PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTION

SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

By Invitation of the Council of Philanthropies of Montclair

UNITY CHURCH
FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH
MONTCLAIR

NEW JERSEY REFORMATORY PRINT
RAHWAY, N. J.

Table of Contents.

PREFACE

It was natural that all of the sessions of the sixteenth annual New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction should touch upon the problems arising out of the war. It was natural to compare present needs and conditions with those of three years ago. It was encouraging to hear that the Government was planning some system of insurance instead of the haphazard system of pensions to relieve soldiers and their families. This formed the basis for a strong plea for health insurance generally. It was somewhat disconcerting to learn that the good wages of the negro who migrates northward could not buy him decent living conditions and that the vices of the overcrowded, poorly housed negro were invariably perpetuated throughout the city. It was striking when Mr. Burns, of Cleveland, told us that the social worker only half did his work when he relieved a case of distress. He should enter politics and help to elect candidates who would enact laws and help to prevent a recurrence of that tragedy.

These and other topics considered made it evident that the social worker was recognized as a force in the community and that he had unlimited possibilities for uplifting the social strata of our people.

E. D. E.

Organization of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction, 1916-1917

Officers

President, MRS. LEWIS S. THOMPSON.....Red Bank
Secretary, ERNEST D. EASTON.....Newark
Treasurer, ISAAC C. OGDEN.....Orange

Vice-Presidents

HON. JAMES F. FIELDER.....Jersey City
RT. REV. EDWIN S. LINES.....Newark
HON. J. FRANKLIN FORT.....East Orange
HON. EDWARD C. STOKES.....Millville
HON. FRANKLIN MURPHY.....Newark
RT. REV. JAMES A. McFAUL.....Trenton

Assistant Secretaries

MR. FRED S. HALL.....Montclair
MISS MARY JORDAN DIMOCK.....Elizabeth
MR. DOUGLAS P. FALCONER.....Newark

Executive Committee

Mrs. F. C. Jacobson, '09.....Newark
Mr. A. W. McDougall, '10....Newark
Dr. David F. Weeks, '16....Skillman
Rev. Walter Reid Hunt, '14..Orange
Dr. Frank Moore, '13.....Rahway
Miss Harriet Townsend....Elizabeth
Mrs. G. W. B. Cushing....E. Orange
Mr. Robt. L. Flemming..Jersey City
Mr. C. L. Stonaker.....Newark
Miss Julia Conover.....Princeton
Mrs. Sidney M. Colgate.....Orange
Prof. Frank A. Fetter.....Princeton

Ex-Officio

Hon. Richard Stockton.....Trenton
Mrs. Lewis S. Thompson..Red Bank
Ernest D. Easton.....Newark
Isaac C. Ogden.....Orange

Advisory Board

A. D. Chandler.....Orange
Dr. Christopher C. Beling....Newark
Miss G. L. Button.....Red Bank
Miss Anna B. Clark.....Englewood
Mrs. D. W. Cooper.....Montclair
Dr. Henry A. Cotton.....Trenton
Seymour L. Cromwell.....Mendham
Dr. Gordon K. Dickinson....J. City
Rev. C. M. Douglas.....Short Hills
John A. Cullen.....Newark
Rev. Augustine Elmendorf..Newark
Mrs. Wilson Farrand.....S. Orange
Rabbi Solomon Foster.....Newark
John J. Gascoyne.....Newark
Dr. Madeleine Hallowell....Vineland
Dr. John A. Ingham....N. Brunswick
Prof. E. R. Johnstone.....Vineland
Dr. Frank H. Mikels..Morris Plains
Dr. Stewart Paton.....Princeton
Dr. Calvin N. Kendall.....Trenton
Mr. Walter Kidde.....Montclair
Mrs. M. H. Kinsley.....W. Hoboken
Prof. Oswald W. Knauth..Princeton
Mrs. Geo. M. LaMonte....B. Brook
Mrs. Sarah W. Leeds..Atlantic City
Miss Marg. MacNaughton....J. City
Hon. William Fellowes Morgan
Short Hills
Judge Harry V. Osborne.....Newark
Edward E. Read.....Camden
Dr. J. J. Savitz.....Westfield
Mrs. Leon Cubberly....Long Branch
Mrs. H. Otto Wittpenn..Jersey City
W. L. Kinkead.....Paterson
Henry L. DeForest.....Plainfield
Mrs. E. V. H. Mansell.....Trenton
Mrs. Jas. H. Rosenkrans....Hoboken
Miss Elizabeth A. Allen....Hoboken
Rev. Waldo A. Amos.....Hoboken
Mrs. Richard Beyer.....Hoboken
Miss Charlotte Machold....Hoboken
Mrs. Thomas B. Stillman....J. City
Mrs. George W. Black....Jersey City
Miss Cornelia Bradford..Jersey City
Mrs. Brice Collard.....Jersey City
Mrs. Arthur A. de Bonneville
Bayonne
Miss Anita Grish.....Jersey City
Miss Helen M. Hamilton
Jersey City

Program Committee

Seymour L. Cromwell, *Chairman*

Mrs. Lewis S. Thompson	Robert L. Flemming	Chester H. Wells
Mrs. F. C. Jacobson		Mrs. Robert H. Dodd
W. L. Kinkead	Dr. Frank H. Edsall	Henry L. DeForest
Fred S. Hall	Mrs. H. Otto Wittpenn	Mrs. Chas. W. Stockton

Finance Committee

Isaac C. Ogden, *Chairman*

Richard Stevens — Walter Kidde

Ernest D. Easton

MONTCLAIR COMMITTEES

Citizens' Committee

Mr. Starr J. Murphy, *Chairman*

Mr. Frank H. Presby, *Treasurer*

Mr. W. I. Lincoln Adams
Mr. C. W. Anderson
Mr. Charles Whiting Baker
Mr. M. N. Baker
Rev. Hugh Black
Mr. Don C. Bliss
Mr. John J. Blondel
Mr. R. M. Boyd, Jr.
Dr. Stella Bradford
Mr. John R. Bradlee
Mr. E. A. Bradley
Dr. J. S. Brown
Rev. Frederick B. Carter
Mr. C. S. Chapin
Mr. W. B. Dickson
Mrs. Robert H. Dodd
Mrs. Franklin M. Dorman
Mr. Charles F. Droste
Mrs. E. P. Earle
Mrs. William G. Frost
Mr. Frederick H. Gibbins
Mrs. E. W. Goldschmidt
Mr. Edwin B. Goodell
Mr. F. F. Gray
Mrs. Frank A. Hall
Mr. Francis Halpin
Mr. Emerson P. Harris
Mr. B. V. Harrison
Mr. Rudolph Hering
Miss Louise C. Hinck
Mr. Ernest C. Hinck
Mr. Walter B. Hopping
Mr. L. O. Ivy
Mr. James N. Jarvie
Mr. Walter Kidde
Mr. Frederick E. Kip
Mrs. Henry Lang
Mr. John R. Livermore
Mr. Herbert M. Lloyd
Rev. John G. Love
Mr. Alexander Luchars
Mr. William L. Ludlam
Mr. David B. Mabey
Mr. J. G. MacVicar
Dr. Elizabeth Marcelis
Mr. Benjamin Moore
Mr. Vincent S. Mulford
Mr. George Welwood Murray
Mr. P. Palladino
Mrs. N. H. Patterson
Mr. Nathan T. Porter, Jr.
Mr. Erman J. Ridgway
Mr. Decatur M. Sawyer
Mr. W. H. Schoonmaker
Mrs. T. G. Sellew
Mr. James M. Speers
Mr. T. W. Stephens
Mr. Julian Tinkham
Dr. Antonio Tirico
Mr. Edward W. Townsend
Mr. Otto C. Wierum, Jr.
Mr. Solomon Wright, Jr

Executive Committee

Mr. Edgar Swan Wiers, *Chairman*

Hospitality

Mrs. W. L. Conwell, *Chairman*

Mrs. L. G. Benziger
Mrs. F. E. Bliss
Mr. C. R. Langenbacher
Mrs. Warren Pond

Mrs. R. M. Boyd
Mrs. Frank T. Chapman
Mr. Charles F. Chase
Mrs. H. H. Dyke
Mrs. H. L. Gantt
Mrs. Clifford Schultz
Mrs. H. DeForest Stephens
Mrs. James S. Stewart
Miss Mary Talmage
Mrs. T. T. Waller
Mrs. Carrington Hening

Entertainment

Mrs. F. H. Hooper, *Chairman*

SUB-COMMITTEE ON LUNCHEONS

Mrs. M. M. LeBrun, *Chairman*

Mrs. H. DeForest Stephens
Mrs. M. F. Synnott
Mrs. Edward Winslow
Miss Clara Best
Mrs. G. E. W. DeClercq
Mrs. L. F. Dodd
Mrs. E. B. Goodell
Mrs David Mills
Mrs. T. P. Alden

SUB-COMMITTEE ON RECEPTION (Upper Montclair)

Mrs. T. Grafton Abbott, *Chairman*

Mrs. J. H. Gannon
Mrs. L. R. Eastman, Jr.
Mrs. R. Elliot
Mrs. F. Pendleton
Mrs. E. Goldschmidt

SUB-COMMITTEE ON AUTO RIDE

Mrs. John R. Bradlee, *Chairman*

Miss Amelia Jarvie
Miss Corinne Smith
Mr. Albert H. Ellis

Exhibits

Mrs. Joseph Van Vleck, Jr., *Chairman*

Mrs. W. R. Gregory
Mr. D. C. Bliss
Mr. C. H. Wells
Mr. Frank Gray
Mrs L. Price
Mrs. W. E. Marcus, Jr.
Mrs. J. G. MacVicar
Mrs. Dallas Flannagan
Mrs. F. H. Kingsbury
Mrs. W. S. Woods
Mrs. H. N. Sheppard
Mrs. W. H. Schoonmaker
Mrs. P. J. Cosgrave
Mrs. H. Emetaz
Mr. E. S. Wiers
Mr. C. E. Frances
Mrs. J. M. Speers
Mr. Fred S. Hall

Press and Publicity

Mr. Fred S. Hall, *Chairman*

Mrs. James A. Ryan
Miss Annie L. Fuller

Ministers

Rev. George D. Hulst, *Chairman*

Registration

Mrs. Robert Lynn Cox, *Chairman*

Mrs. J. Allen Patton
Mrs. Charles H. Alling
Mrs. C. G. Appleton
Mrs. Frank Ferris, Jr.
Mrs. Drury W. Cooper
Miss Gladys Humbert
Miss Dorothy Gage
Mrs. R. E. Tomlinson
Mrs. John H. Fertig
Mrs. Maurice H. Ewer
Mrs. S. T. Coale
Mrs. T. A. Painter
Mrs. W. H. Crane
Mrs. Mervyn Rice
Mrs. A. L. Price
Mrs. Philip Goodell
Mrs. G. E. W. De Clercq

Badges

Mrs. Charles H. Alling, *Chairman*

Organization of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction, 1917-1918

President, ROBERT L. FLEMMING.....Jersey City
Treasurer, WALTER KIDDE.....Montclair
Secretary, ERNEST D. EASTON.....Newark

Vice-Presidents

HON. WALTER E. EDGE.....Trenton
HON. JAMES F. FIELDER.....Jersey City
RT. REV. EDWIN S. LINES.....Newark
HON. J. FRANKLIN FORT.....East Orange
HON. EDWARD C. STOKES.....Millville
HON. FRANKLIN MURPHY.....Newark

Executive Committee

THREE YEARS

Mrs. H. Otto Wittpenn
A. W. MacDougall
Mrs. Lewis S. Thompson
John A. Cullen
Rt. Rev. Wilson R. Stearly

TWO YEARS

Seymour L. Cromwell
Mrs. F. C. Jacobson
Rabbi Solomon Foster
Mrs. Sidney M. Colgate
Judge Patrick J. Dolan

ONE YEAR

Prof. E. R. Johnstone
Mrs. J. B. Webb
Rev. Augustine Elmendorf
Prof. Frank A. Fetter
Mrs. G. W. B. Cushing

Advisory Board

A. D. Chandler.....Orange
Miss G. L. Button.....Red Bank
Miss Anna B. Clark.....Englewood
Miss Julia Conover.....Princeton
Mrs. D. W. Cooper.....Montclair
Dr. Henry A. Cotton.....Trenton
Rev. C. M. Douglass.....Short Hills
Wilson Farrand.....South Orange
John J. Gascoyne.....Orange
Dr. Madeleine A. Hallowell
Vineland
Dr. John A. Ingham..N. Brunswick
Dr. Henschell.....Morris Plains
Dr. Calvin N. Kendall.....Trenton
Mrs. M. H. Kinsley....W. Hoboken
Mrs. Geo. M. LaMonte....B. Brook
Miss Harriet Townsend....Elizabeth
Mrs. Harold Buttenheim....Madison
Judge Clarence L. Cole
Atlantic City
Mrs. Robert H. Dodd.....Montclair
Mrs. Leon Cubberly....Long Branch
Mrs. Arthur Whitney.....Peapack
Rev. Walter Reid Hunt.....Orange
Dr. David F. Weeks.....Skillman
Rev. Edgar S. Wiers.....Montclair
Henry L. DeForest.....Plainfield
Zed H. Copp.....Camden
Dr. J. J. Savitz.....Westfield
Major Charles W. Irwin....Elizabeth
W. L. Kinkead.....Paterson
Miss Anita Grish.....Jersey City
Mrs. Brice Collard.....Jersey City
A. W. Abbott.....Orange
Mrs. E. V. H. Mansell.....Trenton
Miss Cornelia F. Bradford
Jersey City
Rev. Waldo Amos.....Hoboken
Hon. Henry E. Ackerson....Keyport
Mrs. Chas. W. Stockton..Ridgewood

Time and Place Committee

Henry L. DeForest.....Plainfield
Miss Harriet Townsend....Elizabeth
Mrs. G. M. LaMonte..Bound Brook
Seymour L. Cromwell....Mendham
Zed H. Copp.....Camden
Prof. E. R. Johnstone.....Vineland
Mrs. Sarah W. Leeds

Auditing Committee

Henry L. DeForest.....Plainfield
Seymour L. Cromwell.....Mendham
Richard Stevens.....Hoboken

Sociological Exhibits

An unusual exhibit of the local charities was shown in the reception room of Unity Church and open daily from 9 A. M. to 5 P. M. The following organizations by their exhibits showed how well the philanthropic needs of Montclair are being met:

Altruist Society
Board of Education
Board of Health
Boy Scouts
Camp Fire Girls
Children's Welfare Committee
Children's Home
Community Garden
Day Nursery
Fresh Air and Convalescent Home
Memorial Home
Mountainside Hospital
New England Women's Exchange
St. Vincent's Hospital
Tuberculosis Preventive and Relief Association
Unity Forum
Y. M. C. A.
Colored Y. W. C. A.

OPENING MEETING

Sunday Evening, April 29, 8 o'clock

General Topic: COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

ORGAN PRELUDE

INVOCATION—Father J. J. Gately, Montclair

SELECTION by the Choir, First Congregational Church

ADDRESS OF WELCOME—Hon. Louis F. Dodd, Mayor of Montclair

Ladies and Gentlemen of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction:

I bid you all and each of you a hearty and cordial welcome to Montclair. We feel that you have honored our community in the compliment you have paid us by choosing Montclair in which to hold your sixteenth annual meeting.

We in Montclair appreciate the inestimable value of the organizations that make up this Conference both to the whole State and to our own community. We want you to feel at home while you are here, and we bid you command our entire hospitality.

The organizations which compose this Conference have already given much to the State of New Jersey in the splendid womanhood and manhood of the loyal workers who are typified by the leaders whose names appear on this program, of your committees and officers. We in Montclair feel it a great privilege to have the opportunity to enjoy with you the deliberations you are about to undertake and carry forward in the two or three days you are to be here. It has been well said that our community looks over or overlooks practically one-tenth of the population of our whole country, and we are happy to have you here with us for this brief time that together we may consider some of the things that affect our fellow men and discover, if we may, ways and means to bring them out of their afflictions and distresses.

You have chosen a community which is peculiarly receptive for the work which you are doing and the deliberations you are about to undertake, because we Montclairians take pride in the

fact that in the activities along philanthropic lines which we have undertaken we have tried to overlook none; we have begun with the orphan babies and gone through the calendar of philanthropy, and we feel that we are perhaps fitted to confer with you in these meetings.

We hope that the State of New Jersey will not only be tremendously benefited in this Conference, as it has been in the past, but that in the interchange of views we may all learn that which will make for greater usefulness in the future.

You are meeting in an hour of crisis when the whole world is sick and bleeding, and the great cry of humanity is for service. It is a fitting time, therefore, and we, the citizens of Montclair, should join with you and the citizens of this whole State in giving thoughtful consideration to the great problem of the brotherhood of man—acknowledging and realizing that we *are* our brother's keeper.

It was my privilege to appoint, in connection with the holding of this Conference, a Citizens' Committee. That committee has co-operated with those who have arranged the Conference, and it is now my great pleasure to introduce the chairman of that committee, the Hon. Starr J. Murphy, who will say a few words of greeting to you.

HON. STARR J. MURPHY

Chairman Local Committee, Montclair

Greetings.

His Honor the Mayor has spoken the word of official welcome on behalf of the municipality. To me is assigned the pleasing duty of saying a word of greeting on behalf of the community and the local committee.

I wish to share in the Mayor's expression of our gratification that the convention has chosen our town as the place in which to hold these meetings. We deem ourselves honored by that choice and your presence here. We feel also that all of our local institutions will be stimulated to renewed activity and that those who have charge of the conduct of their affairs will be greatly benefited by the papers and discussions presented, and by the suggestions and counsel of those experts whom you have called to participate in your conference.

And we hope that our community problems may be helped toward solution by your discussions of community questions in general. It is characteristic of the modern point of view that so many of the problems which in earlier days we considered individual problems we now recognize to be community problems as well.

The three great enemies of mankind are disease, poverty and sin, and the mother of these is ignorance. The remedy for ignorance is education, using that word in the broader sense to include enlightenment as well as training. For many generations, in this country and in the more enlightened nations of the world, we have recognized education as a community problem, and no longer consider it a matter of indifference that even a single child should grow up in ignorance and without training. And in spite of criticisms against our system of education, public and private, in spite of its deficiencies in technique, in spite of the normal resistance of the young of the human species against being educated at all, satisfactory results are achieved in splendid and intelligent citizenship.

The problem of disease is now generally recognized as a

community problem. Few communities are so backward that they do not know that. The chief cause of poverty is coming to be recognized as sickness—sickness which robs the family of its savings, and particularly that which takes away the breadwinner, leaving us the dependent family.

We are coming to see clearly now that poverty is a community problem. It has its individual side, of course. We are inclined to say when a man is poor that it is his own fault—he ought to be more industrious, or more saving; but we are beginning to realize that while that is true to a certain degree, there are other factors in it which are community factors, and it is becoming more and more clear that whatever the cause, society is interested because society in the last analysis has to pay the bill.

The greatest single element in poverty is the dependent family whose breadwinner is taken away by death or chronic illness. Society cannot afford to allow that family to be neglected, because the question whether these children will grow up to be social assets or social liabilities depends largely on whether they have a mother's care while growing up, and no woman can be the mother in charge of the children at home and also be the breadwinner. Society will have to pay for that family, either willingly and intelligently at the beginning by proper care and preventive methods, or later reluctantly and more dearly. I was talking a short time ago with a man in charge of relief work of one of the large charitable organizations in the city, and he told me of a case which had come up a few days before which illustrates the point perfectly. A family was brought to the attention of the society, consisting of a widowed mother, a son of eighteen, a daughter of sixteen, and a younger daughter. The son was in jail serving a term under sentence for theft. The sixteen-year-old daughter had already entered on a life of shame. The question came before his committee as to what could be done with this family. He told them that practically nothing could be done; it was too late. They could try to find a job for the boy when he came out of jail, but no one wants a boy with a jail record. It might be possible to reclaim the girl, but the probabilities were against it. Then he turned to the files to see if they had any record of the family. He found that eight years before, the mother, recently a widow, had applied to the Society for aid. In accordance with the practice then obtaining the case was investigated and it was found she was

an able-bodied woman and could earn enough money during the day to support the family, so it was decided that no assistance was needed. After seeing this record, he called on the woman, and she broke into tears and said, "What could you expect to happen when I had to be away from the children all day long?"

Now, gentlemen, for I want to say this particularly to you men, we pride ourselves on being business men and like to look at questions in a hard-headed practical way, so for a moment let us disregard all considerations of humanity; let us forget the anguish of that mother at seeing the ruin of her family; let us ignore the misery that lies before that young man and that young woman in the careers in which they have engaged, and look at it solely from the standpoint of the social ledger and balance sheet.

We are beginning to do a little better in the treatment of that kind of case. Society is beginning to recognize its obligation and beginning to issue pensions to widows. An institution with which I am connected is caring for forty families of that kind. After careful investigation we give whatever sum is needed to enable the mother to keep the family together and give it her personal care and attention, seeing that they have a decent place in which to live, and proper food and clothing, caring for their health. Eyes, teeth, noses, throats are taken care of, and the children are kept in school. That costs on an average $500 per family. In the case referred to just now this perhaps would have gone on for six years; then when the young man came to be a wage-earner the amount might have been reduced, and by the time the girl came to be sixteen and could be a wage-earner, too, it would have been still further reduced and eventually the family would have been on its feet and the young people grown up to be useful members of society. That was not done, and now what has it cost society?

It has already cost a substantial sum to put that boy through the criminal courts and to maintain him in prison. If he continues on the path on which he has started—as he is almost certain to do—he is going to be a social liability as long as he lives. He will either prey on society outside the prison or be supported by society in the prison. The financial burden that that girl is going to lay on society is beyond calculation. And that is not all. That boy and girl will probably both leave descendants, who in all probability will also go into walks of crime and prostitution. "The sins

of the fathers are visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations" and on society also.

Now looking at this case simply as a hard-headed business proposition, you will see that the neglect of that family in its hour of need was, from the standpoint of society, the most wasteful extravagance.

Sin, too, is a community problem—sin or crime, as you look at it from the standpoint of the individual or of society. Crime is largely a matter of juvenile delinquency, and that to a great extent is due to failure to provide proper and natural outlets for the desire for play, recreation, and pleasure, which are necessary and legitimate factors in the life of every human being; they are the lubricants of life, and everybody who knows machinery knows you must have lubricants as well as power.

We are not seeking to break down the sense of individual responsibility and initiative and effort, but we must recognize facts as they are and that individual problems are also related to the community problems. Perhaps the reason why society has been so slow to recognize its obligations is the fear of tending toward the breaking down of individual responsibility and effort. But we have to take the universe as God made it. We have to go out into the universe with head erect and mind alert and eyes wide open patiently to inquire and fearlessly to recognize what God has wrought, and not stay in our studies and try to believe that the universe is not the kind of place it would have been if we had made it instead of God. We must recognize the facts even though such recognition may seem to have its dangers. There will be plenty of opportunity for individual will and effort even though we do recognize the truth that these individual problems also have their community aspects.

Now, one word as to the way of approach. When Jesus was considering the problem of the high cost of living, what men should eat, and what they should drink, and wherewithal they should be clothed, He summed it up in these words: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you." Apart from their religious significance, those words contain the greatest economic truth that ever fell from human lips.

In these days we see all the free nations of the world, Belgium, first in honor and in sacrifice, France, Great Britain, Italy, and the other nations of Europe—except those so close to the seat

of conflict that they dare not act—our own beloved land, far-off Japan and China, alien in race and creed yet one in the common cause of humanity, united in this struggle to crush for ever the monster of military absolutism, that democracy may exist and men may be free. Oh that all the forces of Christianity and her elder sister, Judaism, yes, and of the other great religions of the world might join in a great alliance to apply the principles of the Kingdom of God to the solution of the secular problems of life, in which the strong would put their strength at the service of the weak, to do all that love can wisely do—I say that again, that you may remember it, all that *love* can *wisely* do. The way is dark and the solution of the problems not clear, and we cannot see the goal as yet, but we have faith to believe that love, all-embracing love, self-sacrificing love, enlightened love—love, will find out the way.

(Applause.)

RESPONSE AND PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Mrs. Lewis S. Thompson, President New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction, 1917

After the most auspicious beginning to the afternoon's meeting, and with promise of good things still to come, I am going to take only as many minutes of your time as a President has to take and not one minute over to try your patience. I must first offer a few words of regret on the part of Governor Edge.

He kept this date for many months, hoping to be with us today, and it was only when it proved to be his one chance of a short rest after an arduous legislative session, that with sorrow he decided he could not be here. He sends through me his best greetings to you all and every good wish that we have a successful conference in Montclair.

And now I should like to express my own personal pleasure in being here. I have already found much enjoyment in the few brief visits I have made on the business of the Conference and I am counting that on leaving here I shall not only have received as a member of the Conference a real benefit from the spirit of the place but that I shall also take away the sense of friendliness and kindness that will be a lasting legacy and a promise of future

inspiration and blessings that may continue to come to us all from Montclair.

I wonder if this Conference is going to lose vitality or a sense of the imminence of present problems because we have not taken up in our session either the present prison situation at Trenton or the effect on the social problems of the State of our entrance into the great world WAR.

As far as prison matters are concerned it was decided by those interested in the Conference and serving on the Program Committee that pending the investigations being made of penal institutions by the very eminent Commission that was so wisely chosen to do this work, it would be better and more helpful not to precipitate discussion until the facts and findings were before us and before the public.

As for the larger question of our responsibilities to the National situation—how we can best serve the State and through what channels our warm feelings of love and patriotism can best flow, I hardly know what to say. But it seems to me that most of the people here today are capable, as Phillips Brooks has said, of seeing both back grounds and fore grounds. In fact, people who have thought earnestly and constructively along social lines are pre-eminently those who have carried the back ground to meet today's problem and to shape a fore ground of preparedness that will be a sound and natural development of work already done and not an unrelated and sporadic effort born of excitement. At the present moment, in many places, action is following so quickly upon impulse that thinking people are discouraged at the ill-considered activities springing up all around them and almost feel that they are witnessing a backward step in the march of Civilization. But surely this is not a moment for discouragement nor for a feeling of loss of power on the part of those who have up to now led the forces of social progress. This is in many ways a group of leaders, and this is a moment when leaders should come into their own.

I know I am addressing a group whose patriotism is of a high order; people who have carried the burden of making democracy successful along a weary road, where no crowds lined the pathway, where no banners were waving and no flags unfurled. But again I say I cannot and will not feel that we should be discouraged for the cause of peaceful, steady social progress.

For all permanent social progress the first essential is that public attention should be aroused, and surely now the country is awake. The question on every tongue is, What can I do? Are you not ready to answer this? Are you not ready to repeat once more and this time to listening, eager ears, the tale of obvious daily duties due from every citizen to the State? Surely you need not discourage effort, nor dampen ardour, nor quench the bright flame that springs from such glowing, willing hearts. Is it not possible to make it your opportunity to show to opened eyes what is the larger patriotism? Can you not draw on this fine enthusiasm for more than a war program? Cannot the health of soldiers bring a movement towards better health standards in every community? Cannot camp sanitation be made a demonstration of home sanitation? Cannot the problem of the soldiers' families be made to lead to a better understanding of the relation of the wage standard to the family problem, and to infant mortality, and the necessity shown of scientific, constructive family work? Cannot the children be regarded as the citizens, or, say soldiers, if necessary, of tomorrow? Are not the questions of their health and education, the problems of dealing with the backward and deficient, treading on the questions and problems of today as everyone is seeing them? Cannot we joyfully further a movement that calls prohibition a *Military* necessity for the nation?

Our work may have to be called by new names, words may have to be borrowed from military phraseology to bring our needs home. But it is a moment to speak, and it is a moment when we shall be heard. It is an opportunity to make America realize that all preparedness is one and the same. That it can only be built on a sound social organization. It is a moment when the spiritual significance of work can be appreciated by those whose eyes till now have been closed in the sleep of indifference. It is a chance which may never come again in our lifetime of opening the window, as the prophet did of old, and letting the youth of this country see that the hosts of the Lord cover the mountain sides and are ever ready to descend when the leaders are the leaders of social justice and social truth and the prize of the battle nothing less than a better world for all His children to live in. I now have the honor to introduce to you a gentleman who has been in Montclair before, many years ago, I think, when he made a survey which I imagine has been of great profit to this commun-

ity. Since then he has been connected with the well-known survey made in Pittsburgh, and is now Director of the Cleveland Foundation. I know you will all be glad with me to welcome Mr. Allen T. Burns.

"HOW TO GET COMMUNITY RESULTS"

Address by Allen T. Burns, Director, The Cleveland Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio

Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen: The striking statement of that question "How to Get Community Results" left me no alternative but to accept quickly your very cordial invitation to be with you tonight. The question is not, as it might have been stated, how to get results in philanthropy, in reform, or in social service, but how to get community results. Perhaps some of us well-intentioned people see little difference, and yet it is a fact that perhaps we are too often interested in getting results, philanthropic or social or institutional results, not realizing the bigger problem and value of community aims.

Many illustrations of this could be brought up from your experience and mine. The other day one of our clearest-minded social workers in Cleveland expressed his great chagrin and disgust that our control of the moving picture business (which doubtless is a problem in New Jersey as it is with us) had not become such that his children could attend and find there all the standards observed which he himself believed in. He is one of the clearest thinkers in our country on subjects of recreation and amusement, and as he broached this point of view I asked him whether he thought those who had not considered so profoundly the question of amusement were going to let the highest standard that possibly the community could ever attain rule at the present time. A personal judgment was to be his standard of community result.

More recently I was talking with the president of one of our largest steel companies, also president of the board of trustees of a library. He was considering asking for one of our large institutions an additional endowment of money, something more than a million dollars, and the suggestion was made that it might be better for the community to do something for its own library

rather than be entirely dependent on the good will of philanthropists. This gentleman quite rejected the idea that it could possibly be for the welfare of this town to take any part in maintaining or operating what has come to be recognized as so much of a community institution as a library, for, said he, we are interested in having the best possible library and would not for one moment allow the community thought and weaknesses to be reflected in its operation. Again we see a point of view altogether too prevalent among people of good will who think that the best thing is to inflict their own ideas and standards on others without consideration of the composite thought and measure that must be applied in securing any community result.

Our friends, the Pacifists, I suppose, have given the most recent and striking illustration of this; in trying to make international non-resistance a political issue they are really trying to put their own personal belief into action against the will of the majority, or else they must have been vastly deceived as to the will of the majority in this country. So we might go on multiplying instances of the way in which efforts are being made to substitute steadfast and strong individual beliefs as to right and good and service, in place of a community standard of commonweal and aim.

Why is it that men of good will so often make this error? Why is it that they so commonly make the mistake of taking their own benevolent aim, the result which they could so easily obtain if their will could be law, as a community result? It may be perhaps that we so often forget how unrepresentative we are. Numerically speaking, people of the experience and background of most of us here this evening are an insignificant proportion of the great masses of our people. When you remember that less than ten per cent. of our population have had as much as a high school or secondary school education, when you remember that in our great industries only two per cent. are in a position of supervision or administration, carrying these positions down as low as gang bosses, when you realize that half of our population have incomes of less than $900 a year, that only one per cent. have as much as $5,000 or more a year, then you recognize how far most of us must be from sharing in the common lot and thought and how far from being in close experiential contact with the

thought and standards that must prevail much more widely than our own.

If we are interested in community results, the results must somehow represent the community will, and if our benevolence and good will is deep and fundamental the first question we shall ask ourselves is: How can the different members of the community better understand each other? How can we come to some common agreement, so that the community result may be truly democratic, may be communal?

One of the great newspaper systems of this country has a daily publication in the West that carries no advertising. It is what the proprietor calls a feeler of public opinion. His theory of journalism is that the public interest must be represented in the news printed in order to secure circulation, and so secure the necessary advertising; and this one publication of his, without the advertisements, tries out from day to day its material and news and editorials for the sole purpose of finding what the people like. By dint of this method he is most successful in discovering what will be read and in knowing what to print and so securing large circulation.

Those of us who are interested in community results and how to get them need to be just as concerned and just as ingenious in discovering what results can be secured and still be representative of the community will and thought. No philanthropic institution has rendered a greater service or come nearer to duplicating this newspaper scheme in the community than the social settlement. Far more important than its institutional activities has been its original purpose of being the house of the interpreter. We are likely to forget this in large organizations and equipments that have sprung up around this name and this tradition. Now, when we are thinking that community center work may pass perhaps from private philanthropy into our schools let us remember that the very heart and the very corner of that influential movement lay in the fact that it was a method by which different groups of experience and background could come to understand each other. So, however the institutional aspect of the settlement movement may change, as long as people's experiences and opportunities are as diverse as those already cited, we cannot do without the interpreter's service, the exchange that comes from the neighborly resident, the person of culture and resource coming to share the com-

mon lot where opportunity has been less. This is necessary in order that we all may understand better what community needs are and how possible of attainment and how attainable. This task of understanding can never be acccomplished through the most careful scientific or social investigation. From statistics and figures we can never get the thought and feeling and emotion that lies back of these lives that are narrow and pressed down by the very burdens of existence. But when once we have felt with them by neighborly contact how closely poverty presses we may understand why the most ardent aims and ambitions of our "Child Labor" advocates are not so easily attainable. We may realize, if we have seen the workers coming from work, from the monotonous routine so characteristic of all industry today, so deadened and fatigued as to be unable to engage in any wholesome recreation in the evenings, how unintelligible to them is the effort of us good church people for the strict enforcement of our old Sunday Blue Law. Or, after that approach and contact we may understand also why the movement for prohibition—of which I am heartily in favor—shows no response, no appreciable strength, in our great industrial districts, where the cheapest and easiest thrill and sensation comes through alcoholic beverage. When we appreciate how few the sensations are, then we may come to know better how we must mingle our views with others and reach a common denominator of community action if we are to expect results that in any sense represent the community spirit.

But it would be of little use, this interpreter's function of the social worker, if we were to be satisfied merely with understanding and trying to reach a knowledge of what the next step higher should be and then doing nothing more. We should be too truly described by the rather facetious visitor to a settlement who said it was like the drunken man, a little less tipsy than his brother, who found his brother lying in the gutter and said, "Well, since I can't help you up I will lie down beside you." None of us, though starting with an understanding of the community situation, can be satisfied to let it rest there. We must thank this spirit of benevolence and good will, which so often has been undemocratic and individualistic, for helping us to find the common denominator, and the next step forward will be to keep us from trying either to make the rest of society lift itself by its own boot straps or to advance in three-league boots. While discovering the pos-

sible steps through which the community as a whole may advance, we must believe these steps can be realized, but realized only through long, arduous, and patient processes of community education.

Jacob Riis, I believe it was, who said that nothing happens in the community in less than ten years. Few of us are willing to be as forward-looking, as persevering and enduring, as that statement necessitates. And yet, here again, the children of the light may learn from the children of this world. I heard only today of an advertising plan that was very successful for one of our large automobile concerns. They began by borrowing money from several banks, not because they needed so much money or from so many banks, but primarily as a sales method, because, becoming acquainted with many banks they then visited them all and endeavored to sell automobiles. In this they were fairly successful, due to the acquaintance already set up, more or less enhancing the interest of the banks in the business. Then, after this silent, quiet campaign had been conducted for about a year, we all saw the advertisement of this particular machine—"The Banker's Car. Look and See"—and we looked and saw, and behold it was true! Something as ingenious as that must be devised in helping our communities to take these next steps, and effort as patient and painstaking be directed toward community education.

I suppose there is hardly a better illustration of the success that may come in this way than the movement of the Consumers' League for the Early Shopping and Evening Closing, before Christmas. There, without any law, by sheer force of public opinion, after long years of education, in my part of the country at least and, I understand, in the east as well, the community was brought to accept the standard as its own. Of course we hear of mixed motives in this campaign and the support the merchants give to it, but such mixed motives enter into every step by the community. If it is to be the community result that is to be secured it will be made up of mixed motives as the community is mixed in its make-up. Our understanding of the Anti-Tuberculosis movement and the Playground movement are striking illustrations of how the social worker has seized upon a need felt in some degree throughout the community, and by persistent, painstaking propaganda secured the adoption of this policy as a community conviction. In quite striking contrast to the success, it

seems to me, of these two movements, is that of our relief or charity organization movement in this country. For the work accomplished, for the good done, that movement is less understood, more criticized, more suspected, than any other of our great social institutions. Can it be, I often wonder, that this earliest of our social movements has missed this point of making itself understood, of interpreting itself so to the community that the community might take it up and appreciate it and make it its own, as it has in much shorter time appreciated the methods taken to fight tuberculosis and to furnish adequate recreation for our young people?

We might go on, indicating how the second step in securing community results is through community education. Let me speak out of my own experience, for it is experience alone that has convinced me that through community education almost any social result can be accomplished, provided we start at the point where the community is, with the thinking it has already done, or begun to do, and then, in true pedagogic manner, lead them to the next point ahead. I remember the Good Friday seven years ago in Pittsburgh, when more than a hundred of the public officials were either indicted or confessed to the taking of graft in connection with bank deposits of city funds. Immediately, some of the public-spirited citizens of Pittsburgh believed the time had come to rouse the community out of its lethargy and indifference, and said, "Here for once is a moment when citizens who have been taken up with accumulating fortunes and gaining prosperity for themselves can be awakened to the shame of their government and made to see something better." But the influential citizens were largely indifferent still. Not a paper would mention the movement for entirely reorganizing the Pittsburgh government. But a group of young men, who had no money, who could hire no halls, began persistently to speak on street corners, and for about a year went to work very quietly organizing, doing little but telling the story of Pittsburgh's shame and of methods of municipal government that had really prevented such corruption in more developed municipalities. By sheer force of appeal to popular opinion that movement came to be noticed at last, first by the press, then by influential citizens, and, last of all, by office holders. Against what seemed insuperable difficulties, Pittsburgh was aroused to its disgrace, overthrew its gangsters, and through the persevering and

enduring efforts of almost unknown, but strong citizens, secured community results of lasting value.

In our work in Cleveland we made this principle of community education our prime method in trying to secure community results, for whether the Constitution follows the flag or not, surveys seem to follow me, or I follow them, and in the Cleveland Foundation my main work has been up to the present the making of social surveys of the City of Cleveland. The method differs somewhat from that of Pittsburgh. We spent two months trying to find out what the community could be made to think about, in what line it might care to advance; we talked to labor leaders, office holders, ministers, representatives of foreign nationalities, every leader of public thought and community action whom we could reach, and finally they all agreed that public education was Cleveland's greatest need, and that if Cleveland could be made to think seriously and continuously enough about that problem this one very dark spot, in contrast to her other progressive policies, might be obliterated. And we believed that only by community education could this result be achieved.

The method was as follows: Before deciding to make a survey of schools, we secured the man whom we wanted to direct such a survey, and had him go out and tell organizations how he would do it if they wanted it done. Then they proceeded to ask that the Cleveland Foundation, and this particular gentleman, should undertake the work. That in the first instance made the thing a community undertaking. Then we at once organized what came to be known as our Monday Town Meeting, where any interested citizens came each week and heard the story of the progress of the work; our devices, our methods were explained. We got specialists from many parts of the country and as they gathered information, revealed the facts without drawing conclusions, the more facts we told the more people came to listen. Then, as we were ready to draw conclusions and make recommendations, after about a year of preparatory work, we found the community in a state of mind to agree largely with the conclusions we drew. Some of our criticisms were very harsh and bitter and were resented by the officials who were responsible. At the very close of the study we were criticized as nuisances and public plagues and a few other things by our friends of the School Board, but were much interested a few weeks later to find members of the

legislature from our county coming to us and saying they believed the community wanted the recommendations carried out which the Survey had made. It is perhaps almost the first time on record when social workers have not had at least to take the initiative in securing the interest of the legislature in remedial legislation. For once, the legislators, who usually feel the social pulse better than we can feel it, saw as we saw, and with no effort on our part we secured the legislation.

Only a few weeks ago the Board of Education itself—and its personnel is not changed—came to us and said it had found such an increased interest in the condition of the schools, that it had become so much easier to take the progressive steps they desired to take, that they wished we might conduct a continuous survey of their institutions. Had we needed any more convincing proof that community education is a fundamental way to get community results, all doubts would have disappeared with this experience. But we must remember always that community like individual education must start with establishing a point of contact, and not with trying to lead the community in directions about which it is thinking very little or not at all.

Yet it would not be fair to think that all community results that are desired can be secured through remedial laws. If there is one outstanding weakness in American social progress it is the number of laws on our statute books that are unenforced. The most outstanding shame has been the way in which the laws against commercialized or other forms of vice have been entirely unenforced. In my own state, through public education, we secured the most advanced child labor law that any state possesses, but it again is unenforced. Some five years ago some well-meaning citizens of the country believed that the industrial situation of the country could be relieved by an investigation, and we secured the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations. We found its methods and work almost the opposite to the purposes with which the movement had been promoted. Can it be that our public office holders often look upon us social workers as the unjust judge did upon the poor widow? Do they know that it will be easier to grant our plea than to go on listening to us, with no idea of what we ask for having any more effect than being put into words? We all remember still with horror the Triangle fire, with its fearful loss of life, the process of community educa-

tion which followed, with the result that an industrial commission was created which it was believed would prevent any such horrors in the future. And it was only a few years after that the Williamsburg fire occurred, with similar loss of life. Then those who had plead for the original Commission, who had been back of the investigation and secured the permanent board, urged upon the Governor that this board that had been so ineffective be discharged. And for some reason the Governor was much deafer to the plea to displace an office holder than to that which had secured the original statute. Why is this? Could it be that those who are interested in petitioning for laws for social reform are much weaker in support at the polls than those who have other interests in the elections? Such must have been the Governor's judgment in New York. He seemed more afraid as far as political matters went of those who might be made hostile by displacing office holders than of the legislative influence of the social reformers. This should impress on us the additional method for securing effectively community results. We must be as willing to vote and work for votes for our community results as those who have more private and personal interests in our elections. Yet that very thing is obnoxious and repellent to most of us. If there is anything that is ridiculed and maligned and despised in this country it is the engaging of the ordinary citizen, perhaps most of all the social worker, in political contests. If community results are to be made secure we will have no choice in the future but to follow this line of action. All over this country there is a slackening, a slump, in social legislation, and has been for the last year or two. I heard our Governor of Ohio make his address to the present legislature. In his previous term of office he had passed this progressive Child Labor law, secured the most advanced industrial compensation law in the country, and a most remarkable children's code, caring for all phases of child welfare. In this, his second term—and there had been an interim in which he had not served as Governor—he said, "We will have no new legislation." I enquired why there was such a change. When in Congress he had been the father of our federal children's bureau bill, and I knew his heart was in securing community results for community welfare, and after making some inquiries about this apparent change of front, it seemed that the conclusion must be that he had found that men and women interested in securing

these so-called community results from legislatures were by no means as much in earnest when it came to giving the necessary political backing to establish these results.

Another illustration. There is a congressional district in this country from which have come some of our foremost congressmen. At a recent election the question of national prohibition loomed up, and it was a problem in the mind of every candidate whether to declare in favor or against. One young, fairly inexperienced aspirant came out boldly on the issue, for he found from local records that about eighty per cent. of the voters, or a number equal to that, had signed a petition protesting against any saloon licenses being granted. To his amazement he was overwhelmingly defeated at the election and he went back and investigated—surveyed, perhaps!—that petition of 20,000 people, and found that only one-third of them were qualified to vote at all. Such may be the difference between our good intentions and willingness to do the necessary political work to establish community results.

The City of Cleveland, of which I am a comparatively new citizen, has become justly famous for progressive municipal activity. We have a city infirmary which is visited by citizens from this country and abroad; we have a system of reforming the criminal which is being studied by penologists throughout the land; we have established a public employment office, distribute free milk for the children, care for the expectant and new mother and her baby perhaps more than any city in the country; we have made public activities of private philanthropies; and yet at the last municipal election, being my first in that city, I was astonished to find that it was considered utterly bad form for those who had petitioned the administration for any of these progressive policies to take any part in trying to continue it in power. Thinking in my ignorance that it was the right thing to do, I was quite rebuked by those of long experience. I was not at all surprised to find that that regime was overthrown and that a party that cared little for the social worker or his schemes came into office. Perhaps the social reformer of Cleveland may have learned that he must be as determined in his political life as those who are interested in franchises or railroad or lighting rates, if he is to establish his community results. This is no easy prescription, as a method for getting community results. It is distasteful to us, and we ask

why must we be involved in this ungracious service? In the first place community results are going to be secured only by the work of the community voter and the community citizen, because the community alone is going to be adequate with its resources for rendering the service which social needs require. The movement for mothers' pensions is evidence of the fact that our private relief agencies have been insufficient. Very early the enemies of tuberculosis appreciated the fact that if that dread foe was to be overcome nothing else than full community opposition must be marshalled. At the present, we are facing perhaps the supremest test of our efforts in benevolence and good will. We are going to learn even much more emphatically than we have yet that nothing but the entire community responsibility and capacity will suffice.

The other day I was talking with a leading citizen of Winnipeg, that comparatively little city of 160,000 population from which 27,000 men have gone to the war. "We at first tried to meet the situation by philanthropy and benevolence," he said; "we collected some $800,000 to help those left behind, but we found it was all too insufficient, so we have turned to the only possible resource that is adequate, the public itself." And we are going to find, beyond question, in the stress and strain of this struggle that is before us that the community as a whole is the only sufficient resource for acquiring and meeting community results and needs.

But the question arises: Will they be well met? We have been chagrined and almost ashamed at the hesitation, at the vacillation with which the issue in this country has been faced. We have been wondering why it is. I am wondering now whether the explanation is that we have in the past so far resigned our function of self-government as to make our public officials unaccustomed to face solely from the point of view of public interest their public duty. Have they been so used to look to the office seeker or desirer of special privilege for instruction that they have lost their sense of understanding what the whole community might demand?

You ask why this function of self-government and participation therein cannot be resigned or neglected? Go back to that steel town to which I referred in the beginning. The reason that steel town needed to support its own library was, to use the word

of its own librarian, because it had been spoiled by philanthropy; to use the words of the superintendent of the largest mill of the company, the community spirit was dead. There was a community more than two-thirds of which were alien to our country, and yet taking no step of its own accord to acquaint the alien population with our common medium of expression or make them understand the deeper significance of American life. It was a community so paralyzed that its housing conditions have cried to heaven for regulative law these ten years and yet there was no determination to remedy those conditions.

It is not because self-government and participation in it will secure high community results, but because so far it has proved the best tool for developing human beings that we Americans believe in it. If in this present time of emergency, this self-government is to prove potent it must be because we have recovered from our lethargy and indifference.

We are fond of saying this war is a war against autocracy; we might say that it is a war between self-government and benevolence, for looking at it from the German point of view, the German attitude is that they have been willing to let one person do their thinking for them, to yield almost entirely their participation in their own public affairs.

Germany has perhaps invaded this country even before this great world war broke out; in so far as we have yielded and surrendered this great right for which our forefathers laid down their lives we have begun to be Prussianized. Perhaps it may be in this fiery struggle through marshalling our forces again, in assuming our responsibilities for community results through common effort for a common aim, that self-government may be reborn, never to perish from the earth.

(Applause.)

Benediction, after singing "America," by Rev. Charles S. Mills, D. D., Montclair.

Monday Morning, April 30, 1917

CHILD WELFARE

Robert L. Flemming, Jersey City, Chairman

This meeting is called under the joint auspices of the State Conference and the New Jersey Child Labor and Welfare Committee. We desire to have full and free discussions at this session and all those present are free to discuss the papers after they are read. Before calling on the speakers, I wish to bring to your attention the fact that the war with Germany will make many changes in our way of life and throw great burdens on our citizens.

I have spent, since the beginning of the war, three months of each year in Canada and I watched very carefully the trend of events there and I think it necessary to warn those who are interested in children's work that they are about to face new conditions and that there should be no time wasted in preparing to meet them. The Canadians have handled a part of their child problems far better than the English and in a very simple way, by paying to his, the soldier's, wife in addition to his wages, $30 a month for the support of the family so that she does not have to seek work and charity to support herself and children. But at first they did not do as well in solving their other problems. A wave of the patriotic enthusiasm swept over the country that brought together all those able to work or give financial help and societies started up all over the country to help the soldiers. This took away so much support from the charitable societies and institutions that many had to cease their work. Many large and important institutions like the Montreal Hospital were weakened financially to such an extent that there was danger of closing their doors. This brought about a healthy reaction and a more just distribution of funds publicly subscribed. I tell you this so that those of you that are interested in children may prepare for the coming emergency which will require a strengthening and broadening of your work. You should take immediate steps to adjust your finances to meet the situation that will develop. You will need additional day nurseries to care for the children of mothers who will have to go to work. You should form commit-

tees to collect clothing and especially shoes and have some place where they can be repaired and made serviceable. I also believe it will be necessary to provide food at reasonable rates and committees must be formed to buy and attend to its distribution. The Child Labor problem will be one that will need very careful study and supervision. Many families will not have enough income to buy the necessities of life and will try to have their children work in order to make up the deficit. This problem might be solved by starting part time vocational schools under Chapter 242 of the Laws of 1916. We are face to face with a great emergency and I hope that the various child caring organizations will wake up and get ready to meet the situation. What is the use of raising large sums of money to care for the soldiers unless we can assure them that we are going to care for and protcet their children while the fathers are fighting in our defence. I, therefore, beg of you to "come and do your bit" to protect and care for the children of the state.

THE ELEMENT OF PREVENTION IN CHILD WELFARE WORK

A. W. Abbott, Agent of The Children's Aid and Protective Society of the Oranges

Seventeen years ago the word "Prevention" in child-saving work was almost unknown. "Punishment" was better known, and rescue was a word to win tears from the sympathetic and money from the philanthropic. To picture the horrible abuse and then show how the child was snatched from the wicked and landed in a flower bed of sunshine and happiness was the thing to do. It was in those days not child welfare so much as it was child rescue work that made the appeal. Children were ruthlessly snatched from their parents and homes were broken up, often for very little and insufficient cause, in order that the so-called Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, or the Children's Home Society, or the Humane Society, or whatever may have been its formal title could make a record of the number of children rescued, transferred or otherwise disposed of. It was, as we look upon it, little short of robbery, of home desecration, and it is not

to be wondered at that the methods of these societies then were met in many quarters by a strong opposition and antipathy. "Baby stealers" and "child robbers" were epithets applied to agents of such societies. Warm-hearted and kindly disposed people with the best of intentions thought they could find better homes for children than their own natural homes, and this idea persists. Only this year a court in the southern part of this state was asked to permit by court order a child to remain with its uncle because he had wealth and the father, who was petitioning to have his son restored to him, was poor. The uncle told the court he could give the boy a better home, better clothing and better school privileges than the father could. The judge did not waste much time in arriving at a decision. "The child is part of a family, and relative riches or relative poverty does not so much matter," said the judge, "the natural place for this boy is with his own people and he must be returned to his parents. Then, when he shall arrive at age of discretion, he may choose whether he will remain or go to his wealthy uncle."

I said at the outset that this now almost forgotten viewpoint was prevalent seventeen years ago. It was then that my experience began as agent of the Society I have the honor to represent, the Children's Aid and Protective Society of the Oranges. You will note that the people instrumental in the organization of that Society at that date had conceived of the idea of aid and prevention rather than rescue of children and demolition of homes.

A good many of the members of this Conference, I feel sure, know something about that beautiful community known as the Oranges. I think that you will agree with me that there is a sadness in the reflection that such a Society as this, was and is needed there and only recently within the past two years has a kindred organization been doing similar work in this beautiful cultured and refined town of Montclair, which is so splendidly entertaining the Conference at this time. But it may be added with equal force that there is a more than ordinary feeling of satisfaction in the knowledge that such a Society exists. That a child should need a champion is sad enough, but passing through the bounds of credibility is the fact that in the United States of America no less than nearly 200,000 children needed a friend in that capacity in the year 1916, of which number 756 lived in the Oranges and 278

parents came under the direct supervision of this Society. Facts are not only stubborn, they are often heart-breaking things.

Prevention is the Society's main feature. On that basis it has been conceived, designed and set up. On that side of its work its greatest good has been achieved. It is none the less real that it is the most seldom heard of. Many a father has gone to work to provide for his children rather than go to prison for neglecting them; and many a dirty, thriftless mother has started to clean e her children and home when she has realized that failure to do this was something "in a manner likely to cause her some unnecessary suffering." When neither drink nor dirt were the contributing factors the same healthy fear of consequences has been known to stay the hand of brutality and cruelty and has secured immunity from the neglectful indifference of the selfish.

It is a simple matter of humane philosophy that we want what we cannot get and yet what really belongs to us. Child welfare workers are slowly learning that the way to rebuild a home is to make the home builders desire that very thing. We can build up pride of parental ownership in children easier than we can discourage parental obligations by condemnation and threats of punishment, or by the robbery of their children. The idea that neglectful parents will be robbed of their children if they do not properly care for them is often a most potent lever in lifting up such a family. They resent the idea of being robbed and they begin to try to prevent such a situation. When it becomes necessary to remove the children, then the work begins of impressing the parents that whenever they show indications of a desire to make a better home condition and prove it by subsequent events they shall have their children restored to them again. O, the heartaches of the homes despoiled of children, or of the long and bitter efforts of grown children to find their own brothers and sisters, father and mother again! It is a sad page in our past history of child welfare work.

The Society believes more than ever before in its seventeen years of experience in our community, that the place for every child is in its own home, and each year a greater number of children are the better for this clearer understanding and yet we are far from reaching all the children who suffer injustice and cruel wrong at the hands of those under whose protection they are supposed to be, and to a very large degree the community remains

uninformed as to the methods adopted in carrying out the duty imposed upon us. The education of any community in the sad facts of its social life is a slow and difficult task, as we are too prone to think that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds.

Are we not ready now to move along in our thinking from the child in the foster home or in the institution to the child in its own home—a home made over and reconstructed by a slow and patient service and neighborly helpfulness? Shall we not soon grasp the idea that we are not rescuing a child from a bad environment, but that we are removing a bad environment from the child? The rose in the hothouse is a thing of delicate beauty, but June roses blooming in the open air are of more worth, because they have blossomed in their natural place. Or we may take the illustration of the propaganda against tuberculosis. The first thought was to rescue the patient from his environment and place him in a sanatorium and we have built state and county sanatoriums and have spent much money upon them. Now we are learning that the dread disease is distinctly a disease of childhood and that to combat it with force we must remove the bad environment and save the child in his own home by introducing sunlight and better food and living conditions, and for this purpose we are sending to the child our visiting nurse and our health boards and our tenement house commission and our visiting housekeepers and what not, all for the purpose of preserving the home and preventing the home from harming the child.

The need of a child is its rallying point, the sorrows of a child its inspiration and the relief of a child its aim. Upon this broad platform the Society stands and accomplishes its beneficent work. It holds that a needless pain to a child should mean agony to the heart of a man, and no community should ever lose feeling for a child's sorrow. The instincts of the society must be with and for the children, for without this qualification it is powerless to effect real and permanent good. The society is not let loose on the community to disturb the peace of quiet homes, but it is expected to make inquiry into every case reported in which there is reason to believe a child is caused unnecessary suffering. In many homes the condition of life for the children is being changed, parental instinct is being cultivated and strengthened and filial affection is awakened. It claims rights for children and estab-

lishes them on a sure foundation in reformed homes, for hope for the child must spring from the home and it must be born in the heart of the parent.

While concern for the child is the society's first object, next in order comes the reform of the parent. Men and women are often chained to habit by circumstances. To set them free is to give them that liberty which is the eagle-wing of thought. Much of the neglect of children on the part of parents which has come to the society's attention may be ascribed as thoughtlessness. The satisfaction, therefore, that must be felt at the conclusions already reached by the study of the fact so far, is increased by the knowledge that warnings are becoming more and more effective. The informative as well as the reformative value of the society's work in dealing with such parents is better judged by the number of warnings successfully made than by the prosecution undertaken, for if character is the hall-mark of manhood, then the restoration of that quality is of untold benefit to the community at large.

After all good as a society may be as a means to an end, it is the individual response to the individual need that floods the horizon with hope, and our appeal is one for personal service. This society needs to link up all the forces of sympathetic communication in every center of life until the claims of the children become the first charge in the intelligent interest of the whole community. Moreover, the scheme of the society goes further still, and seeks to instill this same spirit in the hearts of the very people amongst whom its work is done. Its mission is to teach neglectful parents that responsibility for the proper care and treatment of their children rests solely upon them. That the substitution of collective for individual responsibility is a mistake is believed by most of those who know the reforming influences of a good home. It is in a reformed home under the direction of reformed parents that children may learn the best of life's lesson of mutual help and forbearance, and it is there that they can be best fitted for the duties that will come to them in their turn when, in manhood and womanhood, they will be called upon to discharge the responsibilities of good citizenship. What cannot be set out in figures and tabulated in statistics is the change in such homes, the parents and its children. Of the good results accomplished the public very rarely, if ever, hear; it is only the sordid or tragic details of cases

disposed of in the local police courts that are reported in the public press.

The society's work of investigation of cases in its effort to ameliorate the sufferings of the deserted wife and children by a drunken and brutal father very frequently spreads all over the country. Very recently correspondence has been had with kindred societies in California in the West, Louisiana and Georgia in the South, Michigan in the North, and Maine and Massachusetts in the East. In several cases information has been recorded by personal service in co-operation with the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, London, England, as a result of which financial assistance has been secured for a mother and her children in temporary distress. Since the beginning of the society's new fiscal year, which dates from November 15, 1916, about fifty new cases of parental neglect of children have been brought to its attention as well as one hundred cases already on file which need constant supervision. During the past twelve months the society's agent has collected from parents for the support of their children the total sum of $9,960.64, all of which requires constant book-keeping in the handling of it to see that the children secure the greatest benefit possible from it.

Not only is this method an important factor in our work, but we are firmly convinced that a still more forcible method of dealing with delinquent and neglectful parents is the fact that many instances fathers who have heretofore failed to properly and adequately support their families are turning over nearly all their week's wages to their wives for the support of the home. During the past year men who are capable of earning $18 per week are paying at least $16 to their wives regularly for the support of the family, while before complaint was made to the society were in the habit of spending most of their earnings in the saloons and gambling the money away. In such cases the society has knowledge that during the past year men who failed to pay more than $5 per week for the support of their families are now collectively contributing $40 to $50 per week, are not drinking and weekly reports to the society by their wives are "that if they had only known what peace and comfort they are now enjoying they would have called the society's attention to the matter long ago."

During the past two years the greatest factor in Child Wel-

fare Work has been Chapter 246 of the laws of 1915, which is "An Act Concerning the Welfare of Children," approved April 8, 1915. This law is practically the last word in Child Welfare work. It has been endorsed by child-saving experts throughout the country and Mr. C. C. Carstens, General Secretary of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, has declared that this law can be used as a model for the rest of the country. At the National Conference of Charities and Correction, held at Indianapolis last May, it was stated beyond contradiction that so far as this Child Welfare Act is concerned, New Jersey stands pre-eminent in safe-guarding the life of the child. The law defines abuse, abandonment, cruelty and neglect of a child so minutely that it is not necessary to ask questions as to its meaning. In the experience of the Society in the Oranges it has surpassed all expectations. In many instances we have given a copy of the law to neglectful parents, asking them to read it over carefully, giving them a week's time to ponder over its contents, all of which has resulted beneficially to parent and children alike. We have been able to cut our court cases about 75 per cent., so that during these past two years not more than 5 per cent. of the parents we have had to deal with were committed to penal institutions. In the year 1916, under court order, nine parents contributed $1,613.75 to the Society for the support of their children, while 48 parents of their own voluntary act without court proceedings contributed $8,346.89. These figures speak for themselves and show the splendid work which has been accomplished when the law of 1915 has been made effective. Another factor in our prevention work is the fact that we can say with a great deal of satisfaction and pride that during the past four years the Children's Aid and Protective Society of the Oranges has not taken one child away from its parents and has not placed a single child in that time in any institution.

New Jersey is a common law state, and its legal procedure in many respects differs from that of our neighboring states, because of the common law practice and court decisions. The New Jersey courts have by many decisions exploded the old idea that parents have a property right in their children. It has exploded the idea that the parents have private rights in children over which the state has no authority to control. New Jersey court decisions have repeatedly declared that every child is a ward of

the state, and it is the duty of the state to safeguard and protect the welfare of the child, and it is upon this theory that the new child welfare act of New Jersey makes its claim of being one of the most advanced pieces of legislation on child welfare known in this country. Further than that, although New Jersey is not a suffrage state, the fact remains that our courts have always ruled that the mother is generally a safer person to have custody of the child than the father, and there is an old law on the statute books which gives the mother preference over the father to a child under seven years of age, and our courts continually award the child to the custody of the mother as against the father. But the best feature of the New Jersey court decisions is that the courts do not hesitate to award the custody of the child to others than the parents if the welfare of the child warrants this action. Prevention does not mean separation, it does not mean breaking up homes, it does not mean bringing parents before the courts or taking their earnings away from them which are needed for the child, or locking a man up or divorcing the father from the mother in the care of the child. These are punishments which may be applied when other means fail, but the element of prevention today in child welfare work method means to avoid all these things. It means that we should be willing in our work to follow the example of Him who took the little children up in His arms and blessed them and said "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion of this paper?

DR. FREDERICK B. CARTER, *Montclair*: One of the many good points of the paper, it seemed to me, was the fact of the fine results obtained by the work, and I suppose that is what we are all here to hear. I was very much struck by the statement that unfortunately the public knows nothing about the cases which are helped, but only gets the sordid facts of the miserable cases reported in the newspapers. If that is true, why is it not possible for this great society to remedy that? We are all relying on publicity in these days to do almost everything, and there could be no better publicity than these good results. Is there no way these good results could be brought before the community? I suppose such a society as this could at least control the situation in the neighborhood. I cannot imagine that the papers in the Oranges or Montclair or even the papers in Newark would not

be only too happy to have such cases recorded. I should like to know if this is not possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: You will find that unfortunately "news" generally consists of "bad news," so to speak. The newspapers want something first and foremost where there can be no "come-back" and insist on some record they can protect themselves with in case of question as to accuracy. Therefore, they are loth to use any story without actual records. Another reason is a more personal one. I find in my work in rehabilitating a family that the family does not want even a personal friend to know about it, and you cannot, therefore, put facts about such a case in the paper without its being possibly read in the neighbrohood, and that might easily undo all the work we are trying to do. That is one point we have been very careful about in this family work. We are handling a sacred matter and we cannot be too careful in concealing the fact that the family is in trouble and what we are doing for it, because one person's getting hold of that scandal, so to speak, may make an absolute failure of the case. I think that is one very great reason why the stories of these cases are not published. We can give out monthly reports, but newspapers do not find these exciting enough. They want "human interest stuff" that they can spread out and make "yellow."

MRS. CUSHING: Mr. Abbott spoke of the Child Welfare Law of 1915. I want to say that downstairs you will find pamphlets regarding all laws relating to children in New Jersey, compiled under the direction of a committee, the work done by Mrs. Stoningham. It seems to me very valuable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the price is too high—it is fifteen cents.

MRS. CUSHING: Considering war conditions, perhaps we might sell it for ten cents. (Laughter.)

MR. J. C. STOCK: I was not engaged in social work at the time Mr. Abbott began, seventeen years ago, so I do not know from personal experience the conditions that prevailed at that time. I have heard it said that a number of years ago child-caring agencies were classified as home-breakers, and I guess the charge as made was true, but I do not think that charge applies now to any organization doing local or state-wide work on behalf of children.

We have come to see that the parents have prior claim, but

there are certain circumstances and conditions in homes and in child life that require drastic action, and demand for the safety of the child or children and society that the law step in and break up the home. The organization which I represent does not do it until it has tried out every other means of constructive work in the home in order that the parents may keep the care of their children and the children remain in their natural environment.

While Mr. Abbott was speaking there came to my mind a particular case in which I was interested three years ago. I was the unfortunate instrument in breaking up a home. It involved three children, the youngest of a family of fourteen being about four years old. I think you will best understand the circumstances of the family life if I relate to you a little incident that occurred. A benevolent society of the city in which this family lived had aided the particular family as well as other members of it. Two ladies of the organization met on the street one day about the time the children were removed by the court, and discussing the case, one of them said, "Is it not the case that this family has been aided by our organization for the past sixty years?" "No," said the other, "a thousand years." That is, within the memory of the oldest inhabitant, this family was always being helped; there are criminals, and prostitutes, and delinquents, and deficients in the family, and have been for three generations. The little boy is living not far from here now, the older girl with curvature of the spine which our society was finally able to correct, is also near here, both in good homes.

That is a case where there was only one salvation for the children, and that was breaking up the home and placing them in new and wholesome environment. I am in hearty accord with what Mr. Abbott has said, but there does come a time when surgical operation is necessary, and when that time does come it takes a good deal of grace sometimes and a lot of grit to carry it through. But we must use the surgeon's knife when the time comes to use it, and use it fearlessly.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Honorable John Warren has had experience in child-caring work, and also in sitting on the bench and seeing us uplifters in action. I think his viewpoint will be interesting, and I know while he was judge we were able to accomplish results in Jersey City that we had never been able to accomplish before. And his work was so well done that it is

still going on under his successor. I think we have a system in our municipal court that will make it very hard for antis to beat us, and politicians are playing fair with us. I have great pleasure in introducing the Honorable John Warren, of Jersey City.

HOW FAMILY PROBLEMS CAN BE SOLVED BY THE MUNICIPAL COURT

Address by the Honorable John Warren, Jersey City

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been asked to speak on a subject which could occupy a day's time in telling you. It is a hard subject to condense. I want to impress upon you the importance particularly of the municipal court, the magistrate's court, the police court as it is sometimes called, and in your country districts the court of the Justice of the Peace.

In Jersey City we have two such courts, and ten to twelve thousand cases go through each court every year. They go through with great dispatch. There are not a great many lawyers and consequently the cases are not much retarded (laughter). I am a lawyer myself, but I can truthfully say that in not one per cent. of the cases is a lawyer needed; they are only obstructionists and most of the men in the practice of the police courts do not do any good for their clients.

I want to impress on you the class of cases handled in the police court. All of them have a bearing on family relations, assaults and batteries, abandonment, cases of non-support, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, school cases where parents are brought in for not sending their children to school, health board cases, etc. There is hardly a case that comes up before the court in which the family element does not have to be considered by the court. Do not mistake me. I do not mean that the question of family relations is considered in each particular case. What I do mean is that the consideration of family affairs, the relation and position in the life of every person who is convicted in that court, must be considered by the judge if he is going to do complete justice. It is not like an ordinary assault and battery case between two men, or a man found drunk; the judge cannot just find him guilty or not guilty and send him to prison or not accord-

ingly. If he is going to do justice, not only to the man, but to the family, he must go into the details of the family to ascertain whether justice will be done by sending him to jail or by fining him, or whether it would work great hardship and injustice on the man's wife or children. I can truthfully say I have spent more time after a case has been tried, trying to find out what I should do with a man, than in trying him.

And it is the essential job of the judge to do this very thing. It is not a thing laid down by law, it is a thing that can only be done by efforts of the individual judge according to the light he has; and in order to do complete justice in that court it is necessary to have a man there who looks on that position not merely as a political job where he will do as little work as possible to get the salary, but a man who is imbued with the spirit of justice to try and work out the affairs of the people before him so that, instead of tearing down, he may, with the help of the probation officers, social workers and churches, build up a man and his family.

When I got into that court I found out a number of things that did not meet my fancy or the fancy of my good friends, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Stevens, and those with whom I was interested in welfare work. I found a man would go out on Saturday night with his pay envelope and not go home at all. When he was found, sometimes no money was left at all, sometimes only a small proportion of his wages was left. But his wife was home, and his children were home. If the court held him over, it often meant the loss of his job. You know what a serious thing that it for a man making $2.50 or $3.00 a day, to lose his job, or even to lose a day's work.

So we established what perhaps has no official being, but has worked out all right, nobody having questioned the legality of it; we established a Sunday court. In that Sunday court, which sits, not at the police court, but in the police station, are taken up the cases of the people who are arrested and whom the police and the judge may think are in such position that if they were held over to be tried on the following day their families would suffer, that they would lose their job, or lose a day's work, which would mean no meat for the family that week or no pair of shoes for the child that was needing them. This court has done a lot of good work, and we have been able to reach men

through it by showing them what we were trying to do for them and their families.

Another thing we found. There were a lot of petty squabbles in neighborhoods. Or a man would be disputing about a piece of personal property. The complaint would come into the court, a warrant would be issued for the man and he would be arrested and he must get bail. That thing was stopped—the free issuance of warrants. There was a business man in Jersey City who was a partner with a man in an invention. One man took the model to his home, and the other got out a warrant for petty larceny against him. Take a poor man and get him off his job on a petty complaint, and it is a serious thing. He is taken off his job, tried the following day, which means the loss of two days' work, even if he does not lose his job. So we established a night court, which sits once a week. A man goes into this court, wants a warrant and states a good ground of complaint. A summons is issued to try out the case on next Monday night. Very often it occurs that a man has a complaint made against him when he is not guilty. Under the old way this would put him back for weeks. The result is that we had a great many cases every Monday night (Wednesday now). People would rather stay and have their cases done with that night than have it adjourned to the day court, and I have sat until three o'clock in the morning in that court by consent of everybody in each case who desired to have the case tried in the night court rather than have it adjourned to the day court. As people interested in the family conditions of the community, we ought to endeavor to get Sunday courts and night courts in every municipality. I am not talking of the probation system; it is an excellent thing; thank God that we have it. However, instead of turning people over entirely to the probation officer, a system was worked out by Mr. Stevens whereby, insteading of suspending sentence and putting them in the care of the probation officer, we postponed sentence and paroled them in his custody for three months. If conduct was good we suspended sentence, but the judge kept control of the case and was cognizant of it until things were corrected.

That worked out splendidly. You know when a man is put on probation he is on parole for three years. There is practically no incentive for him to do better, for he knows he cannot get off. By this system he has placed before him the proposition that he

must work, he must refrain from drunkenness, he must treat his family right, very often he must go to church; or else, if there is no improvement at the end of the month he will be sentenced. The result has been he works hard to get that degree of perfection where the judge would discharge him. You give a man something to work for and you will generally get better results. The thing has worked out so well in the police court that it has been adopted by two judges of the Common Pleas Court, who now sit at night and very often suspend sentence instead of putting on probation. You cannot do that, of course, without the help of the probation office.

Three elements, or causes, in this family work must be considered at all times.

First, drunkenness. Ninety per cent. of the cases, I think, are either directly or indirectly due to drunkenness. I am not a prohibition advocate, but I have been almost a temperance advocate since I have been in that court. In reference to drunkenness I have used one lever, that is, the Church. I do not know anything much more effective in keeping men straight than the Church, and I do not care what church it is. The trouble with most of the ministers and priests in the Church is that they do not know their people; they do not know the necessities of their people, and when they have a case they do not know how to work with it. If a man leaves one parish and moves into another there is no follow-up system to see that he keeps up, so when he gets to a new parish he is liable to slip back. Some men have a great fear of the minister or priest. I have made men take the pledge and watched them go to the saloon next morning. But I have sent a man to a minister or priest and made him take the pledge before that man who represented God in his idea and who to his thinking would hurt him in his religious life if he did not keep the pledge, and I have found it worked. That is the funny part about a good many of these apparently little things; they work. You don't simply tell the man to go to the minister and leave it to him to do it; you must have the minister or the priest write you a letter about it, and then get monthly reports from the minister or priest as to how the man is doing. This requires the co-operation of the clergy as well as the welfare societies.

I have often found, too, where husband and wife have been

bickering, squabbling and arguing, that they have not been in a church for a long time. I have called up their minister and told him that I was going to send him Mr. and Mrs. So-and-So, saying, "I want you to take care of them. I thing such and such a thing is the trouble. I want to know if they go to you, because if they do not I will send a policeman after them." With the ministers' help we often get people back in the church, and I have had them come back and say to me, "Mr. Warren, I have not known what happiness was for ten years till I got back into my church and felt I was right with God." I am not a preacher, you know, but I am telling you as a practical man the effect of religion on family life. It is a thing that everybody interested in social work has got to deal with. (Applause.)

I have been a social worker myself, and still am to a certain extent, though Bob Flemming is hogging all the work. But I know the work, have been interested in it a long time, have gone out with Mr. Flemming and others and tried to reconstruct families, and so I know about it.

You have to get the right man as judge in your municipality. You cannot reconstruct everybody that comes along, but you have to get the right man as judge. You do not need a learned man. I do not know whether I care whether he is a lawyer or not. But he has to have good horse sense, and he must not look on his position simply as a job. Then don't wait till the breaking point has come to bring the case into court. We are always inclined to do that, but sometimes it happens that by the time you get it into court there is no chance of saving it. Sometimes by getting it a little sooner you might, if you had the right kind of judge, by paroling a man in custody of the pastor or one of the welfare societies or probation officers, get results. Think of the municipal court as a clearing house. It is in that court, as I have observed it, that the bad habits are thrown off and virtues taken on. It can only be done by the help of the judge and the welfare workers. They must get together and work. The judge must understand their work; there must be the feeling on the part of the social workers that when they take a case into court they have done all that anybody possibly could do up to that point. Very often the judge will have an insight and point of view that the person who has been working close to it for a year will not have. Don't be mad if the judge does not send your

man away; don't feel injured if he does not break up the home. And, if you have the right kind of judge, you will get the right kind of results. Don't forget to keep in mind that the religion of every man will help him keep straight. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I am right glad that Mr. Warren has talked the way he has. I think it is a message that wants to go all over the State, and I can assure you he has only told about ten per cent. of the story and of the practical results that have come through his efforts in Jersey City, which have been most remarkable. We are apt to look for big things in family regeneration, and in consequence we fail. In Jersey City, in my own work, it is generally some little scrap, perhaps, that may have occurred years ago, that is at the root of the trouble. In one case it was a fight of eight years' standing, and not till that fight was finally settled could I get the people to live in any kind of decency or order. You have to get into the family and work with your judge if you are going to secure results, and if we follow the advice of the speaker last evening and get a little more into politics and get the co-operation—and, what is more, get the politicians to fear us, we shall be able to get the right judges. We have the votes now, but we don't know how to use them. We must see to it that we have the right judges, especially in our lower courts. It is all very well to appoint great men to the Supreme Courts. But they do not have contact with the poor people. The judges in the police courts do have that contact. In Jersey City there are more money judgments in the District Courts than in all the Supreme Courts. Astonishing, but true! The police courts are the foundation of our justice, the courts in which these people are to get their rights, and unless we are sufficiently alive to see that the proper people are appointed to these courts, there will not be justice.

MR. ABBOTT: I wish we could have Judge Warren in the Oranges. If he will come to Orange to live within the next two years we will try to get him appointed. We would dearly love to have a man on the bench like Judge Warren. And anybody in this audience would like to have such a man on the bench in his police court. We have a case on record during the last two weeks—parents and two children. Boy eighteen years old, just graduated from high school, because of the mother's keeping him at high school she had to keep on at work to help support him

and his sister of thirteen, who will graduate from grammar school this June—a ne'er-do-well father and husband. This has been going on for years, probably twenty years, that he has been in this good-for-nothing, drunken condition. He has been before the court, committed, his fines having been paid for his drunkenness by the saloon-keepers. We had the man arrested as a last resort and sent to Caldwell in January for one year. Our judge then, without the knowledge and consent of the society, without the knowledge and consent of the wife, liberated that man from jail, and the individual who went to Caldwell and wrote his name on the discharge book getting the man out was the bartender of the saloon where this man drank his liquor.

That is the condition we have in Orange. I was glad now of an opportunity to tell this Conference about it.

MRS. MARGARET CHICKERING, *of Moorestown:* We have a wonderful judge, Judge Lippincott. In any of our problems we can get help from him. I can lay down the law to a man and send him to the judge and he will talk to him in his home. The man generally gets pretty well straightened out.

MISS NELLIE SLAYBACK, *State Department of Labor, Trenton:* I would like to emphasize Mr. Warren's point in regard to religious influence in the reform of a man. I knew an insurance man, an agent, who was a great thief. Never was his book correct. The cause was drink. After the man had gone almost through hell, and the family through starvation, he came back to the agent and asked for a place again, giving his word of honor that he would be honest, and he was reinstated in the inspection force. After a few weeks there was a discrepancy in his books. The agent, knowing I knew something of the family of this thief, came to me, and we discussed the affair from a practical standpoint. He suggested that the man should make a pledge before his priest. He did. The priest went before the altar and in most solemn conclave the man made that pledge, and it has worked now for about a year and a half; during that time the man has been perfectly honest, and his accounts straight; he is not drinking, and I believe with Mr. Warren that in our affairs, industrial and social, the religious element is too much neglected and that if it were more emphasized results would be greater.

JUDGE WARREN: One of the essential things we have to deal with is the education of the child. We have had a good deal

of trouble in Jersey City, where we have a large poor population, in keeping the child in school. If we fine a person five or ten dollars for not sending the child to school it does not work, sending them to the juvenile court does not work, suspending sentence in the police court does not work. So we devised this scheme. People come in and say, "We need the child at home," or "we can't make him go to school," and it is evident they cannot pay a large fine. "Well," we say, "you are guilty; you can go home and take the child, but for every child you do not send to school you have to pay a fine of 25 cents or 50 cents (as the case may be, according to the family circumstances)." That plan has worked in Jersey City and Bayonne.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a telegram from Dr. Faulkner, who should at this time have given us an address on "Medical Inspection in Rural Schools," explaining his enforced absence on account of military service.

MR. C. L. STONAKER, *Secretary of New Jersey State Charities Aid Association:* I would like to tell you what Dr. Faulkner is doing, as he is not here to tell his own story. He is in South Jersey organizing the medical service in school districts over which he has control. You, who live in Montclair, the Oranges, Newark, Jersey City, Atlantic City and Trenton, know something of medical inspection of schools, but if you know nothing about rural schools, I will tell you that children in the farming districts, going to country schools, have mighty little medical inspection either in the schools or in the homes, and they are just as much entitled to it as the children in the big city schools; they have the eye strain and the adenoids and all these things just the same. Dr. Faulkner was asked to be the medical inspector of the schools of Vineland. He became so very much interested in it that he put metropolitan ideas into the town, and then he began to say to himself, "If I could throw away my private practice and do this medical inspection how happy I should be!" He went to another town and asked if they would like a medical inspector of schools, and he made a contract for $100 to go once or twice a week, and has gone from school district and town until he has something like fifteen or eighteen school districts and five or six towns—which makes a budget of $3,000 or $4,000 for him. He employs several nurses, runs a card index system, classifying everything. He goes into a school and examines every child care-

fully as in the cities, makes a card record, sends a nurse down to see if the parents have done what was ordered. If the child needs glasses the child goes home to the farm with the formula. Two weeks later the nurse finds the child is without the glasses. She goes out to the farm, and asks why? "Oh, I'll get them sometime when I get time to go into Philadelphia," says the father, "I understand you can get them at Woolworth's for ten cents." "I will send that child to the hospital if necessary, if you don't get the glasses," says the nurse, and the glasses are usually secured. It is that kind of patient work that is saving the health of many a child. Epidemics of typhoid and measles and other things are being checked, and now in his third year, fifteen or eighteen districts and small towns are having the benefit of this scientific work, with nurses doing social work in the rural families. I wish I had time to tell you more in detail. But if you are ever in Vineland, try and spend half an hour with Dr. Faulkner and see what wonderful records he has there. He is studying them all the time, and ministering to the needs of the people of rural districts with just as much skill and enthusiasm as is being given in the best medical inspections in our large cities.

THE CHAIRMAN: In handling our children's laws in New Jersey, we have great difficulty on account of the centralized population in two first-class counties and sparsely settled districts in other parts of the State, and a law practicable for Essex and Hudson may be very difficult of enforcement in other parts of the State. We have tried to meet these problems to some extent, and many social workers in these second-class counties are doing a splendid work that should be recognized and is very little known in this part of the State. One county that deserves special recognition is Monmouth, and Miss G. L. Button will tell us something about that.

MISS G. L. BUTTON: I ask your indulgence, for I am speaking quite without preparation, and on three minutes' notice. But I will try to tell you briefly what we are hoping to do for the children in Monmouth County. One thing we noticed five years ago was that there were altogether too many children not in school; many not even enrolled. Some were never in school at all, and others so irregularly that they were getting practically no education. They stayed in school in this occasional way until they were of the legal age to leave, then dropped out barely able

to read and write. So one of the first things we worked for was a county supervisor of attendance in order that all the children of school age might be in school. In one or two towns we were able to get a school census, but the county attendance officer, when she came, had to work largely without such a census. In many districts one had not been taken for ten years. The law makes it obligatory for all districts to have an attendance or truant officer; but the appointments are merely nominal in many cases, and little time is devoted to the duties of the office. The county officer has for three years been building up an esprit de corps among these attendance officers, and working with the local superintendents and school boards. Her salary for these three years was paid by one of the members of the Monmouth County Branch of the State Charities Aid Association; her traveling expenses by the county, and she worked under the direction of the county superintendent of schools with full authority as a school official. Last winter supplementary legislation was passed making such an office a permanent part of the school system, and from now on the work will be continued by the county supervisor as assistant to the county superintendent, with salary, as well as expenses, paid from the school funds of the county itself.

When we went into the schools we found that of the children who did go to school an unduly large proportion were three or more years below grade. We wanted to know definitely and clearly why this was, so we employed a trained psychologist, who spent two years in the public schools of the county, making a study of the children who were three or more years below grade. Some of them she found below grade because of foreign parentage, or irregular school attendance, ill-health or physical defects, or bad home conditions, and a large proportion because of mental defects which made it impossible for them to profit by the regular courses of the public schools. After she finished this study she went from us to try out her ideas for two years as supervising principal of three rural townships, and in these townships has been able to demonstrate practically what can be done for these misfit children who are not keeping up with the grades, and many of whom are unable to do so. The last legislature passed a bill authorizing the appointment of a county supervisor of exceptional children, and we hope that our former children's agent is going to work out a county plan for the supervision, care

and instruction of this large group of children who are not keeping pace with the procession. She also is to work as an assistant to the county superintendent of schools.

As this work has been taken over by the school system of the county we have another children's agent taking up another phase of children's work. As you all know, the widows' pension law passed two or three years ago in New Jersey carries with it a very inadequate appropriation for the administration of these pensions. The State Board of Children's Guardians does not have a fund large enough to pay agents to make visits to families of widows who are receiving pensions six times a year as required by law. They can get around to each family once or twice a year at most, in addition to making the initial investigations required by law. We have undertaken for our county to supervise for the State Board the families of widows receiving pensions, of whom there are about one hundred in our county. The State Board remains officially in charge, and comes down once or twice a year, as usual, but in the interval our agent takes charge of the families, calling frequently where there are difficulties and making occasional friendly visits where everything is going well.

Taking thought on the health side, we have put in a county public health nurse who, we hope, is going to do for the children, in co-operation with the medical inspectors and local nurses (where there are any of these), all those things you have heard of as being so much needed by the children in rural districts; the children who get so little medical care and the mothers who get so little instruction in the care and upbringing of their children. Two years ago a public health nurse made for us a survey of health conditions in our county. One mother whom she went to talk with told her when the nurse tried to find out why she had lost her baby, that her sister's baby had been sick too, but she lived in a city and took it to a milk station, where she got the advice of a nurse, and her baby lived. "My baby died because I had no one to tell me what to do," she said.

There is another thing we want to do for the children in the country. We are working for their education—that every child shall have the sort of education it is capable of; we are working for their health; we are beginning to work for the widowed mother and her family, but besides these things we want

to see that all the children are provided with wholesome recreation.

In so far as we deal with children in the courts we do it in the course of our regular work for families in their homes. When we find a situation beyond our power to remedy we, of course, have to go into court. Our agent does not act as complainant in any instance, but finds someone who is sufficiently interested to bring the necessary charges, and then we help to get the required evidence; but only as a last resort is a family broken up.

We want just as rapidly as we can to reduce the amount of court work and think that by doing these preventive things—keeping the children in school, giving them school work that will interest them, keeping them well and strong and providing them with wholesome recreation, a smaller and smaller number of them will for any reason be taken into our courts. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: In the course of Mr. Abbott's address he spoke of its being unfortunate that so much money should have to be spent on our large institutions for those suffering from tuberculosis, largely a disease of children, so that if children could be taken proper care of in the homes, the large institutions would be unnecessary. But in the case of a county such as ours, where there are so many advanced cases without large sanitoriums, we should be unable to protect the children.

MR. STONAKER: In some counties of this state there are an unusual number of towns with police magistrates and judges who find it the easiest thing to do is to send a man who has been repeatedly before him for a long term to jail. One such man was sent to the Paterson jail for two years, which is one of the most horrible jails in the world. A woman came into the sheriff's office and said, "Mr. Sheriff, I have eight children, what am I going to do with these children, and that man in jail for a year or two years? He has got a job at three dollars a day that he can come back to and support the children and me—and the judge has sent him to jail."

That man had been repeatedly going to jail for twenty, thirty, sixty days, but this time the justice of the peace got tired and said he would send him for a year.

To meet such a situation as this we secured this year the passage of a law, and I want you to tell your judges about that. When a man under such circumstances as I have told of goes to

jail for a year, upon the petition of the sheriff, or the recommendation of the sheriff, the judge can parole the man, letting him go to his job, and telling him, "We will collect the money for your work and turn it over to the family. You can go in and sleep at the jail; you don't get any money, but you will work at your job, or if you have not got any job we will find you one, and the money goes to your family—and you don't get any for booze." All that is needed is a little bit of social agitation to make this law work.

MR. FLEMMING: I would make that a little more general. You will find when the cases come up and you consult your judge or prosecutor they will tell you there is no law affecting that particular case in the State of New Jersey. What they really mean is that they do not know the law, and I want to urge on every one of you that you follow the advice of Mrs. Cushing and do not leave this building without buying one of those books that she spoke of, and then you will be able to tell your prosecutors and judges that there is a law and you are going to have it enforced. I think every one of you should take that book and read it and study it, and it will give you the law and all charitable and eleemosynary acts of the State. It is the first time in the State of New Jersey that these laws have ever been brought together and put in pamphlet form. It is a very small book, and in that book you have the weapon with which to meet a great many cases and something which will solve a great many conundrums and riddles that have been bothering you for years, and after you have bought it and read it you will find it one of the best investments you ever made. It is called "A Guide to the Laws of New Jersey Relating to Children."

SPEAKER: And it has been reduced to ten cents for the purposes of this Conference. (Laughter.)

MRS. CUSHING, *Chairman of the Child Labor and Welfare Committee:* It is not the fault of Mr. Flemming that the question of child labor was not brought into this program. At the time the program was made up the chairman was unable to be present at the meeting of the committee and the subject of child labor was therefore not suggested.

But war has been declared, and our children are in danger. I come to you to-day to plead that there shall be no breaking down of laws relating to children in this State or in this country,

neither in our compulsory education laws nor in the laws relating to industry. Probably you all value them, but none so much as the little band of people who thirteen years ago formed the New Jersey Child Labor Committee in co-operation with the National Child Labor Committee.

There is a danger in regard to the call of children to go on to farms. Let us guard against that danger. There have been already projects for sending city children from fourteen to sixteen to farms. The National Child Labor Committee has taken great pains to interview farmers and see whether they desire city children to go and work on their farms. Some farmers who should not be entrusted with boys of fourteen want them; those who understand the conditions know that city children of fourteen working on a farm are a nuisance. Consulting with the Secretary of Labor, with the National Organization of Boy Scouts, with the Commissioner of Education of New York State, with the Commissioner of Education of New York City, the National Child Labor Committee has compiled a leaflet which is very valuable, showing how the education of a child of fourteen to sixteen may be carried on in the country. But let us protest against any breaking down of compulsory education laws or of laws for which we stand and have stood for so many years, to defend our children in industry.

The attack has already begun in New York. A bill introduced by E. Brown was passed last Saturday, which will break down the laws of New York, because it is impossible that the Labor Commission can investigate every request that is made, and we shall probably see again in New York State the situation that was overcome last year of little children of seven and eight years old working in canneries, and women being overworked. I beseech you all in behalf of the women of the State to use your influence that there be no breaking down of laws for their protection.

We are willing to take the experience of England with regard to preparation for war. Let us take her experience with regard to the effects on children. Schools in England are almost deserted; they have been turned into hospitals. Sir James Foxhall said in Parliament: "A large portion of our elementary school system is in ruins." The same writer goes on to state that while the situation is not as pitiful and pathetic as that in Louvain, it

is practically the same thing as far as the public school system is concerned. We know that the delinquency in England in seventeen large cities has increased forty per cent. because of unrest and lack of supervision of parents. Let us not repeat the mistakes of England with regard to our women and children.

MISS MILLER, *of Newark:* I most heartily appreciate what Mrs. Cushing has said, having heard Mr. Lovejoy on Saturday, and I would like to ask her through you, Mr. Chairman, whether this Conference should not go on record protesting against the kind of work which I am afraid is going to be inaugurated by the school authorities, sending out groups of children unsupervised into the country districts under the guise of patriotic endeavor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under the Conference rules resolutions are not approved of, so that I am not able to entertain that suggestion.

DR. HALLOWELL, *of Vineland:* There is a very important problem that will have to come up to the Conference in the care of the children of munition workers, especially in rural districts. Probably the cities have this in hand. In rural districts where there are munition factories, even in normal times, the medical, educational and hygienic condition of the children and the homes and mothers has been appalling. I had the privilege of riding on the train with Dr. Faulkner to Camden, and he said he wished I would meet him some time and go down to these districts with him. People would be astounded, he said, at the neglect, the absolute neglect of these children. I know I may say in the name of Dr. Faulkner that if you would like to know of these conditions and would write him he would be delighted to take you in his motor tour which he takes every week through that district. The people in local communities are unable to take care of the problem and need help from the outside.

MRS. SLAYBACK: From supervision of the plants in the northern part of the State I feel that that is a South Jersey condition. I do not think it prevails in the northern districts. The homes are being well maintained, and in many cases they are the younger members of the family, among the women, who are employed. I have never in my life seen such perfect cleanliness as prevails in the munitions plants in the northern part of this State. The DuPont plant is immaculate. For their own safety

there must be nothing by which the smallest bit of friction could cause ignition. I found bathrooms, shower baths, a more than legal allowance of basins, the eight-hour law prevailing, and everything that could be desired in the DuPont plant, and the same in the International. The conditions must be much worse in the southern districts.

DR. HALLOWELL: I was not speaking of the plants, but of the conditions in the homes, chiefly of the aliens. This may not even be in the munition grounds; it is the families of the munition workers I was speaking of.

MR. FLEMMING: Personally I would be very glad to have the conference on child labor adjourned till such time as we could take up these subjects. We shall have a conference in South Jersey, at Burlington, soon. I think it would be well to consider these matters of family relationship at that time.

Monday Afternoon, April 30, 1917

HEALTH AND HOUSING

W. L. Kinkead, Paterson, Chairman

THE CHAIRMAN: As Dr. Edsall was sent away by his physician this morning, being ill, we shall have to forego his talk, and I will try to fill in a little of his time.

The general subject for this afternoon is Housing and Health. The housing end of it here is practically represented by the speaker. All the other speakers on the afternoon's program are more particularly interested in the health than the housing side, and when the Program Committee for this session met there were two health officers and one housing man. I chanced to be the housing man. The other two were both larger in physique than I am, and apparently they outvoted the housing end. In speaking of housing conditions, it seems to me not out of place at this time to recall just for a moment where this State was fifteen years ago. Fifteen years ago we had no tenement house law, but some of the ladies in Orange found the need of such a law, found a man who also saw that need; that man has now, unfortunately for us, passed on. I refer to Captain Allen. All of us who knew him knew he was a power, and he carried through a big work for this State.

The tenement house laws that have come on to our statute books were copied, unfortunately, from the books of New York State. The situation to-day is much the same in that respect. New York State is at the present time debating whether they will not make a step backward; I sincerely hope that New Jersey will not make a step backward, too. We made a step forward this year when we secured the several amendments to the law, and there can be no more changes for a year; but it is an unfortunate thing that we seem to feel in this State somehow that we have to copy the laws of New York State instead of being leaders. When our tenement house law was passed all the good features were put in that were dared, but not all that might have been put in. I am not criticising the law, because we got what we could get; it was a wonderful thing, and if the ladies of Orange and the Governor, who backed it, and others, had not done so,

we might not have been where we are to-day. There were few local ordinances fifteen years ago that had any bearing on housing; to-day we have a goodly number in all of our larger cities. The housing side has only come into its own in the last fifteen years in this State.

This State is one of the few States that have housing associations. In fact, there are only three in the Union. Ours was really the first to thoroughly organize and incorporate. We did not know this at the time, but Mrs. Albion Fellows Bacon, of Indiana, told me that. So New Jersey has been a leader in this. At the Philadelphia Conference on National Housing the first move was made to do something. We have not had a secretary during the past year, but hope to have one who will be a live wire shortly. We are in touch with him now, and believe the association will profit greatly.

I want to emphasize just a moment the feeling there has been throughout the country that people contract disease in houses that have been infected by various diseases, particularly tuberculosis. A thorough study has been made and it is found that the tendency by contact to contract tuberculosis comes much more from individual touch than from the dwelling. Tuberculosis workers in the past have thought that the dwelling had a great deal to do with it, but it has been proved by study that it is only a very small percentage. The dwelling must be right, however, or you will still have the probability of tuberculosis.

I want to speak of what we are spending on housing—less than 2 cents per capita. Our population is about three million; in 1885 it was only one and a half million. We have almost doubled in population, but are still spending a very small proportion of money on housing betterment.

For health matters we spend 4 4/5 cents per capita through our health departments. We are spending about 7 cents toward the conservation of people, therefore. We have looked after animals, the bees, etc., but human beings are only now coming in for consideration.

Surgeon General Rupert Blue has said that the average paid to health officers throughout the United States is $300. I asked the Health Department what New Jersey was doing, and found something like this:

Group	Salary	Average
7 full time	$2,000 up	$2,600
10–6 " " 4 part	1,500–$2,000	1,647
8–5 " " 3 "	1,000– 1,500	1,236

Then a very large group who receive from nothing to $1,000, whose average would probably be about $300. I am speaking of the licensed and qualified health officers, not inspectors who have a right to do work of that kind.

Then I want to say a few words about tuberculosis, not only in New Jersey, but in the United States, of the advance in this fight. Here are some figures:

IN THE UNITED STATES

	Before 1905	1916
Organizations	156	2,500
Sanatoria	100	550
Clinics	20	450
Anti-tuberculosis nurses	30	1,400
Open-air Schools	0	300
Death rate (per 100,000)	200.7	146.8
Real work against	5 States	Every State

IN NEW JERSEY

Organizations	1	49 plus
Sanatoria	0	21 plus
Clinics	1	16
Open-air Schools	0	16

I am glad we are going to have a session on Health Insurance. But I want to read a few words now in quotation from an authority who has been studying this work. He says:

"The real defect of nations has been for lack of healthy, virile men, not for lack of ammunition and arms." And:

"Health Insurance, which would mean a more prompt attention to tuberculosis and other similar diseases, and the passage of great sanitary and preventive measures, would help to build up a nation of healthy, virile men."

We do not get our tuberculosis people early enough. Em-

phasis should be laid everywhere on that point. We should try to make people realize that it is not a crime to have tuberculosis, but that tuberculosis is a fact and we have to fight it.

I spoke a moment ago of the fact that the tenement house law had been amended this year. The most important of these changes are the three that increase the size of the outer court from 2′ 8″ to 3′ 6″, and requires fire escapes on three-story buildings with only one stairway, and increases the penalty from $25 to $50 for violation not wilful. That a basement shall be considered a story based upon its height above curb rather than above the grade of street. That roofs and dormer windows shall be fire-proofed. Slightly enlarges floor space in certain rooms. Provides a sink with running water in each apartment. Gives District Courts located in judicial districts, as well as those in cities, jurisdiction over violations of the act. These are the most important amendments.

Another question that has been much discussed is cancer. It is most interesting to learn that it is neither hereditary nor contagious, according to investigations of life insurance statistics recently completed by Mr. Arthur Hunter, President of the Actuarial Society of America. Mr. Hunter reports that the cancer rate among those in close attendance upon sufferers of the disease is only normal, and that the same normal rate prevails among those whose parents or grandparents died with cancer.

Perhaps before I close it may be of interest to the people here from Montclair to have me read a note written to me by Mr. C. H. Wells, Health Officer, Board of Health, Town of Montclair. He says:

"I am glad to submit for your information the following facts:

"The Fourth Ward is our congested section and 30 per cent. of the people live in tenement houses. Forty-one per cent. of the children under five years of age in Ward 4 live in tenement houses, and the percentage of the population that is under five years of age is 50 per cent. higher than for the town as a whole, so that the death rate in the ward would normally be higher than for the remainder of the town on account of the age distribution of the population. Notwithstanding all of these facts, the infant mortality rate during 1916 was only 72, compared with 61 for the entire town and compared with approximately 100 for the

State and for the country. The death rate for Ward 4 was 12.9 compared with 10.6 for the town and with approximately 14 for the State and country.

"An investigation of the number of cases of communicable diseases in the tenement houses shows that there were fewer cases of scarlet fever, diphtheria and typhoid fever in proportion to the number of people than in the rest of the town, but there were more cases of tuberculosis. The death rate of the tenement house population was slightly higher than that for the rest of the town, but this is explained in a large measure by the fact that there are practically twice as many children under five years of age in the tenement houses as in the remainder of the town, proportionally, and the death rate of this age group is normally more than twice as high as for the entire population. These facts show that the tenement houses of Montclair do not constitute any particular menace to the health of the town."

Mr. Burns last night and Mr. Flemming this morning both reiterated the importance of our getting more and more in touch with the politicians or with the men that are going to be elected to office throughout the State. I think we social workers make a mistake by not being registered, and not going to the polls to fight. Unfortunately the ladies cannot go to the polls, but they will before very long, I sincerely hope. We make a mistake that we do not have the men who are going to occupy positions, where they will vote for our laws, educated to know what the laws are for. Let us see that these men carry out what they are put in office to do.

I want to call your attention to a few more facts in regard to tuberculosis. We have not enough beds in this State to take care of those who should have sanitorium care. Deaths reported for 1915 were 4,337; beds available, 1,531. We ought to follow New York State's standard of one bed for every death. Every county has a right to build a sanitorium, but the trouble is that the politicians want to put up a monument to themselves with a bronze tablet to show that they did it.

GENERAL HEALTH CONDITIONS IN NEW JERSEY AS COMPARED WITH OTHER STATES

Frederic S. Crum, Assistant Statistician, Prudential Insurance Company, Newark

It must have been apparent to the Program Committee that no speaker, no matter how able or epigrammatic he might be, could possibly hope adequately to deal with this large subject in fifteen brief minutes. Sometimes comparisons are odious, but I wish at once to allay the fears of those who may think that I shall find it necessary to utterly condemn New Jersey when she is brought into juxtaposition with her sister States and compared or contrasted with them in the matter of general health conditions. Quite to the contrary, the available facts show that New Jersey comes off remarkably well in any such comparison.

Lacking reliable morbidity or sickness statistics, the best method of comparing the healthfulness of the population of our various States is that of comparing their death returns. In such a comparison New Jersey fares exceedingly well, in view of the fact that she has a complex population, largely of recent foreign origin and largely engaged in industrial pursuits, a fair number of which may rightly be considered extra-hazardous, either because of abnormal accident or of abnormal health-injurious conditions generally incident thereto.

According to the federal census for 1914, 13.1 per cent. of the occupied males of New Jersey were engaged in the various manufacturing industries of the State. This percentage compares with 19.1 per cent. in Rhode Island, 16.6 per cent. in Massachusetts, 10.6 per cent. in New York, 18.9 per cent. in Connecticut, and 11.3 per cent. in Pennsylvania. New Jersey has also her hazardous iron and zinc mines; she has also her fair proportion of railway employees, and she has more than an average proportion of her male population in the pottery, glass, felt hat, smelting and textile industries—all of which are considered to be somewhat abnormally inimical to the health of those employed therein.

For the purpose of testing the comparative general mortality of New Jersey with other of her sister industrial States, I have

drawn up some statistics of mortality, based upon the industrial mortality, as revealed in the experience of The Prudential during the five-year period, 1912 to 1916. These data relate to New Jersey and seven other States—New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio. These returns relate only to deaths at ages one year and upward, thus eliminating altogether the infant mortality. This mortality comparison shows the following average death rates: New York, 15.9 per 1,000; Connecticut, 15.5; Rhode Island, 15.2; New Jersey, 14.4; Massachusetts, 13.9; Pennsylvania, 12.9; Illinois, 11.4; and Ohio, 11.2. The average death rate for the eight States for the five-year period was 13.8. In other words, the average rate for New Jersey was lower than for New York, Connecticut and Rhode Island, and it was higher than for Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Ohio. The New Jersey death rate was also slightly higher than for the eight States combined, or 14.4, in contrast with 13.8.

In this insurance experience New Jersey, therefore, compares quite favorably with her sister, and somewhat similarly conditioned, States.

It is not yet quite safe to compare the infant mortality rates of States in this country, because of our imperfect registration of births, and the difficulty of getting even approximately true comparative figures of infant populations by our present census methods. It is, however, fairly safe to make State comparisons of death rates for ages under five years. I have prepared such a comparison, showing the death rates at ages under five years for New Jersey and the ten other so-called original registration States, or States included in the United States registration area in 1900.

According to this table, the average death rate per 1,000 of population, ages under five years, during the five-year period, 1910 to 1914, was 38.5 for New Jersey. This rate was exceeded in Rhode Island (42.8), Massachusetts (41.1), New Hampshire (39.9), Connecticut (39.3), and New York (38.7). The following States had lower average mortality rates, ages under five years: Maine (32.1), Michigan (32.1), Indiana (28.6), and Vermont (28.2). New Jersey's death rate at ages under five years was more favorable than that of any of the other equally industrial States in this list

This table is made more interesting from the fact that it makes possible a comparison of the relative improvement in the death rates in 1910 to 1914, as compared with 1900 to 1904. In this respect also New Jersey comes off exceedingly well, being excelled only by Rhode Island and the District of Columbia, and the latter area, being wholly urban, is not strictly comparable with a State area, for various reasons. In the fifteen-year period, 1900 to 1914, New Jersey's death rate, ages under five years, improved 18.1 per cent., against 17.8 for New York, 16.5 for Massachusetts and 9.9 for Connecticut. Of the industrial States New Jersey was excelled in the improvement of her child death rates during this period only by Rhode Island, which showed a reduction in the rate of 25.7 per cent., against 18.1 per cent. for New Jersey. In this mortality comparison, then, it must be admitted that New Jersey fares very well.

I have not been satisfied to stop here, but have drawn up quite an extended comparison of the mortality of New Jersey, the original registration States combined, Massachusetts, New York, Michigan and Indiana, with distinction of age and sex—on the basis of the life tables, as made available in the United States Census of 1910. Considering only the males, the death rates of New Jersey were higher than for all the original States combined at all ages except under one year, 13 to 19 years, and 85 to 87 years. Compared with Massachusetts, the New Jersey male death rates were higher except at ages under one year, four years, 15 to 17 years, 65 to 75, 84 to 87, and 99 and upwards. In comparison with New York State, the male mortality of New Jersey was more favorable at practically all ages under 76. In the quite strictly agricultural States of Michigan and Indiana, it is only reasonable to expect that the general death rates at practically all ages would be lower than in industrial States like New Jersey, New York and Massachusetts, and that is exactly what the tables disclose. I do not need to dwell upon this detailed comparison at length, for the appended tables give the results of the quite extended comparison and for both sexes. The general conclusion is that New Jersey compares favorably with her sister industrial States, so far as the life tables available in the 1910 Census may be accepted as criteria for such a comparison.

Accepting the proposition that the mortality rate of New Jersey compares favorably with the death rates of similarly con-

ditioned States, it would seem to me to be profitless and even hazardous to stop there. Our health organizations, State, municipal and private, should not be lulled into any sense of false security or into any sense of false satisfaction and contentment, that health matters in this State have reached the acme of perfection, and that little or nothing yet remains to be done to improve the health and sanitary conditions in New Jersey. Nothing could be farther from the truth. There is abundant evidence that much, very much, yet remains to be done before even a reasonable ideal in respect to these matters has been realized. In another connection, I have recently made a very careful estimate of the present mortality in the United States from the preventable causes of death. The total mortality in the continental United States for the present year (1917) was estimated at approximately 1,400,000 deaths. A detailed tabulation showed that fully one-third of this total mortality was caused by preventable diseases, but it was conservatively estimated that one-fourth of the 1,400,000 deaths could be prevented by strict and intensive application throughout the United States of the known methods of disease prevention. That would mean an annual saving, or more or less definite prolonging, of fully 350,000 lives. In the face of this damning evidence of general neglect, we can hardly remain content and at ease in our consideration of sanitation, hygiene and all the activities embraced in the general field of preventive medicine and the medical care and treatment of the sick.

New Jersey, in this respect, is little better or worse than her sister States. I have prepared some tables to illustrate this point and I have made quite a detailed comparison of the mortality from preventable diseases in New Jersey and in Massachusetts, and for the two five-year periods, 1900 to 1904 and 1910 to 1914. I can only present a few of the main features of this comparison and must refer you to the appended tables for fuller information.

During the five years, 1910 to 1914, 36.8 per cent. of the total mortality of New Jersey was referable to what are generally recognized to be preventable causes, or 71,853 deaths out of a total of 195,238 deaths. In Massachusetts, during the same period, 33.9 per cent. of the total mortality was from preventable causes, or 90,153 out of a total of 265,694 deaths. In the face of these facts, it must be evident that the work remaining for our health

authorities to do is too large to warrant them in sitting in idleness or indulging in profitless discussions of comparative excellencies or deficiencies.

There is, however, a bright side even to this rather doleful picture. What has been accomplished in the past gives promise of what may reasonably be expected in the future—and the outlook from this viewpoint is very hopeful indeed.

Comparing the mortality from the preventable diseases in New Jersey during 1910 to 1914 with the same mortality during 1900 to 1904, we find that there has been a reduction in the combined group of causes equivalent to 16.8 per cent. In Massachusetts the similar comparison shows a reduction of 18.5 per cent. To select only a few of the typical preventable causes, the recent results of life-saving efforts in New Jersey and Massachusetts, as well as elsewhere, are seen to have been very excellent. In New Jersey typhoid fever has been reduced 9.1 per cent., diphtheria and croup 18.9 per cent., tuberculosis 30.8 per cent., pneumonia 16.2 per cent., diarrhoea and enteritis 10.2 per cent. The mortality from accidents has been reduced 11.8 per cent. when comparison is made of 1910 to 1914 and 1900 to 1904. In Massachusetts the similar comparisons are as follows: Typhoid fever mortality has been reduced 8.9 per cent., diphtheria and croup 17.5 per cent., tuberculosis 47.9 per cent., and diarrhoea and enteritis 15.3 per cent. Pneumonia increased slightly in Massachusetts during 1910 to 1914, as compared with 1900 to 1904, or 0.7 per cent., as did also the mortality from accidents, or 1.6 per cent. Homicide and suicide have increased in recent years in both New Jersey and Massachusetts. Homicide increased 3.2 per cent. in New Jersey and 1.9 per cent. in Massachusetts. Suicide increased 3.9 per cent. in New Jersey and 3.1 per cent. in Massachusetts.

There has been a great hue and cry raised in certain quarters in recent years that the degenerative diseases of middle life and the higher ages are decidedly on the increase. This may be so, but the case is not yet, in my opinion, proved to the hilt. It is quite possible that a large proportion of this so-called increase in the heart, nervous and urinary diseases is apparent rather than real. Some of it is clearly due to improving diagnosis and the transference of deaths formerly classified under ill-defined causes to these so-called groups of degenerative diseases. Then, too, it

is quite probable that a very considerable proportion of these deaths is of foreign stocks, whose racial characteristics are such that their mortality from these causes is higher than for our native stocks, or stocks of the older immigrants. Granting that there probably is something, and that possibly there is much, in the theory that the degenerative diseases are increasing rapidly in this country, we have at hand much knowledge for combatting such increase. Much has been learned in recent years of the life-shortening effect of bad habits, worry, fatigue, etc. The chief remedy here is through education of both children and adults to the point where the intelligence of the individuals will be such that it will direct them into such habits, and such methods of work and play that their mental and physical health will be vigorous enough to successfully resist most, if not all, of the present preventable ills to which they are prematurely a prey.

In conclusion, then, this brief survey of comparative mortality leads me to the belief that New Jersey is little better or worse in her general health conditions than her sister States, but in common with all of them, she yet has much to do and much to learn before she shall have reached the ideal condition that is now known to be attainable on the basis of past experience.

COMPARATIVE MORTALITY IN REGISTRATION STATES, U. S.—AGES UNDER 5 YEARS
1900-1904 and 1910-1914
Death Rates per 1,000

States	Population Ages Under 5 Years 1900-1904	1910-1914	Reduction in Rate Actual	Percentage
District of Columbia	68.8	43.4	25.4	36.9
Rhode Island	57.6	42.8	14.8	25.7
New Jersey	47.0	38.5	8.5	18.1
New York	47.1	38.7	8.4	17.8
Massachusetts	49.2	41.1	8.1	16.5
Vermont	33.4	28.2	5.2	15.6
Indiana	33.3	28.6	4.7	14.1
Connecticut	43.6	39.3	4.3	9.9
Maine	35.2	32.1	3.1	8.8
New Hampshire	41.2	39.9	1.3	3.2
Michigan	32.5	32.1	0.4	1.1

COMPARATIVE MORTALITY RATES

AGES ONE AND UPWARD

Prudential Industrial Mortality Experience

1912-1916

States	Policies Exposed to Risk of Termination by Death	Policies Terminated by Death	Death Rate per 1,000
New York	11,289,644	179,367	15.9
Connecticut	700,527	10,854	15.5
Rhode Island	251,386	3,810	15.2
New Jersey	5,840,047	84,144	14.4
Massachusetts	1,677,092	23,253	13.9
Pennsylvania	10,898,471	140,462	12.9
Illinois	4,045,284	46,180	11.4
Ohio	3,478,277	38,979	11.2
Total for 8 States.	38,180,728	527,049	13.8

The average death rates in this experience by single years for the five-year period, 1912-1916, and for the eight States combined, were as follows: 1912, 14.0; 1913, 14.1; 1914, 13.7; 1915, 13.3; 1916, 14.0.

INFANTILE PARALYSIS FUROR VERSUS TUBERCULOSIS

Charles V. Craster, M. D., D. Ph., Health Officer, Newark

Now that the shouting and noise of battle has died away, it is permissible for us at this time to take stock of the trials and alarms of the summer of 1916, at which time the epidemic of infantile paralysis was the universal topic of conversation, and to attempt to make a truer orientation in our view of an extremely new problem that has, so to speak, thrust itself into our public health cosmos like a bolt from the blue. It has always been and always will be a fact that epidemics of disease or plagues carry with them the power of creating consternation and dread in the public mind in so far as the visitation is sudden, apparently of mysterious origin, above all of high mortality, with new and unusual symptoms and after effects.

Poliomyelitis as a disease fulfills all these requirements, except perhaps in respect to its being a new disease, it having been recognized in this country as far back as the year 1841, since which date forty-nine epidemics in various parts of the world have been described by medical observers. Poliomyelitis was, however, comparatively speaking, unknown previous to July, 1916, although some 2,500 cases were recognized in New York City in the year 1907.

To explain somewhat the consternation created in the public mind by poliomyelitis due note must be taken of the publicity given to it and of the minute descriptions given by various authorities upon the disease and published in our newspapers; in some instances, I am afraid that this minute description of the symptoms and after effects was used as a basis for sensational and yellow press material. The following is an instance of the kind of thing that was scattered broadcast.

Speaking of infantile paralysis, Flexner described those clinical symptoms and fatal signs which have, so to speak, put the disease in the spotlight of public interest. He says: "The chief terror of the disease lies in its appalling power to produce deformity. When death occurs it is not the result, as in many infections, of a process of poisoning that robs the patient of strength and consciousness, but is caused solely by paralysis of the respiratory functions, sometimes with merciful suddenness, but often with painful slowness, without in any degree obscuring the consciousness of the suffering victim until just before the end is reached. No more terrible tragedy can be witnessed."

It is such pictures as these that have no doubt helped to place poliomyelitis in the forefront of public attention. There are, I am sure, many of us here to-day who are familiar with death scenes associated with many diseases and of which perhaps a more horror-striking picture could be drawn than the one quoted above, and yet we do not receive minute descriptions of these diseases and their fatal terminations published in the press. There is nothing sadder or more pitiful than to watch the closing scenes of a case of pulmonary tuberculosis, and yet I have not as yet seen such an occurrence graphically described in any public print. Although it is true there are many other diseases whose onset is equally abrupt and whose symptoms are equally as painful to witness as poliomyelitis, such as cerebro spinal meningitis, for

example. One other attribute of the latter disease which has riveted the public attention is no doubt the persistent susceptibility of children under five years of age and the unusually high mortality of the case rate, somewhere above 26 per cent. of all cases being fatal.

The experience of New York City and of Newark has shown also that 85 per cent. of the cases of poliomyelitis and 86 per cent. of all deaths from that disease were under five years of age. Very fresh in our minds must be the recollection of the hardships and even injustice of isolation and quarantine methods adopted by many cities and States against the citizen and his family from infected localities. In 1916 our knowledge of how infection was spread was so limited as to make any form of quarantine measures somewhat a matter of debate, and we may still find it difficult to justify any restriction being placed on the freedom of the adult individual until such time as we have a fuller and more definite direction as to how the actual virus is spread from an infected case to susceptible children. Without detracting in any way from the importance of the lesson to be learned by the poliomyelitis epidemic of 1916, we cannot help notice, as all must notice who are concerned in the conservation of public health, the public apathy manifested with regard to tuberculosis, which is in startling contrast to this furor aroused by poliomyelitis, and yet what are the facts which determine the relative importance of the two diseases? During the three months of the summer of 1916 a widespread epidemic of poliomyelitis was experienced in the Eastern cities from Boston, Mass., to Washington, D. C. In the whole expanse of this widespread epidemic prevalence two localities stand out as being pre-eminently affected. New York City and Newark, with a joint population of 6,352,841, had 2,718 deaths from poliomyelitis, a death rate of 42.7 per 100,000 of this population. In the same year and in the same combined localities there were 9,084 deaths from pulmonary tuberculosis, making a death rate of 141.4 per 100,000. It must be remembered that this latter death rate is an annual one and not a matter of an occasional epidemic visitation, as in the case of poliomyelitis.

Presupposing that the case mortality in tuberculosis is at least 10 per cent. of the cases, this would indicate that there are at least 90,000 cases of pulmonary tuberculosis in these two cities alone always existing at one time, as compared with 10,000 cases

of poliomyelitis occurring at certain indefinite cycles of years, for it is a well-known fact that poliomyelitis exhausts the material upon which it feeds and does not recur again in any one neighborhood until sufficient susceptible children are again present. Pulmonary tuberculosis, on the other hand, knows no age limit and its presence in any community, instead of using up available material and disappearing afterwards, does by its very presence eventually predispose the immune portion of the community to eventual infection. Perhaps some reason for the apparent indifference of the public to appreciate the magnitude of the annual toll paid to pulmonary tuberculosis is that familiarity which breeds the well-known contempt of danger. There is something homely and attractive in a disease entity which is common to all classes in the community. It is looked upon as a necessary evil associated with civilized communities and one which, although regarded in some abstract way as very distinctly preventable, there is a feeling that the stamping out of the disease, if it is ever accomplished, will be through the work and duty of the experts in tuberculosis prevention. This probably being the view of the man on the street regarding tuberculosis, he will fail to be stimulated into concern unless confronted with something more alarming than facts or figures. Tuberculosis lacks the dramatic touch and mystery and lightning-like appearance of such a disease as poliomyelitis. On the contrary, its slow onset and prolonged course, ending in recovery a long way off or total incapacity, must ever fail to inspire the same feeling of dread and fear of its existence in our midst. There is no rigid isolation of tuberculosis, the sufferer being free to move from city to city and from State to State. No federal authority controls his going or coming and his disease, when reported, is required by law to be treated as a confidential report not to be divulged. The daily paper does not chronicle his name and address, nor is his removal to hospital made a special news story. The exact value of the life of a child under five years to the community is, of course, susceptible of fairly definite calculation. It may well be said that the value to be set on persons of young adult life is, comparatively speaking, greater than in the case of the younger age periods where the chances of surviving the assaults of disease incident to childhood are not high.

Pulmonary tuberculosis, as we know, takes a high toll and

is more prevalent between the ages of 15 and 55 than at any other age period. In Newark in 1915 the deaths in this age group were represented as follows:

Tuberculosis	719
Bright's disease	215
Heart disease	205
Cancer	200
Pneumonia	175
Apoplexy	96

Poliomyelitis appears to create greater ravages in the child population than is really apparent from the study of populations by age groups.

Bolduan states that "this disease certainly does not infect all children of susceptible age presumably exposed, and that of 600,000 children in New York City under five years of age in 1916, only 8,000, or 1 1/3 per cent., became infected with poliomyelitis." Who among us will doubt that were most children exposed to tuberculosis a much greater percentage would be infected than this? In proof I may say that of all children who had been in contact with tuberculosis cases in the homes and subsequently examined in the Newark Dispensary Clinic, it was found that over 75 per cent. were infected with tuberculosis.

Comparing this with our experience of the infective nature of poliomyelitis, to quote Bolduan again, "not in a single instance did the disease spread in hospitals to other patients, nurses or doctors. Moreover, secondary infection was infrequent in families. This is remarkable considering the extent of the epidemic and the rapidity of its spread."

I may say that our experience in Newark of the infectivity of poliomyelitis was of a similar nature. We have been sufficiently impressed with the dramatic appeal of this new disease and of its attendant tragic consequences. The picture is, however, not to be compared with the ever-present menace of tuberculosis in a community, which may be said to be a lurking foe kept within bounds only by the most strenuous exertions of social and anti-tuberculosis workers. We may hope for a great awakening of the public some day to the recognition of the foe that is in our midst and to the knowledge of the prevalence of

tuberculosis in the most useful periods of adult life. It is increasingly evident that during the whole life of the citizen he is exposed to possible infection with tuberculosis upon each hand and not, as in the case of poliomyelitis, at only epidemic periods of prevalence. Our limited knowledge of the cause of poliomyelitis and its method of spread is at least some excuse for our failure so far to restrain its ravages in a susceptible population. The same cannot be said of tuberculosis, the organism of which is known and its life history studied from every angle.

The means by which tuberculosis infection is spread are virtually agreed upon, although the exact manner of spread is not as yet clear. Sufficient information is at our hand, however, to indicate empirically that the disease is capable of absolute control. Were such knowledge applied in its entirety or without fear or favor, tuberculosis as the problem of the century lacks proper newspaper publicity. One of the reasons for this must be due to the unwillingness of the public to look a huge problem in the face. It is our duty as sanitarians to preach the gospel of fact bereft of fancy trappings. To ask that some measure of public concern for poliomyelitis be extended to the ever-present tuberculosis menace to our young men and women among us and for the recognition that both poliomyelitis and tuberculosis are not spread by any grand cosmical phenomena, not due to earthquakes or mysterious waves of unseen and poisonous air, but to simple familiar and household conditions of personal contact as yet not fully understood to explain the spread and fatality of epidemic diseases in our modern communities.

LAWS INDIRECTLY AFFECTING HEALTH OF CHILDREN

Douglas P. Falconer, Secretary, Children's Aid Society, Newark

The subject which has been assigned to me covers such a variety of legislative enactments that it will be impossible to discuss even the most important of them. Almost all legislation dealing with living and working conditions, recreation, education and health and almost all the laws designed to protect children, indirectly affect the health of children. The New Jersey Child Labor Committee has recently published an excellent summary

of child welfare laws where all necessary information can readily be obtained. The work of child welfare organizations, however, has very important health aspects.

The medical report of the Essex County Parental School for March, and remember that this institution deals largely with delinquent children, says that of the sixty-nine children examined the following defects were noted: Of the abdomen, four; of the blood, seven; deformities, fifty; ears, two; eyes, seven; glands, twenty-seven; genatalia, twenty-seven; heart, eleven; stomach, three; nose, twenty-eight; nutrition, forty-four; skin, twenty-three; teeth, fifty-three; tonsils, fifteen.

The recent reports of the Medical Inspector of the Newark Board of Education show that of the children examined, 65 to 72 per cent. have physical defects which require treatment.

Of the sixty-one children most recently committed to the Children's Aid Society, twenty-one children, or 34 per cent., were physically normal, while forty children, or 66 per cent., required treatment, as follows: Thirteen, teeth; eight, adenoids and tonsils; five, malnutrition; four, defective vision; three, stomach trouble; two, aural catarrh; two, nasal catarrh; two, ricketts; one, heart trouble; one, lameness from infantile paralysis; one, hysteria from neglected cerebral meningitis; one, kidney trouble; one, flat-foot; one, pulmonary tuberculosis.

When such a large percentage of our children are physically defective it is proper that child welfare workers should pay much attention to the field of health. In nearly 10 per cent. of the cases which were reported to us for our assistance, sickness was the outstanding cause of the family trouble.

Because there are other agencies dealing more directly with ill health, these cases of this kind which are reported to us usually are those where the health agency has failed to secure proper results and feels that we can help them out of their difficulty. One type of case is that where the family, either through ignorance or wilfulness, refuse to provide adequate medical or surgical attendance for the children, or to observe proper sanitary precautions. To illustrate:

A small boy of Montclair who had a broken collar bone which had not been properly set was in a fair way to become permanently deformed because his head was being drawn over toward the injured side. The school nurse and others who had

been interested had been unable to insist on the operation. Under the Child Welfare Law of 1915 we were able to secure the proper result.

Another case of local interest was one where a very tubercular mother had refused to go to a sanitarium and her presence at home, where she was not observing sanitary precautions, was a menace to the children. The Montclair Health Officer had struggled in vain with this case and by working in co-operation with him we were able to get the woman to a sanitorium. Later she returned home without being cured and we removed the children, placing them in private families to board, the father paying the board with a little assistance from the Town of Montclair.

In other cases, acting under this law, we have insisted that families supply glasses, braces and other necessary treatment.

We have also found the Juvenile Court Law very helpful, making a general charge of neglect in instances where proper sanitary precautions were not taken. I need not multiply the detailed cases. Enough has been said to show that the child welfare agent can be of a great deal of assistance to the various agencies directly concerned with health. I feel that we have sufficient laws to cover the subject.

Many people doubt the right of the State to force parents to have operations performed and to accept medical treatment when it is against their wish, and it is possible that the health protection section of the Child Welfare Law would be declared unconstitutional if carried to the higher courts. I trust that this will never occur and that the administration of the law will be so wise and sane that the test will not be made.

The most difficult part of child welfare work is not found in cases where the neglect is so obvious as to make court action necessary, but is rather to be found in those cases where the general standard of living is below par; where the health of the children is endangered because of insufficient or improper feeding and general unsanitary conditions of the home, not bad enough to invoke the action of the Board of Health and yet really dangerous for small children. You have found a danger spot when you locate families living without proper toilet facilities, seven or eight sleeping in one room with one small window, and children sent to school on such poor and insufficient food that they go to sleep in the middle of the morning session, too weary to

profit by the expensive educational system provided for their benefit.

I am reminded of one case which the doctors term hospitalism, where a small child appeared at one hospital or another every few months, and after a cure had been effected, it would be returned to the same bad home conditions and would reappear for further treatment in a short time.

A few of these cases the law sometimes will help and I know of none better than the Child Welfare Law, but in most instances the neglect is due to ignorance and to the low standard of living required by the combination of a small income and a large family. In these cases we must expect to reap a great harvest of undernourished and sickly children until we can attack causes more intelligently than we are doing to-day.

It certainly is clear that the health workers and child welfare workers should more closely understand each other in order that these cases which have both health and child welfare phases shall receive attention from one or the other of the groups and not be neglected by both. I have seen a number of instances of this kind.

In one case the mother and two children had contracted typhoid fever and had been sent to the Isolation Hospital. The children who had remained at home had been exposed to the disease and could not safely be placed in any institution or private family for the care of children. The father could not stay home and take care of them, as he had to work. The Associated Charities referred the case to the Board of Health as a health problem, and they referred it to us as a child welfare task. I am inclined to think it is the former and that provision should be made for children who have been exposed to contagious diseases. It is not enough for the Board of Health to warn that children are a menace because of exposure to disease, but it must go further and take care of them until that danger is over.

We must give that kind of service to the community which will allow us to create adequate community programs for all of our social service activities; programs where there shall be no gaps and which will not allow any one in need of assistance in the community to be without it. In order to further that end, I am glad to have the opportunity to speak for child welfare on

a program largely concerned with health and housing and to add my little share toward the furthering of general mutual understanding.

LAWS DIRECTLY AFFECTING HEALTH OF CHILDREN

C. H. Wells, Health Officer, Montclair

This discussion is a continuation of that opened by Mr. Falconer, and has for its object a review in a brief way of the existing legislation on matters directly affecting the health of children, or on matters with which health boards are directly concerned. It is believed that if the members of this Conference have clearly before them just what can be done under present laws, as set forth in these two discussions, they will be better prepared to urge a definite program in their own communities and they will be able to give better advice when the question of new legislation is being considered by the various organizations with which they may be connected.

Laws that directly affect the health of children are of necessity health laws and they are, or at least should be, enforced by the board of health. All board of health laws also have a more or less direct bearing on the health of children. It is thus seen that the board of health is the key to the whole subject and that without efficient boards of health that are properly backed up by the municipal authorities the health of children will suffer regardless of the laws that may appear on the statute books. The fundamental health law, that affects children, then, is that which provides that there shall be a board of health in every municipality, and every person who has the interest of the children at heart should strive in every way to see that suitable men are placed upon all such boards and that such boards have the support of all interested organizations.

Probably the law which is capable of causing the greatest effect on the health of children is that which provides that "local boards of health shall have power and authority to appoint such subordinate officers and agents as they may deem necessary." This law gives boards of health the right to employ nurses for infant welfare work, and it is now generally recognized that the

nurse can do more than any other one factor in improving the health of the babies by her educational work in the home, by her teaching of milk modification and by her work at the baby clinics. The nurse can also be of great assistance in protecting the health of children through educational work in families in which there are cases of tuberculosis and also by securing the removal of tuberculosis patients to institutions. It is unquestionably the duty of every local board of health to act under this law and employ one or more nurses.

The general law that all births shall be reported within five days gives boards of health the knowledge that is necessary in order to follow up births promptly, wherever necessary, and see that the infant is receiving proper care. In Montclair all midwife cases are followed up promptly and we have an ordinance which provides that all midwives shall report their confinement cases as soon as they are called to attend the case. We are thus enabled to follow up our infants five days sooner than if we waited for the birth certificate to be filed. It may not be out of place to mention in this connection that in order to secure complete and accurate reports of births in Montclair it is the practice of the local health office to mail certified copies of birth certificates to the parents with a letter setting forth the importance of accurate birth registration and asking for corrections if there are any inaccuracies. Birth registration is also of importance in keeping children from leaving school and going to work at occupations and at ages that would result in injury to their health.

In order that proper care may be assured at the birth of a child the statutes provide that any person beginning the practice of midwifery after July, 1910, must first obtain a license from the State Board of Medical Examiners. The law also requires a midwife to secure the services of a reputable physician as soon as an abnormal symptom appears. If, within two weeks after birth, one or both eyes of an infant become inflamed or show any unnatural discharge and no physician is in attendance it is mandatory for the midwife or other attendant to report that fact in writing to the local board of health within six hours, which board shall order that the infant be placed under the charge of a physician. The State Department of Health is required by law to furnish midwives and physicians such prophylactic remedies as

it deems best to prevent ophthalmia neonatorum and all attendants at childbirth are supposed to use such preventatives.

Another law that is designed to have a direct bearing on the health of certain infants is Chapter 209 of the Laws of 1915, which permits boards of health by ordinance to license and regulate the manner of keeping boarding houses for infants and children.

The food supply of the infant is the next most important matter to consider and the State Law provides that local boards of health may pass ordinances to aid in the enforcement of the law as to the adulteration of all kinds of food and drink. Specific authority is given for the complete control of the milk supply. When we consider the large number of epidemics that have been caused by infected milk supplies and when we consider that a large part of the tuberculosis in children is due to the use of raw milk from herds infected with tuberculosis, the importance of this law is very apparent. It has been well recognized for years that impure milk was the cause of a large amount of the sickness of infants during the summer months and that there has been a marked decrease in the infant death rate as soon as a clean milk supply was obtained. In view of the very direct relation between the milk supply and the health of infants every board of health must be considered negligent that does not require that its milk supply shall be produced under the most sanitary conditions, from cows proven by physical examination and tuberculin test to be free from disease and that it shall be handled only by employes who have passed suitable physical examinations. Proper pasteurization may be accepted as a substitute for the tuberculin test. Ten years ago the Montclair Board of Health first required the tuberculin test, or pasteurization as an alternative, and in the resulting litigation the State Supreme Court upheld our authority. There is no question but what the law is ample to protect the entire milk supply of the State and thus protect to a large extent the lives and health of the infants and children if sufficient interest can be aroused in the different municipalities. The State Department of Health is empowered to take full charge when a case of communicable disease is detected upon a dairy premises, so that laxness on the part of local officials is not now such a serious matter as formerly, so far as known danger points are concerned.

Upon reaching school age children are subjected to a medical

examination by the school inspector. By statute this work is now under the control of boards of education for the public schools, and it is mandatory, but boards of health should see that this important work is performed in the parochial schools, as is the case in Montclair and in some other cities. It is impossible to overestimate the value to the child of the early detection and removal or correction of physical defects and abnormalities. Any child who is a detriment to the health or cleanliness of others in the classroom may be excluded from school and parents are obliged to remove the cause of such exclusion if it is possible to do so. The medical inspection system when properly carried out also protects the children from exposure to mild cases of certain communicable diseases and guards against the premature admission to school of pupils who have been absent on account of communicable disease. The value of this work to the health of the child has been amply proven.

When children wish to leave school and go to work the State law provides that they shall be examined by the medical inspector to determine whether they have a normal development and whether they are of sound health and physically able to be employed in the occupation in which they may legally be employed. The laws of 1914 also provide that no child under 16 years of age shall be employed in any occupation that is detrimental to health or is dangerous to life and limb of a child of that age, or that exposes him to excessive heat or cold, or that requires an excessive muscular exertion that is detrimental to the health and strength of a child of that age, or in the handling of any goods, wares or merchandise that are poisonous or that give off dust, fumes or gases, or in working around any heated metal, combination of metal or metals or their salts, that give off any dust, fumes or gases that are detrimental to the health, or on, in or around any scaffolding of any character whatsoever, or on, in and around any building that is under construction, or in any employment whatsoever which exposes him to conditions that will retard his growth or injure his health, or in any place that is damp or unhealthy, or that is injurious in any way to the health and strength of a child, or in any place where, on account of the light or the nature and character of the work, the child's eyesight or hearing will be injured.

The majority of the laws that affect the health of children

are those that have for their object the control of communicable diseases, and local boards of health have full authority to pass ordinances to prevent the spread of epidemics, to maintain and enforce quarantine and to remove infected persons to a suitable place. The law specifically authorizes the removal (by force if necessary) of cases of certain communicable diseases from tenement houses and boarding houses. In communities where there is improper control of communicable diseases the result is due entirely to laxness on the part of the local officials and not to defects in or lack of statutory authority. In order that proper control may be exercised by local boards the State law provides that physicians shall report all such diseases within 12 hours after their first professional attendance.

The laws of 1900 and 1915 provide that the governing body of any city shall, upon the request of the board of health, provide the funds for the construction of a hospital which shall be devoted exclusively to the treatment of persons suffering from contagious and infectious diseases. In addition to the provision thus made for the protection of children against communicable diseases the laws of 1903 give boards of freeholders authority to erect county hospitals for contagious and infectious diseases and the laws of 1910 and 1912 give such boards power to establish hospitals for the care of persons suffering from tuberculosis. While young children are not always admitted to tuberculosis hospitals the effect of this law on the health of children is very great, for these institutions permit the removal of centers of infection. In fact, tuberculosis patients who refuse or neglect to dispose of their sputum in a proper manner may be committed to the county hospital by a judge of the Court of Common Pleas. This law should be of great value in preventing the spread of the disease in families in which there are children. Other supplementary tuberculosis laws give authority to a large extent for the control of this disease. In Montclair we have a regulation that no child under 16 years of age shall be allowed to live in a family in which there is a case of tuberculosis unless every care is taken, to the satisfaction of the board of health, to prevent the transfer of infection. The act providing for the establishment of a State hospital at Glen Gardner for the treatment of tuberculous persons is also of great aid in improving the health of the individual children who are sent there and in protecting the health of other children in

the family. Any one who has seen case after case of tuberculosis among children in the same family cannot fail to be impressed with the necessity of invoking the aid of all of those laws in regard to this disease.

The laws of 1904 provide that indigent patients shall be furnished with antitoxin free of charge, at the expense of the State Department of Health. Most local boards furnish this remedy to poor patients for both curative and immunizing purposes and hundreds of lives have thereby been saved.

The living conditions of children are regulated so far as tenement houses are concerned by the State Tenement House Law, and local boards of health have full authority to regulate for all buildings the method of connecting with the public sewer, the manner of installing plumbing, the method of constructing privies and cesspools where sewers are not available, and to prevent the use of polluted water, to prevent overcrowding to such an extent as to be injurious to health and to prevent the continuation of any nuisance that is detrimental to health. Probably the fly breeding nuisance is the one that has the most direct bearing upon the health of infants and according to the new State Sanitary Code there is now specific authority for the abatement of nuisances of this kind. Some local ordinances also provide that no inner rooms shall be used for living purposes, and there seems to be warrant in the statutes for ordinances of this kind. The enforcement of all of these regulations has a more or less direct bearing upon the health of children.

Other laws that are more general in character, but which assist in protecting the health of the children, are the following:

1. The law of 1911, which prohibits the use of the common drinking cup. It is well known that the common cup is a ready means for the transfer of infection from one child to another.

2. The law which prohibits the sale of soda-water, ginger ale or other non-alcoholic drinks which contain any substance that is deleterious to health.

3. The pure food and drug law, together with requirements concerning the health of food manufacturers.

4. The law concerning the protection of the public water supplies of the State.

5. The law preventing the distribution of medicinal preparations except to persons over 12 years of age.

This brief review of the more important laws that have a direct bearing upon the health of children will show that the pressing need so far as child health is concerned is the enforcement of laws already on the statute books and the enactment and enforcement of local ordinances already authorized rather than additional legislation.

Discussion

MISS BRADFORD, *Jersey City:* Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words, not so much to enter into the discussion of the morning, but rather to correct and amplify some of the statements which have just been made regarding the history of the New Jersey Tenement House movement. I would like this audience to know of its very beginning and I would like to give the credit and honor that is due to Montclair, and I would also like to prove that I am a truthful woman. Should you go to Whittier House you would see on the walls in one of our rooms a large chart, which was prepared for the twentieth anniversary of Whittier House. In its center are the words "Whittier House" and radiating from it in all directions the different things started by Whittier House, the years in which they were started and also the years in which they were given into the hands of the city or of the State.

Fifteen years ago, in 1902, we had in residence at Whittier House, a Montclair girl, who had received her elementary and High School education in Montclair, who entered Smith College from Montclair and who after her graduation from Smith College came to Whittier House as resident. She lived in Whittier House three years. During her second year she obtained her college fellowship, and took for her thesis and her work *"The Housing Conditions of Jersey City."* This young girl was Miss Mary B. Sayles and her investigations were the first scientific investigations made of housing conditions in New Jersey. She was exceedingly thorough and scientific in her work and when I look back to her youth and to her inexperience, I can but wonder at her temerity and her persistence. I could tell you many stories connected with her investigations, for this kind of work was new and not understood in Jersey City. For instance, she was arrested and led to the police station by two policemen. She was driven from the houses several times by irate landlords and tenement house

tenants. However, nothing daunted, she persevered and thoroughly investigated the number of tenements she had set for herself as her task. The result of these investigations was published in pamphlet form by the College Settlement Association and one of them naturally sent to Mr. Robert W. DeForest, then head of the Tenement House Commission in New York, who was so impressed with the work done by Miss Sayles that he sent a copy to Mr. Franklin Murphy, who was at that time Governor of New Jersey. After studying this pamphlet, realizing the need of tenement reform in Jersey City, and reasoning that if such were true of Jersey City it must be equally true of other cities in the State, Governor Murphy established our New Jersey Tenement House Commission. I like to think the very first public meeting ever held by that Commission was held in Whittier House. We invited its members to dine with us, and though the Governor himself could not accept, he sent his secretary and other State officials. The chairman of the meeting was Dr. Leonard Gordon, of Jersey City. This then was the beginning of our present Tenement House Commission and fully explains the chart which were you to come to Whittier House you would see in the large room and which says, "New Jersey Tenement House Investigation started by Whittier House, 1902." It is but natural, Mr. Chairman, to say that in this reform you have the intense interest and sympathy of those of us living in Whittier House Settlement.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are glad to hear this report about the origin of the Tenement House Commission.

MRS. HEILMAN: Does the law make it obligatory to have all rooms with windows, or can they have windows opening into the next room?

THE CHAIRMAN: In a single family house?

MRS. HEILMAN: No, not a single family.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many families?

MRS. HEILMAN: I think there are at least four families in the house I have reference to; one room in the house has a window opening into another bed room, none on the other side. There is really no light or air coming in except through another room.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is permissible—unfortunately.

SPEAKER *from the floor:* Do I understand that milk coming from a tuberculous cow, if pasteurized, is perfectly all right for use?

MR. WELLS: The statement I intended to make—it may not have been clear—was that no milk should be sold in any community unless from tested cows or pasteurized. That does not mean that if cows were diseased the milk could be used with safety if it was pasteurized. But grade cows show the disease on the tuberculin test that do not show it physically. If the milk is pasteurized it is believed to be safe when the disease is so slight that it does not show on the physical examination though it might on the tuberculin test. Probably if it shows only on the tuberculin test the disease has not got so far that it would spread in the herd. You would not want to take the product from any diseased animal, but pasteurization relieves the farmer of the expense of tuberculin test when the animals have passed the physical test. Of course pasteurization accomplishes a world of good besides. It kills vast numbers of bacteria which are known to be detrimental. Pasteurization is not a substitute for the tuberculin test, but many authorities believe all milk should be pasteurized. First we should keep the cows as healthy as we can have them and keep milk within reason as to expense, and then have the milk pasteurized.

MRS. WITTPENN, *Jersey City:* In your opening remarks you said that although houses in themselves had been supposed to spread disease, particularly tuberculosis, recent investigation shows that that is not the case. I think we must emphasize that while tuberculosis can only be spread directly by contact with the disease, the house is so greatly a predisposing cause that it might almost be called a direct cause of tuberculosis and other diseases, for the germs develop and grow and live for some time in the presence of filth and dirt and darkness, and unless we have the necessary light so that the dirt can be seen not only by the housewife but by visitors coming in, the dirt will exist and the germs will exist.

Furthermore, when we have one tuberculosis patient, the germs may die but the particular patient continues to live there and to expectorate, so though some have died others take their place and tomorrow will undoubtedly cause disease among the family and visitors.

I feel we should emphasize the importance of housing associations in local communities. We have our State organizations and local tenement house commissions frequently in the city, but the force of inspectors is inadequate in the State Department, and

the local departments though they have their health officers lack trained inspectors. Then those who are not trained go in and do not really know what they are looking for, and do not find the violations. There is another point. I feel if it were possible for somebody to prepare a simplified tenement house code it would help workers to know what the true violations are, and they would know what to look for and help to get the laws that are on our books enforced.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not mean we were to give up the housing and simply keep the homes clean. But if the houses are well looked after the danger is much nullified.

MRS. THOMPSON: I said last night that I thought it was a distinct loss to the Conference that we had not felt it possible to give up any part of our sessions to the discussion of prisons and the prison situation. It is a specially propitious circumstance that we have an opportunity this afternoon to meet a gentleman whom it will be a pleasure to us all to greet here, and to give our assurance that we are behind him in his policies with regard to Trenton Prison—Mr. Mulheron.

MR. MULHERON: I want to say this is my first appearance before a gathering of this character. I have been the prison keeper for the last three months. A great deal has been written and said about me through the State and generally by those who do not know me.

I entered upon this work not because I was keen for it, but the prominent men of the State seemed to think I was the man for the job, and I am trying to fill it. I may say I have been trying to fill it practically alone. I don't say that in any way of criticism of you ladies and gentlemen who represent all kinds of organizations, as I understand it, here, but I have never met any of you at the prison, neither men nor women, and it is surprising to find all the criticisms in the newspapers about it and about the new prison keeper. He has been styled a politician. Well, I have never been a politician, but I was placed at the head of my party in my county, and if I have made any success of that leadership I have nothing to be ashamed of. I have followed my business all my life as a workman, a business man and a manufacturer, and have nothing to be ashamed of in that.

I was not keen for this job, but I am now, and I will be more than glad and pleased to have your support in every direction in

any way you can use it. But one thing I want to say. Do not criticize unless you come down and find conditions yourselves and see how they can be helped. I say that not to you only, but to the newspapers. Know your ground, I say, before you criticize, have facts and go in the right spirit. You have a Commission investigating prisons, penal institutions, and every other kind of institution, and I want to say I am glad that there are such Commissions. It is just as well that we should know what there is.

Another thing I will advise you ladies and gentlemen in connection with prison matters. Go out and help the dependents of the men who are in there. I get more appeals for help in that direction than any other. They need the help a good deal more than the fellows in the jails. I have mingled enough with men and women in my life to know what I am talking about. Some things have been mentioned here by gentlemen who have read papers that I know are true, particularly the young doctor here who talked about cases where five or six people were living in one room. I know, I have seen it in Jersey City and in New York and in my own city.

But above all, ladies and gentlemen, don't criticize the prison keeper till you have seen conditions, and know. Remember that in great measure his hands are tied behind his back. He is not responsible for all the past difficulties there.

SALIENT POINTS OF WHAT SHOULD BE DONE

Summed Up by Mr. W. L. Kinkead

I think we should ask State officials to spend more for housing purposes. We should insist on better birth records throughout the State. We should emphasize the fact that tuberculosis is not given enough publicity in the newspapers—take the example of the publicity in the case of infantile paralysis and the interest it aroused. Tuberculosis workers should get more publicity. Tuberculosis should be looked on as something that can be helped, not as something that can't be helped.

More Charity organization workers should study the children who get into the courts. We should all study child welfare laws, and should all co-operate with the work, all working together and not apart, as emphasized by Mr. Falconer.

We all need a Central Charities Committee or Council of Philanthropy, such as they have here, to get together once a month and discuss problems and get ideas so that we may work together for the same ends.

Milk facts should be given more publicity. One of the New York towns takes the bacterial tests and sediment tests and publishes them every week in the paper, with the name of the dealer. The housewife knows then whether to buy milk of one dealer or another.

Tuberculosis workers should take notice of the law that covers county work, and where patients are not living as they should, should invoke that law.

SALIENT POINTS OF WHAT CAN BE DONE

Summed Up by Mr. Wells

I made some notes of what appears to me to be the gist of this meeting.

Direct contact with the patient, whether in tuberculosis, scarlet fever, or diphtheria, is the principal thing we should consider, and not infected rooms or houses or school rooms—direct contact with the individual who has the disease or who may be the carrier of the disease.

Early diagnosis in tuberculosis is essential to save the patient and protect the family. It is only by diagnosing cases early and securing proper separation of the child that an effective health work can be performed. Physicians and all interested should make great effort to secure early diagnosis and report in regard to tuberculosis.

We should recognize the marked reduction in the death rate in New Jersey and in the country and in Montclair since the Health Board activities have been intensified; and since the work by private organizations such as the Public Health Committees, Charity Organizations, etc., has been actively carried on; also the marked reduction in certain diseases. New Jersey health statistics are very favorable, but about forty per cent. of the deaths are still preventable. This points to one thing, namely, that efficient boards of health are necessary and boards of health are justified in asking for necessary funds to carry on their work.

The importance of tuberculosis when contrasted with poliomyelitis was very strongly brought out by Dr. Craster. There is no question but what there should be more publicity in regard to tuberculosis and no question that if poliomyelitis recurs this summer it should be considered in a more sane manner and should have no more publicity than should an equal number of cases of scarlet fever, and there is no occasion for making the restrictions any more rigid than for scarlet fever.

We should recognize the great importance of child welfare work on the health of certain classes of children. It was brought out clearly by Mr. Falconer that the majority of these children without child welfare work would go on with impaired health. We should recognize that Boards of Health are the key to the health of the children. They should appoint nurses to do much work that cannot be done by sanitary inspectors, and they should have full power to control milk and food supplies.

It is plain that children cannot legally be employed in any occupation injurious to their health. The laws are ample for the full control of diseases and for the general health of the children, and the importance of co-operation is what should be recognized.

Co-operate rather than criticize, and every society represented here can do no better thing than work with the board of health of its own community and persuade it to do the things that today have been shown possible of accomplishment.

(The session was adjourned.)

Monday Evening, April 30, 1917

SOCIAL AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Robert Lynn Cox, Third Vice-President, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Montclair, Chairman

Musical Selections—Double Quartet from Montclair Glee Club.

THE CHAIRMAN: It gives me very great pleasure to be called upon to preside at this meeting tonight, at which we are to discuss the subject of insurance. It is rather refreshing for a man in the insurance business to find an audience before him that seems ready to proclaim insurance as being a good thing. A large part of our time is spent in persuading people they should have insurance, but we seem to have reached a new era in insurance business—a recognition that insurance is a necessity rather than a luxury.

The field is a broad one, we are learning today that we must have insurance covering almost every vicissitude of life, and this no man believes more firmly than a man who is in some branch of the insurance business.

I suppose we are to deal tonight particularly with those phases of insurance which have to do with the human being rather than with property—that is to say, with insurance against death, personal injury, sickness, maternity insurance, and even unemployment insurance. So we cover a wide range in this discussion of social insurance.

But social insurance, strictly speaking, would not be described by a mere enumeration of the kinds I have described, because it has taken a new meaning. Insurance hitherto has been left to the private company. But we are reaching the point now where many people believe it ought to be inspired, carried on, and perhaps enforced, by the Government. So as we come to believe that the Government itself shall enforce insurance we call it in general terms, social insurance.

This kind of insurance had its inception across the water. We have been accustomed to think of the subject as being best illustrated in Germany. That is not a particularly happy country to refer to at the present time, because we are not at the moment

thinking as favorably as we once did of German methods. But I hope we have not forgotten the fact that Germany has a very efficient Government, and if you can approve their form of government you can see that in the insurance business their methods may be most efficient.

But as chairman I must not trespass too far on your time. I would call your attention, however, to the fact that this subject is very important and has many angles. It is fraught with many difficulties. We are all in sympathy nowadays with the object of insurance. None of us are in the position of people a few generations ago who thought that to insure was to interfere in some way with the divine will. Our only question is how best to insure ourselves.

An audience of this kind, interested in the problems with which you have dealt, can see the results of failure to find some way to absorb the shock of those events which bring so much misery into the world—death, accident, sickness, unemployment, etc.

We are all in sympathy with the object of insurance and with the results, because in the degree that we have insurance and can thereby absorb these shocks, we save or prevent human misery. But we get into difficulties in attempting to work out the method. How shall it be done? What will be the expense? Shall we have it forced on us by the government, or shall we follow the freer paths we have followed hitherto and be allowed to take insurance or not take insurance, pay for it or not pay for it, take the risk and suffer the results if we lose or protect ourselves by insuring and paying the cost?

The thing which is being most actively presented now is the subject of health insurance. Most actively, I say, because its advocacy is being carried on by the American Association for Labor Legislation, as most of you know. So whether we will or not we must consider the question, and as citizens must consider it from the standpoint of public interest, because in the last analysis we all agree that what is best for the public weal we must have. Information along this line we are seeking here tonight. We are to be favored by an address from a man who knows his subject well, a man who has been for many years a student of history, and teacher of political economy. He served as professor in several American colleges, his last position being in our own State

institution, Princeton University. It gives me great pleasure to present my good friend, Dr. Royal Meeker, U. S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C.

SOCIAL INSURANCE IN THE UNITED STATES

Dr. Royal Meeker, U. S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Washington

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great pleasure to meet a great New Jersey audience once more, especially this particular audience. I have had something to do with the Conference of Charities and Correction in this great State, and it gives me great pleasure indeed to be with you once again, even at no inconsiderable personal inconvenience. It was especially difficult for me to leave Washington at this time, but my conscience knocked persistently. I could not fail this time. I remember last year I promised to come and address you, but when the time came I had to be in the State of Ohio, so it was wholly impossible for me to be with you then. So I felt this time almost at any sacrifice I must come.

I wonder if it has occurred to you to question the advisability of holding this Conference at this time? It has occurred to me. The most important thing in our lives today is to bring to a successful conclusion the business of war in which we are now engaged. Is it then not trifling to distract our attention by any object other than that of waging successful war in order that peace may be secured permanently? I thought of this a good deal as I was coming up on the train today. And this is the way it presents itself to me. Accident and illness in industry are bound to occur and to increase because of the speeding up of industry, which must occur in order to enable us to carry out the enterprise that we have engaged in. It is then just as productive for us to consider how we shall best safeguard the interests of the workers in all our factories, on all our farms, as to engage in the manufacture of munitions, clothing, tentcloths, raising of potatoes and hogs, or any of the other things that are to be consumed in this great struggle.

What is social insurance? I think social insurance can best be defined as community risk-bearing from which all private

profiteering and competitive cost have been eliminated. It applies to property as well as to personal risks. It applies to fire insurance, hail insurance, cyclone insurance in property insurance, just as well as to accident insurance, sickness insurance, invalidity and old age insurance, unemployment insurance, death or life insurance as we have come to call it. Usually, however, we think only of personal insurance when we speak of social insurance. Community risk-bearing, from which all private profit has been eliminated, that and that alone is social insurance in the strict interpretation of the term. We use the term very, very loosely indeed; quite generally workmen's compensation is termed social insurance. As a matter of fact, we have almost no social insurance in this country. Social insurance is not necessarily carried on by the State. It can be carried on by mutual associations not for private profit, and I am not sure but that is one of the best forms social insurance can take.

Very few States in the United States have anything that can correctly be denominated social insurance. Only those States which have State funds in which the insured can take out his insurance or which provide for mutual non-profit associations have anything that can properly be called social insurance. Even in these States the workmen's compensation insurance carried by the State Fund is often not social because competition still persists, the State Fund merely adding another competitor. The rates are competitive rates made for the purpose of securing profits to the private insurance companies.

An address on social insurance in this country then would resemble a treatise on snakes in Ireland. But don't congratulate yourselves prematurely. A great deal need be said about the need for more social insurance in this country.

I have said some things about insurance companies on certain occasions, things that needed to be said. In this whole debate about social insurance there has been too much of the personal element injected into the discussions; there has been more energy expended in trying to put an opponent in the wrong than in trying to put the subject right. Perhaps I, too, have been guilty of that offense to some extent. I certainly do not underestimate the value of our private insurance companies; they were on the job early and have done enormous productive work in advancing the principle of insurance, but there are certain social risks, hazards

of life, that the insurance companies have not covered adequately, and so far as can now be discovered they are incapable of ever covering these risks adequately at a cost the people can afford to pay.

The cost of accident compensation insurance is something rather difficult to estimate, especially in this country, because the laws are so various, and the administrations equally various, if not more so.

I was somewhat astonished that my good friend, Mr. Cox, should refer to the cost of insurance against these risks of life in the usual orthodox manner. I thought he was not entirely orthodox, I had hoped he was not, at least, in this respect. It is usual to refer to the cost of insurance as coming into existence only when you insure. No greater fallacy was ever perpetrated than that.

Was there no burden of industrial accidents before industrial accident insurance was invented? The burden was there and it was borne by those who could not escape bearing it—the working people. They could not shift it, they could not dodge it, they had to bear it because they were the least able to bear it of any members of society. Casualty insurance came along. It bore the burden, part of it, but the injured workman had to pay dearly for the insurance he was able to purchase from casualty insurance companies. This ostrich method of shifting responsibility, of shifting burdens by burying the head in the sand does not appeal to me in the least. These burdens exist. They must be borne. The question then to be solved is exactly, as your presiding officer presented it, "What is the best way of equalizing the burden so that it can be borne most easily, so that society can profit most by the burden-bearing?"

We want the insurance companies to help in everything they can do. Can they insure under workmen's compensation so as to smooth out the inequalities, equalize the burdens that exist because of industrial accidents, and at a cost that will not seriously disturb industry? Well, they are insuring in almost all the States under workmen's compensation laws. I have been observing the operation of these laws with great interest, and I must say that I feel very much concerned about our workmen's compensation laws, I greatly fear we are drifting back to the old employers' liability basis of claim adjustment. The Commissions are so over-

burdened with work that they have no time to do anything but adjust claims.

There are three great duties that society owes its working people: first of all, and far the most important, to preserve them against disability either from accident or illness; second, to restore those unfortunate ones who suffer disability in spite of all precaution, to restore them as speedily and completely as possible to industry; and, third, and least important of all, though by no means unimportant, to compensate those who have suffered injury either through illness or accident, to compensate them for their disability, for their economic loss when they have suffered loss.

These are the three great objects we should strive for. If I thought that social insurance, accident, invalidity, old age, fire insurance, or any kind of social insurance would do nothing to cut down the hazards of life I would not feel much interest in it. For that matter private insurance for profit has diminished the hazards of life. I think the most notable chapter in the history of insurance companies is the noble work they have done in cutting down the death rate. The casualty companies have done most excellent work in preventing casualties by holding elevator construction up to standard, and standardizing construction in many other lines. That is immensely more important than either paying claims or getting out of paying claims.

Now I believe that the casualty insurance companies should as soon as conveniently possible be absolutely excluded from writing insurance under workmen's compensation laws, and I have very good reasons for holding that belief. Whenever I sit in with a State Compensation Commission or Industrial Accident Board I am made very impatient by the proceedings there. These Boards and Commissions, as I have indicated, have very little time to give to the prevention of accidents—the most important work that they could do; they have less time for restoring the injured workman as completely and as speedily as possible to work. There is almost no medical inspection or supervision, or adequate medical, surgical, and hospital treatment accorded to injured workmen. Just the other day I saw a man before one of our State boards whose hands were absolutely crippled, making him a total permanent cripple. He had them mashed in hot callender rolls in a rubber factory. The question referred by the Board to the medical ad-

visor was what adjustment could be made, what lump sum must be paid under the law to this man, a totally helpless cripple, unable to earn a cent in his present condition? The question was not what could be done to restore this man so that he could earn a fractional part of a man's wage, or perhaps a whole man's wage. That was not the question at all that was put up to the medical advisor. He was not asked what could be done, how speedily or how completely the injured workman could be restored and what it would cost. Merely, how much are we obliged to pay him to get rid of him, to wipe him off the books? Not a pleasant thing to think of! The physician said the man really has two fingers, one on each hand that are totally disabled, but he can be fixed up so that he can earn a large part of a full man's wage, can probably be wholly self-supporting if you can induce him to submit to a very simple operation. Now this sort of thing is going on constantly and it causes me very great concern. Of course, if the accident compensation insurance were carried by the community instead of by private profit-seeking insurance companies, the pressure to bring about lump sum settlements would be greatly diminished. It would not be eliminated. It would require brains and watchfulness to administer State insurance or mutual insurance funds wisely, but social insurance would help a lot to give the permanently injured man a square deal.

Another thing that is almost as bad is the way hearings are conducted. Boards and Commissions are occupied almost entirely in hearing and adjusting claims, which is or should be the most unimportant part of their work in reality. I have heard scores of cases with the Commissions, and in every instance both the injured workman or his relatives in the case of a fatal accident and the private insurance carrier have been represented by lawyers, whether the carrier is an insurance company or the employer of the man. We are drifting back to the administrative system obtaining under the old employers' liability laws. Can you imagine anything worse than that? It is really in danger of growing worse than the old employers' liability system because under that system damage suits were heard by men who were at least trained lawyers, men who knew something of the traditions of the courts, who had some respect for the traditional ideas of what constitutes evidence. The cases now are tried before Commissions who are not educated in the law as a rule, who do not respect precedents,

who have grown up in no tradition of veneration for the majesty of court procedure. The more honest and straightforward the Commissioner, the more is he likely to become impatient with the bunk questions asked by the bunk lawyers of a still bunker physician. The more likely is he to make a snap judgment that may work a grave injustice to one of the parties in the case—perhaps to both. Judgments are more likely to go wrong in a court procedure conducted before a bench of Commissioners who don't know anything about court procedure than they are before a regularly constituted court.

The only thing that can be said for this is that it is likely to be a little bit more speedy, but some of the Commissions, notably that of Illinois, are held down to all the red tape and formality that doth hedge about the ordinary common pleas courts, so their proceedings cannot proceed much more rapidly than can the proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The responsibility for smuggling the ambulance-chasing lawyer back into the game and for complicating and delaying procedure rests with the lawyer drafters of compensation acts, ably abetted by the insurance companies. It is most unfortunate. We need a lot of new legislation, and a lot of the old wiped off the statute books. We have gone on a wrong path.

The casualty insurance companies have borne their full share in balling things up, and the only way the matter can be straightened out is to exclude them from writing insurance under workmen's compensation laws. I do not want to do them any injustice. I don't want to do the saloons any injustice; they represent capital invested . . . . That was rather an unfortunate utterance, wasn't it? . . . . I didn't mean by placing the saloons and insurance companies in juxtaposition to insinuate that there is any similarity in their functions or in the results achieved . . . . I apologize . . . . It was an unfortunate slip . . . . but it illustrated the point very well, didn't it?

In order to have any kind of insurance written cheaply it must be written on a monopolistic or pseudo-monopolistic basis. Now let that soak in. Accident insurance written either by the State as State insurance, or written by pseudo-monopolistic mutual associations would cut out most of the fuss and feathers Mr. Cox referred to. He told you how difficult it is for the insurance people to persuade people to become insured and he wants

people to be free moral agents. That is fine. I would like to be a free moral agent myself, but when I was working in the lumber woods I would have been very pleased indeed if I had been obliged to pay for accident insurance. I nearly chopped my leg off once. I did not think anything about it then, but I have thought a good deal about it since. Probably I would be begging now if I were still alive at all, if the axe had swung just two inches to the left. I have thought about that a good deal. I most certainly wish that some compulsion could take hold of this great sloppy mess that we call the United States, make it sit up straight and put a backbone in it, compel it to do something and do it right, and do it systematically, and do it economically. There is not any question about it, the cost of accident insurance is a mighty serious matter at the present time as carried on. The cost of industrial accident insurance could be cut in two if the insurance were carried either as a State monopoly or a State monopoly tempered by employers' mutual associations. That is exactly what should be done.

Furthermore, there should be no distinction made between an industrial and a non-industrial accident. A man is just as dead if he gets run over by a street car while strolling home as if he gets forty tons of molten steel poured on him in the course of employment. It really does not make any difference to him or his family which kind of accident kills him. Our accident insurance ought to include non-industrial risks just the same as industrial risks. We do not know how many accidents take place outside of industry, for that matter we do not know how many take place inside. I do not like to blow my own horn too vociferously, but I hope sometime to get some order and standardization into our industrial accident statistics. We have been working pretty strenuously for several years, and we have succeeded in working out classifications of industries, causes of accidents and nature of accidents, and we are now working out standard tables. When we get them completed, then the workmen's compensation states, at least, will be able to furnish their accident statistics in such a way that we can compare accident rates, State by State, industry by industry, and year by year. As it is now you cannot compare the accident rate of one State with that of any other State in the Union. New Jersey is the worst of all the Compensation States, because it hasn't any accident statistics at all, comparable or in-

comparable. I will say this for the New Jersey law, however, while elective in a way, it operates like a compulsory law, and includes everybody except casual labor. Only one other political division of the United States does as well as New Jersey as far as scope is concerned, and that is Hawaii. New Jersey is on a level with Hawaii. But that is about all you can say for the New Jersey law. It is not adequate, the compensation is not sufficient, no insurance against losses from accident is required of the employer. It is pretty bad in that regard. We surely ought to cover non-industrial accidents as well as industrial accidents—perhaps in a separate law; but they ought to be covered.

Again what difference does it make whether a workman is disabled because of illness or because of accident? We surely ought to have our compensation laws broadened in scope, so as to include industrial diseases. But what is industrial disease? I cannot tell, and I know you cannot tell. You can tell some of them, but you cannot distinguish any considerable number of them, and when you get outside the purely industrial diseases what will you do with the other diseases that afflict humanity? I have heard it said a good many times that there is only an inconsiderable amount of illness among the people of the United States, that we are too healthy to need social insurance to carry this burden. Furthermore it has been said in my presence that illness is not of much consequence in this country anyhow, because we are so prosperous. A man who is ill simply loses time during his illness and goes back to work. Well now, I do not want to stop to discuss that question. You people engaged in social work know better than that. What difference does it make whether our illness rate is higher or lower than that of Germany or England or any other country. Great disputes have been waged as to whether the average number of days' illness per inhabitant in this country were nine or twelve or four. Great chunks of oratory have been unloaded upon suffering humanity over that question. As a matter of fact probably all of these different statistical statements are correct. In the investigation into trade union and establishment benefit funds that my Bureau is now conducting, there have been found many inexplicable differences in illness rates, whether due to differences in reporting in local or industrial health conditions, or what, we do not know. So far as trade union benefit funds are concerned their records are almost worthless; we cannot tell

whether they mean illness or accident, they are all bunched in together, so we don't know, and it is impossible from them to determine any rate of illness. In some establishment funds it is possible to analyze the illness statistics and determine what they mean. I have in mind two establishment funds covering people whom you would expect to have about the same illness rates. One shows an illness rate, or rather an average number of days' illness per member, of twelve per annum; the other shows an average number of days' illness of only four. You cannot explain this difference from the data supplied. But why squabble about these things? We know that illness exists in a very serious degree, and that the consequence of illness in the families of working people in this country is something that cannot be neglected, something that affects vitally the whole family life, the welfare of the whole community.

I think we can take it for granted without any further discussion that the matter of illness is settled. It has often been said in justification of opposing social insurance that our death rate is the lowest death rate on record. We do have a low death rate in the registration area, but let me call your attention to the difference between the population in our registration area and that for instance of Germany, the country with which we are most often compared. It is a fact that this country has been peopled by immigrants. We have a small birth rate relatively in the registration areas of this country, and you all know without information from me that the highest death rate is among infants. We have given special attention to cutting down the infant mortality rate. High birth rate always connotes high death rate among infants. There is high death rate in Germany. That high death rate persists in Germany up to the group beginning with fifteen years of age and ending with forty-five, and then it becomes lower than our death rate, and the percentage of our population between the ages fifteen and forty-five is very considerably higher than that of Germany or any other country, simply because our population is added to greatly by immigration between those ages. That sufficiently explains our lower death rate. The death rate has nothing to do with an illness rate. If you want an illness rate you have to go out and get it. We have not got it yet. I am doing the best I can now to get it, but I must say in all frankness that it is a pretty discouraging job.

But I don't think it worth talking about. Illness exists. Supposing it does not exist so much as in Germany. I don't believe that for a minute, but let it go for the sake of the argument. Granted every claim made as to the healthiness of our workers, sickness is still a serious evil and should be insured against just like any other hazard of life.

I suppose I am talking too long? I always do! How many hours have I? I have really not started yet!

(THE CHAIRMAN: I think you have another minute, Doctor.)

I don't know whether that was intended as an insult or an occupational injury!

It has often been said that the voluntary agencies are taking care of illness in this country, that we do not need social insurance butting into this field, which is already adequately covered by voluntary agencies. These voluntary agencies consist of (1) trade union funds, (2) establishment funds, (3) all sorts of mutual benefit associations, and (4) casualty insurance companies writing health insurance. The task I am engaged on now is to determine how adequately voluntary agencies are carrying these very serious hazards of life, the hazards due to sickness and to accidental injuries.

As indicated already the trade union benefit funds do not know very much what they are up to really. Their benefit funds are not solely for carrying the hazard of illness. Furthermore, the trade unions include only a small fractional part of the working people in this country. There are, according to the best estimate, about forty million people in this country that may be denominated as people engaged in gainful occupations. And there certainly are not as many as three million of those people who are members of trade unions, either in the American Federation of Labor or outside of it. And of these three million people about half are covered by some kind of a sick benefit fund—this is the roughest sort of estimate, but based on figures actually obtained by my agents, so that it has some value at least.

Now how adequate are these benefit funds for caring for the burden of sickness? I should say from a superficial examination of them that they were wholly inadequate. Most of them merely provide for money payments in case of illness. There is no sickness supervision, no medical attention, no hospital treatment what-

soever. The sums that the sick workingman may draw range from five to seven dollars, with a few in excess of that. How many of you would like to fall ill in order to draw five dollars a week? Not many, I think. This sum in most instances is all the family has to buy food and medicines and to pay the doctor. Some of the establishment funds provide medical attention and some few provide only medical attention and no money payment at all. I suppose that we could safely say that all told not more than a million and a quarter of the working people are members of trade union benefit funds and less than a million are covered by establishment funds. Thus less than two and a quarter million workers out of possibly forty million are covered wholly inadequately by sickness insurance as it is provided by these agencies. The number given is sufficiently large to include the mutual benefit associations, for they are rather insignificant.

Now the only other agency left then to take care of these forty million odd working people is the casualty companies. And what are they doing? I tried to find out, but I could not. They are doing very little.

The old line insurance companies are interested in writing health insurance not at all; some of them write industrial insurance, which is funeral benefit or burial insurance. I do not need to go into that, but I do wish to say that industrial insurance comes awfully high. I do not mean to say it does not accomplish some good among the families that take it. But how adequate is it when you stop to think that according to Dr. Rubinow the amount that is paid for industrial insurance, namely, burial insurance, in this country would purchase insurance against all the hazards of life in Germany? It seems to me that should make us sit up and take notice.

In other words, insurance is essentially a monopolistic business. It can be carried on immensely more cheaply by a State monopoly or quasi-monopoly, regulated and supervised by the State, that insures workers automatically. It cuts out all the expense of going out to seek the working man to drag him into insurance; it cuts out the enormous expense of collecting the premiums. It cuts out the expense of placing investments of the funds collected; it cuts out most of the expense of accounting and making actuarial estimates of future liabilities. These are

the great overhead charges in insurance as carried on by private profit-making concerns.

It seems to me it is self-evident that social insurance is bound to come. I do not want it to come till people are ready for it. I suppose I will be called a Socialist, but that does not frighten me. I think that time has passed when a thing can be damned by denominating it Socialism. If Social Insurance is Socialism, that is the strongest argument for Socialism I have yet heard. If this be Socialism, let's have some more of the same. If a thing is a good thing, let us have it whether it is Socialism or not. It certainly is a good thing if we can enable the working people of the country to get insurance that will cover adequately the risks they must necessarily run at a figure they can pay. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is rather difficult when you are a chairman and you have a friend throwing brickbats at you occasionally. I must say, however, that I am glad I do not go quite so far as he does. I have sometimes criticised the federal and the State government and pointed out their inefficiency, but I don't believe I have ever endowed them as he has to-night. He has confessed, even to his own detriment, that he cannot do the things he would like to do, and yet he is one of the efficient officials of which we would like to have more. It seems to be the way the government is run.

I hope I was not misunderstood when I referred to the cost of this insurance. When we consider the question of cost we find in Massachusetts a commission reporting the cost of health insurance for the State of Massachusetts at $23,000,000; it was estimated that in New York State it would cost $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 a year. These are facts which we as citizens must consider. We see Dr. Meeker approaching the subject from the sentimental side, and talking as public officials usually talk, without knowing where to get the money except by way of imposing taxes for the purpose. The business man looks at it as business and tries to see where it is going to be provided for. We have a wonderfully efficient business country. There is no place where insurance has been built up as it has in this country. I want to say as a business man that, at least as far as business is concerned, I do not consider this country "a sloppy mess."

We have to consider these things from a business stand-

point. But I am talking as if I were not chairman of this meeting.

The opening of the discussion will be made by Mr. Frederick S. Crum, who will speak in place of Mr. Hoffman.

"FACTS AND FALLACIES OF COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE"

Frederick I. Crum, Ph.D., Assistant Statistician, Prudential Life Insurance Company, Newark

I think any consideration of so great a problem as social, or particularly health insurance, to which I shall largely limit myself, should involve the presentation of both sides as strongly as possible, and Dr. Meeker has presented the compulsory side with much force.

Dr. Hoffman and many others take the point of view that health insurance should be voluntary rather than compulsory. Dr. Hoffman has written a pamphlet, "Facts and Fallacies of Compulsory Health Insurance," pointing out in twenty-nine conclusions what are his opinions and beliefs, based on the facts as he has been able to determine them.

First of all, he points out that this government was founded upon the principle that that government which governs least governs best, and secondly, that this is a democratic government and opposed to compulsion where we can get the same or nearly the same results by voluntary methods.

There is an important point that Dr. Meeker did not bring out. So-called compulsory insurance divides the people of the United States into two wage-earning classes, those receiving wages of $1,200 or less, and the others. Those receiving $1,200 or less will get this compulsory insurance by paying forty per cent. of the cost, the government paying twenty per cent. and employers the other forty per cent. That establishes at once class legislation, and that Dr. Hoffman and many others are vigorously opposed to.

Another important point is that at the present time, as Dr. Meeker admits, we do not know what the voluntary agencies are doing or able to do in this country. That whole matter is more

or less unknown. This year, so far, two quite elaborate reports by State Commissions on Social Insurance have appeared, the Special Commissions on Social Insurance of Massachusetts and of California. The California commission was appointed in 1915 and worked until after July, 1916, and the report is unfavorable to the specific plan for compulsory health insurance as proposed by the secretary of the American Association for Labor Legislation.

The Massachusetts commission very emphatically state that they will require at least another year of rigorous investigation before they are ready to propose legislation, and then are in grave doubt whether the compulsory plan is what they would want or recommend. Both of these commissions admit that present knowledge is insufficient for such drastic and far-reaching legislation as would be involved in the enactment of a compulsory health insurance law.

On the point of average number of days' sickness, I think we ought to have the facts before we have the legislation. We have a vicious habit in this country of passing laws before we are quite sure what is needed. Dr. Hoffman says: "The alarming assertions regarding the alleged physical deterioration of the American people are grossly misleading. . . . The alarming assertions regarding the prevailing rate of sickness in American industry are quite contrary to the evidence revealed by means of trustworthy community sickness surveys of representative American cities, indicative of a decidedly lower rate of incidence than is known to prevail in Germany and Austria, regardless of nearly thirty years of compulsory sickness insurance experience. Thus, for Boston, Mass., the average sickness loss for males is only 6.5 days per annum, and for Rochester, N. Y., the loss is 7.0 days, against more than 9.2 days for Germany and 9.5 days for Austria. For the State of California, according to the Social Insurance Commission, the loss is only six days, and for a selected group of workingmen in various establishments of San Francisco and Oakland, only 2.9 days. The assumed general average loss of nine days by the United States Industrial Commission is merely conjecture and guesswork opinion.

"The alarming assertions regarding the alleged physical deterioration of the American people are grossly misleading and contrary to the facts, which prove that in the registration area

of the United States there has been no very marked increase in the mortality from preventable degenerative disease during the working period of adult life. No thoroughly qualified investigation has been made into the subject and the available statistical information is of doubtful intrinsic value. A material reduction in the adult death rate depends primarily upon a more rational mode of living, improved habits, better methods of early diagnosis, and further progress in the practice of medicine and general surgery. There is no evidence to prove that compulsory sickness insurance has brought about a measurable decrease, if any, in the degenerative diseases in the countries in which such insurance has been in operation for many years.

"To the extent that industries or occupations predispose to physical infirmity and premature death, the solution of the problem lies largely in the direction of adequate compensation for such diseases in conformity to well-considered modern workmen's compensation laws. The sanitary control of work places, and the gradual elimination of occupational diseases, depend chiefly upon the more rigid enforcement of laws of safety and sanitation in their specific relation to industrial life. Compulsory health insurance is not required for the attainment of this purpose, but, quite to the contrary, such a system has almost invariably proved an inducement to indifference and neglect, by providing pecuniary relief during needlessly prolonged periods of alleged incapacity for work.

"The assertions and allegations regarding the remarkable health progress of Germany, attributable to social insurance, are contradicted by the fact that the sanitary advancement of the United States has been fully as satisfactory and possibly even more so, as regards tuberculosis and infant mortality. There has been no marked decline during recent years in the sickness rate of German wage-workers, which, as a matter of official record, remains considerably in excess of the corresponding rate of sickness known to prevail among the wage-workers of this country."

The proponents of compulsory health insurance have even said that the working life span of German workmen has been increased by twelve years largely as a direct result of compulsory health insurance. The best authorities in Europe maintain that this assertion is false.

The primary function of insurance is to distribute risk, not

to prevent loss. The primary purpose of health insurance should not be to prevent sickness. We have our public health organizations for that specific purpose. It is their primary purpose to improve health and sanitation and use every possible means to prevent sickness and increase longevity.

Dr. Hoffman has ten paragraphs in addition to these conclusions, which he calls "Practical Suggestions," wherein he points out how many of these present evils can be remedied by voluntary effort, more adequately and at less cost than by means of such an elaborate, expensive and undemocratic scheme as that advocated by the proponents of compulsory health insurance.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are a number of commissions studying this question, and we have one in this State, and I notice in the audience Ex-Senator Colby, who is on that commission.

MR. COLBY: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appear to-night only in the character of one of those bunk commissioners to whom Dr. Meeker referred.

DR. MEEKER: No, it was the lawyers and the doctors.

MR. COLBY: I happen to be a lawyer. (Laughter.)

At our last meeting the Commission on Old Age Pensions passed a resolution endorsing State compulsory health insurance law, with a supplementary remark to the effect that we should start a campaign this spring, and turn over to Robert Flemming the preparation of our bill, and go before every civic body that would hear us before the Legislature convened, when our bill could be introduced. It is evident from the remarks to-night that the fight is on, and I rather suspect it is going to be sanguinary. I doubt if Mr. Cox would issue a policy now to any of the participants. During the last ten years I happen to know of at least twenty-three different measures enacted by legislatures for the benefit of the public, and have had it proved to me by those opposed to these measures that they would all be failures. You can prove anything by statistics.

It has been suggested that we should wait until we get all the facts. If you do that you will be dead before you begin. You will never get all the facts in any great social problem.

When I heard this Conference was to be held I wanted our commission to be represented here by the person who knew more about this subject than anybody in the world—not in New Jersey or the United States, but in the world—so we took pains to get

Dr. Rubinow, the greatest authority on health insurance anywhere. And I know you will be glad to hear from him, with the consent of your chairman.

Dr. I. M. Rubinow, Executive Secretary, American Social Insurance Committee, American Medical Association

This is very embarrassing indeed. I did not expect any such introduction from Mr. Colby. I do not claim to be the greatest authority on this subject in the world. If I can claim anything at all, it may be that I discovered Germany. I have added very little except a study of experience that has developed in ten European countries. Germany is not as popular an example as she was a year or two ago, but we might learn something even from our enemies.

Other branches of social insurance were so carefully covered by Dr. Meeker that I can limit myself to the question of health insurance.

It is impossible to cover the whole field within a few minutes. Dr. Hoffman has mentioned twenty-nine conclusions against it. If I answered those, and got twenty-nine conclusions for it, we would not finish to-night and would be still working at it to-morrow—and the first of May is an international holiday, so that would not do. However, two or three interesting points might be commented on. The first is the point Mr. Colby made concerning the necessity for having all the facts before you are ready to legislate. It sounds reasonable to say you must have all the facts; you can always appeal to the people on that ground, and because it sounds so reasonable it is an excellent way of delaying legislation. There is no limit to the facts you might accumulate. As a matter of fact, all reasonable people do proceed to collect facts, just as Dr. Meeker is collecting facts, just as the commission in California have been collecting facts, just as a similar commission in New York would have collected facts if it had been established, but the very people who are urging the collection of facts are always opposing the people who would collect the facts. So they are opposing the commission in New York.

The second point is this. I wondered how many facts were known about industrial accidents, when industrial insurance began. They knew less about death rates when they started life insurance than they do now about accidents. And in social legislation it is unfortunately often true that you have to legislate

first and then get the facts. The Germans have a remedy against a serious disease. Must you get the number of people who suffer from the disease before you can adopt it? The question is, does the remedy work? Perhaps Dr. Meeker has assumed that you have studied the problem for a long time, and some of you undoubtedly have, but not all of you. I think I can give you an illustration of how it works. We will have to go to Germany for the best illustration.

Take one German community, Leipzig, population 750,000; they have 210,000 wage-workers all insured against sickness, and if a man or his family is sick, that institution in which they are insured takes care of them. How much sickness did they have? 90,000 cases in one year for financial aid and more for medical aid; 10,000 cases were sent to hospitals, 4,000 to convalescent homes, 4,000 mothers taken care of; four institutions supported there for chronic diseases that require special treatment. Every wage-worker in that town, and it is true of every German city, and cities in nine other countries also, looks forward to that institution or a similar one for assistance, and it is not done in any charitable way. You will probably admit that the greatest cause of destitution is sickness. Mr. Burritt, of the A. I. C. P., said that last year sickness was almost their only problem. Here is the richest period of the richest country of the world, a country that is making more money than it knows what to do with, for the time being there is no unemployment, but while the problem of the sick person continues there is still a certain amount of destitution, no matter how high the wages are, and the charitable institutions have to battle with it. Compare the charity method of chasing around for contributions, making a man a pauper, taking charity aid in a dispensary and a hospital, compare that with the German way—ten thousand cases in the hospital and none of them subjects of charity.

How do they do it? Not by one millionaire contributing money for the building of a hospital. It is a self-supporting scheme. They collect annually ten million marks in that one city, two and a half million dollars in one community for sickness among wage-workers. You cannot speak of the cost or of the burden, because 92½ per cent. of it goes back in service, and only the rest is used in administering the expenses.

I have heard a man argue against sickness insurance on the

plea that it was too expensive in New York. He was president of an insurance company, which casualty company sells health insurance to the amount of about $250,000; what the insurance people get by the premiums is $100,000 of benefits, the agents $100,000 in commissions, and the insurance company uses $50,000 on expenses and profits—and he spoke of the high cost of European insurance!

Moreover, it is very interesting how differently they view the problem of cost in considering Europe and this country. Dr. Meeker quoted some comparisons between cost in this country and Germany. I don't mean to say that by establishing insurance we could have it at the cost they have it for. Things are cheaper in Germany.

People talk about its being a burden on the German people and that it is breaking down industry, and quote statistics about the increased cost of social insurance. But when you talk about insurance in this country the figures of the increase are quoted as an indication of prosperity. Why different arguments for the same phenomenon? except that in Europe you have 90 per cent. for compensation and only 10 per cent. as an additional burden.

I would not dare to say the things Dr. Meeker said. Being born abroad, I might be considered a traitor if I did. But we have sometimes 60 per cent. for cost and 40 per cent. loading, and more than that. But that part of the premium which is returned to the insured in benefits is not a cost; it is simply a question of distribution.

Supposing it does cost fifty million in the State of New York; it means that probably out of the fifty million only five million will be an additional burden. But over forty-five million are a load which is going to be carried by other shoulders and collectively by shoulders more able to carry than those that are carrying now.

Then there is another question, the question of indemnity as against prevention. I sympathize with the point of view of Dr. Meeker, that prevention of disease or accident is more important than compensation for it. But this may become a dangerous argument. You can say, then we do not want insurance, but a method of prevention. But we want both; we want all the protective work we can do, but we know very well that to think of a time when we shall not have any industrial accidents or any

sickness is to think of the millennium. We are going to have sickness and accidents, do what we will; what we want to do is to recuperate people as rapidly as possible and also to compensate, and that is not a small matter. From a social point of view, the man who is perfectly helpless might as well be killed. But from his own point of view it is a different matter. If Dr. Meeker had had that leg chopped off I think he would have liked indemnity. So do the millions of people who are sick want indemnity. They get it even now, but in an undignified, charitable way.

Again, the argument is made that voluntary insurance is better than compulsory insurance. We hear the statement that voluntary insurance can accomplish everything that compulsory insurance has accomplished. We hear also that voluntary insurance has accomplished nothing that is worth while. These two arguments we get side by side.

How are we to prove that voluntary insurance can accomplish anything? We have no statistics that we can rely on. I have spent some time studying sickness, and it is true that as far as our records are concerned we seem to show a lower sick rate than some parts of Europe. But the better the system of health insurance the higher the sick rate. For the purpose of an efficient sickness scheme involves a higher sick rate, involves people staying away from work when they ought to, instead of going back to work when they are not fit to. During the thirty-five years that the German law has been improving, the sickness rate has been growing, but the death rate has been getting less. The American trade union gives benefits for ten weeks, but does not give anything for the first week, then pays five dollars a week. On the other side they pay 50 or 60 per cent. of wages for twenty-six or thirty-three weeks, give hospital accommodations, etc. A man goes to work here before he is well; in Germany he stays away till he is well. A man won't stay away from work if he has to pay his doctor and keep his family; he has to have his wages. The whole problem reduces itself to this: Do we think a man's family, when he is sick, has to live as usual or not? Do we think a man needs a physician and a hospital, and do we think the co-operative way of paying is better than the individual way of begging for it? Do we believe that an appeal to charity is an American way and co-operation is a German way? Do we want to say in the same breath that we cannot afford a scheme that

Germany and England, and such rich countries like Roumania and Bulgaria and Russia can afford, that we cannot afford it (we, the richest country in the world), and on the other hand, that we are too rich to need it? That would mean, of course, that our workmen are too rich to need it and our employers are too poor to pay it.

I happen to have been born in Russia, and I have made myself obnoxious by urging social insurance, and it has been argued that because semi-civilized, autocratic Russia had it we ought not to have it. Well, fortunately, since March 15 that argument cannot be used any longer. I can say quite frankly now what I used to think before, that we have some things we can teach you. But Russia did not get its social insurance because it had an autocratic government, but notwithstanding that it had an autocratic government. The movement for health insurance began in 1905. The government developed comprehensive plans for old age and sickness insurance at that time when there was danger of a revolution, and then as the revolution died down the plans died down, too, and the plan in 1912 was not nearly as good as in 1905. If health insurance is only fit for autocratic Germany and monarchic Great Britain and old Russia, then you would expect there would be a demand for its destruction in new Russia; but, instead of that, you hear that one of the first definite promises of the new government was for a substantial extension of the social insurance system in Russia. The head of the American labor movement is against this. No one respects Mr. Gompers more than I do, and I regret to find a man of his influence and sincerity on the other side, but when I read the other day in the Journal of the American Medical Association that Mr. Gompers is opposed to compulsory health insurance and therefore organized labor is opposed to it—which is not true, because it is an individual matter with him—I noticed that it was not pointed out that Mr. Gompers is opposed to all forms of insurance, and especially industrial and life insurance, and that the same resolution in which he expressed himself as opposed to social insurance contained the statement that he went on record as opposed to any form of commercial insurance.

Now there are arguments against health insurance. There are specific arguments. I am not opposed to class legislation. But I am not surprised if I find opposition among employers.

There is very definite opposition from commercial companies, and that is natural. But I think all the opposition can be overcome.

A year and a half ago it might still have been doubtful, but things have changed rapidly. Look, for instance, to the State of California. About two years ago the commission of that State was organized with five members, only one of whom knew anything about social insurance—the other four were from Missouri. But since then they came out with a unanimous report in favor of compulsory social insurance in a mutual way, practically accepting every doctrine of social insurance. The only reason why they did not persist as far as legislation was because of constitutional difficulties. But finding them, they did not stop half way. They introduced a constitutional amendment which, according to my latest information, has passed, which has the support of the Governor that was and the Governor that is, and they will reappoint the commission not only to get more facts, but much more in order to agitate among the public for two years so that the constitutional amendment may be approved by the people of California. It is propaganda and education that we want more than dry facts. (Applause.)

(*The Session was adjourned.*)

Tuesday Morning, May 1, 1917

FAMILY PROBLEMS

Henry L. DeForest, Plainfield, Chairman

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know what the term "Family Problems" means to you. I have to confess that the phrase when discussed by some friends of mine on the way over on Sunday night seemed to provoke some mirth on the score of my being mixed up with it; these neighbors of mine seemed to think that whenever there was a problem to be discussed in my neighborhood I was apt not to be on the spot.

But family problems, in the sense that we are to deal with them here, mean that family down the street that cannot make both ends meet, and if anything is fundamental in any community program, it is the consideration of that family.

Mr. Murphy put it very aptly when he said the other evening that we want to go as far as love can wisely go. Love expressed in terms of public relief may be one thing and in private relief may have a different standard, but the "wisely" must be in both. And as Mr. Burns told us, we cannot wisely shoot over the heads of the majority of the community. The average tax-payer has his standard of what he thinks is fair, and the average fellow with money in his pocket to contribute has his standard of what is fair in his mind, and we cannot wisely shoot over the heads of these average representatives. We have to bring them along with us or we get into trouble.

We are going to hear about "The Essentials of a Community Program with Respect to Family Problems" from a man who I think is better qualified than most of us to talk on it. He has lived it, he has taught it, and he has got a good heart in it, a heart that is solid and yet soft.

THE ESSENTIALS OF A COMMUNITY PROGRAM WITH RESPECT TO FAMILIES

Prof. Porter R. Lee, New York School of Philanthropy

In an old-fashioned living room which is associated with the experiences of my boyhood hung two old colored prints. They picture two different scenes in the schoolhouse of a little

German village. In the first the schoolmaster, seated behind his rude desk, is listening with an expression of interest to the story of an old grandmother who has brought her grandson to be enrolled in the school. The young man, possibly ten years old, as he leans against the desk displays much less interest in the proceedings than either his grandmother or the schoolmaster.

It is a primitive sort of educational institution, common enough in the early days of the nineteenth century when the picture was drawn, and not uncommon to-day. The children are of varied ages, and they sit on hard, backless benches in the one room of the school. In a corner is a high stool, over which hangs a cap, both ready for use when the school dunce, by failing in his lessons, requires their special form of treatment. On the teacher's desk lies a rod, of proportions which would have satisfied the disciplinary standards of King Solomon, ready to supplement the cap and stool whenever they alone fail to secure from the dunce the desired educational response.

The plea of the grandmother was evidently successful; for the second picture shows us the same scene, with the same characters, several months later. This time, however, the schoolmaster is doing the talking; and from his gesture we judge his text to be hopeless stupidity of the small boy, who is now seated upon the dunce's stool with the dunce's cap upon his head. After months of the most faithful application of contemporary educational methods no impression has been made upon the boy; and the schoolmaster is returning him to his grandmother, probably with the assurance that he is destined to come to some bad end. This interpretation of the two pictures was first given me at the age of eight by the venerable lady in whose house they hung; and such was my admiration for her common sense that I have never questioned it.

The schoolmaster of these two pictures is evidently not an unfeeling man. His face is not that of one who flogs for the sake of flogging, or who rejoices in the use of the cap and stool. It is rather the face of one who is faithful in the performance of his duty, and who would follow without question the educational methods of his professional ancestors.

Turning to modern ideas of education, we look in vain for such a conception as the dunce. Like the slave, the witch, and possibly the absolute monarch, he appears only in the pages of

history. Instead of stool, cap and rod, we find in our modern educational equipment an important and well-organized department wherein doctor, nurse, psychologist, social worker and specially equipped teacher are working to meet the needs of the backward school child. The treatment of the backward school child and the treatment of the dunce have nothing in common save this: they are directed toward the same ends; for the dunce of an older generation is the backward school child of to-day. The dunce has changed none of his characteristics; but we who are responsible for dealing with him have changed radically.

What has been responsible for the change in our attitude towards the school dunce? First of all, no doubt, a reaction against the harshness of traditional methods of treating him. The humane instinct sooner or later leads us to reject brutal methods of dealing with men, helpless men in particular, especially if those methods do not get results. And the method of the stool, cap and rod does not get results with the school dunce. Despite the flogging and the humiliation, the boy who cannot learn remains a boy who cannot learn; and under such circumstances ideals and instincts of compassion will sooner or later lead us to condemn such methods.

Of much greater importance, however, in explaining the change in our attitude towards the dunce is the fact that we know more about him. When we lost faith in our assumptions regarding him and in our traditional way of treating him, we began to study him, in order to base our treatment upon a knowledge of his needs. What have we learned as a result of our study of the backward school child, the dunce described in modern terms?

We have learned that he sometimes has defective eyesight, which prevents his seeing the lessons he is set to study. We have learned that he is sometimes undernourished, which means the low vitality that makes mental alertness impossible. We have learned that he sometimes has other physical defects, such as adenoids and defective teeth, which make him sluggish and not responsive to the stimuli of the school room. We have learned that he is sometimes obstinate, wilful and hard to manage, least of all by the method of humiliation and punishment. We have learned that he is sometimes not normal mentally, that the substance of which his brain is made is not fine enough to permit his learning as other children do.

We have not learned these things by accident. Rather we have deliberately used in our study all the knowledge which science and human experience have given us. The result is that we no longer apply one general method to all backward school children; but we study them individually, and using the best discernment, resourcefulness and skill at our command, we try to do for each one that which will best meet his particular needs. We do not think that we have nothing more to learn regarding backwardness in school children; but we know that we are making progress. The new methods enable us to do more for such children than the old ones did; and both the children and the community are the gainers.

In the field of relief-giving we have inherited traditions which are precisely analogous to the stool, cap and rod method of dealing with the school dunce. From time immemorial we have recognized primarily in the poor that condition which has led us to describe them as pauper, destitute, needy, necessitous, etc., terms which imply a lack of sufficient income for the bare needs of existence. In our desire to deal with them according to their needs, we have therefore relied almost exclusively upon the giving of alms, money or its equivalent in material things. Our modern ideas of relief, however, have rejected this simple prescription for the miseries of the poor, precisely as we have rejected the stool, cap and rod as a prescription for the dunce, and for the same reasons.

In the first place, we have seen that the needs of the poor cannot be relieved by alms alone. Usually the pauper relieved is a pauper still; and the miseries which go with that condition not only persist when we offer him nothing but relief, but they are often actually intensified. At this our humanitarian instincts have revolted. Modern social ideals have rejected a method of dealing with the poor which both humiliates and fails to get results.

Secondly, in the light of scientific knowledge and human experience, we have abandoned our theories of relief and are basing our charitable methods upon a study of the poor themselves. What does such a study reveal? We find invariably that behind lack of income are serious disabilities. We find that those who ask for relief are sometimes sick, and therefore unable to earn enough to support themselves. We find that they are sometimes out of work despite an honest desire to provide for their own

needs. We find that they are sometimes unable because of their inefficiency to earn a wage sufficient to support them. We find that, like many other people, they sometimes drink or indulge in other bad habits which dissipate the earnings that should care for their families and lead to demoralization prejudicial to wholesome family life. We find that their homes are sometimes so poorly organized that they are easily disorganized by the desertion of the father or the neglect of the mother. We find that sometimes through sheer ignorance and despite good intentions they are unable to manage their own affairs; to make an ample income suffice for their needs, to care properly for children, especially babies, and to meet the ordinary contingencies of life with ordinary resourcefulness.

This study suggests two important facts: First, that many of these families suffer from specific handicaps, like sickness, feeble-mindedness and unemployment which prevent their maintaining themselves despite any desire to do so; second, that many of them lack the resourcefulness, skill, standards and spirit which would enable them to take advantage of quite adequate opportunities to achieve self-maintenance. These two facts are the foundations upon which all successful work in behalf of the poor must rest. Recognition of them has led to the development of programs and methods of rehabilitation which have left almsgiving and an exclusive dependence upon relief as far behind as modern methods of dealing with backward school children have left the stool, cap and rod.

What, then, are the essentials of a community program with respect to family problems? If we answer this question with our study of the needs of the poor in mind, we find five elements in such a community program:

1. A knowledge of the facts as a preliminary to treatment in each individual case.

2. The treatment of the disabilities which handicap.

3. The development of resourcefulness, skill or the spirit of self-dependence through special training or personal influence, when necessary.

4. Relief in whatever amount and of whatever kind is needed to make effective the two phases of treatment just mentioned.

5. Team work on the part of all those whose efforts are needed in the treatment of any one family.

1. The gathering of facts is a necessary preliminary step to any intelligent action. A business man who is considering Jersey City as the location for the factory which he expects to establish will inquire carefully into the prevailing rate of wages in Jersey City, the labor supply, shipping facilities, the tax rate, available sites for his factory, etc., before he makes his decision. He cannot take intelligent action without doing so. A physician before he undertakes to prescribe for a patient gathers information of many kinds first. Temperature, blood pressure, habits of life, previous history and the condition of his patient's vital organs have a significance for him even when he is called upon to treat what are apparently minor ailments. He cannot take intelligent action without making these inquiries.

Under our old standards of relief giving, the relief of the poor called for no such extensive inquiries. Relief methods which were contemporary with the cap and stool of the dunce required at best two simple facts regarding those who asked for assistance: "Does this family lack income so completely as to make outside aid necessary?" and "Are they 'worthy' (in the good old-fashioned sense), that is, are they sufficiently decent and respectable in their habits to justify the giving of such aid?" Undoubtedly at one time these simple facts were sufficient for intelligent action in the giving of relief. As we have seen, however, to-day we know more about the poor than we did formerly; and programs for relief which are based upon these meager facts leave us with an uneasy feeling that we are not going as far in our helpfulness as we are really able to go. For the same development of science and the same study of human experience which have taught us more about the poor and their needs have also given us many new and varied ways of helping them. When we depended upon the one simple prescription of relief, it did not take long to determine when it should be used. Now, however, we have many different ways of dealing with physical disability: special treatment of tuberculosis, instruction of mothers in the care of babies, medical inspection of school children, etc.; we have more extensive school facilities for children than formerly, including the kindergarten and vocational schools; through legislation we are able to deal more effectively with the man who

deserts his family; we have recreational facilities to which we can direct families in need of invigoration; and we realize that we can do much to steady and safeguard those who are threatened with mental breakdown. Moreover, we realize that skillful study enables us to adapt the familiar methods of personal influence, advice and even the giving of relief much more precisely to the needs of our clients than was ever necessary when the financial condition of our applicants was our only concern.

These two factors of greater knowledge—greater knowledge of the needs of the poor and greater knowledge of ways to help them—make the gathering of facts imperative as the first step in our treatment. A physician of national reputation remarked not long ago that whereas a generation or more ago ten minutes would have been a fair average time for a doctor to spend in diagnosing a case, the average to-day would be nearer an hour. What is responsible for the change? These same two factors of greater knowledge—greater knowledge of disease and greater knowledge of ways to treat it.

An illustration will make clear the kinds of facts which are important in the treatment of families. A woman of thirty-two, the mother of six children, applied for relief. Her husband had just recovered from an attack of blood poisoning which had incapacitated him for nearly two years. It was evident from the condition of their home that they had had no adequate income for some time, and their appearance, as well as the physician at whose suggestion they had applied for help, testified to their good qualities. Under our old tests for relief they were entirely eligible, as they were both "poor and worthy"; and accordingly relief was given them, it being understood that it would be continued only until the man could get work, which he was admonished to do. He stated that his health was now good enough to warrant his working again.

Now what were the items in this story which make the gathering of further facts necessary? That depends upon what our purpose with reference to this family is. If we plan to help them to reach the condition of self-maintenance which they have lost, we must remember that self-maintenance depends upon physical efficiency, income and the ability and disposition to live up to the responsibilities of life. From this point of view the first item calling for further information is the question of health. This

man has been ill for two years. Is he really able to resume work, and what kind of work is he fit for? During his illness his wife had supported the family by sewing and keeping boarders. Has this work, added to the care of six children and a sick husband, had a bad effect upon her health? For a large part of the two years the children may have been on short rations since the family income has been reduced. Has this affected their health?

The second item relates to employment. This application comes at a time when work is hard to find; and the man may not be fit for the first available job. He was at one time a street-car conductor. Can he secure such work now? Suppose the agency whose help he has asked knows of a job which he might fill; can he be recommended?

The third item relates to the children. I have spoken of the importance of inquiring into their physical condition; but this is not the extent of their claim upon our interest. Three of them are of school age. Are they in school? The oldest, aged twelve, will in two years be able to go to work. What sort of work will he go to? Would it be possible for this agency to give his training during the next two years the direction which will insure his taking up a vocation with a future and one suited to his special capacity, if he has any? The youngest child is a baby of a few months. Have the hardships of the months just passed interfered with the mother's giving her the proper care; and, if so, can the mother be persuaded to take the advice of a milk station, a nurse or a doctor regarding her care?

The fourth item relates to the sense of responsibility of the family, especially, of course, of the father and mother. There is reason to assume, for the time being, at any rate, that they are quite competent to manage their own affairs, if they can be assisted with some temporary income. They are apparently intelligent, they have made a good impression upon their physician, the mother seems to have shouldered uncomplainingly the entire burden of family support and management during her husband's illness and the man is eager to get to work. On the other hand, the long period of hardship may well have broken the woman's spirit. The man has been idle for many months, making slow convalescence, and such an experience is sometimes prejudicial to habits of industry, as those who have worked with tuberculosis

patients have learned. It is possible also that difficulties in finding work may further unsettle his grip upon himself.

The fifth item relates to income. Since work cannot be given the man at once, relief for a period will be necessary. Whence should it come? For a few weeks at the beginning of his illness a benefit society made weekly payments. Would the society contribute further? Are there any other natural connections of the man which would yield financial assistance at this time? Have any such been assisting him during his illness?

To get the information which even these surface considerations indicate to be desirable, several obvious sources were available, such as two of the man's former employers, several relatives, two other doctors, the benefit society, acquaintances who had known them in the neighborhoods where they had previously lived, and the teachers of the children. If further facilities for suggestions regarding the health of the various members of the family were needed, there were available any number of clinics and dispensaries where they could have been examined.

The agency to which this application came did not see fit to get any of the information which I have just discussed, beyond some indefinite evidence of the family's reliability and the statement of the lodge doctor that the man ought to be able to work. Relief was given at once and continued over a period of months. If this policy was justified (and under our old standards it was), we should have expected it to lead after a reasonable period to the re-establishment of this family in a position of independence. Certainly no other result would have been aimed at even under a policy of almsgiving.

Let us look ahead two years. The mother has become utterly broken in spirit. From the resourceful, heroic woman who struggled for two years prior to our acquaintance with her, both to support and to manage her family, she has changed into an indifferent, careless person who neither keeps a clean, attractive home, nor cares what is the condition of her children. She is in bad physical condition, owing to a serious weakness for which she refuses to undergo a second operation. The oldest girl likewise is urgently in need of an operation, which the mother refuses to permit. The oldest boy, instead of finding his way under vocational guidance to a job with a future, has gone into the messenger service in a city where this employment has been given none of

the safeguards which enlightened States have adopted. The man refuses to work. He had six jobs during one period of eight months, and left all of them for no good reasons or was discharged for doing unsatisfactory work which he was quite competent to do. He was arrested once for stealing, and was acquitted on a technicality, although his brother, who was tried for the same offense, was convicted. The parents have been brought into court for failing to send their children to school; and although throughout the period work has been plentiful, the family have twice been evicted from their home for non-payment of rent. Finally, there are two more children.

There would be a certain sort of satisfaction in being able at this point to draw conclusions from this story with mathematical precision, to say, for example, that all these disasters came to this family because important information was not gained in the first place. In work with families, however, no such clear cause and effect relationship is ever discernible. Some significant things, however, we can discover. In the first place, the one thing that was done, the giving of relief, was probably the least necessary, except for some temporary assistance, as diligent effort on the part of the agency would probably have resulted in a job for the man which would have provided the necessary income. The things which really needed attention were not discovered, because no attempt was made to discover them; and yet, as we have seen, the barest statement of the family's need, made by the woman at the beginning, indicated their importance. Furthermore, the facts regarding these real needs could have been easily learned, as later developments proved. Although we cannot say that fuller knowledge of facts would have made it possible to ward off all the later disasters, if these facts had been known, the agency would hardly have felt satisfied with the mere provision of relief. If a careful inquiry had been made at the outset, definite information could have been secured regarding health problems, the problem of the man as a wage-earner, the characteristics of the oldest boy which had a bearing upon his future occupation, and, above all, upon the stability and self-reliance of the man and woman. This last consideration is in this case of supreme importance. Continuous treatment of the most skilled and personal kind was needed to make long-continued relief safe in a family situation which contained the possibilities of demoralization to the extent of this

one. The right use of the sources of information which were mentioned earlier would have put this agency in a position where, if they could not have prevented the disorganization of the life of this family, they at least could have recognized the difficulties ahead and have acted intelligently, if not successfully. How and why such sources of information should be used will be discussed by later speakers; and I will not go into it further. The use of them for the purpose of gathering the facts necessary to intelligent action is the first essential of a community program with respect to family problems.

2. The treatment of disabilities which handicap families in the effort to support themselves is the second essential of such a community program. The poor law of New Jersey, like the poor laws of most of the American States, provides that public outdoor relief shall be temporary. The program of practically all private agencies which concern themselves with the care of destitute families looks forward to the self-maintenance of such families. When we study the poor and their needs we find various disabilities which handicap them to such an extent as to make self-maintenance difficult or impossible. Obviously relief cannot be temporary as long as these disabilities persist. In other words, when illness, unemployment, waywardness, extravagance, ignorance, desertion, drunkenness, or any other factor is in any way responsible for the destitution of the family, it must be treated with a view to its elimination, if possible, before even the simplest objective in this field can be reached. This means that agencies dealing with families, after ascertaining by inquiry what the problems in a given family situation are, must seek the help of court, medical agency, school, church, or any other organization whose particular form of skilled service is necessary for the removal of a particular disability.

This is an essential part of a program for dealing with families, not merely because efficient work is impossible on any other basis, but also because in no other way can we be sure that our charitable efforts are helpful rather than humiliating. We are not so bent upon efficiency that we can afford to ignore the human aspect of our responsibility; and efficiency comes at too high a cost when it crushes the sensibilities of those who need our help. When we extend our helpfulness, however, to include the whole range of need in such families, we are combining efficiency with

consideration to a degree which is beyond any less thoroughgoing program.

3. Consideration for the poor suggests at once a third element in a community program: the conservation or development of resourcefulness and the spirit of self-dependence through personal influence. Dependence is frequently a matter of the unwise use of resources. This may spring from ignorance, from a wrong set of values, from shiftlessness, or from a broken spirit. Whatever the explanation, successful treatment of such families must include the re-education of habit, that subtle process whose importance we have begun to apprehend while we are still seeking to find the key to it. Too often we assume that a family whose wage-earners are employed, whose ill health has had successful medical treatment, whose truant children through fear of the attendance officer are regular in school, whose babies under the watchful eye of the nurse at the milk station have for weeks been properly fed, whose deserting husband and father has been restored to them with a threat from the court which for the time being keeps him up to his responsibilities—is a family rehabilitated. But we must remember that this family had a life before ever they applied for our assistance; and that all of these problems which we have solved for them were too much for their own powers before they came to us. In so far as our treatment of these various disabilities has been directed towards these disabilities alone and not towards the family psychology behind them, we may have merely shifted from the family responsibility for their own welfare, instead of developing or conserving their own disposition and ability to shoulder it.

This is a problem in personal relationships, for which there is no formula. The re-education of habit is accomplished through the influence of one personality upon another. In making it a part of his program with families, the worker in this field is reaching the very heart of the problem of family rehabilitation, for he is influencing those qualities of character upon which, after all, the future welfare of his clients depends. Incidentally, it is of no small significance to those who are sensitive to the criticism that workers in charity tend to become mechanical, that in this important part of their work they are actually expressing the most delicate consideration for the traits and sensibilities of those whom they are trying to help. I should like to give more than passing

emphasis to the fact that many organizations have greatly expanded their resources for this phase of their program by the use of trained volunteers.

4. Thus far we have discussed many other phases of work with families as of greater importance than material relief. This does not mean that relief is to be denied a place in our community program. While we must give the first place to the fitting of families to provide for their own needs, we must recognize that this is sometimes a long process. While it is going on the physical needs of life must be provided for, and on a scale adequate to decent living. Without it the rest of our program is of no effect. What we need to recognize is that our newer conception of family treatment gives a quite different significance to relief. Formerly, whether relief was to be given or not, and how much, depended upon what we could find out about a family. Now, however, the giving of relief has very little to do with what we find out about a family, but depends entirely upon what else we are going to do for them. Unless we have a plan of treatment which covers the removal of handicaps and the developments of family responsibility in which relief is necessary, we are not justified in giving it, except, of course, to provide for the most temporary emergencies. In a community program with respect to family problems, this might well be considered the one fundamental principle of relief.

5. Team work on the part of those who are working simultaneously upon the same families is the final essential. It almost goes without saying that without such team work we lose much of the value of modern expert service and inflict needless humiliation upon our beneficiaries. Team work involves more than a disposition to pull together. It involves a clear perception of the relationship between different things. It is hindered by our entrenched ideas of the way things ought to be done, and a preference for our own ways of doing them. When two or more persons, however, each professing the same purpose to help a distressed family, fail to agree upon ways and means, something is wrong. Much of the difficulty in the way of effective team work would be dissolved if there were on the part of each person in the process a clear understanding of the essential things in any program for dealing with families.

Earlier in this paper I said that we had abandoned our old

reliance upon almsgiving as our method of dealing with the poor. That statement is too sweeping. There are still some places where this practice persists, and even where it is regarded as sound, where the more modern conception of the task and its implications is distrusted as mechanical, heartless and ineffective. Possibly we are too sweeping also in asserting that the school dunce has gone for good. There are no doubt communities where the stool, cap and rod are still regarded as the only sound methods of dealing with the child who cannot learn, and where the psychologist, nurse and social worker would be distrusted if proposed as substitutes. The great contribution of the latter, however, is beyond argument, and we do not expect to go back to the stool, cap and rod. In the care of families also the program of social treatment has demonstrated itself. Public relief departments and private charitable societies where it has been adopted have found it a revelation of new and fruitful opportunities for service.

Possibly, however, we have not yet applied anywhere the most searching test. If he could speak for himself, to which would the dunce pin his faith: the stool and cap or the special class for backward children? If we could read the minds of those disorganized families who ask help of their kind, which would they prefer: the alms of an older generation or the full measure of helpfulness which an enlightened program of family treatment makes possible? To a group representing the interests which we do, the answer is clear. Making the answer, however, is not the end of our responsibility but only the beginning. If we see the possibility of greater service to families in need, we must equip ourselves to render it. Service implies the equipment of sympathy, standards and skill, by which alone programs become achievement.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are going to discuss some of the "Why's" later on, but just now we want to know something about the "How's." You have all heard of Mr. Everitt Macy in Westchester. I have never had the pleasure of meeting him, but I understand one of his best points is that he picks the best people to carry out plans and then relies on them. One of his best men —a woman—is Miss Ruth Taylor, and she is working there in the office of the overseer of the poor and knows a great deal about all these "how's" and is going to tell us something about "how" in Westchester.

THE PROBLEMS OF WESTCHESTER COUNTY AND HOW A PUBLIC AGENCY IS MEETING THEM

Miss Ruth Taylor, Director, Department of Child Welfare, in the Office of the Superintendent of the Poor, Westchester County, N. Y.

As I understand my function here this morning it is to give you briefly the adventures and experiences of a large County in New York State in developing a system of dealing with family problems through a public agency. I will try to give our experiences in such a way that you may see some of them in the light of your own conditions in the State of New Jersey.

The County that has made these experiments is Westchester, a territory of 484 square miles lying directly north of the City of New York, its boundaries running from the northern limits of that City up the Hudson River to a point north of Peekskill, across to the Connecticut State line, and down that line to Long Island Sound. This area has a population at the present time of over 320,000. It contains four cities, Yonkers with 90,000, Mt. Vernon with 37,000, New Rochelle with 32,000, and the new City of White Plains with 16,000. Its village and rural population units vary in size from villages the size of Peekskill and Ossining to isolated hamlets in the eastern and northern hill country, far from a railroad.

In that hill country we find many of the most acute of rural problems; in the southern part of the County and along the Sound we find many of the problems of New York City. In the hill country we have the problem of the old American family that has degenerated for years through the process of inter-marriage and inbreeding; in the southern districts we have the immigration problem in marked degree. With our nearness to New York we have the problem brought by the commuters, the great mass of intelligent people whose business and social interests center in the City and who use our County merely as a place in which to sleep and to play golf. We have the problem of the great landed estate and the millionaire class.

The New York State Poor Law handles its problems of public relief on the basis of Town and County charges. For the pur-

poses of Poor Law administration Cities and Towns correspond and City Commissioners of Charity are the same as Town Overseers of the Poor. Under the Poor Law the 22 political divisions of Westchester County, four cities and 18 towns, which comprise the entire area of the County, are 22 separate Poor Law districts. Each town and city has at least one local poor law official, called in the towns, Overseer of the Poor, and in the cities, Commissioner of Charities. Over these, with powers vaguely defined, is a county official, the county superintendent of the poor. According to law, he has "the general supervision and care" of all the public dependents in the County. On January 1st, 1914, a new Superintendent of the Poor took office in Westchester County. As it is in his administration and due almost entirely to his efforts that the County has forged ahead in the care of public dependents of all classes, I must necessarily speak of his work.

The County Superintendent of the Poor in New York State has, in general, the County Alms House to maintain, and various other special duties. I will mention his work only in its relation to child caring and family problems. These two I must consider together as with us the treatment of one has grown out of our treatment of the other.

In Westchester County in 1914 the situation that existed was not unlike that of many New York State Counties, although its size and importance made its problem somewhat more noticeable. The County Superintendent of the Poor and the 30 Town Overseers and City Commissioners of Charity, for some towns had two overseers, all had the right to commit children to institutions as public charges. The Superintendent of the Poor had the right to remove and dispose of any such child, whether committed by himself or by one of the local officials. The local officials had the right to discharge from public care one of their own commitments but not a commitment of the Superintendent's. It was, therefore, perfectly possible, in cases of disagreement between the County Superintendent and an Overseer of the Poor, for the Overseer to commit a child, the Superintendent to discharge him, the Overseer to commit again, and the Superintendent again to discharge. This process could be continued indefinitely, with limitless possibilities for discord.

The treatment of family problems was left to each poor law district to handle, as it chose, through the old method of out-door

relief granted by the town overseers from appropriations furnished by the town boards. The County Superintendent of the Poor had a fund for the granting of out-door relief to an occasional family that was a County charge. Although he could commit any number of children to institutions at public expense he had no funds whereby he could pay any kind of a bill for the care of children in families. All bills for the care of children in institutions, whether committed by local officials or by the County Superintendent, were paid through funds appropriated in the budget of the Superintendent of the Poor. Therefore, the following situation had been slowly brought about:

The method and extent of granting out-door relief in the 22 Poor Law districts of the County differed remarkably. In a few cases generous appropriations with virtually no restrictions upon them were placed in the hands of the Poor Law officials. In some the Poor Law officials presented each case separately before the town board and secured by vote on each case individual appropriations for them. As a general thing the Overseer of the Poor was allowed to give grocery orders to the extent of $2.50 per week to a needy family without consulting the town board, and in many cases this $2.50 per week limit was set as a maximum beyond which public relief did not go, regardless of the desperate needs of the family.

As the overseers were not supplied with any investigators, and were men of varying degrees of training, with various outside interests, the standards of relief differed in as many ways as there were officials.

Moreover, another difficulty was sometimes found. Families were often broken up and children committed to institutions at public expense because the appropriations of the Town Overseer of the Poor for out-door relief had given out. The Superintendent of the Poor was powerless to meet this situation. Also there was occasionally elected to office a man less interested in family welfare than in his own political career, who preferred to break up a needy family, send the children to institutions, and thereby have their cost transferred to the books of the Superintendent of the Poor, rather than to give them the necessary aid locally and thereby appear before his Town Board as incurring expense for the Town. The accounts of the local Town officials were ordinarily

carefully scrutinized by the local taxpayer, whereas few analyzed the County budget.

In the first year of his administration the new Superintendent of the Poor realized that the County of Westchester was supporting through his office over 700 children in institutions and that the public had provided no mechanism by which he could be sure that such children even existed. He also realized that while he had power to commit an unlimited number of children to institutional care and could pay any rate whatever necessary to secure the proper care for them he could not pay ten cents a week to keep a needy mother with little children in her own home.

As a first step in meeting these problems Mr. Macy increased the staff of children's workers in the County, of whom there were only two so-called "Placing Out Agents," to five. As this could not be done quickly enough by public funds he secured private funds to make it possible. He set these five agents to work finding out who the dependent children of the County were, and how much their support was costing. By November of his first year, when it became his duty to present his first annual budget to the County Board of Supervisors, he was ready to urge that Board to include in their appropriations for his work an experimental sum with which he could care for children in family homes. The Board passed a general and somewhat vague resolution appropriating to the County Superintendent of the Poor a fund of $6,000 for the board of children in private families, limiting the amount of board to be paid at a maximum of $2.50 per week.

On March 1st, 1915, this fund became available and on that same date Mr. Macy organized a Department of Child Welfare for the County, with a Director at its head, as a part of the work of his office. Here again, since the need for Child Welfare work had not yet been sufficiently demonstrated, he called private funds to his aid in the project. The $6,000 fund was turned over to the new Department to administer. Two needs for the fund, both falling within the scope of the resolution, were immediately determined upon. It was decided to illustrate the value of boarding home care, instead of institutional, for a few of the County's dependent children and to demonstrate the keeping of families together and the raising of family standards by the granting of adequate relief to mothers with young children, who were deprived of the aid of the bread-winners of the family.

During the first year in which the so-called "pension work" was possible in Westchester County, the office of the Superintendent of the Poor granted regular monthly relief to fourteen mothers, having a total of 58 children under the age of 16 living at home. Eight of these mothers were widows. Of the remaining six families, in three the father had deserted, his whereabouts had been entirely unknown for some time and a warrant was out for his arrest. Two were the families of men in prison and one that of a man permanently disabled. In each case there were families where the local Overseer of the Poor could not grant adequate relief to the family by the means at his disposal. In each case the relation of the local Overseer of the Poor to the individual family was carefully considered.

In the summer of 1915 New York State passed its so-called "Widows' Pension Bill." This bill made mandatory the appointing by the County Judge of each County of a County Board of Child Welfare but left entirely to the County Board of Supervisors the question as to whether or not such a Board should be granted an appropriation with which to work. Under the conditions of the New York State law, pension relief could be granted only to widows having children under the age of 16, who had lived in the district from which they applied continuously for the two years previous to their date of application, and whose husbands were citizens of the United States and residents of the State of New York at the time of their death. The terms of the bill in no way agreed with the State Poor Law. It was distinctly possible for a woman and her children to be proper Poor Law charges upon a County and yet not be eligible for pension relief under the law. When the Westchester County Board of Child Welfare went before the Board of Supervisors in the fall of 1915 to ask for an appropriation for the purpose of the Widows' Pension Act the Board of Supervisors decided not to appropriate funds under that act but instead to increase the appropriation in the budget of the Superintendent of the Poor on the ground that the Widows' Pension Law would reach only a part of the needy mothers with young children and that the Superintendent of the Poor had already organized to cover the larger field of family relief. To appropriate funds to the Board of Child Welfare would have meant the creation of a new relief agency with a new machinery for investigation, this to care for only one part of family relief

work. Pensions have, therefore, never been granted in Westchester County under the so-called "Widows' Pension Act."

Following the decision of this question the Board of Supervisors increased the appropriation of the Superintendent of the Poor for the year 1916 from $6,000 to $16,000, but still left the appropriation to cover both boarding home and family work. Just this last month, in the passage of the budget for the year 1917, have we secured a complete revision of our budget to meet these new needs. We now have a fund of $30,000 for the year set aside entirely for the granting of a kind of relief officially termed "Mothers' Allowances."

This sketch will serve to show you by what steps the County of Westchester has begun its family relief work. I will now sketch briefly the situation at the present time.

A special bill for Westchester County, which became law January 1st, has created for the County of Westchester the office of Commissioner of Charities and Corrections in place of the old Superintendent of the Poor. Under this Commissioner the Department of Child Welfare is recognized as a Department of County administration. Under this law the Commissioner of Charities and Corrections is given the sole power of commitment of children under the Poor Law for the County and is given the right to make whatever provision for the care of children and of needy families the Board of Supervisors may authorize. The question that has been somewhat in doubt since Westchester County started its scheme as to whether or not we had the legal right to grant relief to families through a centralized department is, therefore, settled for good.

The Department of Child Welfare is in reality more nearly a general social service department than one of child care alone, as it combines for the County child caring and family work, and also such occasional problems of families or individuals in which there are no children at all as fall within the scope of work of no other organization. The Department now has a staff of 18 in its social service division alone; its clinical division has four more workers. Our present method of handling family problems is virtually that of any well organized private society. We have divided the County into seven districts, in each of which we maintain a district office. We have placed from one to three field workers in each district. They live there and confine their work

to their districts under the supervision of our central office in the Court House at White Plains. We have established a registry for all families in the County known to any one of our branch offices. In about nine months we have registered over 3,500 families. Wherever local social service exchanges exist in cities of the County our local cases are registered with them. Applications for regular monthly relief are registered either by our central office or by our local agents. Application blanks very similar to those in use by the private societies doing careful pension work, such as the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, are used by us. Our visitors make thorough investigations and submit complete and detailed written reports to the central office with recommendations. There the reports are carefully studied by the Director and Assistant Director of the Department, conference with the field worker is held, and the application approved or disapproved. If approved the family budget is carefully worked out according to the best methods we have been able to learn of to date. Our field workers study the family's resources with relation to mother's and children's earnings, help from relatives, church, private societies, or private individuals. We consider whether or not the family maintains its own garden and keeps chickens, what the health of each member of the family is, whether the father's death was due to tuberculosis or some other disease that may have imperilled the family's health. We estimate what, in our opinion, the family actually needs per month to meet its expenses of rent, food, fuel, light, clothing, carfare, insurance, and incidentals. In estimating food costs we consider the age and sex of each member of the family and give a higher allowance to families in which there has been or is a case of tuberculosis. Twice during the past few months we have increased our schedule in an effort to keep up with mounting prices; our schedule is still in my opinion too low, and we must soon raise it again.

Our methods of raising the family's standards are those of any good private relief agency. If the family is living in unsanitary conditions we help them to move, if necessary paying increased rent. We attempt to secure needed medical attention for them, we hunt employment, we supervise school records, we secure extra nourishment for delicate mothers or children, we send mothers to hospitals or away for vacations and provide for

their children while they are away. What of their needs we cannot supply from public funds, because of the necessary limitations of the use of appropriations, we raise from private.

The status of this branch of our work at the present time is briefly this: We are granting regular monthly allowances to eighty-five families; sixty-one of these the families of widows who would fall under the technical provisions of our widows' pension act if we were working under it; twenty-four who would not be so included. These mothers have a total of 317 children under the age of sixteen, living at home.

The actual amount of relief from public funds given through our office in the month of March was $2,313.80, or an average of $1.83 per child, per week. During the month of April we have taken on enough additional families to bring our monthly budget up to $2,500, this being the maximum amount of relief we can give monthly this year under our new budget of $30,000, which became available April 1st, if we are not to exhaust our funds and leave our families stranded before the year is out.

We have at the present time one hundred uninvestigated applications on our hands. These women must necessarily be cared for during the coming year by the local overseers of the poor or by private charities as has always been done in the past. Personally, I am not at all sorry that we have not an unlimited appropriation at our disposal. To increase from $5,000 spent for mothers' allowances the first year, to $8,000 the second, to $30,000 the third, is as rapid an increase as I believe we can make without lowering our standards. Being able to relieve only between 90 and 100 families this year will give us an opportunity to develop our system and raise our standards of care. Our work has grown so rapidly that we have not been able to do as well as we know, and there are many weak spots in our record system and follow up work that need attention.

Although we are new at this work, we have made a few observations on the kind of families we have dealt with thus far:

A study we made in January of the first 83 families that we gave regular monthly relief to has demonstrated beyond doubt the economic advantage to the public of this method of child care. Leaving the humanitarian side entirely out of the question, we have proved that it is cheaper to care for children with their own mothers than anywhere else. During the last year, in which the

cost of living has steadily increased in our county, the per capita cost per week to the taxpayer of the maintenance of children with their own mothers did not exceed $1.67 per week. The added supplementary private relief that we received for some of these children did not bring the total up to $2. During this same period institution care for our children averaged over $3 per week.

Due to the agitation throughout the state in behalf of Widows' Pensions we have had a great many more widows apply for relief than other women in need for other reasons than widowhood. In 74 out of our first 83 families, the father of the family had died and we have learned from a study of these cases that 27 out of these 74 men died of pulmonary tuberculosis. Thus we see with painful clearness the part tuberculosis has played in causing public dependency in this one little group. Unfortunately, our acquaintance with the families has taught us that the death of the father from this disease does not end the evil results to the family.

Almost exactly fifty per cent. of the parents of our allowance families were born in the United States. In fifteen families, the parents were born in Ireland; and in twelve, in Italy. The remaining group were scattered among eight European countries, Austria-Hungary leading, with eight fathers and seven mothers claiming it as their birthplace.

To our surprise we have found that our mothers are not as young women as we thought they would be. Only six of the first 83 mothers pensioned were under thirty years of age; nineteen being from thirty to thirty-four; twenty-seven from thirty-five to thirty-nine; twenty-three from forty to forty-four years. Correspondingly we have found that the largest number of children in these families are from six to twelve years of age. That the families we are caring for are on the whole a very promising sort is shown by the fact that seventy-seven per cent. of them were self-supporting before the death or disability of the man. A study of the occupations of the men has thus far shown very little, although we notice that unskilled day labor and factory employment have thus far been the commonest means of earning a livelihood.

The average weekly earnings of the men, however, tell the following story: They range from $5 to $40 a week, but fall in the following wage groups: two men of our first 83 earned less than $10 per week; forty earned between $10 and $15; 22 earned between $16 and $20, while only twelve earned over $21.

It is, therefore, evident why families averaging four children per family were unable to lay away enough money to care for the wife and children for any length of time after the income stopped.

That the mothers made every effort to care for themselves, we have proved by the fact that seventy of the first 83 were actually bringing in money for the support of their children at the time we granted them allowances. Forty of these did laundry or housework outside of their own homes, thereby leaving their children for at least a part of the week entirely uncared for, during the day. Of the thirteen women who were not bringing in money to their families, three were pregnant, one had a husband ill at home who demanded her care, one was crippled with rheumatism, and the remaining eight either had nursing babies or were physically too ill to work. This is a startling indication of the amount of effort these mothers were making to maintain their own homes.

But that they were pathetically unequal to the task is also evident, for of these 83 families, only thirteen were entirely self-supporting at the time the allowances were granted. Of the remaining seventy, sixteen were being helped entirely through public relief, eleven were receiving aid from private charities and forty-three were being helped both by public and private sources. By relieving both the local town overseer and the private charitable organization or individual of the burden of these long-time relief cases, the Department of Child Welfare believes that it is making it possible for each to do its remaining work much more efficiently and adequately.

I must emphasize for one moment our conscious aim: it is educational—to do our work in handling Westchester County's family problems so well that we may permanently raise its standards of relief work. A County organization has a great advantage here. We stand for adequate and constructive relief. The Board of Supervisors has fixed the limit of allowance that we may give a family this year at $3.00 per week per child; where that is not enough, we consider ourselves responsible for organizing sufficient private aid to complete the budget. We aim to see our families the whole way through. We are giving two mothers $55.00 per month each at present from public funds, and when they happen to need, from time to time, such additional equipment as a mattress, a bed, or a new stove, we consider it our business to provide

them means of obtaining it without going hungry for a week or two.

But in return, we demand purpose and plan. We tell our taxpayers that just as when they pay taxes for roads they expect good roads and notice whether they get them, so when they pay taxes for child care and family welfare work, they should expect better children and better families and notice whether they get them. Good roads cannot be built by haphazardly dumping stone and sand on them; neither, we say to the taxpayer, can good children and good homes be made merely by dumping coal, food and clothes upon them. Therefore, we plan, and work with a purpose.

And here let me say that the public has been extremely generous in accepting our plans, studying them and understanding them. Some of our general rules have been rather new in public relief work in our district, among them our insistence on giving no relief to families having an active case of tuberculosis living at home, or to families in which there are feebleminded needing institutional care, but by making a point of carefully and painstakingly explaining, our new methods have been almost invariably accepted. We are not being subjected to any public pressure to lower our standards.

Another expected difficulty that we have not met is that of having needy people of the best sort shun us because we are a public agency. This simply hasn't happened. This I lay chiefly to the type of women we are using as our field workers; they are exactly the sort you meet in private charitable work. Of our present staff of thirteen persons doing case work, seven are college graduates, and four others came to us from charity organization societies or other reliable private organizations.

The greatest difficulty we have met through being a public agency is in getting relatives of needy families to aid them; the belief that we have unlimited funds works harm there.

During the past year our greatest need has been for better physical and mental care for our wards; our county's equipment in this respect has not been adequate to our needs. Within the last two months private funds have furnished a clinic division to the department for the physical, psychological, psychiatric and neurological examination of our wards, with a physician at its head; this will serve both our dependent children and families.

Before fall we must perfect a system of school reports from teachers for our children with their own mothers. We also have need for budget and account books for our most intelligent families, and we must find methods of training in homekeeping and child care our mothers who have grown up as mill workers in Yonkers. We have much work ahead of us.

In closing, I wish especially to emphasize to you the importance in our work of private co-operation and aid. I know of few instances where a public department has received the cordial private support that we have, and I believe that much of the progress we have made in two years is due to that support. Private funds pay the salaries and expenses of our clinic workers and seven of our social service staff. They furnish us extra relief, clothing, medical care, four Ford cars for our agents' use, numberless aids to our families' comfort and our own efficiency. And this is because we are making the people of Westchester County realize that this is their job—the eleven hundred children under our care are their wards, to make as they choose—we are merely their hired servants. They meet with us and advise us, and we tell them of our difficulties, our successes, our problems, our aims. An auxiliary group of 300 citizens has organized to help us—in the last few months a movement has started to give our local agents case committees in each district to help with local problems. Seven such committees are already meeting regularly.

And is this not right? Why should the private organization be any more the business of the general public than a public agency, carried on by their own order, supported by their own money, and conducted by the person they themselves elect to do the work? If in the next three years we can make the people of Westchester County know the problems of their dependent classes, understand their importance, and set high standards for dealing with them in all time to come, we shall have accomplished our purpose.

In Working Out New Jersey's Problems Through Private Agencies

WHY WE CONFER WITH RELATIVES

Miss Harriet Townsend, Formerly Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of Elizabeth

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Conference: "I did not know charity meant taking such a lot of trouble," said a relative who came into my office in response to a letter to confer with us; "I thought charity meant giving ten cents to a poor man in the street, or going into a home with a basket."

We want to be very definite as to purpose before we confer with relatives. Is our purpose to obtain relief from those we think ought to be most interested in the family in distress? In some instances, yes; and in all instances where it develops a sense of responsibility, a dependence and interdependence of the weak on the strong, and obligation of the strong for the weak. And inasmuch as the strong son helps the feeble parent, the strong brother the weaker sister, in all these instances where the family tie is bound more strongly, it is a distinct contribution to the social fabric.

But our adventure is more than this. Our quest is to develop capacity out of incapacity, to make the impotent self-reliant, to make the weak strong, and to develop richness of life from poverty of life.

The factors of development we know are heredity and environment and the reaction of the individual to those conditions. Hence we must know how he is born, where he is born, of whom he is born, what has been the nurture or the lack of nurture, what has been the reaction of the individual to these conditions of heredity and environment. We must learn, we must go far back, we must get the setting if we are to dare to lay a hand upon the plan of that life; it is impertinent of us to impose our plan without this complete setting, without the full history of heredity, environment and reaction.

Perhaps I can illustrate. We heard a short time ago of a missionary who earned the scorn of natives by digging for water in time of drought instead of importuning the heavens. In the

same way we are not understood when we mine among relatives to help him who is borne down by handicaps, to try and fit him for useful life in the community so that he may come into his own. In 1914, in that dreadful period of unemployment, in the first few months, there was a family about to be set out on the street; the man had been laid off among the first because he was elderly and clumsy, wretched housing conditions existed, an ill mother, small children working in the mill instead of going to school. It was hard to get them to tell anything about themselves; while we were relieving the immediate distress, a cousin who was visited revealed something: "Yes, he was a tailor in the old country." So there was a chance. A place was found for him as a tailor, he supported his family that winter and is still doing it because his economic capacity was found for him and he was given his opportunity.

One time we were called on the telephone by a representative of a newly organized private society: "We want to let you know we have found the most deserving little woman. She came to our door selling aprons and iron holders; she is really entirely too good for the charity organization; she is a lady, so refined and gentle. Her husband deserted her four months ago; she has a boy of fourteen; she is so grateful; we are going to do everything for her." Three months ago we were again called up on the telephone and now we heard a very different story—the most obstinate and ungrateful person she was now—"Just got a letter from her saying she is an expectant mother; the boy is a loafer, that she has no fire or food; told her she must go into a hospital," etc., etc. We went to see her, found her before a hot fire, and after a confidential talk got the information that she had a sister and sisters, but she did not want them to know anything about her, said she had always been able to get along for herself. We found the sister, a splendid, kindly woman, living in a comfortable home, and she said, "Has Lola come to this?" Then she told us all about it. "Lola was born," she said, "just after our mother went insane; she was insane twenty years before she died. We always looked on Lola as a little orphan and never made her do anything. She was a pretty, sweet little child. After a while she took it into her head she wanted to be a lady's maid. She had queer kind of spells. Well, she went off, and by and by came home with a little baby in her arms. We took her in because

we loved her and we did everything for her and wanted her to stay. But no, she married. He was a good man, a rough man, but a good man; he took the little boy to his heart and was good to him. Then as the boy grew up there were difficulties and he left her four times. I don't blame him. My sister Frances works in good houses, in good families, and wanted Lola to come and live with us and we would take care of the boy. But she would not. And now this is the second time we have heard this, that she is a beggar." I can't go on with all that happened after this, but we now had an understanding of the best plan for her and the boy. The boy has had his physical handicap removed, and has been released from his slovenly and shiftless habits, and both are living under the protection of the relatives.

There is another instance that came to our experience of the spiritual and moral help in consulting relatives. We were besought to go to a home and take all the children away. The mother, we were told, was cruel, almost killed the children, all the doors and windows open, she herself hardly ever home, not a stick of furniture in the house. We went. We saw the mother. "Of course I am out every day," she said; "ain't I doing all I can? He works, but he don't bring home no wages." "No, the boy doesn't go to school; he won't go to school." The baby was ill, and shortly died of spinal meningitis. We asked about relatives. "The family wouldn't wipe their feet on me," she declared. But we found the relatives, self-respecting, comfortable, kindly people of moral sense and a sense of order, of fitness and feeling. Here was their tale: "After Elizabeth was born my mother died and we were put out. My father put Elizabeth with a careless woman, and we were ashamed of her; we knew she was growing up all wrong. We heard she married a man who took to drinking. We have a brother, who might help; he is sending his boys to college; he might be interested in her boy and might get him to go to school." A very carefully worded letter was written to the prosperous brother in the great city. We got a wonderful letter from him. "I will go out and see my sister," he said, "and do all I can. It is to my shame that I have neglected her all this time." A marvelous transformation came over that family; it is a home now with order and comfort, and really beauty in it, to-day. The boy is going to school and is no longer a loafer. Something has

been aroused in them. The mother feels she is a member of a respectable family.

I wish there were time to tell you of numbers of children we have taken out of institutions where they have been immured and placed them in the family circle of relatives, and all the splendid ties that are knit up so often by conference with relatives. I think we would do well to remember that the root of the word kindred and the word kind are one.

WHY WE CONFER WITH EMPLOYERS

Miss Helen B. Pendleton, Supervisor of Case Work, Bureau of Associated Charities, Newark

In my great aunt's home there was a picture such as Mr. Lee describes, but in the picture an old lady held the rod. In that period—the dame school period—the charity worker saw the employer to find out whether the man drank or whether the family was deserving, and whether relief should be given or not. But our point of view has changed a good deal since then.

The technique of what we call "case work" means that we must know something about the man of the family. We must find out if the employer knows him, if he is interested in him, and what he knows about the family. And it is very extraordinary sometimes what that little personal visit will discover. You write a letter and the reply will be about five or six lines probably, and will say perhaps that the man has done his work pretty well, and that is all. But if you can see the employer, if you talk with him in a direct businesslike manner, and not wander all around the earth before you come to the point, you may find that the employer knows a great deal about the man that will be very helpful in the treatment of the family.

We see employers, then, to find out what to do. We no longer, I hope, write to the employer. Employers are very hard to reach, and especially perhaps in Newark, where there are 1,800 factories, but we have discovered that when we see them, and when we do get them interested, the team work that Mr. Lee spoke of can begin. I am a little bit disturbed now about what is going to happen in the next six months or year—I hope it will be no longer than that—because what we call civilian relief

is going to be started, and I very much fear there will be form letters with printing on them sent out, with questions like "What do you know of so and so?" and that we are going to slip back a bit to the dame school period ways. I read thousands of such letters in San Francisco after the fearful earthquake and fire, and I hope that the people who are going to take up the study of how to relieve the soldiers' and sailors' families will keep away as far as possible from the form letter to employers.

I want to give you some few instances to show how the modern social worker of the type that the lady from Westchester describes can really win the employer over and make him a true social worker. Let us begin with the relief problem. Mr. Lee put it forth, but sometimes we have to begin with it. A young Italian some two or three years ago got into a row with one of his compatriots, stabbed him and fled. The man died, and the murderer has never been found. Who would have thought of bothering with the employer in the dame school period in a case like that? It was a murder. The man was dead. The murderer had fled and the police could not find him. The social worker called on the employer and found he was deeply interested in the young man, knew of the difficulties he had with the man he had murdered, and was prepared to defend him if he could be found. He knew that the young man had an excellent education, which he had got partly in America at night school, had many fine traits, had learned to play the guitar and the violin, and he (the employer) was much interested in the man's children. He offered to give five dollars a week to help the family. (We call him a B. I.—which is the Bostonese for "Benevolent Individual.") Now, to win an employer over to give material relief is a good thing. But the material relief in this case was only a small part. The young murderer has never been found. (The wife says, "Oh, if only I had him in the penitentiary where I could go to see him!") But the family is cared for; the mother has a regular allowance through the Associated Charities; she goes out to work a little, but not so much as to have to neglect her children; the eldest child, who has extraordinary musical ability, is learning the violin, because the social worker, as a result of the information given by the employer about the father, discovered that the child inherited the father's musical talent.

We find the employer can also be made a sort of board of

arbitration. That is very necessary in the team work of which Mr. Lee spoke. Some three weeks ago one of our district secretaries was asked to look into the troubles of a particular group. A grandmother in Providence, R. I., was complaining very bitterly that her son-in-law's motherless children, who had been placed with her, were not being paid for by him. She wanted us to go and see what the trouble was, she felt he was making good wages and that he should be helping to support the two children. His first wife, the children's mother, had died, and the second wife, who had married him in haste, had left him and was repenting at leisure. She was a canny person and had gone to a lawyer and had succeeded in making the man pay her seven dollars a week; she had no children by him and was perfectly capable of working. He was not paying anything for his children, therefore, but was paying seven dollars a week to the wife with whom he did not get along. Did we write to the employer? No, we had a conference with him. As soon as he understood the situation he said, "Let us get the people together." So the employer, the district secretary, the second wife, and the man himself had a conference, and the employer was the chairman of this board of arbitration. Through the employer's influence the second wife, who was repenting to the tune of seven dollars a week, was persuaded that some of that money ought to go to the children in Providence, and as the grandmother only insisted upon three dollars a week, it was settled, and she is now getting part of the man's wages for the care of his children.

Then the employer can also be—well, I don't quite know what to call it, but here is an illustration. We are interested in a Hungarian family. The father is insane and at Overbrook; the woman is one of the most wonderful spirits we have ever known. She insists on doing things—working far beyond her strength at times. She has four charming children, and takes in washing to help support them. I have a picture of those children sitting around the table in the neat little home at night studying their lessons, and it is a very beautiful picture. One of the people for whom the mother works has become so interested in her that she has insisted upon her having a month's holiday, and that she should pay her wages for that time. Who ever heard of a washerwoman having a month's holiday? Do you not think that

employer is a B. I. and a social worker and a wonderful human being all rolled into one?

These are just a few instances to show why we see employers. We have to find out the right thing to do; we want to interest the employer in the family to get relief; but, after all, the big thing, the chief thing, is to make it possible for the employer, who after all represents the great business world, and who cannot do the social service work himself, to take some share, some real part in that work. If you write him perfunctory letters you must expect to get the same kind in return. He will then look upon the Associated Charities as merely an institution to divide the sheep from the goats, and will be contented with the vague general impression that the Associated Charities exists to protect the public and act as a clearing house (that idea of the clearing house is firmly fixed in the business mind) in all these problems. But that is not the sort of result we want, and the reason for seeing the employer is that he, too, may take his part in social service, and I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that when he does understand that, your societies will never go begging for money for salaries.

WHY WE CONFER WITH CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS

Miss Katherine Gardner, Director, Civic Association, Englewood

A great responsibility rests on those of us who are endeavoring to solve the problems of families or individuals who need charitable assistance. The people who come to us for aid are not essentially different from their neighbors, except for some thing or things which have caused them to fall below the level of self-support. It is the task of us social workers to search out the reasons for their dependency and to make a plan which shall bring them to the point of self-dependence.

Theoretically, this may sound quite simple, but in reality it is a very complex task and often requires years of patient persistent endeavor to accomplish the result for which we are working. There are so many things that enter into the problem of dependency; a person may come to us with a request for something that seems to him to represent his greatest need, whereas it is very possibly only the indication of something much more radical that needs care.

As a case in point I want to tell of a man who come to our office with a slip from a physician asking us to provide electrical treatment for his rheumatism. The man was scarcely able to walk and it was quite obvious that he needed treatment; what also became obvious, when we learned the real situation, was that the man, who had recently come from the South, could not stand the Northern climate and would undoubtedly become a chronic invalid if he stayed here. The immediate needs of the family must of course be relieved, but by far the most essential thing was to send that man and his children back to their home in the South, where he could hope to be well and self-supporting.

It was an easy task to diagnose the trouble with the family of which I have just spoken, but there are times when the real difficulty is not so evident and it is then that we must learn to make use of the many sources of information that are at our disposal. We have been hearing of the help which may be secured from relatives and employers in making an intelligent plan for the people whose social disabilities we are trying to cure; let us consider now the value of conference with churches and schools.

In any dealings with our fellow beings we know the importance of the personal element; the strength or weakness of a man's moral character, his degree of intelligence and reliability are things which we must know if we are going to be of help in developing his power of self-maintenance. These factors are hard to estimate in a few visits, and it is in securing this knowledge that we find the church and school to be of great help, for their judgment is not biased by the personal considerations that sometimes influence other sources of information. I remember one family where the man came to us with a request for a loan to tide him over a temporary difficulty. He was well dressed and made a good impression, and his story of loss of work through no apparent fault of his own was substantiated by his employers and his relatives, who gave him high praise on all points. The home was above the average in neatness and comfort. It was from his minister that we learned that he had no moral backbone, and that he never stuck to any job, but depended on the earnings of his wife and boys, who worked out of school hours. The boys' school teachers were then consulted and from them we learned that the father's characteristics were appearing in the sons, who played truant and belonged to a gang which was in frequent

trouble with the authorities. The man's application to us gave an opportunity to go to the real root of the whole family problem and the information received from the church and school led to a plan which included taking one boy away from the demoralizing home influences, securing the interest of a Big Brother for the other, and a continued watch over the man, which has resulted in keeping him at work most of the time.

In other cases these same agencies have given invaluable information about children in the families under our care. A few years ago we became interested in a family that for a long time had been perilously near the line of dependency. There was a huge number of children and the father, who drank a little most of the time, never had steady work. Finally he had an accident which partially crippled him and made it necessary for the family to be cared for for a time. The oldest child's fourteenth birthday was just a few months off and the parents were waiting anxiously for this important event to take place so that he could become a financial asset to the family. We went to the lad's teacher to see about his school standing and whether or not he would be likely to be given working papers. From her we learned of the boy's unusual mental ability and of his great desire to take the commercial course in the high school—a dream for which, as the oldest of eight children and his mother's main reliance, he knew there was small chance of realization. This information from the school influenced our plan, and instead of helping the boy to find a job—probably poorly paid and with little future—we raised money for a scholarship, paid weekly, during the school term, which has enabled him to feel that he is helping support the family, while he is working to attain his ambition of being a real business man.

Another time when we had a puzzling case of a girl who was proving a moral menace to the community it was the information secured from the principal and teacher that helped us in choosing the proper institution to which to send her.

These are instances of the value of the church and school as sources of information in definite cases, and they are typical of what we may expect from them as a usual thing if we form the habit of consulting them. The relations of pastor and teacher are different from those of other people and their insight into the family problem is of great value. When we learn that a family

is not living up to its church obligations, or that the children are truants or falling behind in their lessons, we know that these things must be taken into consideration in forming a plan to rehabilitate the family.

Besides giving information that is essential in the formation of a plan of treatment, the co-operation of the church and school is invaluable in carrying it through. Moral weaknesses underlie much of dependency, and religious influence is of greatest help in overcoming these. Those of us who heard the speakers yesterday morning know how essential is the help of priest or pastor in any form of family work. This is especially true in cases where a man or woman needs to be helped in overcoming habits of intemperance, or in cases of family trouble or of desertion where the man has returned and we are trying to strengthen the family life and prevent a future catastrophe of this kind. This personal influence is also of great value in other ways. We knew a family where the man had worked for years for a New York firm. He had had a good salary, but had become quite deaf, and in a readjustment of business he had been given an inferior position. This demotion had depressed him terribly and he finally gave up his job and decided to become a huckster. He put all the money he could scrape together into this business and had just started when he fell on the ice and was laid up for a while. It was at this time that the family was referred to our society for help. When the man was well enough to work again we tried to persuade him to return to his old position, for he didn't seem cut out for a successful huckster. His clergyman also used his influence, but the man was too proud to think of going back, and he finally borrowed enough money to start in peddling again. We kept in close touch with the family and soon discovered that he was running behind, and was feeding the family on his stock and having a constantly decreasing amount of capital with which to purchase new supplies. While we were sure that the only work for which he was fitted was that to which he had been accustomed all his life, the man's mental make-up was such that he simply couldn't *humiliate* himself (as he termed it) to the point of applying for his old job. We thought that he might feel differently if the request could come from the other end; fortunately the minister knew his former employer and when we made the suggestion he was glad to go to him and ask him to

follow it out. At the same time he went to the man, and the combination of the tactful letter from the employer and the clergyman's advice had the desired result. The man is back at his old work, is making enough to support his family and is even paying back his loan.

While I have emphasized the value of the information and personal service rendered by the church and school, we must not overlook the fact that they also often reveal sources from which financial help may be secured. Most churches have funds with which to help the needy of the parish and we almost invariably find them glad to co-operate in any plan which involves financial assistance. Another advantage of using these agencies is that when they learn what we are trying to do they quickly acquire the habit of using us, too, and in that way we frequently have a chance to be of help to families before they reach the desperate point where they have to seek charity.

These are a few of the reasons why we have found it necessary to confer with the church and school in our attempt to do our bit toward the solution of New Jersey's problems. It is only by securing a basis of knowledge and through the co-operation of these and other agencies that we can do efficient work and be of real help to the people who need us and to the community that makes our work possible.

WHY WE CONSULT WITH MEDICAL AGENCIES AND MAKE USE OF PUBLIC RECORDS

Miss Mabelle C. Phillips, Secretary, Charity Organization Society, Plainfield

When we think well of ourselves, we Social Workers, we call ourselves Social Physicians. So close is the analogy between our work and that of the doctor that we even dare also to speak of the "diagnosis," "prognosis" and "treatment" of our cases.

What else is at the back of all this than a very close relation between the doctor and social worker? Is not our work in fact complementary to his and his to ours? There is certainly not one more indispensable source of information and inspiration than the doctor. In the study of 2,600 case records summarized

by the Russell Sage Foundation there were 800 consultations with physicians, more than with any other single source, saving relatives. If all the social agencies whose records were studied had been on their jobs, I do not see why the number of consultations should not have equalled the number of records, or nearly.

Personally, I can scarcely recall a well-studied family in need, some one or more of whose members have not been in need of a physician. Certainly one should not like to take the reverse for granted except upon the authority of a physician.

I do not wish to appear too laudatory of a profession with which we all at times disagree. There are doctors without the "social mind," the proverbial disagreement among doctors is not yet obsolete. Oftentimes they give us a diagnosis of tuberculosis, for instance, too late to be of use. But speaking on the whole and in the large, the doctor is the social worker's greatest ally and firmest friend. Without him we cannot make our diagnosis or plan our treatment. I recall a recent instance of a woman with many children sadly neglected who was regarded by her friends and employer simply as a tired mother in need of a rest. When we obtained the carefully studied medical diagnosis it was "tumor of the brain," more than enough, certainly, to account for children and home neglected.

Hospital and dispensary are really the doctor magnified. As agencies a little less accessible for inquiry, however, they merit a moment's further notice. A physician on one's Case Committee may be the key to unlock these sources of information when a bit too zealously guarded. Doctor to doctor will unfold secrets which might be withheld from a layman whose discretion was not known to the physician.

The dentist is not only a mouth doctor, as we too long thought, but in his knowledge may we find the solution of problems formerly baffling. A chronic rheumatic we have long known has never been helped by a number of physicians. This winter, while undergoing treatment in the hospital, this patient had the services of a dentist who extracted many useless teeth. The hidden poison thereby dislodged may be, we hope, the cause of the past trouble, and so a real cure may be effected.

In Plainfield the Visiting Nurse Association and the C. O. S. have not only an interlocking directorate, but an interlocking staff, my assistant being the director of the nurses. This close

co-operation accounts for the fact that the percentage of families in which our C. O. S. procured medical or nursing care in the homes was last year 38 per cent. This was the highest percentage recorded by any society, only a minority reporting above 10 per cent.

Although we have at our hospital no Social Service Department, cases leaving the ward are referred to the visiting nurses, who in turn refer those to us who are in need of material assistance. The nurses' cards being in our office, consultation is constant and constantly proving invaluable. Last week, for example, a bright and pretty young girl called for advice as to becoming a trained nurse. Her education being insufficient for this profession, it occurred to us that training as a babies' nurse would be more suitable. A visiting nurse's card, however, revealed the fact that this girl had been discharged from the ward last summer as a patient having suffered from a contagious disease. Consultation with the doctor assured us that her condition was safe at the present time, and she is now in training where her physical condition will be under supervision for two years, as it should be.

I wish that midwives kept records for our consultation either within or outside our office. We consult these women in every case possible, however, to ascertain whether proper precautions have been taken. In one case it was fortunate our nurse made inquiries, as she found that not only had nitrate of silver been used, but a bottle containing one ounce of this solution had been left with the parents to use externally or internally or in what quantities they saw fit.

Another reason why we consult midwives is to find whether the birth of the child has been recorded. Frequently it has not, and we see that the record goes on file—to the joy, probably, of some future social worker seeking a birth record for working papers or widow's pension. We have all, I think, learned to use public records more since the Act for Dependent Children was passed. Sometimes baptismal records will suffice for birth certificates, but deaths and marriages must be registered to allow our widows to secure their pensions. This rigidity will, I fancy, have a good effect in time, especially with the more ignorant women whose husbands they have termed "dead" after a brief absence or "divorced" by means of a postal card declaration. Our search for a marriage record several years ago led to the marriage

which at first we did not find recorded. There was a good reason for this, however, as the real husband of the woman in question was alive. We found him an utterly cruel and worthless fellow, whose one good point seemed to be that he was willing to divorce his wife. Sufficiently encouraged, he did this and our pair were really married, thereby not only bringing to an end a lawless relation, but also incidentally restoring a family to self-support. The man's self-respect apparently was reawakened and he must have become a better workman, too, for there are no more applications from the family.

There is another public record which we do not often have to consult, that is, the record of property owned by our clients. We generally find when we do inquire that it has a value of about $1,000, is mortgaged for $750, and cannot be sold until the youngest of eight children is twenty-one years old. That is the reason one of our widows cannot obtain her pension. I may say no light is shed sometimes by the consulting of a record. In this case we simply felt that the worst was known, and we proceeded to organize relatives, making appeals, and collect income and clothing.

Much more frequently, unfortunately, than property records are the court records we have to consult. Some of our friends thought us very suspicious of a nice looking young boy, the brother of a girl in whom we were interested, when we did not agree to the establishment of a household for just these two. But we had found from court records in another State that this boy had served in three penal institutions, and although we wished to give him his chance, we did not want to put his young sister in the same balance. Our fears were more than justified, as it turned out. The girl, being a dependent and feebleminded, was returned to her legal settlement and institutional care.

Sometimes we are able through the aid of immigration records to do likewise with dependents from another country, when we find that they have been here less than three years. I recall one flagrant case of a peasant girl, feebleminded and of the aggressive type, who came to this country to live with her sister, a tubercular girl who had married a tubercularly inclined man and had had a number of delicate children. We had, at enormous expense, restored this couple to health and re-established them in a home, when Sister Katie came. Imagine our relief when

we discovered her record and her date of admission to this country were such that she could be returned to her parents. She was. And by that deportation alone I felt that the keeping and consultation of records were ever after justified and *should* be made compulsory, under penalty of hard labor at statistical tables.

Tuesday Afternoon, May 1, 1917

PROBLEMS OF NEGRO MIGRATION NORTHWARD

Mrs. Charles W. Stockton, President, N. J. State Federation of Women's Clubs, Ridgewood, Presiding

(Before the regular session proceeded a business session was held.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I had a preamble prepared which I assure you was very artistic and calculated to create the right atmosphere for my little ten minutes' talk. But why waste time creating atmosphere when we have such excellent atmosphere now, to stimulate interest?

In the first place, I think it is a bit of an awakening when you find your speaker is not going to talk about the subject that is announced as her topic.

I am here as State President of the New Jersey Clubs to give one or two ways in which the organization I represent can co-operate with and help your organization and others such as yours, for we are all working along the same lines.

And first, because some of you may not know much about clubs, I am going to say a word about what the Federated Clubs are.

Twenty-five years ago we were a joke. To-day we are a power. Few villages are there even that do not have some federated club. The organization runs through the village, the town, the county, the State, and the nation. Our national organization covers every State and Territory of this Union, until within less than one week, if it were necessary, our national president, who is president of our General Federation, could get a message to every county in this whole country. Do you realize that we are a power, then, and that we may be able to do things for you as well as for others?

Now, when people can do things it does not follow that they can do everything on every line of work. What we do must be in our own peculiar line. We cannot start businesses or institutions; we have no money. Our dues are small; we want every woman to be able to be a member. Let me say to the men, however, that most of the clubs are incorporated and can receive

gifts and make use of them in the work which our dues will not cover.

We cannot do those things, then, that require money, nor can we take time for research or for writing treatises, because most of our members are busy housewives and mothers. But the thing we can do is to be a live wire to send messages such as yours to every hamlet in this country and to create public opinion. You have heard the saying in your home, I am sure, that mother and the girls get what they want—and whether it is in home or town or country, when the women understand things and make up their minds what they want, they are pretty sure to get it.

The thing our world needs now more than anything else is knowledge of conditions, and the human heart and good will can be trusted to do the rest. You can make a law, but you can't enforce it without public opinion behind it. Now, when we have this access that I have described to the women of the country, let us take your message and co-operate with you wherever we can. That is one way we can help.

There is another way in which we can do your work and such work as yours. This work you are doing is more and more being recognized as—shall we say?—housekeeping work. It is housekeeping on a large scale. I notice that many of the members of this audience are women. May I appeal to you, and ask if you do not prefer to keep your house rather than have your husbands do it? When we get this larger housekeeping and perhaps show the same efficiency as we have shown in the smaller housekeeping may not some of the clubs be used to do it? If they call it social service or philanthropy, what does it matter? When people work together and accomplish things they come to understand each other. Let us understand, the women of the clubs, what you want them to do. You understand now, I hope, just what we can do. Do not come to us for money; we have not got any money. But come to us and say, "Will you carry this message of ours out through New Jersey?" And tell us what your message is, and why you want it to go out. We are educating ourselves, educating the women not to just do anything on request without knowing the reason for the request. If you will remember these things I will promise you that you will see conditions altered, and I think I may promise you even that you will see legislation

touched. In the name of the Women's Clubs of New Jersey, I offer you our co-operation.

This afternoon, the first address on our programme will be made by Mr. Ernest P. Bicknell, Director of the American Red Cross, Washington.

MR. ERNEST P. BICKNELL: I am told I have ten minutes to talk, and I will try not to be like the man who was told that, but went on and on talking till he had spoken twenty-five minutes, and as he was winding up he said in a peroration, "It is a great pleasure to me to see so many of my old friends before me, so many of whom I have not seen for many a long day," and somebody in the audience called out, "Name one!"

Now, about the Red Cross. This atmosphere which has been spoken of a moment ago, the cheerful aspect of it almost makes me hesitate to speak of the rather gloomy subject of war and of what the Red Cross may do and must do and is trying to do, and yet that is what I am to do.

About the United States going into the war I have this feeling. If we go into it, knowing what we are doing, with our heads high, and cheerful, well and good—splendid; if we go into it cheerfully because we do not know what we are doing, then we are going to have a dreadful awakening. I hope we are going in knowing that we are assuming a tremendous responsibility, that in setting out to fight for liberty, for right of conscience and right of self-government, and all these rights we value so highly, we appreciate that we are nevertheless taking on a responsibility which is going to mean a tremendous burden of expense—of expense in money, yes, but that is nothing compared to the expense in life and in health and in strength of our young men, nor does that money cost compare with the cost which war always brings on a nation in dislocating all normal life and the usual things of everyday life. The dislocation of normal life that has come upon Europe because of this great war during the last two and a half years is almost beyond comprehension, beyond understanding; it is an undreamed of thing. Now we do not know how far the United States is going to get into this maelstrom; we simply know that we are on the outer edge of a circling current which is drawing us toward the vortex; how far in we shall go we do not know yet. We have committed ourselves, however, feeling that we have exerted all the forbearance that we ought to exert

and that we are doing right in the step we as a nation have taken. And that is final. Now we are in for it. What can we do about it? A million, possibly two million, of our young men may go into the war. That will leave ninety million more who are not fighting, cannot fight, and will not be given the opportunity or duty of fighting in the trenches, or at the front.

Now, the Red Cross is the channel, the instrument, by which those people may do their part. That is rather a big contract, and I have stated it broadly, and roundly, and a bit strongly, perhaps, but that is, in fact, the purpose and intent of those who organized the Red Cross, and it is for that definite purpose and end that it exists. That is what it was organized for more than half a century ago, to give the old men and the boys and the women and the girls, and everybody who for any reason cannot shoulder a gun or take part in the tremendous activity of military movements themselves, a chance to do something.

Now, here we are in the United States with a Red Cross Society which has been standing for that thing for thirty-five years and never had a real chance to show whether it was prepared to do the job or not, until now. Whether it can rise to the great opportunity and do the things it should do in the big splendid way that will be a credit and a source of pride to the members of the society and to the country and to the government and to the world remains to be seen, and whether it does that is going to depend, not on the President or the Directors or the Executive Committee, but on the people of the United States, because the Red Cross does not belong to a little group of people, but to everybody, to every woman and every man in this room just as much as to me or to President Wilson, who happens to be President of the Red Cross as well as of the United States. And it is the intelligent, active, self-sacrificing interest which all of us shall take in the Red Cross, which is the humanitarian arm of our government, that is going to tell the story when the war is over.

We all believe in preparedness. Your meeting here is a tribute to the recognition of the need of preparedness. Preparedness is a thing which everybody accepts as necessary for any work of life, not in war alone, but in all things; in charity, in caring for the defective and the unfortunate, we need preparedness, not only to provide that care, but to prevent the need for it. So the thing the Red Cross stands for is fundamentally the thing which

everybody in this room stands for. We all stand precisely on the same foundation, and every one of those good women in the Federation of Women's Clubs, with the tremendous power that these clubs do exert, can help the country by helping the Red Cross, not alone to do things, but to do things well. I do not mean by that that the Red Cross has got to do everything that is done. Our society is not intended to be monopolistic; but we want to see done what is to be done. If our chapters, our agents, can do the thing and there is no one else doing it and doing it well, it is up to them to do it, but if there is someone else doing it and doing it well, it would be wrong for our agents to break in. The one thing is to get things done. The Red Cross is organized for that, but not at the expense of someone who is already doing a thing and doing it well.

What does the Red Cross have to do in war? We are not in war actually yet; that is, we are theoretically in, but we do not feel it yet. When we begin to feel the bitter depths of war what will the Red Cross be expected to do?

It is expected to do a good many things which I can enumerate, but cannot now go into the description of.

It has to organize hospitals, provide doctors and nurses, take care of wounded men and sick men. It has to transport wounded men from the front back to the hospitals; that means hospital trains, ambulances, hospital ships, wagons, trucks, anything that is available to get the men back where they can be placed in base hospitals and given proper care, base hospitals being the first hospitals and the first they go to. They stop first at a dressing station, a protected point behind a hill or somewhere, for the first dressing, then are taken to a field hospital, a tent or barn or anything out of the range of the guns, where they can be given a little better preparation, and then after that the work of the Red Cross begins; the Red Cross transports them to a real hospital; it may be twenty miles back or a hundred or two hundred or three hundred. The Red Cross has to carry them back and take them to the hospital. Then, men being taken home to recuperate must be fed as they go along, or when being taken to the hospitals. The Red Cross, or at any rate we, the civilian people, are expected to do that. We have an information station in every great army headquarters. That information station is an arrangement by which the Red Cross is the link between the wounded

man in the hospital and the folks back home, keeping them notified of what has happened to their sons, their friends, their fathers or brothers, if they are wounded, telling the folks back home as much about it as the military regulations will permit, also taking charge of records and correspondence for prisoners of war. They would be entitled under international law to have some communication sent to their family and friends at home, and the Red Cross has to look after that. Then there is the care of the families left dependent at home. It is obvious what that means. Then there is the care of the disabled and the discharged men who come home. A man is crippled, has lost a leg or an arm or an eye, and is honorably discharged from service and sent home. His pay stops, the government allowance to the family stops, and he has to be taken care of and readjusted to live and given that sort of inspiration and guidance which will make him again self-supporting as a good citizen.

How big a job is this? Nobody knows how big our job will be. We know something about it by seeing what it is in Europe. I have traveled about in Europe a good deal since the war began, and I was amazed at the magnitude of the work which the Red Cross societies have had to take on. They were not all prepared; the French society was somewhat prepared, the German splendidly, the American totally unprepared, the British unprepared. But now they have got organized, and are all most effective. The British Red Cross to-day requires the entire time of sixty thousand people, not counting the women at home sewing and making bandages, etc., working their lives out, but the people actually giving their whole time either as employed or volunteers. The German Red Cross to-day employs 179,000, without counting the people at home. So the Red Cross, in the magnitude of its operations and the importance of its work in time of war, is second only to the armies of the countries themselves. We have no means of judging how big our work will be, but if we go into war with a million of our young men there is going to be a tremendous piece of work to be done, and something demanded from every single one of us, old and young. (Applause.)

MRS. STOCKTON: We are going to touch this afternoon on one phase of a question which is one of the great questions of this country. I have friends in the South and they say to me as a Northern woman, "I wish you Northern people, when you take

up the negro question, would look at it from all sides, that you would understand our side, and the Western side, and the Eastern side as well as the Northern side, before you judge or act." This afternoon we are going to take up one phase of this big question, and Miss Pendleton will speak first for a short time about the New Jersey situation.

A STATEMENT OF THE NEW JERSEY SITUATION

Miss Helen B. Pendleton, Executive Secretary, New Jersey Negro Welfare League

Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a very American thing that has happened in the coming from the South of a great number of colored people. Ever since our country began immigration has been assisted. The great William Penn sent agents abroad to bring people over to settle in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. When the war stopped immigration from Europe, the employer here was at a loss to know what to do, so he turned to the South, where there are large numbers of negro laborers, and sent agents down there to recruit immigrants, just as forty or fifty years ago the great industries of this country began sending across the water to bring over here millions of European immigrants.

Now, in the coming of these people up from the South to the most congested parts of our country, what has happened? The New Jersey industries of which I speak got excellent laborers on the whole for their work. There is no doubt of that. Please remember I am speaking particularly about the city of Newark, about which I know a little something—Newark and some of the surrounding boroughs. When these people came, at the earnest request of the manufacturers and other industries of New Jersey, they came believing they were going to better their condition. Those of us who are interested in the progress of the negro believe that is true, that the migration is going to better their condition, not only here, but also in the South, but perhaps the great good thing is that it is going to bring a fuller knowledge of the difficulties with which a large group of people are confronted in our country. Unfortunately many of these people came in the fall, and most of those who came to Newark came

from a part of the South near the Gulf of Mexico, where the climate is almost tropical, totally unacquainted with our customs, our ways of working, and unused to the climate, hundreds of them became ill, and many have died from pneumonia.

I went last night to a most interesting meeting, and all the people in the room, except myself, were colored people. I did not have much to say, for I was there merely as a listener, and when the speaker said that these people coming from the South had come believing they were going to the great free States of the North, I thought perhaps I had got the text for a message to white people this afternoon.

Ladies and gentlemen, can we say we are a democracy, can we say these are the great free States of the North, when a group of workingmen, no matter whether they are negroes from the South, no matter whether they are Poles from Galicia, or Italians from Sicily, or Russians from Kief, can we say we are a free people when it is impossible for the workingman of these or any other groups to find a home where his wife and children can live in cleanliness, in healthfulness, and in safety?

The housing conditions in this part of New Jersey have been very wonderfully shown up by the coming of the colored people from the South. I have no time to tell you of the difficult problems these people have been confronted with. The colored man as I know him wants his wife and children around him. The Pennsylvania Railroad says, "We have transported thousands of these people and only a few hundred stuck." As I say, the colored man wants his wife and children around him, and, in coming to Newark, he first went into the camps outside of the city with the idea of staying only long enough to make money to bring his wife and family here. What did he find when they came? That it was impossible to get a decent house for them to live in. Now, I think this is one of the most important things for a conference like this to consider. Yesterday afternoon we were discussing the housing problem, and it seems to me this Conference should go on record as emphasizing the absolute necessity that in this congested part of the United States the working people should have proper homes to live in.

I know a family just arrived from the lower part of Alabama —man and wife and seven children (they almost all have seven children)—living in three rooms, the central room perfectly dark,

and for that they have to pay fourteen dollars a month. The family who moved out of there were white people and they paid nine dollars. The landlady downstairs said quite explicitly that she charged these people fourteen dlolars because they were colored.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is something I think well worth the consideration of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction. It seems to me, too, that we must get into closer touch with the colored people in our State. Where are they this afternoon? I do not see many colored faces at the New Jersey Conference, and yet we have a hundred thousand in the State. When I first came to Newark I asked, "What do you do about a colored family if it is in trouble in the city of Newark?" "Well, there is not much to do," was the answer; "there are not any institutions, and when there is a colored child to be cared for there is very little we can do." There is something else for the consideration of this Conference.

We know perfectly well that among the hundred thousand colored people who live in the State of New Jersey are hundreds —yes, thousands—of good citizens. I believe we want to know these citizens better. I think it would be a splendid thing for the New Jersey Federation of Women's Clubs to ask every woman who has a colored servant if she knows what her colored servant is thinking about. When white people know what their colored servants are thinking about it will make a good deal of difference. De we know their aspirations, their thoughts, what advantages they seek for their children, how they look forward to a time when they, too, will be a part of what will then be a real democracy, the social democracy to which this Conference of Charities and Correction stands committed? We talk a good deal about our country as a democracy, especially in a convention like this; we even talk about possessing political democracy in spite of what happened on the nineteenth of October in New Jersey last year, but it seems to me we have serious need to think of what are we doing as members of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction to make it possible for the colored people of this part of New Jersey to have a square deal?

That is the question I leave with you. The coming of the Southern negroes to New Jersey should make us think. It is all very well for us to talk about conditions in Georgia. I hold no

brief for Georgia. I lived there for four years. But there are other conditions not in Georgia that we might talk about, too. I went to the jail in Newark the other day. I was shown the tier on the sunny side of the building, nice and clean and bright and well kept, where the white women prisoners are kept. Then we went around to the dark side. "This is where we keep the negro women," said the matron.

Are we a real democracy? Are we a nation of freemen as long as such discrimination can take place in this State?

MRS. STOCKTON: We are asked to give five minutes to Mr. W. R. Valentine, Principal of the Bordentown School for Colored Youth.

MR. W. R. VALENTINE: I just asked for the privilege of bringing you a little information about the school for colored youth which the State of New Jersey has established at Bordentown, six miles below Trenton, an Industrial School for colored youth over fourteen years of age. It is patterned after the plan of Hampton and Tuskegee, and expects to do extension work in education throughout the State in the manner of Tuskegee and Hampton, just as soon as New Jersey can give the requisite appropriation.

We do not take children under fourteen; it is an educational, not a correctional institution; girls pay $6.00 a month, boys, $7.00. That may seem a very small sum, but when you add the amount of work each boy or girl is required to do to assist in the general machinery upkeep of the school it amounts to much more, easily to eleven or twelve dollars per month. We teach trades, such as carpentry, and farming. We cultivate every bit of available ground. The boys do plumbing, printing and blacksmithing, and the girls all kinds of domestic work. We give them half the day in academic work, and half in industrial. You have no idea what can be done with a boy or a girl living in an atmosphere like that of the Bordentown School. The school is on a wonderful site us all the time, twenty-four hours of the day, so that we are able (the property is valued at about $130,000). We have them with really to influence every phase of life. It is really an intensive method of training boys and girls or young men and women.

We should be delighted to have any of you come down and see us. Perhaps there are none of you here who know just what the State is trying to do in this way. Last year it put $96,500

into the work and for next year appropriated $76,000, including permanent improvements. The State is, therefore, in earnest about the school. It is under the direction of the State Board of Education. I have outlined briefly what the State of New Jersey is attempting for the development of colored people; I feel it will be a great factor in the State if properly maintained, as I believe it will be.

If any one who desires any information about the school will write to the Principal at any time it will be very gladly sent.

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak, because I know what it means to break into a programme.

MRS. STOCKTON: I am sure we all wish that every colored boy and girl could have the advantage of this opportunity. I will go further and say I wish every boy and girl could have the opportunity of partly mental and partly physical training every day. One of the humiliating things that this war has brought out is that so many of the women, and men, are not in a position to offer one perfect thing to the country; we do many things but not one well enough to be of real service. Let us see to it that not only colored youth but all youth may come to have a real service to offer.

RELATIVE ADVANTAGE AND DISADVANTAGE OF THE NEGRO IN THE NORTH AND IN THE SOUTH

Professor Kelly Miller, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: After all the participants from New Jersey have been heard you have called on an outsider. I am sorry I am not from New Jersey, but today I feel as if I were from Missouri.

I am going to talk to you, I trust in an inspirational, if in rather an informal manner, on the subject that has been announced, though I shall at least stick as close to my subject as the minister does to his text.

The contact, the attrition and the adjustment of the various races of mankind constitute a question which is coterminous with

the ends of the earth. The race problems of the world today cover the landed area as completely as the waters cover the sea. In Asia, in Africa, in Europe, in the two western continents, in Australia, in the scattered islands of the seas, we find that the contact and attrition of races is the one great question which characterizes the relations of men in the world to-day.

In the United States we have but a fraction, an infinitesimal fragment of this universal race question, and yet our domestic race problem has such peculiarly interesting features that the student of social problems is wont to bestow on it a degree of attention accorded to no other question of race contact in the world.

In 1620 there began to pour into the continent two streams of population, one coming from the most enlightened continent and the other from the most bedarkened continent of the world, and these two streams have gone on, increasing in volume and in a continuous rush, until now we have a population of 100,000,000 human beings, divided between the races in the ratio of ten to one.

It was Voltaire, I believe, the French sceptic and philosopher, who said that it is more difficult and more meritorious to wean men from their prejudices than to civilize the barbarian. Here we have the dual aspect of the race problem explained in the concise terms of a French aphorism. How can the white race be weaned from its prejudices while we are civilizing and uplifting and reclaiming the African in our midst?

Either of these problems is sufficient to tax human ingenuity, but when we roll the two into one we stand appalled at the task, and to add to the difficulty it seems the two factors are inseparable.

The good old slave, faithful and loyal to the welfare of his master, was acceptable to the white race; but the more ambitious son, with a college diploma, is likely to be persona non grata.

The negro race, for economic reasons, located in one section of the country. The institution of slavery was not considered to involve a moral issue at the time the population began to flow to this country, and when the northern section did not prove hospitable slavery was relegated to the South, because that proved to be a profitable section for the employment of slave labor.

Just before the invention of the cotton gin, when slavery had begun to be unprofitable in the northern tier of the Southern

States, a great many of the Southern leaders were advocates of emancipation—Washington, Jefferson and Madison, for instance. Slavery had proved unprofitable, but when Eli Whitney, a Yankee from Connecticut, invented the cotton gin, slavery was profitable again, and we heard no more about emancipation from the South. I presume if it had been profitable in Massachusetts the conditions would have been the same as in the South. However that may be, the negro has been settled in the South because of climatic and industrial and economic situation. It might seem that this race would have rushed from the South to the North because of the freer conditions prevailing in the North—freer political and civil and educational conditions. Why have they remained down South all these years when they might have moved North for the railroad fare?

People do not emigrate in quest of free institutions or religious freedom or civil conditions. Compared to the few who have come here in quest of free institutions, the mere handful of people in the Mayflower, you may say that the people who have come in a hundred years in quest of improved industrial and economic opportunity are legion. People are very much like birds; we see them moving from South to North in the spring and back to the South in the fall. That is just what the negro immigrant is going to do. These birds are in quest of better feeding ground. The gates of Castle Garden swing inward. That is because wages are higher in America than in Europe. If wages were higher in Europe than in America they would swing outward. If wages in New York were suddenly changed to twice those of New Jersey, there would not be in all New Jersey an Irishman left, certainly not a Jew, and very few people of any description. And if the reverse were true they would move from New York to New Jersey. So the negro is moving from the South to the North today because of the sudden economic opportunities that have opened up to him. They are impelled by the same motive which impels the minister of the gospel to change his pulpit. This is a human motive, and we may discuss it all we please and condemn it all we please or commend it all we please, but just as long as wages are three times in New Jersey what they are in Georgia they will go to New Jersey.

Now where the negro goes he carries his problems with him, and as he goes into the North he takes his problems there. The

unsatisfactory, rigorous regimes in the South are fostering and stimulating this movement northward though they are not fundamentally the underlying cause. I live in Washington, and I know a great many people go from the North to the South as soon as they are graduated from the colleges in the North—go to the South in quest of a field in which to exploit their attainments and powers; and in just the same way the negroes are coming from the South to the North to find a better field for their activities. It is true that this movement will react on the South and inevitably bring about more satisfactory living conditions for the negroes there. The Southern white man sometimes claims he cannot get along with the negro, and when the negro leaves he finds he can't get along without him.

War always results in readjustment of peoples. And people at the bottom of society are always the ones who are the chief beneficiaries. They say sometimes that it is the poor man who has to fight the wars, but in the long run it is the poor man who gets the benefit of the war directly or indirectly. As a result of this war already many of the poor man's disabilities have been removed. Russia has become a democracy, even Germany is inoculated with the germs of democracy. The working man in France and in Italy and in England and everywhere will receive stimulus and uplift as a result of the war which he could not have brought about by a hundred years of agitation. And it has reacted on the negro of the South. For it is the war that has opened the new economic opportunity to him in the North. He has been politically disfranchised in the South, but in the North he has been industrially disfranchised. I am not going to say which is the more important of those two facts, but at any rate he has become industrially enfranchised in the North and now he is moving away from the South where he had been politically disfranchised.

Mr. Booker T. Washington knew more about the relation of races than any man, white or black, who lived in a generation. He had an intuitive insight, a God-given understanding of this delicate question—somewhat the sort of vision that Abraham Lincoln possessed; he knew without learning. And yet see how far short his prophecies fell. He said in his day that the negro had the opportunity in the North of spending a dollar but not of earning it, and in the South of earning it but not of spending it. Yet in the brief period of two years all this has been changed, and he

has opportunity in the North both to earn and to spend the dollar, and will soon have like opportunity in the South.

The world is divided into three classes, represented by the three symbols in algebra. There are a number of people who must get from society more than they give back. They are represented by the negative, always subtracting from the equation of life. The negro race belong to the negative side of the equation, because of circumstances over which they have had no control. Then we have those who receive about as much as they give back. These are represented by the "equal" sign. They are a step above the first class but in an unsatisfactory stage nevertheless. Then we have those who have surplus powers and energies not only for their own needs but to devote to the betterment of those less fortunate than themselves. These are represented by the positive sign in algebra.

The white race in large numbers represents the positive side. It is to these elements that all progress is due. The chief task in algebra is one of transportation, and this is precisely the chief task in social welfare, to shift individuals and races and groups from the negative to the positive side of the equation of life. Those who have been benefitted and put onto the positive from the negative side have, in their turn, to lift up those on the negative side of the equation.

I have not any ultimate philosophy as an outcome of the race problem, but I do know with the certitude of science and the infallible assurance of inspiration that whenever an individual who has been ignorant has been made intelligent, when one who was vicious has been made virtuous, the sum total of human good has been added to; and that, therefore, the chief task of those on the positive side, whether North or South, is to take the man on the negative side and transpose him to the positive side of the equation of life.

Now the negro in the South has some advantages. He has the advantage of climate. I doubt whether the northern climate is suitable for the permanent habitat of the negro. Nobody has studied this yet from the statistical point of view. But it seems to me that the negro race does not thrive in the North except as reinforced from the South. The Yankees do not seem to thrive either for that matter—they are gradually dying out!

In the South the housing conditions are free and easy. I

have been through the South thousands upon thousands of miles. I was born in the South. I was born almost out of doors, like Booker T. Washington. I have seen these cabins down there in the South, and I want to say that these cabins about which we hear so much have one advantage and one virtue—they admit of free and ample ventilation, and that is an immense advantage over the tenement houses which the negroes are forced to occupy in the North. There is not a cabin in southern Virginia so unsuitable as a place of abode as that basement tenement which Miss Pendleton spoke about. So when the negro comes to the North and is subject to these unsanitary housing conditions, you may not be disappointed if his vital equation declines.

I am glad in a way that the negro is coming to the North and bringing his problems face to face with the people of the North. We can never express our gratitude to the northern white people, the best of them, for what they have done in the uplifting of the race, especially in the early years after the War. They left their homes, their friends, their firesides, all they held dear, to go to the remote South to labor for the uplifting of the slaves. As long as the human heart beats in response to benefits received, so long these angels of mercy and light who sowed the seed of intelligence in the soil of ignorance and planted the rose of beauty in the garden of shame will never want for a living monument of ebony and bronze.

But this was a long circuit. You know philanthropy on a long circuit is easier than on a short circuit. The negro is coming into your midst, and you want to exercise that philanthropy now within your gates. You may recall perhaps the case of the pious slave-holding lady in North Carolina who was so concerned with the missionary movement in China that she stole a slave in order to add to the missionary contribution.

Now the negro is going to learn when he comes to the North that he has every political advantage that the rest of the population has, every educational advantage, and these are very important considerations. But there is something that he can learn in the North which is perhaps the greatest of all advantages for him; he can learn that efficiency which distinguishes the northern white man, who in this respect sets a higher standard than the southern white man. The negro can learn by degrees to acquire this higher method and efficiency—can learn what is meant by

initiative—can acquire the ability to do a thing without being told. Initative is the ability to do the right thing without being told; efficiency is the ability to do the thing right when you have been told.

Our Saviour said, "He that would be great among you, let him be your servant." It takes a pretty great man to understand that. The northern white man has in a measure learnt that lesson that without service there is no distinction. The South has rather thought that the greatest was he who had most people to serve him. But we must learn the significance of the Saviour's saying, that greatness and service are in exact ratio. That is a lesson the negro can learn better in the North than in the South. It makes no difference what the service is; it depends on the skill, the energy, the enterprise injected into the service whether it is service that makes for honor.

I was down in Atlanta, and there were two men there who had hit upon an enterprise and put business system into it and had made fame and fortune out of it. It was a preparation called Coca-Cola. It is absolutely nothing but cold water and a little molasses, and a dash of dope thrown in. All the rest is energy and enterprise. They told me down there it was not half so soothing or refreshing as the concoction the old colored butler used to pour, called mint julep. But the trouble with the butler was that he never had energy to prepare more than one julep at a time.

You have probably heard of the controversy between two senators from the South recently, who did not speak to each other. The real basis of the trouble was that the mother of the one sold peanuts for a living, while the father of the other sold slaves. It was an honorable thing to deal in the one of those commodities, but not so honorable to trade in the other. The cabman who hauls a single passenger from the depot is engaged in the same kind of service as the Pennsylvania Railroad. The Pennsylvania gets the more honor because it renders its service more efficiently. Your washerwoman is engaged in the same service as the big laundry corporation. The laundry corporation has more science and system and more business-like methods. They are growing quite fastidious in the South; you see on the laundry wagon the words: "We work for white people only." Even that is nothing new, however; that is precisely what the colored woman

has been doing all these years; she worked for white people only. They need not put on airs, for they are all taking in washing. The oil peddler who peddles oil in the street by the pint is in partnership with John D. Rockefeller; they are both giving oil to the world, only John D. Rockefeller has more oil. The farmer who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before is a co-worker with God (applause)—we appreciate that in these times! So there is nothing high and nothing low; there is no such thing as servile service—except service that is rendered in a servile spirit.

I used to be concerned about the superiority of the white race and the inferiority of the negro race, but I don't feel like that now. If anyone is superior to me I am glad to know it. I am five feet eleven inches tall, and if you are taller I am glad to know it. I believe there is no such thing as racial superiority. There is individual superiority. The Germans are superior to the English in the art of war, man for man, but it is discipline and efficiency and training and experience, not racial superiority.

So I say, it is well that the negro shall have this opportunity today to get hold of the broader and more efficient ways of the North, well for him even if eventually it shall prove that his permanent habitat should be in the South. I feel that while there has been a strong current of movement to the North, the centre of gravity is still steadily about the Gulf of Mexico.

In the South values are cheap—in the North values are high. I stayed with a man in the State of Virginia who was receiving a wage of $1.25 a day. He had built a six room house, bought ten acres of land, planted fruit trees, and said that he hoped within a few years to make his living on that ten acres of land. What that man has done practically every negro in the South could do, but in the North that would be practically impossible. I do not see how any working man can ever hope in ordinary circumstances to get hold of values in New York City, or to own his own home, although his wages may be very high for the time being. But in the South values are low. And the opportunity of the poor man will always be found in the open country where land is cheap and values are not high. Therefore I believe the home of the negro will be in the South rather than in the North. Yet I do not believe in the principle of segregating the negro in the South or any part of the South. There are ten million negroes in

the United States, and we have been in the habit hitherto, for the most part, of treating them as one man—they must all live in the North, or they must all live in the South; they must all live in the city, or they must all live on farms, or they must all be servants. There are ten million of this race in the United States, and I believe that among that ten million there are all the different aptitudes of humanity. I want some of them, the bulk of them, to live in the South. I think their destiny is there; I think it better they should be agricultural rather than industrial people, and the value and worth of agriculture is increasing or becoming more appreciated. But I want to see them in the North too, coming in contact with the highest standards of the North. But when they come to the North you want to be careful that you do not allow them to change the attitude of the North into that of the South.

You may not like the negro. People don't like each other very well anyway. The white race fall out with each other, and wrangle, and go to war and kill each other for every conceivable reason under heaven, and over every conceivable proposition except the one proposition of how to treat the negro. But granted that you do not like him, it is the part of common prudence to give him these human advantages. If you and I were on a steamboat together we might not like each other, but if I were to get smallpox I should certainly be a great object of solicitude because you might get it too. The germs of ignorance and vice are just as contagious as those of physical disease; therefore it is incumbent on the North to see that the negro people as they come in are given the proper advantages.

I think one way in which the North and South can co-operate to help the negro to the best advantage is by raising up and sustaining a class of leaders in the race itself. A white man cannot be a leader among us unless he is willing to be naturalized. We want to raise up among these people a class of leaders who shall stand on a high plane of intellectual and moral authority and guide them right and keep them in the right direction.

In Howard University we have an institution of fifteen hundred colored men and women who are preparing for high places of leadership and guidance among the people. We have three hundred young men studying medicine; they are the missionaries of health, and the world is going to need them today as never before. Others are studying for the ministry, to stand in the high

places of moral authority; others are to be teachers, to guide the youth of our race in the way they should go. If you want to keep these people in the North, and if you want them to go in the direction they should go, you will have to rely largely on the colored churches and organizations and activities, and give them your sympathy and support.

There are three factors in the race problem of this country: the white man in the South; the white man in the North; and the negro himself. There is a disposition on the part of the North and South to come together and eliminate the negro. I think the two physicians ought at least to ask the patient how the treatment feels. I am sure we can reach a *modus vivendi,* but we ought not to be too anxious or feel too hasty about "settling the race problem." There are no infallible cures for anything. If you see a man drowning your impulse is to offer him immediate and unconditional rescue. And when you see the negro in your midst in need of help and uplift and treatment it is your duty to throw out the life line and offer him immediate and unconditional rescue, and leave the question of ultimate destiny in the hands of that God who shapes all human ends.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure we all feel that we have been started upon lines of thought that it behooves us to follow out and deeply consider.

This address brings our meeting to a close, and we shall adjourn.

BUSINESS SESSION

Tuesday Afternoon, May 1, 1917

The President, Mrs. Lewis S. Thompson, Presiding

The reports of the treasurer, organization committee, resolution committee and nominating committee were made.

Eulogy to Mr. Ogden

Upon the resignation of Mr. Ogden as treasurer, Mrs. Wittpenn offered a special resolution of appreciation for his untiring efforts and ceaseless devotion to the financial interests of the Conference. The resolution was heartily accepted.

CLOSING REMARKS OF PRESIDENT

MRS. THOMPSON: When I was made President I accepted the position with hesitancy and some reluctance, but I want to say that I have enjoyed it, and I thank the committees who have worked with me and borne the burden of the work. I want also to express much gratitude to Montclair for making this Conference a success. The sense of personal kindliness and friendliness, the sense that we all have had here of being taken care of and treated with more than hospitality, has been very grateful and pleasing to every one of us, I know, and will always be a charming recollection. And I want to say that while you have lost me in an official capacity I shall return as a private citizen and I hope you will receive me as kindly when I come that way!

And having finished my administration I would like to introduce the next incumbent, a gentleman with so much more experience that it is with the pleasant sense of doing a last service to the Conference that I step down and give him my place. May I introduce Mr. Robert L. Flemming, our new President?

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

MR. ROBERT L. FLEMMING, *Jersey City:* I wish to express my appreciation of your kindness in electing me to office as your President, and in doing so I wish also to say as I did in my talk before the Monday morning meeting that since the beginning of the War I have passed my summers in Canada, and have seen

what has happened to the Charities in that country, and I want to say this—that the members who are now assuming office are more than willing to help the people of the State of New Jersey to do what they can to meet the situation that is about to come here. The people in Canada did not wake up soon enough, and I beg of you who are interested in the various charities in the State of New Jersey that you do your bit to gather together proper funds. Do not wait till next fall or next year, when the burden of the increased cost of living will be so great that you may not be able to collect sufficient to help those dependent on you. Start right in now to meet the situation, to meet the demands, to gather in the additional workers who will have to assume this burden. Those who are now taking office, I can assure you, will do all they can to assist in this work; and we offer our services freely and gladly to assist you in meeting this situation.

The organization is such that we cannot take up any great active work in organization of and carrying out new work. Anything of that sort will be done by us as individuals and not as a Conference, but we can help you in supplying speakers or in an advisory capacity or in any such ways, and on behalf of myself and the new officials I say that we shall be more than glad to confer with you and give what assistance we can in the awful situation that confronts us.

I thank you again for my election to this office, and once more assure you that I will do my best to carry on the work that has been done by those before me. If I can only make the next Conference as successful as Mrs. Thompson has this, I shall pass the work on to my successor with confidence and great joy.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION

To the Members of the Conference:

At the annual meeting of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Corrections, held last year in Hoboken, the following resolution was reported by the committee on resolution and adopted by the Conference:

"*Resolved,* That a Committee of nine be appointed by the President to recommend such changes in the form of the organization and management of the Conference as may in its judgment be expedient, which report shall be sent in printed form by the

Secretary to all subscribing members of the Conference at least two weeks before the next annual meeting."

President Weeks named the following persons as members of this Committee:

Augustine Elmendorf, Chairman.
Mrs. H. Otto Wittpenn.
Mr. Isaac C. Ogden.
Mr. Ernest D. Easton.
Prof. E. R. Johnstone.
Mr. Robert L. Flemming.
Mr. C. L. Stonaker.
Prof. Frank Fetter.
Mrs. Sidney M. Colgate.

This Committee has held four meetings, one at Skillman, May 25th, one in Newark, June 22nd, one in Hoboken, November 28th, and one in Newark, January 17th. Resulting from these meetings have come the following proposals as last amended:

First. That the Executive Committee of the New Jersey State Conference of Charities and Corrections shall consist of fifteen members to be elected at the annual meeting, and the President, the Secretary, the Treasurer, with the State Commissioner of Charities and Corrections ex-officio. Five of the elective members shall be chosen for one year, five for two years and five for three years, and thereafter all elective members shall be elected for three years. The Conference at its annual meetings shall elect members to fill vacancies for the unexpired terms respectively.

Second. The incoming president shall appoint a nominating committee of nine, which shall present its report on the last day of the next annual Conference, said committee having in the meantime through the Secretary of the Conference, asked for suggestions as to the officers and the executive committee, from the members of the advisory board.

Third. The Conference shall elect an advisory board of forty members for a term of one year, who shall as far as possible be representative of all societies and agencies throughout the State interested in and affiliated in any way with the purpose of the State Conference. The advisory board shall be invited to sit with the executive committee at its first two meetings and participate in the deliberations, and to other meetings at the call of the President.

Fourth. The executive committee may assign time and place on the program or otherwise authorize section meetings for organizations or groups as may be approved by said committee, on terms to be approved by the committee.

Fifth. That no publication of proceedings of section meetings in the annual proceeding shall be allowed without first having the approval of the executive committee.

Sixth. The program of section meetings shall be subject to executive committee's approval before printing in preliminary or official program.

Seventh. That the executive committee shall arrange that no other meeting shall be held at headquarters than those first approved by said committee.

Eighth. That the Program Committee shall allow reasonable time for discussion from the floor.

This report was submitted to all members of the Committee on January 16th, and subsequently a request came from the Nominating Committee to the effect that this report should include also a recommendation to the effect that the Secretary of the Conference be elected by the Executive Committee instead of by the Conference annually. No meeting was called subsequently, but by correspondence it was learned that the members of the committee were not in agreement upon this change in the method of electing the Secretary.

Your committee submits herewith the text of the proposed changes to the constitution and by-laws in conformity to the above recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,
AUGUSTUS ELMENDORF,
Chairman.

C. L. STONAKER,
Secretary to the Committee.
May 1st, 1917.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

Your committee on resolutions expresses its appreciation of the excellent program prepared for this Conference, and wishes to thank the writers of the papers and the speakers who have each one contributed to making this meeting unusually helpful and constructive.

It wishes to call attention to the valuable exhibits that have been displayed and is especially grateful to Mrs. Joseph Van Vleck, Jr., for her work in gathering the special exhibit of Montclair agencies.

The Committee voices the gratitude of all visitors to Montclair for the delightful hospitality in private homes, to the local clergy and their congregations for the use of the churches, to the Boy Scouts, to the members of the Montclair Club and the ladies of the Baptist, Episcopal and Congregational churches for their luncheons and to the Women's Club of Upper Montclair for their reception at the Commonwealth Club; also to the citizens who placed their automobiles at the disposal of guests.

Resolutions

Your Committee feels that it is opportune to present the following special resolutions for the consideration and vote of the Conference:

WHEREAS, Our country now faces a serious international situation which will test the resources and patriotic spirit of the whole nation, and

WHEREAS, Special duties and special endeavors will be demanded from every individual and from every group of citizens to carry through successfully the great undertaking that involves the honor of our nation and the ultimate peace and welfare of the civilized world. Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction assembled at Montclair April 29th-May 1st, 1917, that the social workers of the State and of the nation have a peculiar and priceless service to perform in this crisis.

That there is a supreme need to maintain unimpaired throughout the war the various charitable and correctional agencies.

That Child Welfare will call for careful guardianship as never before.

That the women and children left unprotected and dependent because of the absence of husbands and fathers, be efficiently and adequately aided.

That the youth of both sexes left unprotected and exposed to

unusual temptations be made the object of our most particular solicitude and effort.

That in support of this critically important social work, this Conference hereby pledges its loyal and untiring efforts.

Be it Also Resolved, That this Conference recommends to all social workers full and active co-operation with State and National authorities seeking to increase agricultural products.

MRS. CAROLINE B. WITTPENN, Chairman,
REV. J. C. STOCK,
MR. RALPH ROSENBAUM,
MISS CORNELIA F. BRADFORD,
REV. J. C. WELLS,
DR. MADELEINE A. HALLOWELL,
PROF. FRANK A. FETTER.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

Mrs. G. W. B. Cushing, Chairman.
C. L. Stonaker
John A. Cullen
Prof. E. R. Johnstone
Rev. Walter Reid Hunt
A. W. MacDougall
Miss Margaret MacNaughton
Mrs. Leon Cubberly

See page —— for Officers, Executive Committee and Advisory Board of 1918 Conference.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

The New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction as Revised 1917

Adopted 1912. Revised 1913, 1916, 1917.

The objects of the New Jersey Conference of Charities and Correction are to afford an opportunity for those engaged in relief, reform and preventive work to confer respecting their methods, principles of administration and results accomplished, to diffuse reliable information respecting preventive, relief and correctional work, and encourage co-operation in humanitarian efforts, with the aim of further improving the system of prevention, care, relief and correction in the State of New Jersey.

The Conference shall not formulate any platform, nor adopt memoranda, nor adopt resolutions other than those of appreciation and thanks for services and courtesies to the Conference.

By-Laws

ARTICLE I.

Membership of the Conference.

All who have any active interest in the public or private relief or correctional work in New Jersey are invited to enroll themselves as members of the Conference. No other tests of membership shall be applied and no membership fee charged, the expenses of the Conference being met by voluntary contributions.

ARTICLE II.

Officers of the Conference.

The Conference shall have the following officers, to be elected annually: (1) A President, who shall preside over the session of the Conference and of the Executive Committee; be a member ex-officio of all committees, and with the assistance of the secretary, supervise the editing of the proceedings of the Conference.

The incoming President shall appoint a Nominating Committee of nine persons, which shall present its report on the last day of the annual conference, said committee having in the meantime through the Secretary of the Conference asked for suggestions as to the officers and the Executive Committee, from members of the Advisory Board.

(2) Six Vice-Presidents, who shall, at the request of the President, assist the President in the discharge of the President's duties, and, in case of the President's inability to serve, shall succeed the President in the order in which they are named.

(3) A Secretary, who shall keep the records, conduct the correspondence and distribute the papers and documents of the Conference, under the direction of the Executive Committee. He shall assist the President in editing the proceedings of the Conference and direct the work of the Assistant Secretaries. The Secretary shall be a member ex-officio of all committees.

(4) Three Assistant Secretaries, who shall assist the Secretary of the Conference, at his request, and work under his direction.

5. A Treasurer, who shall receive all moneys of the Conference and disburse the same, upon vouchers duly certified by the Secretary, the expenditure having been approved by the President.

ARTICLE III.

Committees of the Conference.

(1) An Executive Committee, which shall consist of fifteen members to be elected at the annual meeting, five to be chosen for one year, five for two years, and five for three years, and thereafter all elective members shall be elected for a term of three years. The Conference at its annual meetings shall elect members to fill vacancies for the unexpired terms respectively. The President, Secretary, Treasurer, and the State Commissioner of Charities and Corrections, shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee shall have charge of all business relating to the Conference, and may appoint such other committees as it may deem desirable, except the Auditing Committee.

The Executive Committee may assign time and place on the program or otherwise authorize section meetings of organizations or groups on terms to be approved by said committee. Programs of section meetings shall be subject to the Executive Committee's approval before printing in a preliminary or official program, and no publication of proceedings of section meetings in the annual report of the Conference shall be allowed without first having the approval of the Executive Committee. Reasonable time for discussion from the floor is to be provided.

The Executive Committee shall arrange that no other meetings shall be held at headquarters than those first approved by the committee.

(2) An Advisory Board of not more than forty members to be elected annually by the Conference for a term of one year, who shall as far as possible be representative of all societies and agencies throughout the State interested in and affiliated in any way with the purposes of the Conference. The Advisory Board shall be invited to sit with the Executive Committee at its first two meetings and participate in the deliberations, and at other meetings at the request of the President.

(3) An Auditing Committee, which shall consist of three (3) members, to be elected annually by the Conference, to serve the same year and report to the next Conference.

Index.