looking to some mutual agreement concerning cases of non-support and abandonment, so that the offender might be returned to the State from where he has deserted his family, to be tried there. This is merely a rough outline of conditions as they exist, and the suggestions may be taken for what they are worth.

WHAT TYPE OF SUPERVISION DO PRIVATE CHARITIES NEED FROM NEW JERSEY.

E. R. JOHNSTONE, VINELAND.

(Read by title.)

I am not going to discuss "what type of supervision does New Jersey need for private charities," but "what type of supervision do private charities need from New Jersey."

The importance of the private charities of the State can hardly be overestimated. In every town, village and hamlet are men and women who are gratuitously giving their time and energies to some private charity.

By private charity I mean the work of all of those societies and associations which are not controlled by the State, county or municipality.

This private charity is the only real charity, and is, perhaps, the most humanizing influence of the present century.

It must be remembered that the State gives no charity. The money given by the State, county, etc., is for protection, not for charity. The State is not a charitable institution, neither are the State hospitals, State industrial schools or State schools for the defectives. When the tax gatherer sends in a bill to you and you pay it, you are not giving charity. When the law says that you must pay so much to help care for the dependents, defectives and delinquents of the State, you are not giving charity; neither is the Legislature giving charity when it appropriates this money to erect schools and asylums for its degenerates or to pay for the maintenance of them. The State is in the capacity of a policeman, who must exercise strict surveillance over all classes who are likely to do it harm; therefore, as I said, State aid is protection, not charity, protection from the infirmities, appetites, ignorance and sloth of its own body.

Charity is the giving of one's self to one's neighbor. It is an individual matter, and St. Paul meant it as such when he spoke of it as the greatest of the three cardinal virtues.

Now, what shall the State through its supervisory board give to private charities? (I use the word private because in general we speak of State protection as State charity.)

The State can give help—not financial help. The Constitution of New Jersey specifically prohibits the donation of lands or money to any society, association or corporation; but it can give moral help, and especially help in the way of information.

This board will be in a position to *know* things, and tell them to the societies that do not know them. It will be able to help the private charity where it is weak. It must at the very start assume a spirit of friendliness. It must see the needs and possibilities, the weak points and the strong ones, and then advise and encourage, suggest and lend a hand, but never hinder nor hamper.

This will mean untiring and often discouraging work on the part of the board, but it must enter into a sympathetic relationship with the societies, and steadily and perseveringly lead them out of darkness into the light of the knowledge which will be gathered as a mine of wealth in its office. This board must be a bureau of information, without which intelligent, progressive charity cannot get along. It must be the oracle to which all charitable societies may come for advice and counsel. Private charities need such a central board, one that will investigate them to find what they need, one that makes its investigations and records as a means toward an end, that will say to these societies we are trying to work out general principles which will be of help to you. We need your assistance. We need all the information you can give us about your methods and plans, the results of your experiments, the causes and effects of certain conditions as you find them, and then we shall work them out and pass them on, giving you in turn whatever you may need.

This board must be for the charities of the State what the investigators in the laboratories of great manufacturing concerns are to the business, or what the scientific child-students of the day are to the public schools. These men send to the various schools throughout the State or county and ask for certain facts concerning the children in those schools, and, after getting together several thousand papers and working them carefully over, they are able to draw deductions that are of real value. For any individual teacher or school to attempt to do this would be foolish. There would not be sufficient data to formulate a principle, and, instead of scientific facts, the teacher would find herself floundering in a mass of differences almost as numerous as her pupils.

Now, the private charities are like the individual teachers, and, alone, can only follow out narrow lines of thought and action. And this board is like the scientific child-student, and can only give to the private charities general principles for their guidance, because it is not familiar with the details of environment, construction and administration.

Another way it can give help—it can further co-operation. The private charities are too much separated not only from each

other, but from the so-called State charities. There is great need of co-operation.

They are all working toward the same end—the elimination of the unfit, the uplifting of the fallen, the curbing of the unrighteous—but often they work at cross-purposes; often two are doing the work which one could do. Some are taking advanced steps, introducing modern and scientific methods and accomplishing permanent results, while others are fossilizing, old ideas have become ingrained, and time, money and benevolence are alike wasted.

This central board, with the permanency of the State behind it, could easily draw these charities together. It could foster co-operation and consultation, the best brains and knowledge of the State would be at the service of all of the charities of the State, and the result would be far-reaching and permanent.

These private charities do not need a board to act for them, but to teach them better how to act for themselves.

There is probably not a charity in the State that does not need the refreshing influence of such a board. If it will meet frequently, and draw to its meetings the leaders in charitable and correctional work, without asking their sect or creed, or whether they are State or private, only demanding that they shall bring their best intelligence, conservative opinions and a broad spirit of charity, presenting the problems they cannot solve, and giving the solutions of those with which they have been successful, it will accomplish the State regeneration with which the State intrusts it.

Another thing private charities need—a board of this kind to stand by them as a friend, to aid them in all legitimate demands, to reconcile them with the commonwealth, to speak in their behalf as the need arises or against what may be hurtful.

School and home, asylum and hospital, fresh air society and day nursery, private charitable agencies of every kind, would hail such a board and gladly contribute to the general fund the best they have, and the very fact of giving this would raise the standard of charitable work in New Jersey until it shall be second to none in the world.

