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LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1919.

Sir:

Herewith are submitted the proceedings of a conference on Child Welfare Standards recently held under the auspices of the Children's Bureau as the conclusion of its Children's Year program.

Children's Year, as the second year of the war was called in this connection, grew out of the studies made by the Children's Bureau of child welfare abroad under war conditions. It was seen that, under circumstances of such difficulty as we happily can not conceive, the civilian population of Europe were achieving new laws for the protection of childhood, new ideals for the future development of the race. It was felt that the second year of the war in the United States ought to show a popular sense of responsibility for child welfare in some degree commensurate with our opportunities. Hence a program was stated briefly in the Fifth Annual Report of the Children's Bureau, which was adopted by the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense and, for the purpose of carrying it forward, an organization of the great bodies of women associated under that committee was effected by a specially created Child Welfare Department, of which Dr. Jessica B. Peixotto was the secretary.

When the President wrote a letter approving Children's Year, he concluded with the following statement:

"I trust that the work may so successfully develop as to set up certain irreducible minimum standards for the health, education, and work of the American child."

So that this conference was a natural part of Children's Year, and by means of a special allotment from the President's fund, and with your approval, it was held. It was felt that the presence at the conference of guests who were engaged in the practical protection of children under war conditions in the allied countries would be an invaluable stimulus to this country.
The following guests from abroad attended the conference at your invitation:

Sir Arthur Newsholme, late Principal Medical Officer of the Local Government Board, England.

Mrs. Eleanor Barton, of the Women's Cooperative Guild, England, an organization of the wives of British wage earners.

Mr. Ronald C. Davison, Director of the Juvenile Labour Exchanges of England.

Sir Cyril Jackson, Board of Education, England.

Dr. Clothilde Mulon, War Department, France, who has done special work in the supervision of industrial creches during the war.

Dr. René Sand, Professor of Social and Industrial Medicine at the University of Brussels, and Adviser on Medical Inspection of the Ministry of Labor.

Miss L. E. Carter, Principal of High School C, Brussels.

Mr. Isador Maus, Director of the Division of Child Protection, Ministry of Justice, Belgium.

Mr. Takayuki Namaye, Department of Interior, Japan, in charge of reformatory and relief work and the protection of children.

Dr. Radmila Milochevitch Lazarevitch, from Serbia, a physician and leader in social service activities.

Dr. Fabio Frassetto, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Bologna, Italy.

Their coming to this country to attend the conference gave signal proof of the new international sense of responsibility for child welfare. The generosity and graciousness with which each individual has assisted the conference is gratefully recognized.

This conference consisted not of a single meeting, but of a series of regional conferences, eight in number, beginning with one in Washington, May 5, 1919. Following the Washington conference, meetings were held in New York, Cleveland, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Seattle. In addition, certain of the foreign guests were speakers at various national associations, such as the Southern Sociological Congress, the National Conference of Social Work, the National Women's Trade Union League.

Because of the crowded living conditions in Washington, it was practicable to invite to the Washington conference only a small number of American experts upon the different subjects considered, and the discussions were of an informal round-table character. The attendance at the regional conferences was large and representative.

Naturally somewhat varying views of method and approach are presented by the different authorities whose contributions make up this volume. On the great essentials of a child-welfare policy for the nation there is, however, marked agreement. Public responsibility for the
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growing generation, confidence in constructive measures, insistence upon greater uniformity in laws, and upon the necessity of enlisting able and devoted citizens to carry on both public and private child-welfare activities, are all steadily emphasized. At the end of the Washington conference the tentative child-welfare standards which appear in this book were agreed upon. They were printed and distributed for discussion by the regional conferences and a committee was named to revise them in the light of criticisms and suggestions which might be received from the later conferences and from other interested citizens and associations.

This committee consists of Dr. Hastings H. Hart, of the Russell Sage Foundation, New York City; Mrs. Ira Couch Wood, of Chicago, Director of the Elizabeth McCormick Memorial Fund; Mr. Owen R. Lovejoy, of the National Child Labor Committee, New York City; Dr. H. L. K. Shaw, of the State Department of Health of New York, Albany; and Mrs. Helen Sumner Woodbury, of Chicago.

The Bureau invited the head of the Public Health Service, Dr. Rupert Blue, and the Commissioner of Education, Dr. P. P. Claxton, to act with it as a Committee of Arrangements.

Miss Grace Abbott was the secretary of the conference, and Mr. William L. Chenery has written the general summary and, assisted by Miss Ella A. Merritt, has prepared this volume of proceedings for publication.

Respectfully submitted, Julia C. Lathrop, Chief.

Hon. William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor.
Section IV

Children in Need of Special Care

(The minimum standards for the protection of children in need of special care adopted by the Washington Conference will be found on pages 440-444.)
I wish at the outset to offer three fundamental points regarding the nature of human society; and to follow them by some considerations touching the responsibility of the State for children who stand in need of special care.

First: It is necessary to the advancement of any community that the forthcoming generation be superior physically and mentally to the generation out of which it springs.

Second: Consequently, organized society owes to the growing child who is in need of special care sufficient protection to render reasonably probable his upgrowth to the age of self-support with physical health and intellectual attainment equal to that of the average child in the community.

Third: The history of mankind shows that the monogamous union of one man and one woman for the purpose of procreation and the rearing of their offspring is a natural evolution extending over a geologic age; that it stands, under the short name of the "family," as the vehicle and the basis of our social order. Hence it is the proper channel through which the average opportunity for development which I have just mentioned is to be sought.

The various course of history—the growth of early communities, the rise and fall of empires, the up-spring and decline of communistic experiments—shows these three fundamentals to be sound.

What then, in specific form, is the responsibility of organized society—the state—toward those of its children who need special care,—the dependent, the neglected, the delinquent, and the defective.

Successful community life presupposes that the individual will support himself after reaching the age when he is physically able to do so; and that parents will support their offspring through infancy and childhood until they can become self-supporting. The first boundary mark of this responsibility of the state, then, is negative; namely, that no policy should be inaugurated or practice carried out which deprives the child of the care, comfort, and affection of his parents; or which tends unnecessarily to relieve the parent of the natural burden of supporting and fostering his child.
With these points in mind, I wish to discuss this state responsibility in the light of the experience of Massachusetts. The primary unit of government in that State is the Town, with its selectmen and its town meeting. City government is an elaboration of this ancient town system, subject to the principles of town law. County government exists, but its functions are so far circumscribed that it may be termed for the most part a judicial unit merely. All poor relief is administered locally, in the first instance, always by cities and towns. The overseer of the poor, a local officer, is the agency through which the government takes notice of dependency. The State treasury is called upon for reimbursement of aid rendered where the child is without legal settlement. The State has an elaborate and complicated settlement law.

THE DEPENDENT CHILD

In Massachusetts, public aid to children whose only handicap is a failure of support is given almost exclusively in the child's own home. Since September 1, 1913, when the Mothers' Aid Law became operative, assistance in the home, given mostly in cash and totalling $3,886,678.58, exclusive of administrative expenses, has been given to 7,651 mothers, in order, as the law states, to enable them to bring up their 24,464 dependent children under 14 years of age in their own homes. Under other relief laws, overseers of the poor render temporary aid in the home to many children where sickness, accident, or other cause has cut off natural support. According to law, the State board of charity may receive dependent children for support, but they are not now taken where dependency is the only cause. The dependent children now in the board's custody are those who have been orphaned, neglected, abandoned, or abused.

The illegitimate child falls within the group of dependents. For him the family has failed. It is the obligation of the State to guarantee to the illegitimate as much of its family rights as can be preserved. Thus, it has a right to its mother's affection and personal care. Hence, mother and child should not be separated in cases where the mother has a passable degree of intelligence. The illegitimacy statute of Massachusetts makes illegitimate paternity a crime. It protects the man by requiring proof beyond a reasonable doubt, as in any other crime. It imposes upon the father as much responsibility for the support of his offspring as is required of the legitimate parent. The parties in interest are the public and the child.

Considering the responsibility of the State for the dependent child, I submit that when the normal child, through the loss of parents or for other reason not due to its own conduct, is deprived of its natural home and the support necessary to its growth, the State owes the positive obligation of transplanting it to a foster family home as the best sub-
THE NEGLECTED CHILD

The neglected child is dependent and should be treated according to that standard. But the family, of which it is the most valuable part, is an offender against society. The parents are delinquent. The State, obliged as it is to safeguard the institution of the family, owes a positive duty to punish and to correct parental neglect of children.

Only as a last resort should the family be broken up. Compulsion under non-support and desertion laws can do much. The 155 probation officers of our 88 Massachusetts courts of first instance collected in 1918 from non-supporting husbands and fathers and from persons who failed to support their aged parents a total of over $485,000 and turned it over to the dependents of those backsliders. The item for the support of aged parents is probably less than ten per cent of the whole. The State board of charity collected $25,936.02 in the same period from parents of children who by court order or through other provisions of the law had been placed in the custody of that board.

When the child is removed because of neglect, that act of severance should be accompanied by all practicable compulsion of the parental responsibility for support. The Uniform Desertions Act should be in force in every State in the Union. It declares wilful failure to support to be an offense. It makes that offense extraditable. It makes it possible to commit the offending parent to hard labor, the government repaying to the dependents a sum per day for his labor. A charge of neglect should lie against the offending parties only. It should not, as in Massachusetts, be brought as though it were a charge against the child. The little fellow, innocent as your child or mine, stands wide-eyed before the court wondering why he is so accused. Seen through his eyes, poverty is a great sorrow, but neglect is tragedy.

THE DELINQUENT CHILD

Delinquency among children arises, as I apprehend, from two chief sources: (a) bad environment; and (b) abnormal mental development or mental defect. Its treatment must follow widely divergent channels in accordance with the one cause or the other. If the cause is environment, the child should not be removed from the family until the full possibilities of court probation have been exhausted and every effort made to correct the home conditions. This effort may take the form of moving the family bodily to another district. In these environmental problems, the child is found often to do well when placed in a foster family home. Very many wayward children coming out of wrong home conditions do well after probation when placed out
in families. The State Board in Massachusetts has 304 such children in family homes under the supervision of field visitors. All of them came to the board as delinquents and none of them has been in an institution for delinquents.

Where the child’s conduct is such as to demand custodial care, he should be sent to an industrial training school which is developed on the cottage plan and to which is attached an effective parole system—so that the child may be placed out as soon as his conduct appears to warrant so much confidence. There are three such schools in Massachusetts, two for boys and one for girls. They contain 1,145 inmates, and there are 2,831 other children who have been in these schools and who are now placed out in family homes or who are with their parents on parole. These remain still under the custody of the trustees of the schools.

THE DEFECTIVE CHILD

The defective child is almost always a dependent. He is often neglected, and he is in very many cases a delinquent. His defective mind indicates at the outset small likelihood that he will be able to adjust himself to his surroundings to the satisfaction of society. The insane and the feeble-minded in Massachusetts are cared for by the State Government. A feeble-minded person is committed to institutional care in much the same manner that an insane person is committed. There are two schools for the feeble-minded, now housing 2,806. A third has been authorized, but is not yet ready. There are over 1,000 persons on the waiting list for admittance to these schools. Over 100 of these remain constantly at the State Infirmary, which is the State’s almshouse, where they do not belong.

The defective child does not necessarily need institutional care in all cases. Estimating approximately 15,000 feeble-minded persons in Massachusetts, there is a strong likelihood that almost half of these will not need restraint in an institution. This proportion will readily obtain among the children. Either they are found to have watchful and helpful relatives; or they are of such low grade that they do not come within the dangerous class of breeders. For whatever reason may appear, they are not a menace to the public welfare. All these should be supervised in their own homes by the State Government.

Research discovers that feeble-mindedness is transmitted by inheritance in about three-fourths of all cases. Consequently, the great menace caused by this group is that of procreation. The State owes the positive obligation of protecting itself against the transmission of demonstrated hereditary mental defect. This duty it will carry out in the way that is most humane. Our present method is segregation of the sexes.
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For the defective child who is not feeble-minded, institutional training can do much, and so long as there is reasonable hope of returning him to the community with enough capacity or sufficient mental habit to get along without endangering society, his care in the institution should include vocational training.

The condition of feeble-mindedness is not curable, though it is improvable, within narrow limits, in the direction of self-support. It must follow that institutional care of feeble-minded children should seek to fit them for such occupation as their capacity will admit; and for the rest, should make them as nearly self-supporting in the institution as humane treatment will permit. Where facilities for care are inadequate to meet the need, preference should be given in the admittance of cases to the institution to the feeble-minded girl with sex tendencies, as she represents the greatest threat to society.

Research discovers another vital fact about feeble-mindedness, namely, that it never develops in adult life. Where present, it must have existed either from birth or from early childhood. This fact, together with that other finding on heredity, should point the line of responsibility for the State. American childhood has a right to be protected in adolescence. More than this, it has a right to be well born. The State will not have protected itself in any true sense until it shall have approached its child problems with a view to preventing them—until in the case of the feeble-minded, it shall have sought out the defective in the days of his childhood, at the outset of his career, and before he has created problems of illegitimacy, of venereal disease, of crime, and of tragedy for every heart along his trail of anti-social conduct.

I have mentioned here and there the experience of Massachusetts in these problems. Last year the Government, State and local, exclusive of the maintenance of the 5 county training schools, expended approximately $3,230,289 in the care, custody, and treatment of the children of these several classifications. Yet that was not the only contribution. Large sums were expended by private incorporated child-caring agencies. There are 110 of these corporations in Massachusetts. Forty-five are congregate homes for children, some of them with placing-out systems attached. Fourteen do only placing-out. Twenty-seven are day nurseries, and nine are special hospitals for sick children. The total capital funds of the 90 of these societies that reported are $15,906,882. Last year they rendered child care in 106,717 instances at a total expenditure of $1,833,170. They received from or on account of beneficiaries $428,455 and from investments and all other sources $1,496,121, making a grand total of $1,924,576 received. The State board of charity has 6,440 children in its custody, and of these 5,531 are in foster family homes. The total expenditure last
year for the care of these children, including administration and tuition in the public schools, was $925,010.

One may rightly inquire in view of my insistence upon a positive responsibility in Government itself, what is the function and the responsibility of the private charitable agency in child care. That true relationship I take to be this: The primary obligation rests upon organized society—the state itself. The care of children needing special care is therefore a function of the State. The private agency, in fact as well as in law, is a public trust, performing a function of Government. To borrow the words of our greatest judicial definition of charity, the private agency in its operation is "relieving the burdens of Government." ¹ Hence the process of child care, whether it be public or private, is based upon those same fundamental elements of responsibility which rest upon organized society, and must therefore conform to identical standards.

¹Gray, J., in Jackson vs. Phillips, 14 Allen, 539, at p. 556.
STATE SUPERVISION OF AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS

By C. V. WILLIAMS

Director, Children's Welfare Department, Board of State Charities, Ohio

The humanitarian impulses manifested by the majority of the people of the country have been responsible to a large degree for the commercializing of physically handicapped or unfortunate children by unscrupulous individuals. In States where there is no regulation of child-caring agencies, persons utterly unfit are permitted to exploit these defenseless children for their own gain. In some such States a fearful traffic in infants is carried on through so-called maternity hospitals or lying-in homes where adoptions or abortions may be had for a consideration.

Everybody recognizes the necessity of securing the elimination of these human parasites from the community, but I am of the opinion that of even greater harm is the operation of institutions by well-meaning but incompetent men and women who retain the standards of a generation ago. Some of these institutions are well supported, and are tolerated in the community because nobody wants to hurt the manager's feelings. The health and happiness of thousands of children is sacrificed because of the failure of the State to secure the protection of these children through a system of State regulation which will demand minimum standards of efficiency from every child-caring agency.

To be specific I will cite a few conditions common to States where there is no provision for the supervision of child-caring agencies. Only the greatest care will prevent the best-managed institutions in the land from becoming a "dumping ground" for parents who do not care to support their children or for agencies that summarily and unnecessarily separate children from their parents. A large number of so-called dependent or delinquent children have been separated from parents because of their delinquency which has been due to conditions for which the community is responsible. With the development of a program of service for the family, a large number of these homes can be reclaimed and the children returned to their parents. Only constructive State supervision can prevent the needless detention of children in institutions.

A practice common today in many institutions smacks of conditions existing a generation ago. Respectable and worthy mothers are compelled to relinquish all right, and claim, and title to their children in
order that they may receive the care of some of our public and private child-caring institutions. The social crime of this procedure is overlooked by the enterprising, ambitious agent of the Home, who is more interested in finding an attractive child for a prospective foster parent than in recognizing the God-given rights of an unfortunate woman who at the moment is neither physically nor mentally responsible for her conduct.

State regulation is necessary to humanize some institutions to which these children are committed and where children are practically buried for many of the most important years of their lives. Their timidity, their rat-like faces, their undernourished bodies, their closely cropped heads, their frightened though eager and hungry look, reveal something of that great though unsatisfied longing for parental care, which of course institutions cannot give. They become a part of a system; their individuality is consequently dwarfed, and though maintained at great expense, a large number of these children can never overcome the baneful influences incident to this early training.

Many of these children still eat their meals while sitting upon backless benches. The use of the oilcloth table cover, of ironware or tin dishes, and of spoons instead of knives and forks, does not contribute to their training in proper table manners.

Tooth brushes in some of these institutions are unknown. Infectious diseases are communicated through the use of a common towel. Three or four children frequently sleep together in one bed. Much immorality prevails, as dormitory supervision is lacking and the mingling of the sexes is frequent. In many well-supported children’s institutions, that invention of the devil, the “silent regime,” still prevails. Here the children eat their meals in silence, march from one room to another in silence with hands behind their backs, and sit in their playrooms in silence, doing nothing. In many institutions there is no attention whatever given to remediable physical defects of children who remain wards for long periods of time. Some institutions boast that the physician rarely comes—that it is not necessary.

One of the greatest problems requiring standardization is the system employed by agencies engaged in the placing of children in foster families. I have personal knowledge of the ease with which persons physically and morally unfit have secured even from so-called substantial organizations the custody of homeless children. I know that many of these children have not only been placed in unfit homes, but that they have subsequently been literally abandoned by the officials who were entrusted with their care and guardianship. I also know that the lives of great numbers of these children have been irreparably blighted because of the failure of the State to secure their protection through a competent system of State supervision.
In many of these institutions the records concerning the children and their antecedents have been mislaid or lost; nor is there information available concerning the manner in which some of the children have been disposed of. Nobody knows where they have been placed, and supervision is rendered impossible. The futile efforts of children who have reached their majority, who seek to ascertain something concerning their family history or their relatives, is sufficient commentary on the seriousness of this neglect.

It is highly significant that nearly every State has developed some system for the protection of neglected children. Provision has been made for courts of certain jurisdiction to remove neglected children from the custody of their own parents and to award their guardianship either to public or to private child-caring agencies during their minority. However, it so happens that sometimes the children thus legally and properly removed from their own parents are legally placed in the care of an institution or agency even less competent to care for them than are their parents.

In outlining the scope of supervision, I would consider that the responsibility of the State for the standardizing of child-caring agencies should apply to the same extent to private as to public institutions. The State is more interested in the nature of the treatment afforded these unfortunate children than in the auditing of financial accounts to ascertain whether or not the funds of public agencies have been wisely expended.

The Ohio law provides for the supervision by the Board of State Charities of all institutions or associations, public or private, incorporated or otherwise, that receive children or that place children in foster homes. All of these institutions are subject to inspection and endorsement by the State department and a penalty is provided for the non-observance of this statute. The Board of State Charities is required to pass upon the manner in which the wards of these institutions are cared for and also to examine into the systems employed in the admission and discharge of children and their placement in foster homes. It is required to visit such children as have been placed out in foster homes by the agencies under supervision as, in the judgment of the board, may be necessary to determine the actual character of the work accomplished by the agency.

The present legislature has also provided for the licensing of all boarding homes in the State where private families care for children not related by blood or marriage for "hire, gain or reward." This law will make it possible not only to reach the "baby farms," but also to regulate the activities of individuals, who in the past, without any board of managers, have been exploiting children. The Ohio law also provides that the Board of State Charities shall pass upon the merits of all in-
stitutions or associations desiring to incorporate, whose objects may include the care of children or their placement in foster homes. This provision has enabled the board to prevent the incorporation of useless and even vicious organizations.

The Ohio law is weak, however, in that it makes no provision for the supervision of children who are placed out in foster homes by juvenile court judges. Nor has it jurisdiction over the operation of the humane societies which engage exclusively in the enforcement of the anti-cruelty laws. These agencies are just as greatly in need of standardization and regulation as the recognized child-caring associations, and should be included in the development of a State supervisory program.

State supervision, to be constructive, must be sympathetically exercised. Any investigator can find abundant opportunity for criticism in the best ordered institutions. It becomes therefore a task necessitating unusual tact and discretion to secure needful corrections without dissipating the altruistic activities of the trustees. The State is as greatly concerned in the conservation and the development of the initiative of managers and trustees as it is in the correction of the abuses of their institutions. It is therefore necessary to employ in this service only such persons as are able to maintain a properly balanced perspective, who have an understanding of children, and who understand the technique of case work and family rehabilitation and at least the fundamentals of institutional administration. The investigators must have a profound sympathy for the children concerned, and a vision as to the possibilities of their future. Such investigators will readily impress the officials in charge of the institutions of their desire to be of real service in the solving of the institution’s problems. They will be able to advise with the superintendent sensibly concerning the creating of a normal atmosphere in the institution. They will be able to secure for the children the recreational, the vocational, the physical, the social, the educational, and the religious opportunities so frequently denied. If the low standards of the institution have been due to ignorance, the investigator should remain in the institution long enough to work out a program consistent with available resources. If the institution’s standards are sacrificed because of the necessity of keeping within a low per capita, it becomes the privilege of the investigator, through the development of educational propaganda, to secure for the institution needful financial support. The State will make a serious mistake if in the exercise of its police function, in the elimination of bad agencies, it forgets its greater opportunity in rendering helpful and constructive service to the weaker agencies under its supervision.

The State should establish a uniform record and blank system, and when desired, should assist in its installation. It should secure the registration of all of the wards of the public and private child-caring institu-
This can be readily accomplished through a system of monthly reporting on the movements of children, which can be readily posted on a card index. The supervision by the State of children who are placed in foster homes by child-caring institutions, is a task necessitating the exercise of unusual tact. The State is primarily interested in determining the fitness of the endorsed agency to engage in this work, and unnecessary duplication of effort should be avoided. Irreparable harm can come through the unnecessary visit of a tactless field agent. It is of far greater importance to the State that it secure the maintenance of the necessary standards incident to investigations, supervision, and records, from the supervised agencies, than it is to perform that function itself. When there is any indication of the failure of the agency adequately to perform this function, each of its wards should be visited, such as are found in improper homes removed, and a definite program created by the State which must be accepted by the institution as a minimum which will justify subsequent endorsement. Each institution should be required to develop a record system sufficiently intensive to satisfy the State investigator as to the type of work accomplished. This record kept on file in the office of the institution and available to properly accredited agents of the State supervisory board, should ordinarily furnish sufficient data for a determination as to the agency's fitness for endorsement.

The exercise of a supervisory prerogative unaccompanied by a penalty for violation is without great value. The Ohio law provides that any person who receives a child or solicits money on behalf of an unendorsed institution or association, upon conviction thereof, is subject to a fine. It has been the experience of the Ohio board that the civic pride of a community is in itself generally sufficient to accomplish certain reforms when the official family refuse to maintain proper standards. And I am of the opinion that better results are ultimately accomplished by confining the power of the State to its function of licensing or refusing to license than in actually giving to the State the control over the wards of the institution except where it is impossible otherwise to secure them proper care. The Ohio Board of State Charities has met with certain difficulties which are local in their nature, in securing the protection of the wards of unendorsed agencies who have been placed out in unfit homes. The State, having refused or revoked the license of an institution, can go no further, and the indifferent trustees permit the continuance of the neglect of these children. A remedy for this condition may ordinarily be found through the juvenile court judges or the courts exercising that jurisdiction in the counties where the children are neglected. The strongest possible pressure that can be brought to bear upon the officials is through local public opinion, and wisely directed sympathetic and constructive State propaganda.
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locally directed will in most instances accomplish the necessary reforms. It is a primary duty of the State to make the community see its problems, and then to treat them.

A supervisory board will early make a survey of the children's needs of the entire State. It will inform itself concerning the conditions prevailing in localities where there is a preponderance of child dependency and child delinquency and will develop community initiative to the end that the conditions producing these conditions will be changed. It will not only standardize and intensify the activities of the existing organizations under its supervision, but will assist in bringing into existence necessary agencies to meet the needs of children in neglected communities, and it will undertake to secure a coordination of all the agencies interested in human welfare. It will operate as a clearing house to which all problems concerning children may be referred. It will conduct community conferences, circulate educational literature, and take the initiative in the development of legislative programs. It will be a tremendous factor in the development of the thought that in the care of neglected children the State needs the service of every individual. It will undertake to dissipate the complacency of individuals based upon accomplishments for some of the children of the State, by directing their attention to the unfinished task; to the great multitude of children who, surrounded by vicious influences, will be driven into lives of delinquency unless protected, and to that large group of children found in every State who, because of physical or mental handicaps, are in special and imperative need. The State has an unquestioned responsibility not only in securing the protection of those who are cared for by existing agencies, but also in the development of a State-wide program which will recognize as its minimum of responsibility, the adequate protection of every child.

How long will the State remain indifferent to the needs of these defenseless children who deserve at least a chance to become useful citizens?

DISCUSSION

Miss H. Ida Curry (State Charities Aid Association, New York City): I am greatly interested in some of the suggestions Mr. Williams has made in regard to State supervision and State licensing, which is something in which I strongly believe, and which I should like to see extended very greatly in all of the States.

We have everything in New York, from the very best institution to the very backward institution; and I think that, in some of the towns where the backward organizations exist, we are sometimes in the position of waiting for somebody to die. As Mr. Williams has suggested, we fail to improve our methods because we do not want to hurt somebody's feelings—some person that helped to organize the institution.

And yet it was only a few years ago, that one little institution in New York State had a punishment closet built for the children, and had it painted black inside.
When the State Board of Charities objected to this, the board of the institution held a meeting and solemnly decided that they could not do away with the punishment closet, because they could think of no other mode of punishment for disobedient children. That was only about five years ago. But the other day a young woman, a member of that board of managers, came to our office and talked over a plan for selling that old-fashioned little building, in which they kept almost as prisoners about forty little children, and doing away with it in its present form. She discussed with us a plan for organizing a receiving home, which would receive the children accepted as public charges, find out what they really needed, and pass them on to a boarding home or to a special institution if they needed special care—in fact give each child what each needed.

Progress is being made, even in the more backward institutions. Certainly we do need, in most of the States, much more careful inspection of the placing-out work. The better organized placing-out agencies are probably doing as good work as can be done. But there are very many unsupervised agencies.

In a little maternity home of which I know, the physician is placing out children all the time. In one instance—we laid the facts before the authorities in this case—he placed out a child giving a false date of birth, making a false statement of the circumstances of the birth; the only name recorded on the adoption papers is the name of the foster parents; there are no names at all of the real parents of the child. Such instances still prevail in our old Eastern States, and I suppose in other States as well. We need more State supervision; we need State supervision in all work done for the children, both by private and by public agencies.

Mr. C. C. Carstens (General Secretary, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children): There is a question which, it seems to me, is coming into the social work for children and needs our very careful consideration during the next few years. There are States of the Union where the private agencies are practically doing all, or at least 75 per cent of the work. There are other States in the Union where public agencies are practically doing all, or, we will say, 75 per cent of the work. I know of State agencies that are in every way discouraging private agencies to get under way and to assist in doing the work. I know States where there are private agencies that in a good many ways are blocking the public work. I think it is time for us to find out where we stand on that question. What shall be the relation of the private agency to the public agency? There is a fundamental service that both can render. I do not mean that at this moment I am ready to give any outline of what it shall be. But I believe that we have got to do some thinking about it, and have some considerable discussion of it, so that we may have both, for I do not believe the development of any State, whether it is in the Middle West, the Far West, or the East, will be right unless there is a relationship growing up between public and private services so that they may supplement each other, and that neither shall think it its duty to kill off the other.

Mrs. Ada E. Sheffield (Director, Bureau on Illegitimacy, Boston, Massachusetts): I have worked on a public board, and I have had connections with quite a few private agencies. It has impressed me that boards of private agencies are, with few exceptions, looking for the promising cases; they like to see results; and of course, as the judge of the court of special sessions in New York once said to me, one can make work 100 per cent successful by taking up only the best cases.

It has been my opinion that, as between the two kinds of work, work for promising children and work for children that do not show promise on the face of things, the public agency is fairly well equipped to take care of the promising child.
It is not well equipped to take care of the difficult child, who needs close intensive study and experimenting—trying-out of methods that the State has not yet taken over. That seems to me to be the only excuse for having private agencies. At present, the boards of private agencies are not interested in that kind of work; but it is my own opinion that they could be brought to be interested in it. That would give the excuse for having private agencies. The latter are going to be asked, before a great while, what their function is. Why should we give money to those agencies, when we pay taxes to maintain the public agencies? Under such a division of functions, private agencies would fill a genuine need.

Dr. Hastings H. Hart (Russell Sage Foundation, New York City): I am convinced not only that we need public supervision, but that we need supervision of some of our supervisors. The truth is that a good many people who have that responsibility laid upon them have not yet got a conception of what is meant. What we need is to get supervisors in these institutions to study their jobs.
CHILD WELFARE WORK IN JAPAN

By TAKAYUKI NAMAYE

Department of Interior, Japan

Ellen Key said that the twentieth century was the century of the child. It is well said, for the world is beginning to realize the importance of children's welfare as never before. The protection of children is demanded not only from the consideration of humanity, but also from the self-evident truth that the future welfare of society and nation at large depends upon the healthy minds and bodies of the present children. It is the realization of this fact that has made the question of children's welfare a social and national problem from the latter half of the nineteenth century up to the present time. The fact that a bureau for children's welfare was organized in the American Labor Department about six years ago, although many States at that time had highly efficient organizations for children's welfare work, must have been due to the same consideration.

Japan is not behind other nations in appreciating the importance of children's welfare; but our means for promoting it are far inferior to those of America and the nations of Europe. Various circumstances, customs, and habits are responsible for the poor accommodations; but it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss them. I shall confine myself chiefly to stating what regulations and provisions different departments have in regard to child welfare, and give explanations and personal views only occasionally. The departments that supervise children's welfare are the Department of Interior and the Departments of Education, of Justice, and of Agriculture and Commerce. In discussing children's welfare work, it is convenient, therefore, to divide it as it is divided by the departments.

THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Children's welfare work under the Department of Interior may be divided into two classes; namely, that which is regulated by law and that which is not.

Under the first class we have (1) the provisions of the Poor Law concerning the children of the poor, (2) the Foundling Act, and (3) the Reformatory Act.

(1) The Poor Law was enacted in Japan in 1874, and the provision in question states that the forlorn children under thirteen years of age...
shall be given rice at the rate of three bushels and a half per year, and states also that the children who, although not strictly forlorn, have no relatives under seventy and above fifteen years of age, and are in distressing condition, shall receive the same amount of rice as that allowed to the forlorn children. It is hardly necessary to say that this method of relief is very primitive and the recipients necessarily very few. The expenses are to be paid by the national treasury; but as a matter of fact the local public corporations supply the deficiency, which amounts to a considerable sum, although their legal responsibility in the matter ends with the actual carrying out of the relief measures.

The latest statistics, which are those of 1917, will give a general idea about the amount of expenses and the number of recipients, as they have not increased or decreased to any great extent in late years.

Government expense .................................................. Y 3,070
Local expense supplementary to the government expense ...... Y 8,452
Local expense ............................................................. Y 23,630

Total  ............................................................................. Y 35,152

The total number of children cared for was 1,203, of whom 213 were cared for at government expense and 990 at local expense or at local expense supplementary to government expense.

It should be noticed that, although the local public corporations are not required by law to provide money for the relief of the poor children, the actual financial assistance given by them to the relief work is comparatively large, as the government allowance is insufficient, its policy being to let them take the matter as much as possible into their own hands.

(2) The Foundling Act was passed in 1871, and is the oldest of the relief enactments now in force in Japan. The original act enjoined that three bushels and a half of rice per year should be given to each foundling until he reached his fifteenth year; but in 1873 the age limit was reduced from fifteen to thirteen, and has remained so ever since.

The number of foundlings found in Japan in a year is very small compared to those found in any of the European countries within the same length of time,—a fact of which Japan can be proud. For illustration the number of foundlings for several recent years may be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foundlings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for the five years</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹A yen is worth approximately fifty cents.
In a country possessing a population of more than sixty millions, only two hundred and forty-six foundlings a year is indeed a very small proportion. One might suspect that this scarcity of foundlings may be due to the strangling of infants or to abortion; but now such crimes are seldom perpetrated in Japan, though in the past they seem to have been quite frequent. In 1916, the total number of the foundlings under the protection of this law was 1,733, and the total expense for them Y 66,826. The foundlings being so few, it is scarcely necessary to have separate asylums for them; so the public corporations put them under the care of orphan asylums.

It will be seen that the total number of the children under the protection of the Poor Law and the Foundling Act is about 2,930 for a year, and the aggregate sum of expenses for them only about Y 101,970. European and American specialists may, no doubt, wonder at these small figures; but I believe that the chief causes are the following facts:

(a) The Japanese Poor Law is extremely retrenching.
(b) Social consciousness of the necessity of supporting the poor has not yet dawned.
(c) The spirit of mutual help is quite strong.
(d) The strong solidarity of the family system.
(e) The strictness of legal responsibility of parents to take care of their children.
(f) The natural kindness of Japanese people towards children.
(g) The comparatively small disparity between the rich and the poor.

(3) The Reformatory Act was first enacted in 1900 and was amended in 1908. The act requires each prefecture to establish reform schools to take in delinquent children under eighteen years of age, the upper age-limit of the inmate being twenty. The bulk of the expense is to be paid by the prefecture; but one-half of the expenses required in founding reform schools and one-sixth of running expenses are to be granted from the National treasury.

There are 54 local reform schools in Japan at present. They are divided into two kinds, public and private. The public reform schools are 28 in number, the private ones 26. The total number of inmates of all these reform schools at the end of 1917 was about 2,100, of which about 500 were taken in during that same year. They are mostly treated under the family system or under a system which is a combination of the family system and the dormitory system. One hundred and fifty is the largest number of inmates that a reform school has at present, and 9 or 10 is the smallest. Under the family system, about 10 inmates are taken in as a rule and the master and mistress or nurses look after
They are given some elementary school lessons in the morning and some practical lessons in the afternoon, mostly in agriculture and manual labor. We have no accurate statistics as yet on the results of these efforts; but we can say that 70 per cent of the inmates come out of the reform schools much improved. The total expense in 1917 was Y 246,886, of which Y 44,000 was Government subsidy.

Besides the local reform schools, there is one national reform school which was opened in March of this year. The number of inmates is limited to 100. A training school for officers and staffs for reform schools in general is to be established in this institution.

The special feature of our Reformatory Act is that the executive department, and not the judicial, is the one that places the delinquent children in the reform schools. This is because we believe that the purpose of placing delinquent children in reform schools is not to punish or imprison them, but to educate and improve them, and to make them decent members of society. It is, therefore, the prefectural governor who issues the orders to be served upon those whom he thinks it to be advisable to put under the care of a reform school. This is a procedure which is seldom seen in other countries.

The reasons why there are only about 2,000 delinquent children in more than 50 reform schools are (1) the scarcity of delinquent children in Japan, and (2) the inadequacy of the Reformatory Act. The Government is contemplating a revision of the act to make it more effective.

Under the welfare work not regulated by the law, we have (1) orphan asylums, (2) day nurseries, (3) the Committee on Social Affairs for work on the Bureau of Local Affairs, (4) the Committee on Investigation of Health and Sanitation, and (5) the Lectures on Sanitation for Women.

(1) Orphan Asylums.—The origin of orphanages in Japan was more than ten centuries ago; but it is unnecessary to dwell upon its long and obscure history. I shall speak only of the orphanage work since the Restoration of 1868. The first orphan asylum built in Japan in the Meiji era was started by a French Catholic nun in 1874. This orphanage has been making great efforts for poor and orphan girls for the past 45 years and takes the first rank among the orphan asylums in Japan in the number of children taken in, which is over 4,100. Besides this, one of the best known asylums in Japan is the Okayama Orphan Asylum, which was started by the late Juji Ishii, who had been greatly inspired by George Muller. This is widely known as the model orphanage in Japan.

There are at present 138 orphan asylums with 6,500 inmates. Their aggregate expense for a year is about Y 420,000. Their properties are estimated at more than Y 2,000,000. They are, with very few
exceptions, private enterprises founded by some benevolent person; and in financial matters they are always hard pressed because there are not enough of public orphan asylums to relieve the private ones of their burdens. It is true that the Department of Interior subsidizes, to some extent, such institutions as are doing excellent work, and each prefecture gives some financial aid to those that are within its jurisdiction, out of the interest on the common fund of Y 5,000,000, which was granted by the Imperial Household; and the money that comes from public corporations when they give the charge of foundlings to orphan asylums is of some help. But all these aids are far from being sufficient to enable orphanage workers to carry on their work as they wish.

There are now about 700 charitable institutions in Japan, and there are indications that they will increase year after year. It seems that Christianity is responsible for this stirring up of the public conscience. There are more than 70 charitable institutions under the management of Christians, and 30 of these are for orphan children. But charitable institutions are not monopolized by Christians by any means. In fact, Buddhists have more than 80 of them under their management, and their institutions for orphan children also outnumber those conducted by Christians. It should be mentioned here as a tribute of praise to both Christians and Buddhists that, though they differ in their religion, they are working hand in hand for the cause of charity.

The unweaned orphans are mostly placed under the care of farmers' families and when they reach school age they are, as a rule, taken into the regular orphanage. In Japan the farming population is very large as compared with the city population, and there is not much difficulty, therefore, in finding suitable families among farmers to whom to entrust these children, and the result has been excellent. Those who can not be placed in families are taken into the regular orphan asylums where they are now mostly treated under the family system, though in the past they used to be treated under the dormitory system. The orphan asylums conducted under the family system have from ten to fifteen inmates with a nurse or a master and mistress to look after them.

(2) Day Nurseries.—The first day nursery in Japan was established by the Kobe Women's Public Service Association during the Russo-Japanese war. At that time when it was necessary to support the poor families of soldiers who went to the front by giving them some work, and to enable mothers with small children to work they hit upon the idea of the day nursery and immediately some hundred day nurseries sprang up in different parts of Japan; but soon after the war all except one or two closed. Lately, however, their necessity was felt again owing to the demands of the times, and as a matter of fact they are increasing rapidly in number compared with other charitable institutions. Almost all the day nurseries in Japan are private establish-
ments. They are divided into creche and infant schools. The former take both the unweaned and infants, the latter the infants only. The four day nurseries managed by the War Memorial Day Nursery Association of Kobe, and the Samegahashi Infant School of Tokyo are among the best known in Japan. There are over fifty day nurseries now and over three thousand infants taken care of by them. The total expense is more than ¥ 50,000. In every day nursery great care is taken about the health of the children.

In Japan there is very little settlement work; but in the day nurseries they have family meetings from time to time, and they even visit the poor families and encourage them to save money and give other advice. In this way they are doing a sort of settlement work to the great benefit of the poor. Though the day nurseries have been only recently organized, their good work is already appreciated by the public.

(3) Committee on Social Affairs.—The Japanese Government, in view of the tendency of the times, deemed it advisable to make investigations about the social conditions, both at home and abroad, with the purpose of availing itself of the suggestions obtained from the investigations in coping with problems that may arise in the future, and organized a committee on social affairs, consisting of twenty members, partly selected high officials of the Government and partly experts who have special knowledge and experience on such matters. The committee makes investigations about such matters as are requested by the Minister of the Department of Interior, and makes reports giving its views on them. The scope of investigation is quite extensive. At the last year’s meeting the subjects brought for discussion were the public market, the housing problem, the employment bureau, the adjustment of capital and labor, and others. The committee is to make a thorough investigation of children’s welfare work in the near future with the purpose of aiding those institutions already in existence and of establishing new ones.

From time immemorial the Japanese have had the custom of ancestor worship and even now they attach a peculiar importance to the notion of “family,” and children as future successors to the “family” are treated with great care. They are regarded literally as family treasures. A well-known old Japanese poem says:

Silver, gold and precious stone,
What are they in comparison
With a daughter and son?

Traveling through any part of Japan you will see images of Gods and Goddesses which are regarded as protectors of children. From this superstition also you can see how solicitous they are for children’s welfare. At any rate, the birth rate is always on the increase, and Japan does not have to resort to a premium system for the encouragement of
childbirth as in other countries. The following statistics show that not only does the birth rate exceed the death rate, but it is also steadily increasing every year—a phenomenon seldom seen in any other country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Birth Rate</th>
<th>Death Rate</th>
<th>Rate of Increase of Population per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1,058,137</td>
<td>753,456</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1,335,125</td>
<td>876,837</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1,614,472</td>
<td>1,016,798</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1,737,674</td>
<td>1,037,016</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics for 1910 show that the number of births exceeded that of deaths by over 700,000.

But though we are very optimistic about the birth rate we are somewhat alarmed about the death rate of babes and infants, for it has been increasing in the past except in very recent years, as can be seen in the following statistics on the death rate of the unweaned less than one year old.

The following figures show the yearly average ratio of these deaths for every hundred births:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Age 1-2 Years</th>
<th>Age 2-5 Years</th>
<th>Age 0-5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1886-1890</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1895</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1900</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1905</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1910</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The slight decrease in the death rate as shown in the last two figures may be due to the efforts which the Government has been making of late years.

The average death rate per hundred children over one year and below five years of age is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Age 1-2 Years</th>
<th>Age 2-5 Years</th>
<th>Age 0-5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1889-1893</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-1898</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1903</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-1908</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures show that the death rate of children under five years of age has not materially decreased, but is still about twice as high as that of some European countries. It is a regrettable fact that notwithstanding this enormous death rate of children there are very few private enterprises to combat this problem. At present there is only one mothers' consultation society in Tokyo and another in Osaka. There are hospitals for children, the circuit hospitals, visiting nurses, and such organizations, which may be available in giving medical treatment to sick children, but these accommodations are but a few drops in a bucket. This state of things may look strange in a country which has been called by some "the paradise for children," but the fact is

---
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that the social consciousness has not been awakened to the actual state of affairs, the public at large having no knowledge of it.

(4) The Committee on Investigation of Health and Sanitation. —Two very promising organizations have been started lately to probe this problem—namely, the Committee on Investigation of Health and Sanitation and the Lectures on Sanitation for Women. The former, which was started by Imperial Decree in 1916, is under the supervision of the Department of Interior and at present has thirty-six members, part government officials, part non-official experts. The Vice Minister of the Department of Interior is the president of the committee. The work of the committee is divided into eight divisions, and one of them is the investigation of the health of infants, school children, and youth. The matter which has already been investigated and published is the death rate of children under five years for the last ten years. Other matters now under investigation are the sickness of school children, physical development of babies, the health conditions in the day nurseries and orphan asylums, and the condition of about 20,000 sick infants in the pediatric departments of the medical school. The completion of statistics on those matters will facilitate in ascertaining the causes, whether this higher death rate is due to poor nutrition or to the mother's lack of knowledge in rearing children or to endemics. Then the committee will be in a position to devise some suitable means to check the widespread deaths and diseases.

(5) The Lectures on Sanitation for Women.—In prefectures and public corporations in our country, lectures on sanitation are held for women. Although these were first started scarcely ten years ago they are now held throughout most of the country. The aim of these lectures is to diffuse among women knowledge in the rearing and care of children. The regular meetings continue several days at a place and sometimes they have exhibitions of things which are of interest to the work, something like the Baby Week Movement.

It is possible that by these means, the death rate of infants in Japan will be reduced as low as in other countries.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

The Primary School Education

(1) History.—Compulsory education is the most important means of building up a healthy nation by inculcating a wholesome national spirit and diffusing general knowledge among the children of school age. All nations of Europe and America have adopted it long ago. In Japan it was in 1886 that compulsory education was adopted. The present school regulation requires six years' course of instruction and as a rule does not charge any school fee.

(2) Matriculation and Attendance.—Though it is only thirty years
since school education became compulsory, school houses have been built all over the country. The following table shows the percentages of matriculations and attendance from 1911 to 1915:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Matriculation</th>
<th>Percentage of Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>98.23</td>
<td>92.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>98.16</td>
<td>92.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>98.26</td>
<td>93.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>98.47</td>
<td>93.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>98.61</td>
<td>94.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The Number of Schools and School Children.—The number of schools in 1914 was: public, 20,440; private, 136. In 1915 it was: public, 20,516; private, 150. The number of school children in 1914, 6,700,000; 1915, 6,900,000.

(4) Finances.—Expenses are paid by public corporations. They amounted in 1914 to ¥56,720,000 and in 1915 to ¥60,000,000. This rapid increase of expenditure is due to the fact that the population of Japan increases by 600,000 or 700,000 every year and consequently many new school houses must be built. Such being the case, the burden of the self-governing communities becomes heavier yearly, and in some towns and villages the school expenses amount to one-half of their whole expenditure. Last year the Government decided to grant ten million yen annually to relieve the self-governing communities to some extent.

(5) Exemptions.—Children of school age afflicted with lunacy, idiocy, or serious illness may be excused from matriculation. Guardians too poor to send their children to school may postpone their matriculation. It is to be regretted that the nation and self-governing communities have no legal responsibility for educating these poor children. But the Government is contemplating making their education compulsory, though it is not known yet when this provision will be put in force. There are some public and private schools, however, which take in these poor children. So, in fact, this defect in our school regulations is not so bad as it appears. As those special schools have the double aspect of being institutions of education and of relief, they are under the joint supervision of the Department of Interior and the Department of Education.

(6) Institutions of Relief for the Defective and Destitute Children.—In 1917 there were twenty-nine schools for the blind and dumb (both private and public); three schools for the deaf, and thirty-eight schools for the blind. The number of children taken in by these institutions was 3,326. They are given four or six years of common education and practical training, in most cases free of charge. Some of these special schools have dormitories where the students can board with little expense. Most of the blind students be-
come masseurs after their graduation; but as the deaf and dumb cannot
easily earn a living, employment offices are established especially
for their benefit. The total expense of these 70 institutions was
Y 176,000 in 1916. The National treasury, the self-governing com-
minities, the educational associations, and some individual volunteers
contribute to defray the expense.

In 1916 the number of the blind children of school age was 3,240;
that of the dumb children of the same age, 6,039. These numbers are
rather large in proportion to the number of the children taken in by
these institutions for defective children. But as they are building new
schools and enlarging some of the old ones, they will be able to take
in a larger percentage in the future.

To come back to the education of the poor children, although the
self-governing communities are not legally responsible for the educa-
tion of the poor children whose matriculation is delayed for reasons
stated before, some of them have voluntarily established schools for
the poor children. Besides these there are some conducted by in-
dividual benefactors. In 1915 there were 67 schools of this kind, of
which 52 were day schools and 15 were night schools. The total num-
ber of the pupils in these schools was 14,176. The expenses for the
same year amounted to about Y 142,000. Moreover, almost every
town and village has societies for the protection of the children of
school age. Textbooks and lunches are distributed by them among the
poor children. In this way, the inadequacy of the school regulations
is supplemented to some extent.

(7) The School Physicians.—In 1898 an Imperial Decree was
issued to the effect that all primary schools except those in small
towns and villages having less than 5,000 inhabitants should hire phy'
sicians to improve their sanitary conditions, the physicians to be ap-
pointed by the local magistrates. Now most schools are too poor to
hire private physicians exclusively attached to them—only those in
large cities can do that. Consequently they hire ordinary practitioners.
Thus, nearly 57 per cent of the entire primary schools, that is, 15,300
out of 27,000, have their physicians. Those physicians inspect the
sanitary conditions of the schools from time to time, and once a year
they make physical examinations of all the pupils and report to the
Department of Education and also to the guardian of the students.

The results of the physical examinations of the school children for
ten years (1906-1915) show that their height, weight, and lung ca'
tility are getting more satisfactory.

Although considerable efforts are thus being made for the im-
provement of the sanitary condition of schools, sometimes the im-
provement does not come up to the expectation, because most of the
school physicians, being poorly paid, cannot give sufficient attention
to the schools. Therefore, in the large cities the schools are trying to have their own physicians if possible. Under the present regulation the school physician does not examine the mental condition of the children, but something will have to be done to remedy this defect.

(8) The Central Organ.—For better supervision of the sanitation of schools, the Department of Education established the School Sanitary Office in the Department in 1915, and in addition to this organized the School Sanitary Association as the consulting organ of the Minister of Education, and also holds a lecture class in the department for the benefit of the school physicians from all over the country. Apart from this supervision of the Department of Education some prefectures have their own supervisors.

The Supplementary Industrial Schools

In Japan as elsewhere there are many graduates of primary schools who desire to engage in some industry. To meet this demand the Japanese Government issued the Industrial School Order, encouraging the establishment of such institutions as are necessary to give proper training to these graduates. Those institutions are technical, agricultural, commercial, mercantile, marine, and supplementary industrial schools. I shall speak here only of the last.

The supplementary schools are divided into technical, agricultural, fisheries, commercial, and other schools. They matriculate primary-school graduates and those who have an equivalent education. The length of the course and the number of study hours vary according to the season, locality, and the like; for instance, the supplementary agricultural schools are opened during the winter season when there is little agricultural work to be done. The supplementary schools are of very recent origin in Japan, but they are making rapid progress. Of these, the agricultural schools are most numerous, which is quite natural, Japan being essentially an agricultural country. The lessons taught in common throughout the various kinds of supplementary schools are morality, the vernacular, and arithmetic. Other lessons vary according to the kind of school.

In 1916 the number of the public and private supplementary schools was 7,063 and that of the students 369,000. The following are the statistics for all kinds of supplementary schools for the same year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>9,344</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>12,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pupils</td>
<td>565,899</td>
<td>11,868</td>
<td>577,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>¥931,134</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The supplementary school education is not yet compulsory, but the wonderful growth of this kind of school in a short period shows that it is almost as good as compulsory, and it is believed that the Govern-
ment will extend this course of instruction by two years and then require those who do not receive high-school education to attend one of the supplementary schools.

The Religious Education

Catholicism was introduced into Japan several hundred years ago; but Protestantism came in only at the beginning of the Meiji era (1868). In the fifth year of Meiji, that is in 1872, the first Sunday School was opened, but for some time the growth was very slow. About twelve years ago, however, Mr. Brown, general secretary of the World Sunday School Association, came to Japan and organized the National Sunday School Association of Japan, and from that time the Sunday School work has made a rapid progress, until in 1917 the number of Sunday Schools reached 2,473 and that of the Sunday School children 160,000.

The following table will show how rapidly the Sunday School work is growing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Attendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>64,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>106,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>156,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prominent men like Marquis Okuma, Baron Shibusawa, and others were appointed as the promoting committee of the World Sunday School Association Convention, to be held in Japan in October of next year, and preparation for it is already on foot. The expenditure, it is said, will be Y 150,000. It is believed that the coming convention will bring a new epoch to the Sunday School work in Japan and will make a great contribution to the general education of the Japanese children.

Sunday schools were at first all Christian institutions, but of late Buddhists also began to feel the need of them and established their own, and it should not be overlooked that they have made a remarkable progress with them.

The Young Men's Association is an institution wherein the boys, who, though graduates of primary schools, can not receive higher education, get together and learn about supplementary studies, industrial work, and citizenship. The management of the institution is left to the self-governing communities, the government only giving instructions on proper occasions. Most of these associations were organized after the China-Japanese War and again after the Russo-Japanese War. They had already done much good for social improvement, and in 1915, in view of the Great European War and for the future welfare of Japan, the Ministers of the Education and the Interior Departments gave joint instruction to the prefectural Governors for the improve-
ment of the Young Men's Associations, which brought them under a system and made them doubly efficient.

In most cases each city, town, and village constitutes a Y. M. A. district and has its headquarters; but within a district branches are established to facilitate the work and to bring the members into close touch. In some counties and prefectures they have headquarters to supervise Y. M. A. work within their districts. The age limit is not quite uniform throughout the country, but in most places twenty, and in some, twenty-five years of age is the limit. According to the last year's report of the Department of Interior there are 18,482 associations and 2,932,113 members.

Among the various works carried on by the Y. M. A., the most general are the supplementary education, circulating library, keiro kai (veneration of aged people), temperance work, physical training, improvement of amusement, popular education, and the moral training of young men. Instruction is mostly given from time to time by lectures by school teachers, local officials, religious leaders and sometimes by business men.

The expenses of the associations are paid: (1) out of money earned and contributed by the members of the associations; (2) by subsidies from the cities, towns, and villages; (3) by individual subscriptions; (4) by income from the capital; (5) the proceeds from cooperative enterprises of the associations. The total expenditure of all the associations in the country for 1916 was Y 736,750. Their property in the same year was estimated at Y 1,000,000.

The aim of the Young Women's Association is practically the same as that of the Young Men's Association, namely, to make more efficient those girls and young women who are graduates of primary schools, but who cannot get higher education. The work of this association is naturally different from that of the Y. M. A. It includes domestic work, hygiene, rearing of children, cooking, sewing, family nursing, morality, and so on. The instruction is given by lectures of experts in these lines. These associations are all of very recent origin; but they already number 8,852 and have 1,049,652 members. The age limit of the membership varies from twenty to thirty years.

One very noteworthy feature of these two organizations is that they sometimes have joint meetings. The occasions for these joint meetings are when they have school exhibits, pictures, lectures on moral culture, charitable work, and so forth. I say it is noteworthy because in Japan com mingling of young men and women in this way is very rare, and those joint meetings, though humbly started, may if wisely conducted on a large scale have a great significance for the social welfare of Japan.
The treatment of criminals, especially young criminals, is an important question for criminology. In 1907 the criminal code of Japan was revised and the age of discretion was fixed at 14. The act says "the acts of persons under 14 years of age are not punishable." Young offenders above that age are punished by ordinary criminal law, there being no special laws for them.

When a police officer apprehends a young offender, he takes him into a police station and there and then they examine him. If the offense is only slight they let him off with an admonition; and if it is not so slight or so serious they keep him in the house of detention for not more than 30 days; if it is serious they send him to the public procurator's office and the procurator examines the case and decides whether the offender should be prosecuted or not. The average number of young offenders who were subjected to judicial examination in five recent years was about 30,000; of these only 10,000 were prosecuted according to the regular law—some of them were fined, some put in jail, and others imprisoned. The average number of those who were imprisoned during the period of the five years 1913-1917 was 2,248. The statistics, however, reveal an annual decrease in the number of juvenile offenders in prison beginning with the year 1914, as shown in the accompanying table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of trial of young offenders is not uniform throughout the country, but in large cities like Tokyo, Osaka, and others, the courts have a juvenile department with a special judge. They usually segregate the young offenders from adult criminals and have a separate room for them. The trials are not open to the public. In these matters the spirit and the method closely resemble those of the juvenile courts in America and Europe. But as there are no special laws for children they are judged according to ordinary criminal law.

The prison regulations provide that the offenders under 18 years of age who are subjected to more than two months of penal servitude may be put into special prisons or special departments of regular prisons, and that they be kept in them until they reach their twentieth year. Thus the juvenile offenders are treated in a different way from that in which ordinary criminals are treated, the object being their protection and reformation more than punishment. Moreover, they are
SPECIAL CARE—THE STATE

obliged to attend school a given number of hours every day, and even
the labor they are required to do is rather for their training than for sup-
plementing the funds by which the prisons are maintained. At present
there are nine such juvenile prisons in principal places of Japan, and
several more will be established in the near future. In the treatment
of juvenile offenders both the grade system and the mark system have
been adopted and the choice between them is left to each prison.
Whether they use the grade system or the mark system, they keep each
prisoner in a separate cell for the first three or four months of his im-
prisonment in entire seclusion from the outside world, and if he shows
signs of improvement he is promoted to a higher grade and treatment
becomes more lenient.

The result of this treatment is shown in the accompanying table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Offenses</th>
<th>Second and Later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it may be seen that the number of offenses is decreasing every
year, but the number of second and later offenses has not materially
changed. The latter fact may be due partly to not imposing an indefi-
nite sentence and partly to the lack of social sympathy with the dis-
charged prisoner.

It can easily be imagined that many of those who are set free without
trial will repeat the offense if adequate protection is not given to them.
Therefore whether the juvenile offenders are homeless or not, some
further means of protection is absolutely necessary. In this regard we
regret there is no probation system in Japan as yet. Not that there is
nothing done in the way of their protection, for there are two homes
for boys and one for girls in Tokyo. In those two places for boys they
look after more than a thousand boys every year, and their work in
seven cases out of ten is successful. There are more of these societies
outside of Tokyo, but they are not so active in their work as those in
Tokyo. It is to be hoped that many more such societies will be organ-
ized in the future to give adequate protection to the misguided youth.

The Children’s Act

Though various attempts have been made at devising means of pre-
vention of juvenile crimes, they have not accomplished the desired re-
sults; but it has been thought that the establishment of juvenile courts
would be best suited for the accomplishment of this object. The law
investigating committee have been working at a bill for some years, and
the bill is nearly completed. It is not time yet for its publication; but—
generally speaking—it seeks to apply a sort of probation system to
those under 18 years of age who have committed some criminal
offense or are inclined to do so. What the bill seeks to accomplish is as follows:

(1) To give admonitions from the court.
(2) To obtain admonitions from the principal of the school.
(3) To demand a written promise for repentance.
(4) To hand delinquents over to some protector on certain conditions.
(5) To place them under the care of some religious organization or protective society.
(6) To place them under probation officers' care.
(7) To send them to industrial schools.
(8) To send them to reform schools.

There are also features not seen in the laws of other countries, but on the whole the provisions are practically the same as the juvenile court regulations of America and of Europe. If the bill passes, after some amendments, it will do a great deal of good in the way of rectifying the defects of the present law.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE

The development of factories in Japan is of very recent origin. In fact it is not fifty years old yet. Therefore the capitalists and factory owners of Japan have not had experience in the management of such enterprises. Before the introduction of the factory system, the various industries of Japan carried on their business by means of handicraft and home industry. In those days, when international trade was forbidden and the principal of "self-supply" had to be enforced, no great inconvenience was felt from those old-fashioned methods, and the handicraftsmen and those who were engaged in home industries dragged along in their work from morning till late at night in a most lax manner without any definite restriction of time. The relation of the employer and employee was, of course, that of master and servant. But when Commodore Perry came and broke the spell of a long dream, all of a sudden the policy of isolation was abandoned; international commerce was allowed, and in fact everything changed in a very short time. The social, political, and business conditions underwent a complete change and left no trace to remind us of former conditions. In the industrial circle also the factory work took the place of home industry and a great many operatives began to work with wonderful machinery and to have definite hours of work. But even when such violent change had been accomplished, the relation of the capitalist and the factory workers remained that of master and servant. As to the long hours of labor, too, employers, employees, and the public at large, being accustomed to it, never thought anything was amiss.
The Factory Act

Such being the conditions under which the factory system had developed, the Government perceived the necessity of taking some protective measures and in 1882 organized a committee to investigate the actual conditions and customs of the factories throughout the country. In 1897 a bill was drafted based on the results of the investigation by this committee. But very unfortunately the Parliament dissolved at that time and the bill was not even presented. After many years of hard labor in overcoming obstacles thrown in its way, the bill finally passed through both Houses in 1911 for the first time; but it was not until 1916 that it became operative, owing to the fact that deciding on the rules of enforcing the law took a long time.

As a result of this law, an Imperial Decree was issued ordering the Department of Agriculture and Commerce to establish a factory section in the Department. In pursuance of this decree the Department appointed the Vice Minister as the sectional chief with four factory supervisors and five sub-supervisors to assist him. Moreover it has been decided to have local supervisors placed in several important places, and in fact there are now about two hundred of them distributed in various parts of the country. The expenditure required in this work is about Y 200,000. Although we have now this Factory Law for the protection of child laborers, no special law has been enacted as to the restriction of the work hours of adult laborers, it being left entirely to the agreement between the employers and the employees.

The restrictions placed upon child labor are as follows:

1. **The Age of the Child Laborer.** "The factory owners (employers) are not allowed to hire children under twelve years of age except under special administrative permission."

2. **The Prohibition of Night Work.** "All children under fifteen years of age are not allowed to be employed in any work after 10 P.M. and before 4 A.M. But for fifteen years after the enforcement of this law, those special industries which require night work or continual day-and-night work may be exempted from the application of this law by the permission of the Minister of the Department."

3. **Holidays and Recess Periods.** "To children under fifteen years of age, two holidays should be allowed in a month and to children of the same age who are employed in a business requiring day-and-night work, four holidays should be allowed in a month, and if the working time should exceed six hours a day, a recess of at least half an hour should be given to them, if ten hours, a recess of at least one hour."

4. **Cases Where Assistance Is to Be Given.** "When a factory operative meets accident, falls sick, or dies without any serious fault of his own, the employer is required to give financial assistance to him or to his surviving family."
STANDARDS OF CHILD WELFARE

The Number of Child Laborers in Japan

The number of child workers in factories in 1916 is shown in the accompanying table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10,914</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>8,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>133,370</td>
<td>29,853</td>
<td>103,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>144,484</td>
<td>31,791</td>
<td>112,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of the adult operatives and the child laborers in factories being about a million, children form nearly fifteen per cent.

Welfare Work

Special arrangements made for the promotion of the laborer's welfare are not few. Since the operation of the Factory Law, they have rapidly increased, although their exact number is not yet ascertained. In the Prefecture of Tokyo there are about 1,600 factories of all sizes and about 230,000 operatives. There are about 500 factories that employ more than 50 workers. Sixty-three out of these 500 factories have mutual aid societies, some of which, in case of sickness or retirement of the members, give financial aid out of the fund paid up by operatives exclusively, and others of which give aid out of the fund contributed to by the operatives and the employers. The latter usually contribute as much as or half as much as the total sum of the contributions by the employees. There are also day nurseries, rent-free houses, dormitories, bath-houses, places of amusement and so on, altogether numbering 210. And for the education of the employees there are fifty-six institutions where they train apprentices and give supplementary instruction or primary school education, and the prospect is that these institutions will gradually increase.

I must confess that what has been said above is a very imperfect presentation of the subject. And time does not allow me to discuss fully the advisability or inadvisability of the long hours of labor to which Japanese children are subjected. I should only say that labor in Japan has a peculiar history and circumstances, and now to adopt the American or European system bodily in entire disregard of that history and circumstances would be only to bring on unnecessary disturbance if not disaster. As principles, the propositions made by the Committee on the International Labor Alliance meet our approval, but Japan is under the necessity of steering her course in this matter with due regard to her peculiar internal conditions as well as external circumstances, and for this reason Japan may have to be treated as an exception. We are not, of course, satisfied with the present condition of the Factory Act; but we must be patient. Perseverance has accomplished wonders. Rome was not built in a day. Japan, though not very slow in making progress, requires time to bring about such fundamental changes as suggested by the committee now meeting in Paris.
CARE OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE—
TEN YEARS AFTER

By DR. HASTINGS H. HART
Director, Department of Child Helping, Russell Sage Foundation
New York City

One of the last official acts of President Theodore Roosevelt was the calling of the White House Conference which met at Washington January 25 and 26, 1909. The idea of this very remarkable conference was conceived and its details were executed by James E. West, now Chief Scout Executive of the national organization of the American Boy Scouts. About 200 delegates were invited, representing every State in the Union, and every kind of agency for dependent and neglected children: State boards of charities, boards of children’s guardians, charity organization societies, associated charities, children’s home societies, children’s aid societies, societies for the prevention of cruelty to children, juvenile protective associations, juvenile reformatories, orphanages, children’s homes, and institutions for mothers and children. The delegates represented all forms of religious belief, including Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and the Salvation Army.

It was felt that the conference ought to formulate some kind of a statement embodying those principles upon which these delegates could agree, which might contribute to a better understanding between them, pave the way for a greater degree of cooperation and serve as a point of departure for future progress and for the standardization of child-welfare work. On the night before the opening of the conference, a small representative group of about 30 people met in the New Willard Hotel to consider the possibility of agreeing upon such a statement. There appeared such a wide diversity of opinion, especially between the representatives of the child-placing societies and those of the orphanages, that it seemed as if it would be impossible to agree upon any comprehensive platform; but the subject was amicably discussed, and it was agreed that the attempt should be made.

On the following day the conference convened at the White House, with President Roosevelt in the chair. A committee on resolutions was appointed, of which I had the honor to be chairman. The other members were Edmond J. Butler, Homer Folks, Julian W. Mack, and James E. West. All of the members of the committee worked earnestly.
and harmoniously. It is only fair to say, however, that the credit for the great report of that committee belongs chiefly to Col. Homer Folks, who was its author, together with the late Thomas M. Mulry and Judge Julian W. Mack, through whose wise and far-seeing cooperation a surprising and happy result was attained.

The conference sat for two days, during which the committee on resolutions was hard at work. At times they sat in the conference to catch the spirit of its deliberations; at other times they consulted with members of the body as to what should be included in or omitted from the document.

The report of the committee on resolutions contained fourteen articles, covering home care, preventive work, home-finding, the cottage system, incorporation, State inspection, inspection of educational work, facts and records, physical care, cooperation, undesirable legislation, permanent organization, a Federal Children's Bureau, and a summary. It is impossible, in 15 minutes, to discuss in detail this great platform of 3,000 words. It included such vital propositions as the following:

1. The creation of a National Children's Bureau, accomplished by the prompt action of President Roosevelt and seconded by his successor President Taft, which resulted in the splendid bureau whose guests we are today.

2. The conservation of family home life as "the highest and finest product of civilization," "not to be broken for reasons of poverty, but only for considerations of inefficiency or immorality," and to be preserved by "such aid . . . as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children . . . to be given by such methods and from such sources as may be determined by the general relief policy of each community." This proposition has been realized: first, through an increasing recognition of the importance of preserving home life, by the courts, by children's aid societies and children's home societies, and by the constructive work of such agencies as the societies for the prevention of cruelty to children in Boston, Brooklyn, and Philadelphia, and the Cleveland Humane Society; second, by the development in most of the States of the Union of the plan of "mothers' pensions," "mothers' assistance," and so forth. This plan has developed with such rapidity that it has not had time to crystallize into fixed and definite policies. It is clear, however, that it has come to stay, and that it involves a new realization of the value of home life and the community's responsibility therefor.

3. An emphatic endorsement of the doctrine that "the carefully selected foster home is for the normal child the best substitute for the natural home," with the proviso that "such homes should be selected by a most careful process of investigation, carried on by skilled agents through personal investigation and with due regard to the religious
faith of the child," and that, even for temporary care, "contact with family life is preferable for these children, as well as for other normal children." The use of boarding homes was suggested, but the difficulty of finding such homes was recognized by the statement: "unless and until such homes are found the use of institutions is necessary."

4. Recognizing a legitimate field for some institutional care of dependent children, it was declared that "these institutions should be conducted on the cottage plan, in order that routine and impersonal care may not unduly suppress individuality and initiative. The cottage unit should not be larger than will permit personal relations between the adult caretaker . . . and each child therein. Twenty-five is suggested as a desirable cottage unit, subject to revision in the light of further experience."

5. It was urged that "child-caring agencies, whether supported by public or private funds, should by all legitimate means press for adequate financial support," and that "cheap care of children is ultimately enormously expensive and is unworthy of a strong community."

6. It was proposed that only incorporated institutions should be allowed to assume the duty of child-caring, and that incorporation should be permitted only after careful investigation and certification by a responsible State board; that "all agencies which care for dependent children, whether by institutional or by home-finding methods, and whether supported by public or private funds" should be subject to thorough inspection by trained agents of the State; and that the State inspection should extend to their educational work as well. Since 1909 there has been a gradual increase in the number of States adopting such legislation.

7. "The establishment of a joint bureau of investigation and information by all the child-caring agencies of each locality" was "highly commended, in the absence of any other suitable central agency."

8. The declaration was made that "we greatly deplore the tendency of legislation in some States to place unnecessary obstacles in the way of placing children in family homes in such States by agencies whose headquarters are outside the State, in view of the fact that we favor the care of destitute children, normal in mind and body, in families whenever practicable."

9. A proposition was offered for "the establishment of a permanent organization to undertake in this field, work comparable to work carried on by the National Playground and Recreation Association, . . . the National Child Labor Committee, and other similar organizations." A movement is now on foot for the development of such an organization through the expansion of the "Bureau for Exchange of Information," an association of about 50 of the leading child-welfare agencies of the United States.
10. The spirit and essence of the "Conclusions" was expressed in the following summary: "That the particular condition and needs of each destitute child should be carefully studied and that he should receive that care and treatment which his individual needs require, and which should be as nearly as possible like the life of the other children in the community."

In view of the diverse interests represented in the conference, and in view of the advanced and in some respects radical declarations contained in the conclusions, it was anticipated that this platform would arouse a vigorous discussion and that it would be necessary to amend it at various points in order to secure anything like harmonious action. And indeed it seemed almost too much to expect that, even with such discussion and amendment, unanimous agreement could be secured. In order to give opportunity for free discussion and amendment, the report was presented at four o'clock on Tuesday, January 26, and two hours were allotted for its consideration.

The report of the committee was read to the conference. Its adoption was moved by Mr. Edmond J. Butler of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and seconded by Mr. Sherman C. Kingsley, of the United Charities of Chicago. Then Mr. M. V. Crouse, Superintendent of the Cincinnati Children's Home, arose and said: "I favor the report of the committee most heartily throughout, with the exception of one single word. In speaking of the frequent visitation of children placed out, it says that in some cases it would be greatly to the advantage of the child in the family to be frequently visited. I suggest to the committee 'adequate visitation.'" This important and far-reaching amendment was solemnly considered by the members of the committee who were present on the platform, and was accepted by them. Favorable remarks were made by Dr. W. P. Spratling of Baltimore, Dr. Edward T. Devine of New York, Mr. J. P. Dysart of Milwaukee, and Mr. Charles W. Birtwell of Boston. The question was then called for. The Chairman said: "If there is no further discussion I will put the question." A rising vote was called for, and the entire conference rose to their feet. The negative was called for, but there was not a single adverse vote.

Thus this great platform of 3,000 words was unanimously adopted, with the change of only a single word, by as representative a body as could be convened in the United States.

I have been asked to indicate what portion of the program thus adopted "has been outgrown or proved undesirable." To the best of my knowledge, only two of these fourteen articles have been seriously questioned during the ten years since they were adopted.

There are some who still believe that the transfer of dependent children from State to State should be prohibited. This belief takes two
Some oppose such transfers on the ground that the immigration of dependent children imposes an unjust burden upon the community into which they come; but a very little investigation will demonstrate that healthy children, not vicious, are an asset to every community, especially in these days of declining birth rate and deficient man power. Others oppose the transfer of children from State to State because they believe that dependent children should be the wards of the court within whose jurisdiction they are found, and ought not to be taken beyond that jurisdiction.

The other article which has been challenged is the proposition that "the carefully selected foster home is for the normal child the best substitute for the natural home." In view of the long-continued prejudice in favor of the orphanage as against home-placing, it has been surprising to see the general acceptance of this idea, even among the people who maintain orphan asylums; but there are still a limited number of people who advocate the commitment of all dependent children to orphanages.

In the City of New York, under the administration of John Purroy Mitchel as Mayor, and John A. Kingsbury as Commissioner of Charities, there was inaugurated an enterprise for placing children in family homes, which was the largest in the United States except that of the Massachusetts State Board of Charity. This work was developed under the immediate management of Mr. William J. Doherty, Deputy Commissioner. A trained and efficient corps of social workers was organized, and the work was put on a practical and modern basis. Homes were selected with great care, and thorough supervision was undertaken. The placing-out method was adopted only for children under the age of seven years, while older children continued to be boarded out in institutions.

Upon the election of a new mayor and the appointment of a new commissioner, this valuable agency which had been created with so much labor and at great expense was discarded. It was announced that experts were not wanted; and while a limited amount of placing-out was continued, vigilance was relaxed, and the careful standards which had been established were lowered. Recently, however, the Commissioner of Charities has taken steps to make arrangements with a number of private accredited child-placing agencies to find boarding places for children who are wards of the city, the expense to be borne by the city.

I believe that it is fair to say that, after ten years, the conclusions of the White House Conference stand as a permanent and authoritative declaration of the principles which should direct the treatment and care of dependent and neglected children, and that they have the indorse-
DISCUSSION

Mr. S. C. Kingsley (The Welfare Federation, Cleveland, Ohio): It seems to me in general that this program has had a profound effect on the thought and practice of the whole country. As far as I have sampled the attitude of my own and the practice of the different communities, I can say that one can trace the effect of that notable meeting.

As I have listened to the speakers this morning, knowing as I do something about the plans and hopes for this meeting, it seems a happy augury that such a gathering should have been called together now on not only a national scale, but an international scale. Since that meeting ten years ago, the world has moved along very fast. We are thinking now in terms of countries as well as in terms of States and communities. All of these countries which were quite strange to us then, now seem neighbors. The matter of taking painstaking and discriminating care of the child has not gone as far as I wish it had and hope it will. We have not, in my opinion, outgrown these recommendations.

I am interested in the child-caring agencies in Cleveland as a group of people responsible for one section of the field. We have not begun to catch up with this program. I think what we need today in the way of information is the interpretation of experiences gained and facts gathered in the prosecution of the work. We are not getting enough of that sort of thing. We are all individualistic, each holding some little sector of the child-betterment front, but without enough of orderly procedure and mobilization of the child forces to go warring against the various causes that are producing trouble in the field. I do not feel that in many places the information which those who are doing the work on these definite fields have obtained is positive enough and well enough interpreted to give a community the guidance and leadership it should have. I think the community has a right to ask the workers of the child-welfare field for that necessary information.

We have not gone far enough in this matter of giving to the child the kind of a real home it ought to have. We are still under the spell of bricks and mortar—something we can look at and touch. There are many of us who have our faces toward the bricks and mortar while our backs are toward the world from which the children came. We are too much interested in seeing little people stand up on the platform and sing. So I would say: Be more alert now in this day, when it seems to me we are calling for leadership; we want to know where we are going; we are more interested in the solution of these problems than in the maintenance of a given number of organizations.
WHAT CONSTITUTES SUFFICIENT GROUNDS FOR THE REMOVAL OF A CHILD FROM HIS HOME

By JUDGE VICTOR P. ARNOLD
Cook County Juvenile Court, Chicago

If a twelve-year-old boy smokes cigarettes, should he be taken away from his home? If his father habitually brutally mistreats him, should he be taken from his home? Should he be removed if he has committed a burglary? Should the State take him in its arms if he is feebleminded?

The very serious responsibility is laid on me to tell you what constitutes sufficient grounds for the removal of a child from his home. It is my daily duty in the Juvenile Court in Chicago to make decisions which remove children from their homes. In the year 1918, I found it necessary to enter 1,448 such decisions in the cases of dependent or neglected children, and 989 decisions in the cases of delinquent children.

The authority for taking children away from their homes is generally to be looked for in the juvenile court laws which are now on the statute books of a great proportion of the States. These laws also define under what circumstances a child is dependent, or neglected, or delinquent, and their inclusion of circumstances under these terms is usually very broad. In the short time allowed me I cannot review the situations covered by these laws, nor is that necessary, as I shall draw upon my experience which is governed by the laws of Illinois. It is enough to say in general at this point that the juvenile court laws are usually so broad that the State, in its capacity as parens patriae, through the juvenile court, will take jurisdiction over practically every significant situation where it appears it should do so in the interest of the child or the State, whether that situation be caused by the nature, bad training, or conduct of the child, the unsuitability of the home, or the controlling bad influence of environment.

Yet this jurisdiction should be exercised with grave caution. The integrity of the family circle is a relation so fundamental and held in such high respect that the law, both legal and ecclesiastic, has clothed it with a special sanctity. It will be apparent that the court, under these laws, exercises a discretion in a responsibility so great that under its order the sacred bond of the family can be broken. These laws,
however, intend that this drastic action shall only be used as a last resort when it appears that any course less drastic has failed or will fail of remedy. Juvenile court laws are laws of mercy and not vindictiveness, and should be mercifully and sympathetically administered, always throwing the advantage of the doubt, if there is one, in favor of the child. Of the juvenile court is expected also an unusual patience and hopefulness, and faith in the capacity of human beings to improve. The result of all this will be, in the hands of the enlightened juvenile court judge, that the court will to the utmost try to influence the child or his family to the proper mode of life, and probation and supervision will be tried generously as a remedy. Decisive firmness must, however, be used when it appears that the child must be taken from his home, whether to be placed under guardianship or to be committed to an institution.

In my administration of the Juvenile Court Act of Illinois in Chicago, I do not hesitate to take from his home a child, neglected or dependent, where it is clear from the evidence that the immediate prospects of the home are hopeless, whether this is due to immorality or depravity on the part of the parents or guardian, or to cruelty or positive neglect of the child, or to some other unfitness.

In cases where the mother of young children is leading an immoral life, if it appears that the mother's conduct is due to ignorance and lack of standard rather than depravity, and if it also appears that there is still a basis of good in her and if she is otherwise a good mother, she should be permitted to keep her child or children under supervision of a probation officer of the court and under the strict warning that her immoral or compromising conduct must cease. If the mother appears depraved and callous to any moral improvement, the child should be placed under the care of a guardian. If the home is depraved by habitual drunkenness of the parents or guardian, or by habitual furious or violent quarreling, or by habitual indecent, vulgar and profane language, then I have no scruples about taking the children from them. If the evidence shows that the parents have until recently maintained a suitable and fit home, but by reason of drink have made their home a rendezvous for disreputable characters, the children may remain with them only if I can be sufficiently satisfied that the cause of complaint will be removed or the dangers lessened, and then only on probation under supervision to an officer of the court.

In cases of cruelty, if the cruelty is such as to indicate a depraved mind on the part of the parents, the child should be rescued from that menace by taking him away from the home. If the cruelty is due to ungoverned temper on an exceptional occasion, or to a mistaken idea of parental authority and what parental control ought to be, I may give the parents an opportunity to correct their conduct and allow the
child to return to the home on probation to the officer of the court. I heard the case of one little girl, a child of about twelve, whose father in his inhuman treatment of her fractured her arm and threw her out. The poor frightened child hid under the house until found some days later by neighbors who notified officers of the court, who in turn took her in charge and had first aid given her. In this case it was clear that the child should be taken from her home, the father being subsequently dealt with in another jurisdiction.

Cases of neglect are of great variety. In a large group of cases of this type I invariably try probation if the parents show a disposition to cooperate, and resort to taking the child from the home only after I have found that probationary supervision has failed. In this group I class such cases as follows: where the neglect has been due to the ignorance of the parents in properly caring for or supervising the children; where the parents have refused to give the child adequate clothing and nurture; where the mother has been shiftless, has neglected her children, has failed to supervise their conduct; where both parents have worked outside the home, leaving the children without supervision during the day to the detriment of their behavior or the neglect of their school attendance, but an agreement is made that the mother shall remain at home and give the necessary supervision; where the father has been spending his money on drink, failing to provide clothes and food for his children; where one of the parents is a step-parent and has assumed an obstinate attitude resulting in the neglect of the child, but promises to improve according to the suggestion of the court; where the child has been allowed by the parents to beg or gather alms, but the parents assure control; where the parents have kept the child from school to work. In cases such as these I am not likely to take the child away until after a probationary trial with failure. Of course, in cases of homeless or abandoned children there is no alternative for the court but to make a final disposition.

In cases of delinquency of children I never order the child taken away from home on the first time in court, unless the delinquency with the circumstances attendant is so gross as to show a depraved, vicious, or recklessly destructive spirit with respect to life and property, or unless the delinquency, while very obviously reprehensible, has been done with the approval or active encouragement of the parents; or unless the home of the parents or guardian is so bad that it cannot be a factor in a plan for correcting the child. In such cases as these I must immediately be drastic to protect the community and to save the child. In these extremes are included such cases as those where boys break into a store at night and wantonly destroy the contents; or where they steal an automobile and race down the streets endangering human life; or commit a robbery and deliberately shoot a person; or assault
a girl; or where a boy strikes and injures his mother; or where he teaches small children bad habits or criminality. These are merely suggestive of what I mean by extreme cases.

In the great majority of cases of delinquent boys in court for the first time, I try probation. In many cases I try probation repeatedly when the boys come into court for subsequent delinquencies. A decision should never be made hastily. Such a complex and vari-colored community as Chicago has its currents of degradation and vice that flow through hidden channels and find the congested poor districts especially non-resistant and easy of penetration. It is not easy for a child or his family to correct the fault in such unlikely circumstances, and great patience is necessary. I take the child from the home only as a last resort.

The cases of delinquent girls who come before the court are in a great majority of instances for immoral conduct. Such cases present a distinct, special problem, and involve so much for the sake of the girl that they require a more final disposition by the court than cases involving depredations on property or many types of other delinquent conduct. This is brought out by the statistics of the Chicago Juvenile Court, which show that for the past three years from 45 to 55 girls are placed on probation at home per year as against 100 taken from the home and committed to institutions or placed under guardianship or in some home other than their own. During the same period, from 110 to 200 boys were placed on probation at home as against 100 taken from their homes. The girls frequently come from homes where they receive little, if any, supervision, where the relations between the members of the family are infelicitous and unsympathetic, or where the parents are ignorant of our language and customs, and are easily imposed upon by their precocious daughters. A great number of girls are incorrigible, and their appearance in court is due to their refusal to recognize parental control.

We are in need of further legislation, which should render subject to the jurisdiction of the State children who have remediable marked physical abnormalities which greatly handicap them, whether caused by accident, injury, malnutrition, or heredity. In cases where parent or guardian neglects or refuses to permit medical attention to remedy the above condition, the court could on a proper showing order that such conditions be remedied. As with juvenile court legislation and legislation on feeble-mindedness and insanity and epilepsy, such legislation would be for the mutual good of the child and the State; however, it should be conservative and drawn with the utmost caution. Hand in hand with this should go legislation by which children suffering from curable diseases or from serious ailments, who have not been given proper attention by their parents or guardian, should come under
the jurisdiction of the State to the extent of requiring remedy upon a proper finding by a competent court.

After a careful investigation of the home and the social environment has been made, and all family facts available preliminary to the hearing have been secured, together with full information concerning the specific offense, the tendency should be to permit the child to remain in the home if the home can be made a proper place for the child. In other words, if the judge hearing the case can be given a fair guaranty that the child will no longer be menaced by former conditions in the home, a supervision or probation order should be entered. In delinquent cases, probation is desirable where the child indicates a corrected attitude toward society and shows a willingness to submit to court supervision, and that of the natural guardians.

Great caution should be exercised by officers investigating complaints of dependent, neglected, and delinquent children, to the end that no child should become a court case where it is possible to reconstruct conditions in the home so that the home can be made fit, or where the causes of delinquency can be corrected without court action. In Cook County, during the year 1918 over 16,000 complaints of juvenile delinquency were adjusted out of court under the direction of the judge and chief probation officer and about 3,000 became court cases in a total of 19,000 cases. In dependency and neglect, 2,350 family adjustments were made out of court, while but 660 families were brought into court.

All honor to the family, its high meaning, its great function; yet to idealize it does not give it any immunity from ignorance, or the sad train of consequences that go with ignorance. Enlightenment is the very foundation of civilization and any advance in civilization. Can the State have any greater responsibility than to throw the focus of enlightenment into the dark places of ignorance and maladjustment, and to counteract the unhappy results of these by the beneficial ministrations of the agencies of enlightenment?

It is essential for the proper administration of the law and for constructive and effective work by the Juvenile Court that the officers be competent and efficient. The judge enters the order or decree but does not carry it into effect. If the officers of the court are not specially trained, if they are lacking in devotion to their duty and are not capable in every way, the court order or decree will not accomplish that which is desired. The probation officer is, in reality, an extension of the court.

I cannot approve the policy in some jurisdictions of assigning judges to juvenile court work for short periods. My own experience would indicate that it takes approximately a year for the judge to become accustomed to and understand the administration of the law in the
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juvenile court. Judges experienced and trained in the administration of the juvenile laws are as essential as trained probation officers.

DISCUSSION

Judge James Hoge Ricks (Juvenile Court, Richmond, Va.): I feel especially keenly the force of the points that Judge Arnold has made. This question of taking children from their homes is indeed of most vital importance. It must be an absolutely last step. Within the past six months I have had to take children from families which we had been holding together for a period of a year or even several years. In one instance recently I took three of the younger children of a family which we began to deal with in 1912. I admit that it does seem that the court should have learned in shorter time than seven years just whether the children should be taken from that home or not; but I do feel that if our social agencies had really been on the job in that particular case it might not have been necessary to remove those children at all. This is the point that I want to bring out: that if the social agencies of the community will stand solidly behind the court, and particularly if the churches and religious influences will cooperate with the court in helping to build up the standards and the ideals of the home, then fewer children will have to be taken from the home; and that is the ideal which I believe every right-minded judge seeks to attain.

Mr. Arthur W. Towne (Superintendent, Brooklyn Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Brooklyn, New York): I think we can all agree to three points without any discussion: First, no child should be removed from his home on account of poverty; second, many judges of juvenile courts need to be educated as to child psychology and social points of view; third, each case must be looked into on its own merits.

No law can minutely define what constitutes neglect or cruelty. What applies to one family will not apply to another family, because of a difference in age, or grade of intelligence, or some other factor.

Now, the degree of neglect formerly considered insufficient to remove children from home is in many cases today considered sufficient to cause removal. Moreover, the field of neglect is extending in scope and the rights of children are multiplying; things formerly not recognized as being sufficient ground for removal are often considered sufficient today. For example, years ago children having hereditary syphilis and wilfully deprived of treatment were not thought of as subjects for court action; now they are subjects for court action. So, with moral influences in the home—those intangible subtle suggestions that influence the minds of children.

Two or three questions should be asked in all cases before we decide to take them into court. First, is the child in jeopardy? It does not mean that we are going to remove children simply because one bad act has been done on the part of the parent. Is it going to continue? Second, we want to know whether the condition is remediable, and we want to give the benefit of the doubt to the child and the parent, and to the preservation of the home. If through friendly influence we can build up the home, and can get the parents to take an interest in the children, then we do not want to consider removing the children. If that does not work there is another possibility—to take the parents into court, and put them on probation, and make them mend their ways. Only as a third resort should we remove the children. Social workers, in general, do not know the necessity of legal evidence in such cases. I think our schools of philanthropy should train
social workers more in the principles of evidence. Moreover, we want to be assured when we remove a child it will be better off than under its present conditions.

Mr. Bernard J. Fagan (Chief Probation Officer, Children's Court, New York City): I do find that a great deal of the burden is upon the social workers who bring many of the cases to court without having a knowledge of what constitutes evidence. The court is a court of law, call it by what other name you like, and it must be governed by the rules of evidence. It is not a psychopathic laboratory. When it comes to a question of breaking up a home, the responsibility rests where the people have placed it—upon the shoulders of the judge. I find few who even after they have had a supposedly adequate training know what our courts can do. A great many do not even know the functions and powers of the juvenile court in their community.

Mr. C. C. Carstens (General Secretary, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children): One thing that Judge Arnold said leads me to call attention to the fact that the doubt should be in favor of the child. I am inclined to think that judges even in our better juvenile courts have less hesitation about resolving the doubt in favor of the child in the case of the first action, but are inclined to resolve the doubt in favor of the family when it comes to returning the child to the home. Some of us who are active in work for the protection of children feel that judges usually interpret the evidence presented in the same way as those who are presenting it, in the first instance, but when it comes to the question of the return of the child one month, two months, or six months, or even several years later, there are a number of other things that have to be taken into consideration besides evidence. We must continue to favor the child, rather than say "Now, this home has straightened out and this child must return," when, as a matter of fact, the cleavage that existed in the first place has grown greater during the time while the child has been away. There arises a nice question as to whether the child should be returned even though the home may have gotten somewhat straightened out.

I hope also the time will come when the child will not be brought into court in cases where the question is whether he is being properly cared for. I do not think that it is a good thing for the child to get familiar with courthouses and court procedure. We ought to recognize the fact that the child should be taken care of somewhere else while the parent is brought in to be disciplined. As a rule the child has no evidence of any particular value.

The work of the children's protective agencies is of two sorts—prevention of the breaking up of homes and the helping of their breaking up. Helping to break up is easy; it is the prevention that is the hard work; and it is towards this that we should direct our greatest energy. Let us see that the numerous agencies working for the protection of children devote themselves definitely towards reshaping the home long before breaking up is possible. That, I think, is the function of the State, though it may not be the function of the juvenile court. That, it seems to me, is the work to be done in the protection of the child, so that the break-up does not need to come. How soon will the State undertake that job?

Mr. Fagan: What is the procedure in courts throughout the country as to having the child appear?

Judge Ricks: In the Richmond court, in cases of dependency and neglect, the children are always sent out of the court room.
Judge Arnold: In Chicago, in cases involving facts and circumstances which children should not hear, the parents remain and the children step out.

Mr. Fagan: In New York the children are arraigned and the names certified to, and they are then sent out and hear nothing of the testimony given by the parents.

Mr. Carstens: I plead for an arrangement by which the children will be left miles away from the court.

Mr. Fagan: Would you still have the judge commit them without having him see the children in court?

Mr. Carstens: That is a perfectly fair question when it is a case of the removal of the child, but you will notice that I spoke of the procedure against the parent when the child would be only a witness. If it is necessary to have a child committed away from the parents, I believe the court should see the child, but we should not require that a child be brought into court unless it is absolutely necessary.

Dr. Hastings H. Hart (Russell Sage Foundation, New York): There is one point that has been overlooked in this discussion which seems to be a necessary corollary of what has been said. The sacredness of the home and the care that should be taken in separating parent from child, or child from parent, has been emphasized here this morning, but nevertheless such separation is constantly accomplished without having the court say anything about it. A poor mother is advised that she can have relief if she parts with one of her children. She simply signs a paper and the child is gone. The thing is not adjudicated by a competent court. A poor girl lies in a hospital with a baby. While she is lying there, a man persuades her to sign a paper and the child is separated from her forever. Before I left the city of Chicago the Children's Home and Aid Society adopted a rule that under no circumstances would it be a party to a transfer of guardianship of a child without taking the matter into court. In every case the judge is to determine the question whether the guardianship should be changed. I think that is an essential question for every one interested. It should be understood that in no case shall it be possible for a parent to be divested of guardianship unless the case is passed upon by the court. That does not necessarily imply that the parents shall appear personally in the court. Under the Illinois law an unmarried mother may sign an appearance and consent, and the judge, if he sees fit, need not have that mother present, but the guardianship is not accomplished until the court has passed upon it.
STANDARDS OF CHILD PLACING AND SUPERVISION

By EDMOND J. BUTLER
Executive Secretary, Catholic Home Bureau
for Dependent Children, New York City

In order to keep within the limits of the time and outline of subject allotted me, I shall have to present these standards in somewhat brief outline. I realize the necessity for these limitations in view of the many divisions of child-welfare activity scheduled for the conference and the possibility of duplication of treatment of particular phases of the work which have a direct relation to all, but I nevertheless feel that these limitations deprive me of the opportunity to furnish adequate reasons or explanations for the standards offered.

The plan I have adopted for the presentation of the subject is as follows: (1) Definition of terms; (2) the child; (3) the foster parents; (4) home finding and investigation; (5) supervision; (6) discharge from supervision; (7) after-care; (8) records.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Placing-Out.—The term "placing-out" has acquired, during the past fifteen or twenty years, a distinctive meaning which should be generally known, especially to charity workers, in order that the confusion which has resulted from its improper use may be avoided. It does not mean boarding-out, indenturing, baby-farming, the securing of employment or the mere transferring of the custody of a child from one person to another or to an institution without regard to the object of such transfer. It means placing a placeable child in a free family home for the purpose of making it a member of the family with whom it is placed.

The New York State Law defines the subject as follows:—"The term place-out . . . means the placing of a destitute child in a family, other than that of a relative within the second degree, (parent, grandparent, brother or sister), for the purpose of providing a home for such child." This definition, with the qualifying of the home as a free home, offers a complete definition of the term.

Boarding-Out.—This term qualifies the act of placing a dependent child in a family home, where payment is made to the boarding-home mother for the care of the child.

Adoption.—The law of New York State, which is probably
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similar to those of other States, defines this subject in the following terms:

"Adoption is the legal act whereby an adult takes a minor into the relation of child and thereby acquires the right and incurs the responsibility of parent in respect to such minor."

As the future development and welfare of the children concerned in these activities depend for success upon a proper recognition of the needs and rights of the child, all persons or organizations engaged in conducting such work should be required to secure a license from the State for that purpose and should be subject to inspection by the State board of charities.

THE CHILD

As a general proposition, any normal healthy child is a placeable child, but aside from this subjective qualification there are many conditions which would render placing-out undesirable.

The age of placeable children may be briefly stated as follows: Boys to and including the age of fourteen; girls to and including the age of ten. The placing of girls over ten years of age, particularly where there are other children in the family, does not give promise of good results. The most flagrant exploitation of child labor and neglect of scholastic training occurs in the cases of girls between the ages of ten and fifteen. The experience of placing-out agencies will show that the most successful results occur in the cases of children placed at or below the age of five years. No child should be placed out who is suffering from any physical or mental defect. All such children should receive the attention necessary to bring them up to normal standards before placement.

No child should be placed without a sufficient guarantee that it will be kept at school until it reaches the age of sixteen.

Parent and child should not be separated because of temporary disability. If poverty, illness or even improper guardianship make it necessary to give a child temporary care, nothing should be done to cause a definite and continuous separation, if there is hope of rehabilitating the parent and again restoring the normal relation. As the natural order provides for parental care, based upon love and affection, for the support and training of the child, it also demands a reciprocal service for the aged based upon filial love and duty. When, therefore, there is possibility of reuniting parent and child, such a child is not placeable, but should receive temporary care in a boarding home or institution.

Careful investigation should be made as to the cause of death or any present probable incurable condition, mental or physical, of the parents of the child to ascertain what, if any, inherited tendencies are likely to develop in the child. If there is any danger from this source, the child
is not placeable. Such a child should be cared for in a boarding home or institution until in the opinion of experts all danger from such a source has disappeared, when the child should receive, if possible, the advantages of a normal home.

The placing of a child with a family for the purpose of legal adoption, without investigation as to whether all of the requirements for that procedure can be complied with, is a matter likely to create serious consequences. Courts cannot abolish by any legal process the parental rights recognized by all civilized governments, and many instances may be cited of the reversal of legal adoptions. When one or both parents of a child are living, such a child is not placeable for adoption, unless the parental consent is provided or the legal conditions favorable for such action exist.

Consent to legal adoption should depend upon a favorable probation period—of at least one year. It is absolutely necessary, before undertaking to place out any child, to secure definite information as to its family history and the possibility of subsequent difficulties which might result from ignorance with regard to the matter. For the children who are not placeable, there is the boarding home and the institution, either of which may be used to meet the temporary or permanent care needful for them.

THE FOSTER PARENTS

In view of the fact that the vast majority of the families of our country consist of persons having a limited amount of wealth, an ordinary education, and little or no distinction of a social character, it would be unwise, if not futile, to set up standards for foster parents of so high a character as to limit our possibilities for success.

We should realize that most, if not all, of the children we aim to help, do not come from homes where at any time unusual conditions of wealth or distinction prevailed. If we can secure homes and foster parents among the wealthy or well-to-do, we shall be pleased to have the opportunity to contribute uncommon means for future welfare to some poor children. It does not however necessarily follow, that children so placed have greater futures in store for them than those placed with families who have been accustomed to making personal sacrifice to maintain their positions in life; in fact, that willingness to make such personal sacrifice may contribute more to the child’s welfare by securing greater personal attention, consideration, and allowance for the trials incidental to child life than could be expected from those who delegate such care and attention to a hireling.

We should aim to secure for foster parents, persons who desire a child for the child’s sake. They should have an income, with a reasonable prospect of its continuance, sufficient to ensure proper care and
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support of the child. They should not be advanced in years, as otherwise the child might lack the continuous care necessary to enable it to reach manhood under their training and supervision. They should be persons of good physical and mental health, industrious and thrifty, should possess at least average education and intelligence, and should enjoy the respect and endorsement of their pastors and neighbors as law-abiding and respectable citizens of their communities. They should be of the same religion as that of the child to be placed with them, and should be vouched for by their pastors as persons who are practical in the performance of their religious duties and as persons who will provide religious training for the child assigned to them.

The foregoing standards, except as to the financial requirements, apply also to the parent or parents of the boarding-home. In this matter, however, it should be distinctly understood that the parents should not be dependent solely upon the sum received for the board of the child to enable them to supply the care and attention necessary for its support and training.

home finding and investigation

Home Finding.—The methods to be adopted for developing homes will vary according to the experience obtained by those engaged in the work. My own indicates that advertising is not worth the cost. “Sob stories” may develop a large number of appeals for children but many of them will be from persons who demand impossibilities. Some publicity, however, is necessary and the interesting and appealing press items and stories will play an important part in preparing the way for other methods.

We have found that the efforts of a careful, conscientious agent can produce more satisfactory results than may be secured by any other method. In making his appeal to prospective parents, he has the opportunity to eliminate much waste of time and money needed for investigation, by selecting approved sections and neighborhoods, and desirable families. He will also learn of the local opportunities which may offer helpful assistance to the family in matters of education, religious training, recreation, companions for the child, etc. The securing of homes by such a method will, I am sure, be found the most satisfactory means employed in this phase of the work.

Investigation.—Following the receipt of an application for a child, the most thorough investigation should be made concerning the applicants, their home, the members of the family, and the locality of the home. This investigation to be complete should be made by an agent duly qualified for the purpose, and the report of the agent should include definite information on the following lines:
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1. Character of house, location and surroundings.
2. Personality of (a) husband, (b) wife, (c) children, (d) other members of household, (e) possible companions or neighbors.
3. Religion and general character of parents.
4. Business, occupation or earning power.
5. Remarks of pastor or reliable neighbors.
6. Has family ever had a child before? How treated?
7. Proposed occupation and arrangements for care of child.
8. Such additional facts as may tend to give a complete survey of all conditions affecting the character of the foster parents and their home.

SUPERVISION

Within a month after a child has been placed it should be visited by an agent of the placing-out society with a view to learning whether the home fits the child and whether the child fits the home and is a welcome member of it. Thereafter the child should be regularly visited by the agent, not less than twice each year and as much oftener as the necessities of the case demand. No person or society should engage in doing placing-out work unless prepared to follow this initial feature by providing adequate supervision continued for the period necessary to ensure good results. To place out without such supervision is a crime and should be treated accordingly.

Agents when visiting the children should ascertain and make complete reports as to the child’s physical and mental condition; conduct and attitude towards family; attendance and progress in school; attention to religious duties; the kind of work, if any, performed in the home or elsewhere; if working, the compensation given, savings and bank account and amount of same; sleeping accommodations; clothing and bodily comfort; recreation facilities and companions; and such other matters affecting the interests of the child as may be necessary for a comprehensive knowledge of the situation by the administration of the placing-out agency. They should also note any change of address and, where same occurs, give complete details of the new home and its location, and should state what changes or additions have occurred in the make-up of the family since the last visit, the attitude of the foster parents toward the child, their attention to their religious duties, and such other matters as may indicate whether they are continuing their qualifications as desirable foster parents for the child. Where adverse conditions occur which justify the removal of the child, the agent should transfer the child at once to such approved home as may be available or return it to the placing-out agency.

Placing-out and supervision are not and cannot be looked upon as
separate pieces of work. From the time we begin our search for a free foster home, procure it, and place the child in it, whether it remains there or is transferred to another home or homes, up to the time when we may be able reasonably to declare that the child no longer needs supervision, all of the work done in connection with the care of that child is a continuing act, which is not completely or well done if we should discontinue supervision, except in the cases mentioned hereafter, at any time prior to the age of twenty. Proper supervision in the cases of children placed in boarding homes requires that the visits should be more frequent. Due to the fact that the relation of the child with the boarding-home mother is based primarily upon a money consideration, it is necessary that the minimum requirements for this service should be those established by the Board of Minor Wards of Massachusetts. The knowledge gained by the years of experience of this board should prove a valuable guide as to all details concerning the boarding-out system.

DISCHARGE FROM SUPERVISION

The position taken by the Catholic Home Bureau, with an experience of twenty-one years in dealing with the problems arising from the care and supervision of more than four thousand children placed by the bureau in free family homes, is that such supervision should not cease until the wards of the bureau, both boys and girls, have attained the age of twenty years.

This standard does not apply to such cases as are disposed of by adoption, as all such cases automatically leave our jurisdiction upon completion of the legal formalities of adoption. Nor does it apply to such exceptional cases as may arise from time to time where it becomes desirable, because of unusual and justifiable conditions, to cease visitation in the interest of the future welfare of a child; as where the latter has been living for a number of years in an ideal home, under the most favorable conditions, believing that its foster parents are its real parents, and a strong bond of affection exists, and the necessary publicity of visitation by our agent might result in breaking up existing relations. These cases however will always be small in number as compared to the whole, and cannot be used as fixing the period for necessary supervision.

We have found by experience in dealing with children who are not in the homes intended for them by the natural order, those of their parents, that the most critical period in the lives of such children lies between the ages of sixteen and twenty in the case of boys and between fourteen and twenty in the case of girls. It is during this period that the child begins definitely to manifest that spirit of youthful independence and disregard for authority which results so disastrously in some
foster homes which lack the complete tempering affection of the father-
hood and motherhood of a normal home. In such cases the aid and
advice of our interested agents are needful to adjust the difficulties and
restore harmony. It is during this same period that the boy and girl
develop an earning capacity which should be properly directed and for
which due recognition should be provided by procuring for them a
wage commensurate with their service and home conditions, to the end
that they may have an opportunity to put something aside for the pos-
sible break in home conditions or other phase of adversity. Where
such recognition is denied them they should be removed and placed in
other homes where they will receive adequate recognition and com-
pensation for their labor.

Foster homes are subject to the same fatalities that befall those of
the normal type. Death, sickness, adversity, or other causes may lead
to the breaking up of the home, and as a result the child placed therein
may be forced out into the battle for existence at an age when a boy
or girl is unable to make the struggle unaided. Again, intemperance or
other adverse influences may enter the home and cause it to be so dis-
organized and unsafe as a shelter for the young as to make it desirable
to remove a child from such conditions. It surely cannot be claimed
that a boy or girl of immature age is competent to meet these adverse
conditions and make proper provision, unaided, for the adjustment of
them. It should be and is our duty to anticipate such results by a con-
tinuous supervision up to a time in the life of the child when we may
feel certain that we have completed the work undertaken by us in plac-
ing the child in the home of strangers; and we feel, as the result of our
experience, that as a general proposition supervision should not cease
before the age of twenty for both boys and girls.

AFTER CARE

Complete service in placing-out work requires that when discharging
a child from supervision he should be informed that the placing-out
agency is not bidding him farewell, but wishes to continue as his friend
and to be one indeed should he need one at any time. Hundreds of
instances could be cited of wards of our bureau who have visited us
when grown to manhood and womanhood seeking advice, aid to em-
ployment, adjustment of family or other difficulties, etc., and many
consoling results have followed such visits.

RECORDS

The records of child-placing agencies should be most complete in
all details. They should include a record of the child; its physical and
mental condition, scholastic training, family history, birth certificate,
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etc., at time of placement; all reports concerning the child and its home subsequent to placement, details as to discharge from supervision, legal adoption, and after-care. All records should be kept in such form as to make it possible to secure prompt and complete information concerning the case.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Edwin D. Solenberger (Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society, Philadelphia): There is a group of children presenting problems that are special to themselves, so that it seems wise to relate the discussion of standards of care for dependent children to the standards of care for children of illegitimate birth. Now, I am going to ask Dr. Sheffield, Director of the Bureau on Illegitimacy, of Boston, to continue this topic by taking up that particular division of the subject.

Mrs. Ada E. Sheffield (Director, Bureau on Illegitimacy, Boston, Massachusetts): There are two questions related to placing-out work that appear again and again in connection with unmarried mothers. They are both questions of method, and questions to which I myself can offer no answer. The first is this: Is it better that pregnant girls should be placed in maternity homes up to the period of confinement, or is it better that they should be boarded out or placed out? We have found in Boston that the maternity homes hold the one view, and certain of the child-placing agencies hold the other. So far as I know, it is a matter of opinion, and not a matter of adequate evidence on either side. The second question is: Should the mother and child be placed together—dual placement—or should they be supervised separately, the mother at her work and the child in a foster home?

I suppose we all agree that the mother and child should be kept together through the nursing period. But how is that to be done? It is frequently done by keeping the two in a maternity home, the home giving them care and protection over a period of several months. It is sometimes accomplished by placing the mother and infant together at domestic service. It might also be done by giving the mother a pension. There are those, however, who feel that the mother should not be kept in a maternity home for a long time. There are also those who believe that the placement at domestic service will not do; that it is asking too much of the mother that she support herself and her infant at the same time.

For the sake of argument, we will assume that we are talking about fit mothers. When the mother and child have been kept together through the nursing period, then arises the question, how much longer ought we to urge that they be kept together? There is considerable evidence showing that many unmarried mothers give up their children at anywhere from one-half year to three years of age. Now, ought we to urge that they should keep them longer than that? If on the other hand we are going to encourage the separation, ought we to aim to bring it about at the end of the nursing period rather than try to have them stay together for a matter of months or of two or three years? Of course, we all hope in this work with the mother and baby that we may get some support from the father. Thus far, however, in most organizations that hope has been rather a vain one. The organization which has done most in that direction in Massachusetts is the State board of charity. They have had the services of a special lawyer, who for several years has prosecuted all the cases on which they had sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution. I have not the figures as to the proportion of cases which they have taken into court, but it is not large—which means that in many instances it is difficult to get the necessary evidence. The head worker of the department
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Mr. Solenberger: There arises in this connection, of course, the question of
whether or not the child should remain in the home. Mr. Butler has said that his
agency has taken the child of the unmarried mother in certain instances. That
is true, I suppose, of practically all child-placing agencies. It is probably also
true that the removal of the child of the unmarried mothers from the mother is in
most States often a matter of chance.

Miss Mabelle B. Blake (Boston, Massachusetts): I want to refer to two points
in Mr. Butler’s paper. If I understood him correctly, he said it was almost im-
possible to place girls over ten years of age. I would not want to go that far.
Although it is difficult to place older girls, it is possible; the whole importance
of the matter is in selecting the right family for the girl. I happen to know of
forty-two girls who are placed out, earning their own way and attending high
school. Thirty-two have had sex experience. Three are preparing for college.
One will enter normal school next year.

There is one other point, namely, the selection of the boarding home. One
of the most important ways to get the right kind of boarding homes for the
children is through the education of the foster mothers and foster fathers that we
already have. I mean the successful foster mothers. In this way sometimes
we have been able to get together the foster mothers and tell them what our work
is and how we expect them to help.

Furthermore, I do not believe we ought to accept a family as satisfactory when
it is dependent upon the amount which we pay for the board of the child. The
board ought to be absolutely an additional amount.

Mr. W. W. Hodson (Director, Children’s Bureau, Minnesota State Board of Con-
trol, St. Paul): The Minnesota law provides that the father of an illegitimate
child shall be subject to the same responsibility for the care of that child as though
the child had been born in lawful marriage. The statute also places upon the
State board of control responsibility for seeing that the child is given a fair chance,
and more particularly to see that the proceedings to establish paternity are begun,
and that having been begun and properly concluded, the natural responsibility is
thereby assumed. The activity of the board of control has been centralized in
getting the evidence necessary to establish paternity in any given case and then
in overcoming the out-worn prejudice against bringing proceedings under the
bastardy law. I am very glad to say that Minnesota no longer talks about the
bastardy law, but has stricken that word from the law entirely.

The point upon which the board of control has laid specific emphasis has been
that when this responsibility on the part of the father is established, the mother
also shall assume the natural responsibility of nursing her own infant; and to that
end the State board of control and the State board of health have joined in a reso-
olution providing that every hospital licensed by either board shall require the pa-
tients to nurse their babies so long as they remain in the hospital.
Mr. John P. Sanderson (Executive Secretary, Connecticut Children’s Aid Society, Hartford): I have been interested in Mr. Butler’s paper because he laid before us certain definite standards in child-placing work. To my mind the critics of child placing have criticised principally not the family care for children but the mechanism we have used in placing the children.

To my mind the standards for child placing are identical in any type of home we use, whether it be a boarding home, a free home, a wage home, where the children are working for so much a week, or a home for adoption. Perhaps the latter types require more thorough work, but the fundamental principle, I think, which we should work out is to set up a code of case-work standards. The child is our responsibility.
CHILD CARING WORK IN RURAL COMMUNITIES

By MISS H. IDA CURRY
Superintendent, Children’s Agencies, State Charities Aid
Association, New York

The need of social work in cities has long been recognized, and recently there has been an increasing recognition of an equal need in rural communities. In any large city will be found a long list of social agencies, each dealing with a particular social problem: charity organization societies and associations for improving the condition of the poor, that deal with family problems in the home; hospitals, dispensaries, visiting nurses, and milk stations, endeavoring to cure and to prevent sickness; institutions, child-caring societies, child-rescue societies, home-finding societies, child-labor associations, day nurseries, kindergartens, special industrial schools, and fresh-air movements for children; probation and prison associations dealing with delinquents; lodging houses and temporary shelters for the homeless man and the wandering woman; social settlements, organized recreation facilities, saving and loan societies, committees on housing and sanitation; and scores of other agencies that seek to better living conditions in the city. The name of each of these organizations presents to our mind a recognized city condition demanding organized social service.

Let us now look at a family living in the country, one mile from a small town. The house is a two-room shack on the hillside. In one room live an old woman, her son, and from time to time anywhere from one to four or five relatives. This room is almost devoid of furniture, but is always clean. In the other room lives the old woman’s unmarried daughter with two children and the man who is the father of a coming baby. This room contains a bed, a broken stove, and a chair, and is dirty beyond description. At noon on a warm day of early summer the woman and children were found on the filthy bed of rags. The one window two by three feet was tightly shut, as was the door. The air within was suffocatingly hot and heavy with unwholesome odors. The water supply for this dwelling is a nearby brook, and the only toilet facilities are those provided by nature on the hillside.

The group abiding in this place pick up a living by doing odd jobs in winter, the old woman acting as a midwife, and frequently using her one room as a maternity hospital. In summer the men, women, and children pick fruit on a nearby farm. School attendance is irregular at
all times, and during fruit season it ceases. These people are all of old, if degenerate, American stock.

The situation described can be duplicated over and over in the rural parts of the country, and it presents problems of over-crowding, unsanitary conditions, irregular employment, lack of nursing care—especially maternity care—child labor, non-attendance at school, general neglect of the children, and many other antisocial situations.

Social problems are, after all, problems of people rather than problems of place, and are to be found wherever people live. In the rural communities, no less than in cities, do we find immediate need for some social agency to deal with all of these problems. Even more than the city does the rural community, with its high death rate, need improved care for the sick. Intelligent child care is also more urgently needed, possibly, than in the city, and a need at least equal to that of cities is found for social effort on behalf of the delinquent, for organized recreation, for better housing, and for improved sanitation.

In all rural communities we find the destitute child or the child belonging to a destitute family. When destitution is the only problem, there should be readjustment within the home. Successful experiments in various places are being made in improving the existing machinery or creating new machinery for public relief to needy families—notably through widows' pensions or mothers' allowances—so that the same adequate and intelligent care may be given through public agencies as is now being given by the best private relief societies. But usually the relief to the destitute is but poorly administered, and there is urgent need for it to be guided aright.

The neglected child is found everywhere. Possibly more gross forms of neglect can be found in isolated rural communities than in a city where the proximity of neighbors tends to control individual action. For the neglected child, some agency is essential to improve conditions in the home if possible, to remove children from unsuitable homes when necessary, and to prosecute wilfully neglectful parents. After children are removed from unsuitable homes, it is of greatest importance that an intensive study be made of the personality of each child and of its future needs. Bearing in mind the principle that family life is essential for the normal development of the normal individual, care suited to each child should be planned—in a boarding or free home or in an institution, as circumstances demand.

Delinquent children, too, abound in all communities. To deal with these in rural communities is needed a development of the juvenile court and probation system. An improvement in dealing with truants is also essential. By the consolidation of school districts it should be possible to employ a well-trained visiting teacher instead of a low-paid truant officer, who not infrequently in rural schools at present, is also
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the janitor, and who generally is more competent as janitor than as
truant officer.

Defective children are found everywhere, both those who have some
physical disability and those mentally handicapped. The social well-
being of the community as well as that of the individual demands that
the blind and the deaf shall have specialized education; that the cripp-
led shall not be excluded from schools because of physical handicap,
and that they shall have the most expert orthopedic advice available
to prevent deformities or to correct them as far as possible. The men-
tally defective require even more careful attention, as they are apt
to be a greater menace in a community. Protection and oversight in
the home, or custodial care in institutions, must be provided.

Medical care in rural communities is of prime importance. Outside
of cities there is at present little or no facility for dispensary or hospital
care or for expert medical service. Great progress is being made in
developing the nursing service in rural communities throughout the
United States. In certain States—notably in Vermont, New York,
Massachusetts, and Minnesota—highly specialized aftercare of polio-
myelitis has been organized by State departments of health with travel-
ing clinics which have carried expert orthopedic advice to the most
isolated neighborhoods. Recently similar traveling tuberculosis clinics
have been tried in New York State. The success of these clinics seems
to point to a method whereby other specialized medical advice might
be made available in regions where it is now so sadly lacking.

How all of these varying social needs of childhood in rural com-
munities can be met, becomes a very practical question. Probably in
most of the United States the county is the most practicable geographi-
cal and political unit for general child care, although in certain phases
of children's work the State is the smallest practicable unit. Particu-
larly is this the case in the finding of free homes for children, as it is
always desirable that there be a wide range of homes from which to
select the one most appropriate for a particular child. It is also gen-
erally essential that a child's foster home be at a distance from unde-
sirable relatives as well as from neighbors who have known of the family
disability which has cast the child upon the community for care.

A rural social program may be organized by public or private initia-
tive, or by a combination of the two, but it must be accepted by the
community as a local community endeavor. To be effective it must rec-
ognize the natural and inevitable variety of local conditions; it must
be elastic enough to meet local needs, and it must be a growing program
to meet changing needs. It should function along lines most natural to
the particular community, and it should, to the greatest extent possible,
use the forces already existing therein.

Experience has led me to believe that one central-directing organiza-
tion for the social work of a county is highly desirable, except possibly where a city of considerable size is located in the county. It is sometimes desirable in such counties to have one organization for the city and another for the county outside of the city, as the problems of the two sections may be quite dissimilar. It is desirable that local organizations should be closely associated with some outside agency of at least State-wide interest, equipped to stimulate development and to standardize methods; and whether under public or private control, they should always be subject to State supervision.

It is obviously impracticable to have separate organizations to deal with all the different problems found in the rural field, but any rural program, to be adequate, must include at least a nursing service and a social service. Success will depend more upon the human element—upon the expertness and the adaptability of the persons selected to carry through the program—than it will upon the program itself. It is important that the nurse should be a general public-health nurse, rather than one dealing only with tuberculosis, with baby welfare, or with any other one phase of public health. It is equally important that the social agent should be a general practitioner in the social field, sufficiently familiar with all welfare effort to deal intelligently with maladjustments of whatever nature. There should be, however, as has been suggested, some opportunity to call into consultation outside experts when particular difficulties arise, just as the general medical practitioner will call a specialist into consultation when necessary. In New York State the appointment of public-health nurses in the counties and the appointment of county children's agents has been furthered by a State-wide private organization, the State Charities Aid Association, which has furnished such consulting advice. But I am inclined to think that such functions, when carried by a private association, should be turned over to a State department of charities and to a State department of health as soon as these departments can safely assume the responsibility.

To sum up:

(1) The county is probably the best administrative unit for rural organization, but a State-wide agency should be used for the placing-out of children and possibly for other specialized work.

(2) Every rural community should have a nursing and a social service, which may be organized under private or public control, or a combination of the two, but which should invariably be under the public supervision of the State.

(3) The nursing and the social service should be under the same general direction or under closely affiliated direction.

(4) The nursing service should be in the hands of broadly educated public-health nurses, to further public and private health programs,
including the establishment of adequate home nursing and of suitable clinics and hospitals. The social service should be rendered by broadly trained investigators to deal with social maladjustments and to further public and private programs for rural betterment.

(5) Success will depend primarily upon the personal and professional qualities of the field workers.
I am going to paraphrase my subject as a discussion of the machinery of the juvenile court. I think it was Andrew Carnegie who startled the industrial world by scrapping practically new machinery whenever newer and better machinery could be found to take its place. This has been true also in the educational world. Wherever teachers have found a new way of teaching or a new text-book better than the one in use they have cast the old one aside, although it may have been scarcely used. That is even true in the medical world, although I must confess that a doctor is almost as slow to learn as a lawyer. It remains for the lawyer to be guided by precedent and tradition.

In the Eastern States we have inherited our laws from England. The English law came from three sources—the statute law, the decisions of courts, and customs which the courts after a certain number of years treated as having the effect of law. In other words, the very antiquity of a custom or a way of doing things gave it the force and effect of law. In the eyes of the courts, what is so must continue to be so. I think we have no clearer illustration of how hidebound courts are than in this particular subject which we are now discussing.

At a very early date in England the courts of chancery began to administer the property of children. Wherever a man died leaving small children and it became necessary to dispose of their property, the court of chancery, representing the Crown itself as ultimate guardian of the child, took charge of the property and administered it. That proceeding is a very careful and a very thorough one. First, a bill stating all the facts in the case has to be filed with the judge, who refers it to the commissioner in chancery. The commissioner calls in witnesses and inquires whether it is to the best interest of the child that the property should be sold, and, if so, what disposition should be made of the proceeds. He makes a report and a recommendation which is returned to the judge; the judge reviews that report and then makes such final disposition of the case as the welfare of the child demands. What a careful and wise provision for the protection of the property of the child!

Suppose, however, that a child is the son of a laboring man who has
been able to accumulate (we will say) enough to buy a small lot costing probably $500. If it becomes necessary to sell that property the interests of the child will be safeguarded. But if, because that child is half orphan, his mother has to work in the factory all day, and the child is left to run in the streets at will; if, because he wants a baseball mitt or glove such as the other fellows have, he breaks into a store and gets it; then he is haled before a magistrate and his case is heard, sometimes in three minutes or even less. No question is asked as to why he is there or what can be done for him. He has violated a law, has offended against the peace and dignity of the commonwealth, and he must be punished for his offense. In the shortest space of time his whole life may be made or marred with no thought of his moral and spiritual development or even of his education.

There are in America today three ways of dealing with children. One is the old one I have been describing, and it is still far too prevalent. Even in those States where we have laws that provide for special procedure in children's cases, we often still have this old way of treating the child, of sending him to jail, or even to the penitentiary. That is the first method which has been handed down to us through the ages.

The second method, a modification of the first, is the one generally used in the courts of the Eastern States of the Union today—the handling of children under quasi-criminal proceedings, in which the child is still treated as an offender against the law but in which the harshness of the ancient criminal law is modified as far as possible.

The third method is that of the chancery proceeding. There is plenty of law to sustain the handling of the child through the chancery courts, as the following quotations show:

"The custody of a child is always a proper subject of chancery jurisdiction, and courts of chancery generally exercise a wide jurisdiction over the persons and property of infants as 'wards of court,' exercising the right of the Crown as parens patriae to protect and care for incompetent persons. The benefit of the infant is the foundation of the jurisdiction, and the institution of any proceedings affecting his person is sufficient to make him a ward of court." \(^1\)

Lord Eldon in Wellesley's case said: \(^2\)

"It is not from any want of jurisdiction that it (the court of chancery) does not act, but from a want of means to exercise its jurisdiction, because the court cannot take upon itself the maintenance of all the children in the kingdom. It can exercise this jurisdiction fully and practically only where it has the means of applying property for the maintenance of the infant." \(^2\)

Nevertheless, in most States we still find our lawyers will not let us institute the chancery method of procedure in dealing with delin-

\(^1\) 122 Cyc. 519.
\(^2\) 1827. Russ. 1 (1827).
quent children. At the last session of the Virginia legislature a bill was introduced providing for dealing with delinquent and dependent children through chancery proceedings. The city attorney, when he read that bill, said that it was a "monstrosity." He said: "It is something we have never heard of before." My friends, the "monstrosity" that had been imposed upon the legislature of Virginia was a bill prepared by a special committee appointed by the Attorney General of the United States to draft a juvenile court law for the District of Columbia, which had been revised so as to make it as nearly as possible fit the conditions in Virginia.

The proceeding in chancery is the ideal and surely the proper manner in which to deal with a delinquent as well as with a dependent child, treating the child and his future as of more consequence than the offense and the penalty to be exacted therefor. In such a proceeding the paramount questions, once it has been determined that the child is wayward, are: Why is this child here? What are the underlying causes of his delinquency? What can the court do to set him straight—to mould him into a decent, self-respecting citizen?

Most of the statutes relating to the trial of children provide for a hearing "in chambers" (that is, in the judge's office), or at least at a "special session" of the court with no one present except the officers of the court, the witnesses in the case, the child, and his parents. Surely this is a reasonable provision and one which can be observed by every court whether it has the complete machinery of a juvenile court or not. Let us insist upon the strict observance of this rule in every court, however small, so that the child may at least be spared the humiliation of a public trial.

There is no greater blot upon the fair name of the American States than the wrong which they have perpetrated upon their wayward boys and girls in confining them in station houses, jails, and even penitentiaries, which to them have proven veritable schools of crime. Think what must be the effect upon the plastic mind of a young child of associating day after day, week after week, and month after month, with adult offenders many of whom have become vicious and depraved!

The Virginia statute expressly provides that:

"No court or justice, unless the offense is aggravated or the ends of justice demand otherwise, shall sentence or commit a child under 18 years of age, charged with or proven to have been guilty of any crime, to a jail, workhouse, or police station, or send such a child on to the grand jury, nor sentence such child to the penitentiary."

Pending trial and disposition, the delinquent child should be held, where that is necessary, in a detention home established and maintained for that purpose. In the smaller cities and rural communities
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where such an institution cannot be maintained, private homes should be secured in which juvenile offenders can be boarded temporarily until their cases are disposed of. The city of Boston, I believe, still uses this method of detention, considering it best. If Boston can work such a plan successfully, there is no excuse for any smaller community to confine its erring children in jail on the plea that “we only have a few children in court each year.” If it were only one child, is not that child as much entitled to protection and a decent chance in life as the hundreds who pass through the portals of the large city court?

Further carrying out the spirit of the new procedure in children’s cases, it is essential that not merely the evidence in the particular case at bar be laid before the court, but also the surrounding facts and circumstances, including the previous history of the child, his present social environment, and his physical and mental condition. These facts should be secured accurately and impartially by the probation officer of the court. In making such an inquiry the probation officer should first talk with the child himself, seeking to win his confidence and his friendship. This is the most important step in the investigation, for after all it is the child whom we must know and understand thoroughly if any definite reformation is to be effected. Next the probation officer should visit the child’s home and talk with his parents, explaining to them that his mission is entirely friendly and in the interest of the child. He should communicate with the school, or, if the child has been working, with some of his former employers. Every available source of information should be consulted. Wherever it is possible, and especially in serious cases, or where physical or mental defect is apparent, the probation officer should arrange for the physical and mental examination of the child. His purpose should be to discover all facts about the child which will throw any light upon the causes of his delinquency or which may be helpful to the court in deciding upon the wisest disposition of the case.

I like to compare the modern juvenile court proceeding to a medical clinic. When a child is ailing physically, the parent consults a physician. The physician, either personally or through his assistants, first seeks the symptoms of the ailments, and gets his physical findings. When he knows what these are he proceeds to make a diagnosis, and then to prescribe a remedy. Just so, the judge of the juvenile court should view each delinquent as one who is morally sick. The investigation of the probation officer, and the physical and mental examination should disclose the underlying causes of the delinquency. In the light of these facts the judge should then proceed to deal with the child with an eye single to his welfare and reformation.

There are three general methods of disposition open to the courts today, namely: probation, commitment to an institution or a child-placing
organization, and commitment to an industrial training school. Whenever possible, first offenders and those charged with minor offenses for even the second or third time should be released under the friendly supervision of a probation officer and allowed to return to their own homes. It then becomes the duty of the probation officer to throw around the child every available influence for good, inducing him to join a boy scout troop or some similar club and to go to Sunday school, in every way encouraging him to seek clean amusements and companions of the right sort. If, however, the child's parents are hopelessly weak or morally bad, or if he has no home, he should then be given a chance in a good institution or foster home. If his delinquency has become so confirmed that neither of these remedies will effect a cure, then the child should be sent to an industrial school, where he will receive discipline and training.

What should be done with the information obtained by the probation officer in his investigation? In my opinion, any information that is worthy of the consideration of the court is worth recording in writing and preserving for future reference. The child may again appear in court; if no record be kept of the facts learned when he made his first appearance, the work done by the probation officer in his initial investigation will have gone for naught. Furthermore, information obtained then may not be available later. It is, therefore, essential that a clear and concise statement of the legal and social facts of the case should be prepared by the probation officer, and that this report, together with the physical and mental diagnosis, should be filed away among the permanent records of the court.

It is in keeping with the spirit of the new era, however, that the child should be protected against an improper use of the record in his case. There is even some sentiment in favor of the destruction of such records entirely. A few years ago the speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates introduced a bill providing that all records in juvenile cases should be destroyed after a certain time had elapsed. This bill was too drastic and it failed of enactment.

The special committee appointed by the Attorney General of the United States in March, 1914, for the purpose of preparing a model juvenile court law for the District of Columbia, in its report, called attention to the fact that in the District alone upward of 4,000 children had had judgments of conviction entered against them, and were in consequence disqualified under the law from voting, performing jury duty, holding public office, etc. The committee recommended the enactment of a law which would emancipate all children who had appeared before the juvenile court from the disabilities which had thus been imposed upon them. Its Juvenile Court Bill provided also for a proceeding in chancery instead of the old quasi-criminal procedure,
and further provided that the records of all cases be withheld from indiscriminate public inspection in the discretion of the court.

These recommendations of the Attorney General's special committee would seem to be the reasonable solution. Under such a statute, the important social facts of a child's life could be preserved and used as a source of information in later years should the occasion arise. On the other hand, the fact that the child had appeared in the juvenile court in his youthful days could not be used against him in the criminal court as a "previous conviction," nor could it be used as a Banquo's ghost to haunt him in his public or private life.

The best opinion today is that the same tribunal which hears the cases of delinquent children should also have jurisdiction of the proceedings against those who have offended against children or caused them to offend. Under this general principle the enforcement of such laws as compulsory school attendance, child labor, contributory delinquency, and domestic relations statutes is brought within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. It would seem most appropriate that this class of cases should be heard by the judge who deals with the child. He knows the effect upon the child when these laws are violated. He sees most clearly the necessity for their rigid enforcement. He knows that the child who is neglected by his parents today is the potential delinquent of tomorrow. He knows that the child who is permitted to go to the factory too early in life is apt to show a reaction that is detrimental not only to his physical and mental development, but oftentimes to his moral character as well. Furthermore, it is in the interest of efficiency that the same tribunal which gathers the facts in the child's case should handle the other matters naturally arising out of those facts. For instance, the hearing in a child's case frequently develops the fact that the cause of delinquency lies in the neglect of an indifferent parent or in the malicious influence of a vicious adult companion. Thereupon the court can hale before it the offending party and deal with all phases of the case, rendering it unnecessary to refer a part of the matter to another tribunal which must consider the case with no knowledge of what has already transpired in the juvenile court, and perhaps with no appreciation of the tremendous issues involved.

The child of today is the citizen of tomorrow. He will be precisely what we make him. Wise and merciful treatment will be rewarded with good citizenship—indifference and injustice with crime.

DISCUSSION

Robert W. Kelso (Executive Director, Massachusetts State Board of Charity): I think we should take note of Judge Ricks' thought that the juvenile court should be developed along chancery lines. To me that does not mean that we should make the juvenile court an administrative agency. After all, the juvenile court
is a tribunal of justice. It is a tribunal to administer the law on a modern basis; and the place to socialize is not there in the first instance; it is in the law. Your court will administer whatever law there may be, and in general it will administer it according to an absolute set of rules. Now, it is for us as a community to develop and to socialize the law for the court to apply, and to eliminate from that tribunal of justice the obligation of going out into the community and running an administrative business for the Government. There is a distinction, and we must observe it. A tribunal of justice with chancery powers is that instrument which, when properly allied with the social agency in the community, can effect genuine social justice. The bar has not yet seen it. They think you are trying to make a white blackbird out of a court of law. I think we should win them back by showing them we do not mean that at all.

Dr. Hastings H. Hart (Russell Sage Foundation, New York): Judge Ricks has referred to a matter which seems of vital importance, that is, the case of the children awaiting the action of the juvenile court. I have had occasion frequently to recommend, especially to rural counties, the adoption of the Boston plan of making an arrangement for the care of these children in private families. One of the great difficulties is the lack of a social agency such as the Boston Children's Aid Society to administer it. It requires good judgment in the selection of the homes and in looking out for the children. It cannot always be done through the ordinary country judge who has comparatively few cases a year. I believe that in many counties some kind of a detention home must be provided. I have recently three applications for advice with reference to such a home. I do not know of a single detention home in any of the smaller communities which can be referred to as a reasonable model. I am working to accomplish the establishment of a home that can be used as such a model.

I was interested recently to discover that the representatives of children's welfare work in Massachusetts were recommending the establishment of three or four homes for different classes of children, especially for the older boys that cannot be handled by the method of placing in private families. I was startled to learn that in the State of Massachusetts last year there had been 100 children detained in jail awaiting trial. We ought to solve that problem in such a way that people who want advice will know where to get it. I have not yet heard of a satisfactory plan. As a rule, an old dwelling house is taken for the detention home. But the boys and the girls and the delinquent children have to be separated, and when the proper separations are made you have not less than six classes. It is difficult, therefore, to devise a plan whereby you can erect a building at a moderate expense which will provide for these six classes of children.

Mr. J. Prentice Murphy (Boston Children's Aid Society): Dr. Hart is right in saying that the Boston plan is not perfect. There are two or three aspects to which I would like to refer. We do not have dependent children in the courts of Massachusetts, and the courts do not have the administration of mothers' aid. This relieves the judge of an enormous burden. There are no detention homes in the State, but I think we need three or four.

The important part of the Boston plan—or the Massachusetts plan, as it should be properly called—is that a very determined effort is made with each particular child before the juvenile court to avoid removing him from his own home for placement in even a family temporary "detention home" unless it is absolutely necessary that he should be removed. I think I am right in saying that in the country at large there is too general a tendency to make the separation of a
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child from its own home always a first rather than a last consideration. A movement is under way for the erection of a few small detention homes throughout the State, the same to be under the control of the State board of charity. The latter body already has ample family detention homes to meet its needs. In the city of Boston a large part of the detention service necessary for the Boston juvenile court and some other courts in the city is given by the Boston Children's Aid Society through a number of subsidized and highly trained and carefully supervised private families in the city proper. The success of this special work deserves wider mention. It might easily cover all of Boston but for a lack of funds. There is needed for Boston one of the special institutional detention homes referred to above, to be located within the city limits, to which could be referred the small number of older children, both boys and girls, who are not suitable for temporary care in a family home. On a rough estimate about 150 older boys throughout the State spent from one day to three weeks in various jails while under juvenile court supervision during continuance or awaiting admittance to one of the State schools. Some of these boys were almost eighteen and there is a question whether they have suffered much if at all from being in jail, but the protection of those children liable to injury should be complete, and a small detention home offers a certain measure of this protection. The Massachusetts courts need a few non-jail places to which they can refer a very small number of children of a type almost certainly bound for disciplinary or correctional institutions.

A few of us are questioning the extensive detention home movement that is under way throughout the country. Some reaction to these large congregate affairs is inevitable. The larger the type of detention home the more complicated and involved are its social problems, and the greater is the danger that it will be used in lieu of the determined effort that each child should be kept in his own home unless great and sufficient reasons exist for a different procedure.
I am the chief probation officer of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia, which has jurisdiction not only over the juvenile cases, but also over a great variety of other cases. I say this, in order that you may understand that my position does not give me the intimate knowledge of details in the administration of juvenile work that I perhaps might have if I did only that work.

It has not seemed to me advisable to discuss the problems involved in dealing with actual cases. I shall confine my attention to some of the broader principles of probation work which determine very definitely the success or failure of such work.

The general public, as a rule, does not have a clear conception of probation work and is therefore unwilling to give it the necessary financial support. Last fall I visited a court in one of our Middle Western States having jurisdiction over misdemeanants. This court had nearly eighteen hundred persons on probation and had three probation officers to handle the entire number. Under such circumstances, probation could be nothing but a farce. It meant merely the setting at liberty of eighteen hundred people found guilty of some petty crime. The general public can easily understand that it costs money to run an institution for the detention of prisoners, but they have not been educated to perceive that the somewhat intangible probation work costs money also. Buildings, land, walls, food, clothing, guards, are easily visualized, but it is not so easy to see the cost involved in securing reliable information on which the court may base a wise decision, or to appreciate the fact that men and women fitted to act as discerning friends to the unfortunate cannot be expected to render their services free of cost to society.

Every day that goes by makes it clearer to all who are in the work that the investigation side of probation work is bound to broaden greatly. Take for example the problem of juvenile delinquency that is discussed in Dr. Healy’s book entitled “Mental Conflicts.” It can mean only that there are a rather large number of cases of normal intelligence which will yield to neither ordinary probation nor institutional treatment, and that to effect any cure whatsoever, it will be necessary to probe deep into the content of the mind and to find out what
has taken place there perhaps years ago. Our knowledge of social causation, of heredity, of the relation of physical condition to conduct, and of the springs of human action is increasing constantly, and wherever science leads the way the probation officer must follow. As we get further and further away from the idea of punishment for an act inimical to society, and direct our attention more and more to the problem of restoring to society an individual sound in mind, in body, and in conduct, the task of rendering justice becomes ever more complicated and baffling; and yet this is the task which we took upon ourselves when we set up probation systems.

The broadening of the work of investigation means additional demands upon probation officers. The investigation becomes in fact the work of specialists. When we can have skilled physicians, psychologists, and social workers who are trained to pick out the significant features of the social environment, all cooperating in the common task of diagnosing each case, we may feel that we are at least starting our task in the right way.

But if the newer type of investigation demands a newer type of probation officer to conduct the investigation, it is no less true that the work of supervision is certain to increase in complexity. If it takes specialists to make the diagnosis, must we not also expect that the cure will require expert attention? It seems to me that we will unquestionably get away little by little from the practice of assigning probationers to probation officers by districts, or by sex, by race, or by religion, and assign them according to the function for which a probation officer has been trained.

The point which I want especially to make is that the old time probation officer, supposedly capable of handling any and every kind of a case, will probably disappear; or if not, he will have to be trained to carry out the orders of those who have thoroughly studied the case. The child needs something more than a good-natured friend; he needs skilled direction. We can get this in part from those who make the diagnosis, and we can get it also from a wise use of agencies, organizations, and individuals lying outside of the probation machinery, who can usually be persuaded to render their services if tactfully approached. In my opinion, we have not yet exhausted the possibilities of the volunteer. In the past, the volunteer has been the kindly disposed but untrained citizen from whom we have no more right to expect success in handling a case than if he had been a paid probation officer of the same stamp. But is it not possible to make a far greater use of the men and women who have been trained to do some special thing for the human animal? I believe that there are many such in most communities who would gladly do a special task for which they are particularly fitted by their skill or training.

Placing on probation is often looked upon as a substitute for com-
commitment to an institution. Historically this is correct, but the statement gives a wrong impression of what should be the relation between probation and institutional care. Unfortunately this dilemma often confronts a judge sitting on a case with the record spread before him—a choice between sending a child to an institution which is not suitable for him and placing him on probation, which is also the wrong thing to do. Probation, he feels, will probably be more beneficial, or stated negatively, will probably be less injurious, and he therefore places the child on probation. The information which we are slowly accumulating as a result of more scientific investigations, does not show us that there will be no need for institutions in the future, but rather that there is great need for institutions of a new and better type. In a city or State well equipped to handle delinquents, probation will not be regarded as a substitute for commitment; but both probation and commitment will be considered as separate, distinct tools, each fitted for a given task, and the record of the case will automatically determine which will be used. Probation officers and judges who must decide what is to be done with a given case are today fully aware that we cannot successfully handle the problem of delinquency without a great improvement in the character, an increase in the number, and a differentiation in the type of institutions for delinquents.

If the character of probation is to be such as I have indicated in the preceding paragraphs, then there must be the utmost freedom to experiment with new methods and new ideas and to adjust our machinery of probation accordingly. Let us not, for example, tie ourselves down legally to time limits in the handling of cases. Prison reformers have never been entirely satisfied with the indeterminate sentence which in practice is never wholly indeterminate. So in fixing the conditions of probation, let us of course see that the rights of probationers are fully safeguarded, but let us also realize that permanent probation of certain individuals, which is now undoubtedly a necessity, may be a possibility in the future.

I cannot in closing fail to add a word about the relation between a public agency like a court and the various private agencies which are at work on the same or allied problems in the community. Very often one finds surrounding the relation of the two an atmosphere charged with hostility, contempt, or indifference. The attitude of private agencies is very often similar to that held by the early economists who believed that a public agency was by its very nature unfitted to perform any but the most mechanical of tasks. Case work, many social workers feel, requires too much initiative, too much freedom of action, ever to be carried on successfully by a public agency, and they are therefore prone to feel that whatever is done by a public agency must of necessity be slipshod and indifferent. Public officials can view the work
of private agencies from another angle than that from which they view themselves. Officials know oftentimes that they themselves are accomplishing a great deal of good in spite of their defects, and they rather resent being looked upon as people living in a Nazareth out of which no good can come. Personally, I do not believe that we can settle in any a priori fashion this question of whether social work should be done by public or private agencies. However, I am sure that the success of our future civilization lies in governments adding to their responsibilities and taking on work which people have not hitherto been willing to intrust to them. At any rate, the social work which we have inherited from the ages is so vast that public and private agencies should cast aside petty jealousies and distrusts and should delay falling out with each other as long as the whole field is so imperfectly covered.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Bernard J. Fagan (Chief Probation Officer, Children's Court, New York City): I wish to express my sincere gratification at the about-face movement in some communities which now recognize that the juvenile court is not a cure for all the ailments of the juvenile population. I remember several years ago standing practically alone on the proposition that we deal with only two classes of children—delinquent and neglected. We in New York have always felt that it was not the duty of the juvenile court to correct any other conditions in the community than those responsible for delinquencies and neglect.

I must say that I disagree with Judge Ricks on the proposition of not having the child brought into court. It reminds me somewhat of bringing an empty stretcher to a hospital and telling the physician to look it over and prescribe treatment, while the injured patient is down somewhere in the railroad yards. It seems to me that the judge in delinquent cases and in neglect cases must see the children. He must have in mind a picture of the child. It may be a case of malnutrition, or one where the children have been cruelly treated, or a mental examination may be necessary. I do not see how a judge can proceed intelligently without having the child before him.

I am in accord with the proposition of extending chancery powers to juvenile courts. We are aiming for that in New York and I am certain we will attain it eventually.

I do not think it practicable for juvenile courts whose territory is confined to large and congested localities to assign probationers to probation officers according to types. I believe, however, that the special abilities displayed by probation officers should be more generally recognized and utilized in investigations and probation work.

In conclusion, permit me to state, that while legislatures throughout the country have declared that juvenile delinquency is not a crime, the Laws of God still hold these acts to be sinful, and I believe that the religious forces in our community are the strongest bulwarks that the juvenile courts have at hand in preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency. The strongest possible use of the existing cooperative agencies in the field should be made. The churches of all denominations are beginning to recognize the work of the probation officer, and we must, in turn, recognize the helpfulness of the churches.
Judge James Hoge Ricks (Juvenile Court, Richmond, Virginia): May I be permitted to say that Mr. Fagan misunderstood me. I do not believe in bringing an empty stretcher into court. I believe that the child should be in court in delinquency cases. In cases of dependency and neglect, however, I do not think he should be. It may be necessary under certain conditions to bring the dependant child in, but he should not remain through the entire hearing. I thought that I made that distinction clear; I certainly intended to do so.

I want to say this in connection with the discussion of the paper that has just been read. I know, of course, that Dr. Robinson could not cover every point fully in this short time at his disposal, and I want to emphasize the importance of personality in the selection of probation officers. If you train a man and make him a perfect machine, he will probably be the worst probation officer you can find. Unless a man has personality and can get a grip on the child, he is not fit to be a probation officer.

Mrs. Joseph P. Mumford (National Congress of Mothers): I am glad to see that it has been agreed here this morning that it is possible to scrap even a new institution if it is not doing all the work it should be doing.

I want to make one suggestion, that perhaps the public school might take over a part of the work now done by the juvenile court, which comes properly within its survey. Where there is a compulsory education system, there is practically a little court for children, with officers who visit the homes of the children. The difficulty begins with truancy; I think there is no probation officer here who would not acknowledge that. It is my thought that truant children should be dealt with within the school, and never have to carry the stigma of having been arrested or seen in a court of law.

Dr. Helen T. Woolley (Director, Vocational Bureau, Cincinnati Public Schools): I have been most interested and was very glad to hear Mrs. Mumford mention the public schools. Hers was the first mention of the schools as an agency to be counted upon in helping to solve the problem of delinquency. We are making a beginning in that direction in Cincinnati. Most of the children that come to the juvenile court have, we find, already been problems in the public schools. Corrective measures are being introduced in two directions. We are keeping full and complete records of the children who pass through the schools, in the form of a cumulative record card on which four kinds of information are recorded—academic records, medical examinations, fundamental family facts, and teacher's estimates of personality. In addition, we have a psychological laboratory which examines about 1,000 children a year, and those are, of course, the problem children of the schools.

The system has been in operation long enough to show that many of the cases which come to the court are those of children for whom we have already a fairly adequate and accurate record, in terms of mental tests. A part of the investigation is therefore already made for the court.

We are now beginning a movement by which delinquent school children are to be taken care of along the lines suggested by Mrs. Mumford; that is, the lesser cases of delinquency in children who are still under the compulsory education age will be handled by the school. A few years ago our attendance department used to send many truancy cases to court, while now it sends almost none. Judge Hoffman is thoroughly in sympathy with the idea, and we are trying to work out a plan of cooperation.

Miss Mabelle B. Blake (Boston, Massachusetts): In connection with Judge Ricks' remarks with respect to the personality of the probation officer, it seems to me...
that one of the great factors to be considered is that the probation officer must not give up too easily. Boys and girls are put on probation, and perhaps they do not do just as well as the probation officer thinks they ought to. Often in a few weeks' time—certainly within a month's time—he has gone back to court and said, "Probation is a failure; this child is not doing well," and consequently the child is surrendered to the court. That is a very serious situation. We must give children time to make good, and for that reason we need probation officers who are not going to give up quickly. We need those who are not too far away from children themselves, so that they will not forget the ordinary and natural things that children do.

In regard to volunteers, if we do use them, they should if possible be especially trained, and they should be carefully supervised and under the direction of a probation officer who knows his job.

Miss Anna B. Pratt (Director, White-Williams Foundation for Girls, Philadelphia): We began in a very small way in Philadelphia with some delinquent girls whose difficult problems were brought to us by the bureau of education. We have gone into one school with the idea of trying the experiment with all the children in the school, beginning with the fifth grade, and taking up the health problem. We have made a special study of each child in order that its peculiar problems might be understood, and we have endeavored to bring an understanding to the teacher. Next year it is our intention to begin in the primary grades.

Major Bird T. Baldwin (Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C.): There is one phase of the problem which has not been touched upon. After every great war we have found the country flooded with derelicts, dependent men who have been unable to find themselves again. We are at the close of a great war. For the past year and a half I have had charge of the reconstruction work at the Walter Reed Hospital. Our object has been to take the wounded men—the same will hold true of the enlisted men in general—and prepare them to go back into society as normal men, physically, socially, and economically. We want each man to be a social asset rather than a liability in his particular community. It is not an easy job. We started in one room and for six months we have averaged 1,200 young men. These are largely boys, and most of them are untrained. A great many of them have had only meager education. Of the first thousand, 90 per cent had not passed beyond the seventh grade. If you will go to the Walter Reed Hospital today, you will find 40 or 50 men learning to read and write.

Now, what is the problem? To get the boys back into society as normal men. It is a very difficult problem, and I think the probation officer can be of direct assistance in studying society rather than the men for a little while. These men are face to face with very difficult situations, for society encourages mendicancy. We started to have the boys sell newspapers—"The Come Back"—and people would give them 50 cents and $1.00 for a 5 cent newspaper. We had to stop it. In other words, society is, in a way, the wounded boy's worst enemy, and we must teach society not to misdirect its sympathy toward these young boys, whose greatest assets are their independence, their self-reliance, and their self-respect.
MEDICOPSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF DELINQUENTS

By WILLIAM HEALY, M. D., and AUGUSTA F. BRONNER, Ph. D.
Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, Massachusetts

The most fundamental need of courts which deal specifically with human problems is knowledge of the qualities of the human beings concerning whom a decision is to be made and knowledge of the causes of the behavior which is the affair at issue. Why should there be the slightest expectation of doing anything like the best that can be done in court work without following the guiding principles of science and common sense which have led to all improvement and success in other fields? These principles involve, primarily, scientific acquaintance with material handled, and with the relation of adequately ascertained causes to ascertained effects, including the effects of court action. The application of such principles requires, here as elsewhere, the development of a technique of studying causes—which, as we can readily show, are frequently not at all superficial or easy of discernment—and requires, as well, the building up of a rational system of observing effects.

It is certainly not impertinent to the dignity of the law—in this day of aiming at progress—to ask why this particular department of human effort, this deciding of human affairs under the provisions of legal procedure, should in any way be exempt from investigations of efficiencies and of the reasons for the failures which we know exist in such large measure. Indeed it is no small matter for wonderment that there has never been any keen necessity felt by the legal profession for at least the sort of critical and interpretative statistical treatment of success and failure that is considered an absolutely necessary periodical procedure in other human activities. It is plain, however, that the special study of fundamental causes has lagged behind because it is only recently that a science of behavior has been even projected.

In this brief discussion of the part that medicopsychology can and should play in aiding solution of the problems of delinquents, we especially desire to make clear its function in gathering, differentiating, and interpreting the facts of the background and of the possibilities in the given case. This may perhaps best be done by centering about a concrete case; the last one seen before this paper was written is typical enough in many ways.

A boy, 11 years old, is in court as a night vagrant; repeatedly during
the last few months he has been staying away from home all night, and sometimes even two nights. The police have several times found him after midnight. His parents appear with the officers to substantiate the complaint. The lad, Jim, is a very ordinary-looking boy, with nothing in any way remarkable about his appearance. What basis has the judge for decision in this case?

There is, of course, the lad's offense. Anyone with experience or imagination can apprehend that this is a very important case because of danger for the boy's future, danger to him and to society. His night habit of wandering about and sleeping here and there, will probably lead him straight into a thieving career, perhaps into burglary; he is likely to become acquainted with sexual misdemeanors and acquire bad sex habits; to say nothing of a general lowering of his moral standards and conditions of health. The repetition of his misbehavior, of course, has greater weight than a single escapade, but any wise judge knows that the bare fact of repetitions of offense or of previous court record offers no criterion for safe judgment. The fact is that the day has long gone by when a decision concerning the juvenile offender can be regarded as good procedure if it is made merely on the basis of offenses, even when they are as serious as the above.

The boy's age signifies little; many a long career of crime has begun as early. His nativity—he was born in Boston, and his parents in Italy—denotes nothing in itself; similar misconduct is found equally among other nationalities, even our native stock. His physical appearance, his size and signs of normal health, offer no help for adjudication. The other facts presented to the judge—that the lad is normally advanced in school for his age and social group, being in the fifth grade, that the parents seem to be decent people and partake in the complaint, that he lives in one of the most crowded districts—likewise suggest no solution.

The judge proceeds further, giving as much time as the press of other cases allows. He learns that the parents are intelligent above the average immigrants. According to the officers, they bear a good reputation and are not alcoholic. They are concerned about their boy, and have searched for him at night. They say that until five or six months ago he gave no trouble, and that since then they have punished and scolded and begged him to do better. He has made many promises, but very soon stays out again. They know nothing of his companions or of his night doings, and he does not answer when they ask him about this. He is a healthy boy, of good habits otherwise, and not peculiar in any way, as far as they can tell. The officers state that Jim engages in no other delinquencies; the boy bears a good reputation in school, except for occasional truancy. Then it comes out that he often attends school after he has been out all night. The boy himself
STANDARDS OF CHILD WELFARE

insists that he always stays out alone and that he merely wanders about looking at things. Jim's attitude towards his parents is normal in the court room, and he says that they treat him well and that he loves them. Finally, he states in ordinary boyish fashion that he does not know why he prefers wandering on the streets to sleeping in his own bed.

The judge has taken nearly an hour; skillfully obtaining a clear statement of these essential facts to supplement the investigation already begun by an officer of the court. Here is a case without obvious intricacies; but what are the real guides to rational adjustment? The parents in genuine solicitude say they are willing that Jim be sent to an institution; that they have tried hard with him and have failed. The boy does not want to go, and renews his promises to remain at home. At this point the judge, without pretending to know the real personality of the boy or the causation of his misbehavior, may make the shrewdest decision he can. (Of course, sometimes there is pretense from the bench of ability from vast experience, and so on, that makes it possible to diagnose mentality, causation, and what not from an interrogation lasting even a few minutes—but then from other judges comes the more ingenuous assertion that a judge is paid to make a guess in these matters, to be sure, the best guess that he can make.)

On behalf of probation in this case the judge may think of the possibility of modifying behavior through fear of the court, or through friendly supervision of the probation officer. But if we may judge by other careers which have begun with this type of offense these general measures are not particularly likely to prove effective, since they cannot meet special needs which are really not known. The probation officer without specific knowledge has no specific remedy to offer. The other usual alternative, an institution for delinquents, is the easiest solution. But would this, either, meet the boy's individual problem? Everyone knows what an institution for such a case means; artificial conditions of home life, repression of many normal activities and interests of boyhood, companionship with other older and worse delinquents, costliness to the State, and so on. Puzzled, the judge may continue the case for further information. This ordinarily means nothing but gathering more facts about the objective features of the home life and neighborhood.

The point of view of medicopsychological study and diagnosis may now be considered. First, what can be known through ordinary courtroom observation of the physical makeup of this boy? He may have some significant defect or irritative condition, not at all suggested by his normal appearance. He may have astigmatism and headaches in the evening, or even a heart lesion of which his parents do not know or a
hernia, or definite symptoms of some nervous disorder. Such physical findings may have significant relationship to causation, prognosis, and treatment of his delinquent tendencies.

The developmental history has not been ascertained; evaluated in the light of a careful professional inquiry, this history may in some cases be largely explanatory and show the limitations and possibilities of treatment for delinquency. For example, Jim may be subject to the slighter forms of epilepsy, readily overlooked, which in certain cases are so clearly associated with the impulse to wander. Or some fact of earlier disease or injury may throw light upon the present tendencies. The possible variations of antecedent causation are many.

Many facts told straightway in professional consultation, but rarely revealed in the court room, often include very significant data concerning the heredity, family life, habits, and behavior reactions of the young offender. And specially do we note that, naturally, this account of the boy’s character and conduct often much more nearly approaches the truth than the picture given to the judge.

Most important of all, however, is what may be learned through medicopsychological study of the mental aspects of the boy’s life. And we must insist, first and last, that by psychological inquiry we mean study of the functioning of ordinary normal mental processes and laws as well as possible abnormal phases of mental life. Mental habits, ideas, imageries, repressions, commanding interests, special abilities, particularized disabilities, form a field of greater importance for understanding if one is really to know the total range of problems presented by delinquents, than does the discovery of mental defect and psychotic conditions which all recognize as one of the big single factors in the production of delinquency. In the dynamic features of mental life and in the mental content itself we have material for explanation and for redirection and reeducation that is invaluable. This is true even of some of the cases where there is abnormality of slight degree.

To come back to Jim; the fact that he answers fairly well the judge’s questions and that he is reported to be in the fifth grade, means little concerning his mentality. He may be mentally defective in important ways and still be a fair conversationalist; he may possess the good memory powers characteristic of many of the feeble-minded, and so have progressed to the fifth grade; or, on the other hand, he may be above average or even be a genius in some particular ability or in general, and yet be no further advanced in school. We are acquainted with just such irrational school advancements and retardations, and have seen many individuals whose mentality it would have been quite impossible to estimate as they appeared in the court room. To what extent the offender may or may not be psychopathic, or what peculiar
personality traits he may have, is also not in the least revealed without special psychological examination.

Moreover, without this study what can be known of his inner life in the aspects mentioned above? Who knows what he is thinking about or repressing, or what moods, or grudges, or feelings of limitation and conflict in his own household he may be harboring? The exciting cause or the underlying motive of such behavior, the force of which the experienced psychologist knows, ranges from such a general fact as feelings of distaste for old country standards in his home on the part of a young American, to some secret subtle revulsion against some one experience. Or what about an unknown hold of a bad companion upon the boy, or some obsessive ideation concerning hidden knowledge, usually of sex affairs, one of the strongest driving forces towards delinquency?

It is perfectly clear, then, that to understand even the minor essentials of Jim's case he must be looked over physically (perhaps some special physiological tests being made), and be given a full round of psychological tests, not alone grading him according to a mental age-level, but also looking for specialized features of the mental functioning, strong or weak; and that then by the most skilful methods his inner mental life and mood and attitude must be explained in its relationship to his misbehavior.

Accepting, as always, the challenge of the practical issue, we may meet the fair question: What is ascertained through this study that the judge did not know, what facts that bear upon the really proper treatment of the case? Our answer is: The contributions are both positive and negative; the latter quite as valuable as the former. It is as essential in Jim's case, for instance, to rule out epilepsy, chorea, hysteria, syphilis, psychosis, mental defect, and various other possibilities which we have found active factors in other cases of delinquency, as it is to discover that he is physically healthy and particularly energetic, and that he is highly supernormal in general mental ability and possesses dynamic qualities that demand much in the way of interests, activities, and new material to satisfy them. Likewise careful summation of data shows that there are probably no very significant facts of heredity and development bearing upon the boy's tendency to delinquency.

Analysis of the boy's reactions as exhibited in his own account of them show no indication in this first study of him that there is clash of ideals in the household, or that bad attitudes and grudges have been formed. For the more positive side, it stands out clearly that though the household is well-managed and favorable in many ways for the development of a boy of the most mediocre capacities, and though there is quite normal affection displayed, there has been no understanding whatever of Jim's peculiar needs (perhaps this has led to a
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certain reserve which Jim shows towards his parents but has not exhibited elsewhere) and there is very little at home to hold the interest or provide outlets for such an active-minded and capable lad.

The necessary careful psychological analysis of effects of influences outside the home shows early acquaintance with bad companions, rejection of their modes of conduct, the dwelling on ideas of adventure in city life received from them, a first taste of it alone; and then, following the laws of repetition of pleasurable effect and of mental habit, frequent renewal of adventures in which much that was new and of great interest was experienced. Always alone, Jim found in his night wanderings satisfaction not obtained elsewhere. In the early morning hours, for instance, he would be held by the romance of huge printing presses turning off newspapers for the day.

The essence of such study is the focussing and interpretation of sufficient data, negative and positive, for the purposes of treatment. Brought together and evaluated are many more facts and even types of facts than the judge in court can ascertain. The way to a better adjustment of the situation concerning Jim is now obvious. It cannot be doubted that an institution would probably be his undoing; it is equally clear that there are special measures which very likely will prove reconstructive, even if he remains at home.

Summing up, we know on the basis of long experience that such medicopsychological study frequently brings out points that are absolutely essential to knowledge of causation, which, in turn, is the only rational and immediately effective approach to treatment. Short cuts to such knowledge are not possible; why should one expect to find them, considering the complexities of human behavior and mental life? And what are hours of diagnostic study compared to months of treatment which may be unnecessary, as in institutional life, or to efforts ineffectively directed during probation?

Without desiring in the least to usurp the functions of the law, and without the least argument against punishment in appropriate cases as a good therapeutic agent, and holding no brief for any theory of either causation or treatment, we may insist on medicopsychological study as representing a minimum standard of welfare in the treatment of delinquency.

A rational method of meeting the needs of the youthful offender, which indirectly affords, of course, the greatest protection to society by thwarting his prospective career, is only to be developed by utilizing the facts acquired through a good technique of medicopsychology. This procedure, carried out with sympathy and thoroughness, will contribute greatly to the effectiveness of courts and of other human agencies which attempt some solution of the problems of delinquency. Many of the huge number of failures which occur under the ordinary system
it will be possible to avoid. Moreover, concerning any method or régime, the only legitimate conclusions, as judged even by successes and failures, are possible when the essential facts that deal with the potentialities of the human material handled and with causation form the basis of judgment.

DISCUSSION

A Member: I would like to ask, What is the matter with "Jim"?

Dr. Healy: The time is too short to say much about "Jim" himself. I want to mention one thing, however. Suppose the judge had thought, here is a case where fear of the court will improve the boy's conduct, and on the basis of this had sent him home. In reality, after his appearance in court Jim stayed at home just two nights and then went out again for three nights, showing that the idea or the impulse towards wandering was not inhibited in the least by fear of the court. He now is of course, what is known as a "repeater". He is an individual on whom the law has laid hands, and in spite of this he continues in his delinquency.

A striking fact about treatment under the law, which has not been impressed upon us enough in this country, because we have no national statistics on the point, is that individuals coming before the court in a large share of the cases go right out and commit the same offense again. In connection with this matter I remember reading in the English Blue Book the fact that in one year—I think 1907—there were 187,000 convictions in England, of which 10,000 were of persons who had been convicted upwards of twenty times before. Your "Jims" handled by the courts in the ordinary way, without an understanding of their condition, as to whether they are feeble-minded or supernormal, or, indeed, without any knowledge of their characteristics or the causations of their behavior, in a large share of the cases become recidivists. Would we in any other line of human effort proceed in such an unscientific way as to continue a system that in a large share of cases gets us nowhere? These are actual facts to be considered in connection with this situation.

You ask me: What can one do with "Jim"? I say that you know as well as I do what to do with "Jim". It is a matter of using your common sense. What do you think should be done for a very bright boy who comes from an unlettered family, exceedingly poor, who have no books and things of interest at home? Someone just said to me that the boy had the making of a poet in him. That may be perfectly true. He is a most charming individual who sees romance in life, who wants experience, who has not mental pabulum enough to satisfy him; and he finds in the joys of night wandering and street experience things that are more satisfying.

How do such problems turn out? In general I can say this: Take the cases that have been failures as handled by the court and under probation, attempt to study them, and then do the thing that really needs to be done, and you will get the most marvelous returns you have ever seen in any line of effort. Just as this particular individual needs all sorts of properly provided mental food, instead of being allowed to find it in the streets at night, another individual may require segregation from bad companionship, or may need hard work, or friendly conferences, or commitment to an institution for the feeble-minded, or any one of a thousand things which may meet his special needs.

A Member: May I give one incident that illustrates this principle?

My "Jim" was a boy of sixteen who was in a good home. He was about the
average boy. He became very tired of his studies in school. He wandered at night, though he did not stay out all night. He loved his parents, but he came to the point where he thought he could not stand home any longer; he felt bound. I got the permission of "Jim's" parents to help "Jim" run away. "Jim" ran away from home under chaperonage. He went to work in a mill, and he worked out some of his love of adventure and desire for excursion in the world. Then he came back and completed his education. He is now a desirable citizen.

Mr. Bernard J. Fagan (Chief Probation Officer, Children's Court, New York City): The New York statistics show that 20 per cent of the children brought into court have previous records. Eight per cent had previously been on probation, 7 per cent had previously had institutional treatment, and 2 per cent were on probation at the time of the new arrest. I find that what we lack is enough psychiatrists and physicians with whom the probationary staff can consult constantly during the probationary period. We do get a report from a psychopathic clinic, and we may or we may not understand all that it contains. We would like frequent consultations. This should be made as much a part of the treatment as any other phase. Where we have but one psychologist in a city or town, I feel that the probation officer cannot go very far in following out the excellent suggestions as to what to do with "Jim."

Mr. J. Prentice Murphy (Boston Children's Aid Society, Boston, Massachusetts): Dr. Healy has opened the eyes of a number of children's workers in Boston to the possibility of a new kind of case work for children. He has brought out the idea of the necessity for more emphasis on the subjective and for less emphasis—or not too much emphasis—on the objective, in each social inquiry. It has been very interesting to watch the trend within the last eighteen months since he came to Boston—a place which has talked a lot about its case work—and to see how much the work of the children's organizations has been changed and how much more often the emphasis is placed upon the contents of the child's mind, where it should be. The usual procedure in most social work is to spend a short period with the individual who is most vitally concerned with whatever plan is made and then to chase all over the earth for people who do not really know him. We have been bringing to Dr. Healy children presenting new difficulties or recurring old ones whom we have had in our care for five, six, or more years, and he tells us things that we should have known when the children first came to us. He reveals mental contents which account for or explain many delinquencies and poor social adjustments—the understanding of which is the very basis of helping the individual. This new power of understanding makes the job of dealing with a difficult child a thing of promise.

Dr. David Mitchell (Bureau of Educational Experiments, New York City): I would like to emphasize one point which Dr. Healy has made—the necessity of studying the individual. I greatly fear that too much of our work has been concerned with establishing a mental rating, and deciding that because the child fails to do a particular thing he is feeble-minded and therefore should be committed to an institution. The fundamental part of the study of the child in the court is the study of his emotional disturbances. Undoubtedly a great many of the children are in the juvenile courts largely because of these emotional factors, factors which so far we have almost invariably neglected to study.

I should like to suggest further that such studies be carried on long before the children reach the stage where they enter the juvenile court. The suggestion was made this morning that the work might be done in the public schools. It seems
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to me that this would be a much better way than to wait until the child reaches the juvenile court.

Dr. Frankwood E. Williams (The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York City): Of course the medicopsychological clinic is a comparatively new thing, and it is not surprising, therefore, that a good many probation officers and some medical workers have a tendency to feel that the object of these clinics is primarily to classify the individuals who come before them. The matter is not so simple. I want to emphasize the fact that there is a particularly large group of delinquent children and of difficult children in the schools who do not fall into any classifiable group, and, further, that among those who are classifiable there are frequently such marked individual differences that the classification can be considered as but the first step in the understanding of the child. The problem is complex, and we must recognize it as such if we are to make headway at all. We must study, as Dr. Healy has so well suggested, the personality and the character traits of the particular individual; only in this way can we handle the larger part of the defective and special children. We must get away from the notion that classification is sufficient, or that diagnosis (in the sense of diagnosing a disease) is sufficient, or that we can find a short cut.
Mental hygiene is a term with a cold and formal sound; it seems somewhat remotely connected with the ideas which arise when the topic of health is mentioned. To those, however, whose daily work brings them into contact with the sick, the term represents a body of simple common-sense principles, dealing with factors in life, which are most intimately connected with human health, happiness, and efficiency. Mental hygiene deals with real life in its actual complexity, it deals with real human beings in their concrete environment, not merely with their component organs isolated in a laboratory; it deals with men and women who crave, and strive, and suffer, who are driven by deep-seated forces, only partly controlled by reason. When these men and women fail in their adjustments, whether the symptom of the failure be palpitation, headache, indigestion, or irritability, misinterpretation, delusion, mental hygiene comes to the situation willing in an unbiased way to give weight to factors which laboratory medicine is wont to ignore.

In these factors the key to many disorders is found; conflicts in the instinctive life, emotional tension with its bodily expression (cardiac, gastrointestinal, muscular, etc.), earlier experiences and situations, which have sensitized the individual to special topics, the true inwardness of the family and social environment, the fictitious gain to the patient from the invalidism, may all contribute something to an apparently simple case of sickness.

The physician has to be sensitive to the presence of such factors, and must be willing to ask frank questions about them, even although he may seem to intrude on private matters; he must not be embarrassed by the necessity of a personal analysis, as the "Straightener" in Erewhon by the patient's reference to physical ailments.¹

¹In the drawing-rooms of Samuel Butler's Erewhon indigestion could only be referred to under the decent euphemism of kleptomania or dipsomania, and even in the consulting room of the "Straightener" any reference to physical ailments was considered very embarrassing.
These factors, to a large extent neglected by modern medicine, are the complex or personal or so-called mental factors, to which mental hygiene tries to do justice. It is unfortunate that the term "mental," with its medieval associations, should be such a stumbling block; mental hygiene is merely hygiene adequately conceived, hygiene which does justice not merely to the individual organs and systems of the body, but to the more complex factors involved in instinct, emotion, and personality. It is dawning on the medical profession that these factors cannot be ignored in dealing with the wide problem of health, as it is dawning on the economist that labor unrest is a malady, which may require for its explanation not merely the abstract economic data of the past, but consideration of the real living working individual with his cravings, his repressions, his tensions, and his dissatisfactions.

In scientific work, medical as well as economic, one has periodically to return to the fullness of reality in order to get a deeper insight into causal relations. One of the outstanding results of this recognition of the importance of complex or personal (to avoid the use of the misleading term "mental") factors in health problems, is the realization of the fact that the efficiency and health of the adult adjustment to the tests of life is profoundly modified by the experiences and situations and influences of childhood. In this connection there passes at once before the mind's eye a procession of adults, the fundamental basis of whose maladjustments can be traced to sources in childhood; some are suffering from obscure and elusive invalidism (gastric, cardiac, etc.), others from futile and ill-balanced enthusiasms; others are disillusioned, critical, unproductive; others in revolt against all authority; others with unexplained estrangement from those who should be nearest and dearest. In how many cases is a profound marital maladjustment due to the influences of the childhood period? How often the adult is still sub-consciously harking back to a paradise that can never return, and therefore is embittered by a reality in which he has not been trained to find true satisfaction! How often is a distorted career with odd enthusiasms and fads to be traced to the fact that the individual was not trained to face at the start some of the crude difficulties of human nature? How much adult invalidism is to be traced to childhood training and influences!

Whoever has to deal with these adult maladjustments is profoundly impressed with the importance of the period of childhood, as determining the later health and efficiency of the individual. He would have these facts known to the community at large and become more than data of scientific record; he would have them assimilated by all those who have a positive influence in promoting the welfare of the child. Such is the motive of this paper.

To show how real, solid, and concrete are the facts with which mental
hygiene deals, how close they are to the actual problems of workaday life, a few cases may be cited, taken practically at random.

A little girl of 5 is carried into the dispensary by an over-solicitous mother, who states that the child is unable to walk; the child is a little fidgety, but is found to be capable of walking with normal gait. At home the child has been kept in bed or has been carried around by the mother; in order to avoid tantrums the mother gives the child her own way; the diet is regulated by the child’s own whims—she will take neither milk nor eggs. One of the reasons for the solicitude of the mother is that an older child had well-marked chorea and his care had entailed a great deal of hardship on her.

With a nervous child of this type it is important that the régime should be regular and determined by objective considerations; the child should be trained to adapt itself to this régime, and not find that it can dominate the environment by playing on the emotions of the mother. The mother must be encouraged to carry through a healthy régime with regard to food, sleep, and toilet habits; there must be no evidence of alarm over trifling symptoms; the child must not find invalidism a potent weapon.

Advice of this nature is apt to leave a mother rather bewildered, she needs help to carry it out; it is not so simple as to give a teaspoonful of medicine three times a day. In this case a social-service worker visited the house, to organize the daily program for the child and to show the mother that the advice could be translated into action; a dietitian also visited the home to show the mother how to prepare suitable food for the child.

In some cases mother and child react upon each other too strongly for the former to be able to control the situation, to break up the domination of the nervous child; a brief stay in a children’s hospital or in a better home environment may be very helpful; in the hospital there is an objective atmosphere, and the group influence, which is very important. “It does not matter in the hospital whether you cry or not,” said a disillusioned child, who at home had given her mother the greatest difficulty with regard to food; in a few days she was devouring the regular hospital diet with avidity.

A girl of 9 has always vomited food which she dislikes; her aunt had the same trick. Needless to say her mother has been at the mercy of the child’s demands; at home the child has tantrums, but it is interesting to note that in the more objective atmosphere of the school there are no tantrums. As to the ability of the mother to regulate the child’s life one may judge from the fact that the child has had coffee since she was 3 years old. In this case the possibility of infection from the aunt has to be considered; what is due to bad example and training is likely to be put down to heredity.
A boy of 9 would vomit if forced to take food which he disliked; he had other evidences of a nervous constitution. The mother was encouraged by a social-service worker to carry out a well organized program and the vomiting was eliminated.

A boy of 17 had for many years vomited if forced to face any uncongenial task; he had thus avoided going to school, for the tender-hearted mother kept him at home when the anticipation of school made him vomit. Under this regime the boy had remained uneducated, was living in the closest emotional dependence on his mother, and making no steps in the direction of adult independence. Here too heredity might be wrongly blamed for the result of faulty training. The mother had been likewise dependent on her parents, and was fostering the dependence of her child; she liked to have a 17 year old baby, but the pleasure meant a distorted mental life for the boy. Here again intensive social-service work was of great help to mother and child.

A girl of 12 vomited on school days; she complained "of feeling a chunk of blood in her throat;" she was a bed-wetter and suffered from night terrors. In this case the factors which determine the vomiting are not on the surface, but require a detailed study of the complex life of the child.

The above cases have been chosen on account of their simplicity, with the prominence of an apparently bodily ailment, viz., vomiting; a symptom, however, which could only adequately be explained when one took into account not merely the diet and its chemical constitution, not merely the gastric function with the degree of acidity, etc., but also the reaction of the whole child to the actual environment, its emotional life, its self-assertiveness, the formation of its associations, in other words, took into account the mental factors.

The physician is in danger of dealing with the situation in a much more abstract way; he may treat the symptom, or the stomach, instead of treating the child. He can give sedatives or tonics or alter the diet; but to give the most help he has to treat the situation in a concrete way; he has to deal with child, mother, home and school atmosphere, and must help to organize the necessary factors required for the welfare of the child. Prejudices have to be overcome; mothers have to be convinced and given practical demonstrations. It is interesting to note the answer of mothers to the question, "Did you ever make the child eat anything it did not want to?" For example: "No, thank Heaven, there has always been enough for the child to have what it wanted" (proudly); "I consider it criminal to make a child eat what it does not want" (indignantly). The mother does not recognize that, while a few drops of coffee in the child's milk may not have serious toxic consequences, they may be a bribe which has an unfortunate influence on the formation of habits of the child.
At an early age the child may develop poor habits of adjustment of a different type, exaggerated emotional reactions which will be fostered or eliminated according to the injudicious or judicious behavior of the mother. It is not necessary to give a description of all the forms which these tantrums may assume.

One may mention a child of 11, who, if displeased, throws himself back in a condition which alarms the mother; a judicious punishment may eliminate this, while weak yielding fosters it and other reactions. With one child of 2½ years, who had such tantrums, the injudicious régime was illustrated by the fact that he still got a bottle, would go to the movies, and bought candy. The later development of the spoiled child is illustrated by a boy of 14, spoiled at home, at school unable to adapt himself and therefore teased, withdrawing from hard reality into an imaginative world of his own, and frequently evading school on account of headache.

The fundamental principle to emphasize is that the child should be encouraged to form good habits of adapting himself to the reasonable requirements of the environment and to make progress to independence at a good rate; the child should not be allowed to tarry at any stage in order either to give the mother a sentimental pleasure, or to avoid the trying but temporary incidents that go with good discipline. So it is undesirable to allow the child to continue to use the bottle indefinitely, undesirable to have the child dominate food and sleep conditions, undesirable to have the child accustomed to demand and receive an unwise amount of caressing and personal attention.

Not only does an unwise régime tend to produce, even during childhood, such symptoms as have been illustrated in the above cases; it is a poor preparation for the tests of adult life, it does not enable the individual to meet efficiently the tests of a world, which is no respecter of persons, which refuses to be moved by tantrums and expressions of ill humor. Unless he overcomes the handicap of the earlier attitude, the spoiled child is liable to demand too much, to blame the environment for its scanty display of affection, to adapt himself by either withdrawing from it and consoling himself with phantasies of his own worth and of the world's defects, or by physical invalidism with its protean manifestations. So does he wring from the medical profession and the environment an attention and an interest, which is the substitute for the tender affection of the fostering mother.

As an unwise régime fosters such symptoms as tantrums and vomiting, so it may be at the basis of, or foster, other manifestations—night terrors, poor sleep habits, headache, fidgety movements (choreiform conditions), fainting attacks, etc. But quite apart from these simpler conditions we have to recognize that in childhood we find already the same types of neuroses which are so familiar in adults.
Thus a little boy of 5 with a stiff right leg, who said, "I want to be a cripple," is the naive prototype of the adult hysteric. Frequently one meets epileptiform attacks on an hysterical basis, an emotional reaction to certain situations, fostered by the gain accruing from an environment without insight.

A little colored boy of 3 for two years had been afraid someone would bite him; corrected for masturbation, he showed obsessive cleanliness. At 3 he was still taking milk from the bottle.

A girl of 12 had for some time suffered from morbid ideas and scruples; she scrutinized carefully every glass of water or milk to make sure that it was clean; she washed her hands constantly and was afraid to eat if her hands had touched anything. At night she carried on an interminable discussion as to whether she had been disobedient, etc.; she was preoccupied with thoughts of falling sick; she had always to have her mother within earshot. She made great demands on her mother's affections; she had been accustomed for a long period to sleep in her mother's arms. These cases of neuroses are important because they show in an extreme form forces at work which have to be reckoned with in general.

There are also cases where the disorder of adjustment takes the form of wandering episodes, moods, pilfering, lying, outbreaks of violence, sexual activities or interests of unusual degree or nature, which demand the attention of the physician.

The great problem with regard to these children is how to be sure that in a community there are fair opportunities for help for those who need it. First of all it is important that physicians in general should become sensitive to the issues referred to above. It has to be recognized that, although in the medical profession preventive medicine or hygiene is much in vogue at present, it is hygiene inadequately conceived, the hygiene of organs and systems, rather than the hygiene of persons. To the average physician the term mental has an embarrassing and unscientific sound; the people he deals with are thinly clad versions of the abstract entities of the laboratory; medievalism is firmly entrenched in medical laboratories. In the interests of child welfare we have to see that a sound grasp of mental hygiene becomes part of the equipment of every medical graduate. The great number of war neuroses has done much to bring the actual situation before the medical profession and to show that mental hygiene deals with real and vital factors of practical importance, open to scientific study and management.

The nursing profession, the valuable auxiliary of the medical profession, must have the same opportunity; especially is this part of the curriculum necessary for the visiting nurse, who enters the home of the poorly educated, and meets situations which are so important for
the health of the individual child. The cases cited above have shown that the environmental influences of the child must be made as much a subject of accurate study as its pulse and temperature; the visiting nurse must be sensitive to these problems.

But how can we disseminate in a more universal way throughout the country the important gospel, bring to the majority of homes the needed outlook? To the newspaper-reading public, appeals may be made by propaganda, but this method is obviously insufficient.

There is one social apparatus already in existence, of which every child is forced by statute for many years to be a member, the school system. In this system he is under supervision by trained workers. whose special problem is to educate him. The idea that education consists merely of furnishing children a stock amount of information is yielding to a nobler conception, the conception that education is preparation of the child for the adult tasks of life.

Then we must know for what the child is constitutionally equipped; we must not assume that all can be prepared for the same later activities. We shall give children the opportunity of developing each one his own talents. We shall lay less stress upon the amount of information acquired; that is not what determines adult health, efficiency, and happiness; the latter depend upon the harmonious adjustment of the conflicting demands of human nature; they depend upon being able to adapt one's self happily and productively to the mutual restrictions of community life, upon the ability to grasp situations objectively and not through the distorting influence of passion and prejudice; they depend upon pertinacity of purpose, adequate output of energy, responsiveness to the deeper issues of life.

If such be the goal of education, the teacher will need to be as sensitive to moody periods on the child's part as to bad spelling; will pay attention to day-dreaming as well as to faulty declensions; will take truancy not as a statutory crime, but as a personal problem, the roots of which have to be traced; will regard pilfering and lying as problems of equal interest; will note any sexual aberrations not as awkward incidents disturbing one's own prudish repressions, but as indications that one of the most important biological forces is causing difficulty, and that help may be needed.

The teacher imbued with these principles and taking seriously the task of training the child, will seek to make the atmosphere of the school tonic, character-building as well as instructive; and will be forced to recognize that the school and the home cannot be treated independently, that there should be a continuity of influence over the child, that home training and school training should be guided by the same principles.

The teacher, therefore, will feel it obligatory to have some knowledge
of the total situation and to help in the home situation if help be re-
quired. The teacher with her special training can come to the assis-
tance of the parent, and the interest in the child will give the teacher
an entrée and an influence which otherwise might be denied. This
work may be done largely by means of special school nurses.

Already we have gone part of the way; the school sees that teach-
ing grammar to an empty stomach is poor policy, and that a child learns
slowly who cannot see the blackboard nor hear the teacher; teeth,
nose, and throat are being attended to, and the school has accepted
partial responsibility for these organs. The next step is to accept re-
sponsibility for the child, and to realize that beside the impersonal
factors influencing childhood conduct, there are other more complex
factors—instinct, emotion, personality, and environment—equally de-
serving of attention.

Summary

The welfare of the individual child will be better safeguarded, when
parents, nurses, and physicians realize that simple symptoms are not
always an indication of simple bodily ailments, but are frequently due to
the complex action of instincts and emotions, to the reaction of the
whole personality of the child to definite situations.

It is important that physicians and nurses directly engaged in child-
hood welfare work, should have some personal experience with these
facts, and should be sensitive to these problems.

The broadening of medical work to include preventive medicine or
hygiene, and to give effect to the principle that hygiene adequately
conceived is not hygiene of one organ or group of organs but includes
the hygiene of the personality, is an important problem in medical
education.

It is especially important that visiting nurses, who are brought con-
tinually face to face with family situations, should recognize this aspect
of the health problems of the home.

The most complete apparatus for the survey and supervision of
childhood material is the school system, backed by compulsory school
attendance laws; this comprehensive machinery is beginning to be
used for more than imparting information, it is now utilized to make
children more healthy, as well as more literate; it has begun to pay
attention to the hungry stomach, the diseased teeth and tonsils, the
faulty eyes and ears of the children; the next step is to take an interest
in the carrier of these organs, the child himself, with his instinctive and
emotional problems and his individual environmental problems.

In order that the welfare of the school child may be adequately
safeguarded and guaranteed, teachers, school nurses and physicians,
and truant and probation officers, must learn to appreciate the important
problems of health which are involved in the personality of the child.
A STATE PROGRAM FOR THE CARE OF THE MENTALLY DEFECTIVE

By DR. WALTER E. FERNALD
Massachusetts School for the Feeble-Minded

It is now generally understood that the feeble-minded and the progeny of the feeble-minded constitute one of the great social and economic burdens of our modern civilization. We have much accurate knowledge as to the prevalence, causation, social significance, prevention and treatment of feeble-mindedness, its influence as a source of unhappiness to the defective himself and to his family, and its bearing as a causative factor in the production of crime, prostitution, pauperism, and other complex social diseases. The literature on the subject has developed to enormous proportions. An intelligent democracy cannot consistently ignore a condition involving such a vast number of persons and families and communities, so large an aggregate of suffering and misery, and so great economic cost and waste.

Nearly every State in the Union has already made a beginning in the way of a program for dealing with the mentally defective, either directly or indirectly. The development of this program in the different States varies greatly in degree and method. Even the most advanced States have not yet formulated a plan for reaching all of the feeble-minded of the State. It is safe to say that no State has yet officially taken cognizance of ten per cent of the mentally defective persons in that State. No State has even ascertained the number of feeble-minded in the State, their location, or the nature and expression of their defect. The great majority of these defectives receive no education or training, and no adequate protection and supervision. We know that feeble-mindedness is highly hereditary, but in most States there is no legal obstacle to the marriage of the moron, the most numerous class of the feeble-minded.

There are many reasons for the lack of a formal accepted program. The problem can not be solved by a simple formula, which can be expressed in one definite piece of legislation. It is an infinitely complex problem, varied according to the age, sex, degree and kind of defect, presence or absence of hereditary traits or criminal and antisocial proclivities, home conditions, etc. The idiot, imbecile, and moron present different needs and dangers. Each of these groups has different troubles, according to age and sex. Rural, sparsely-settled,
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communities, with homogenous racial population, have conditions pertaining to the defective which differ from those of urban industrial centers, with cosmopolitan racial complications.

The first step in a rational program would be the beginning of a complete and continuing census of the uncared-for feeble-minded of the whole State—this would state and define the problem. Many privately conducted surveys show the feasibility of such a census. The data for this census would be furnished by physicians, clinics, court and jail officials, social workers, town officials, teachers, etc. No doubtful case should be registered. Only those persons whose mental defect has been scientifically diagnosed should be registered. The register should be highly confidential and accessible only to properly accredited persons.

This coordination of existing records would be available for social workers, school authorities, and other agencies, and would be of enormous service in the solution of the individual problems which the feeble-minded constantly present. This alone would mean a great saving in time, effort, and money. This official census would give a logical basis for intelligent management of the mental defectives of the State.

A census of the feeble-minded would make possible and desirable some provision for a central governmental authority responsible for the general supervision and assistance and control of the uncared-for feeble-minded of the State, who do not need immediate institutional commitment. This State supervision of the feeble-minded should be directed by a State commission for the feeble-minded, or a properly constituted State board of health, or other similar body. Its responsible officer should be a psychiatrist, with special knowledge of mental deficiency and its many social expressions.

The local administration of this supervision could be carried out by the use of existing local public organizations, existing local private organizations and societies, or by properly qualified volunteers in each community. These peripheral workers could be made efficient by the use of suitable manuals, etc. This systematic supervision of the feeble-minded could easily be made to cover the entire State, with a local representative in each community, but all under the direction of the central authority.

Each defective could be regularly visited and kept under observation by the local visitor. The reports of these visitors, covering the life histories and the family histories of many cases, would soon constitute an invaluable treasury of information as a basis for scientific research and study in the search for practical methods of prevention. The official visitor would advise the parents as to the care and management of the defective, and would have opportunity to inform the family,
the local officials, and the community generally as to the hereditary nature and the peculiar dangers of feeble-mindedness.

The registration of every feeble-minded person, and the regular visitations, especially of children of school age, would make it possible to inform the parents of the condition of the child, of the probable necessity of life-long supervision, and of the possible need for future segregation. Suitable, tactful literature should be prepared, which could be gradually presented to the parents in a way that would have great educational value. Sooner or later, the parents will probably be willing to allow their child to be cared for and trained in an institution if he needs such care. In suitable cases parents should be allowed to have the custody of their child, with the understanding that he shall be properly cared for and protected during his life, that he shall not be allowed to become immoral or criminal, and that he shall be prevented from parenthood. Whenever the parents or friends are unwilling or incapable of performing these duties, the law should provide that he shall be forcibly placed in an institution, or otherwise safeguarded. The local representatives of the central bureau would officially serve as advisors and sponsors for pupils graduated from the special school classes, for court cases under probation and observation, and for institutional inmates at home on visit or on trial.

Under this plan there would be a person in every locality familiar with the opportunities for mental examination and methods of permanent commitment. The extra-institutional supervision and observation of cases in their homes would do away with the necessity of institutional care of many persons who would otherwise have to go to an institution, thus reducing the expense of buildings and maintenance.

There should be legal provision for the commitment of uncared-for defective persons to the permanent custody of the central authority. This commitment should formally recognize the actual mental age and degree of responsibility of the defective person so committed. The legal status of a defective should be that of a normal child with a mental age of 8, 9, or 10 years. The permanent 8 or 9 or 10 year mentality of the defective should be legally acknowledged.

The extra-institutional supervision should include cases dismissed from institutions, so that the defective who has spent many years in an institution would not be thrown out into the world with a freedom which he does not know how to utilize. In these cases, the supervision would constitute a permanent parole which would be most effective. This provision would enable the defective to be returned to the institution if he did not properly conduct himself in the community. Such provision for registration of the feeble-minded and for extra-institutional supervision would ensure that those defectives who most need institutional training and protection would be sent to the institutions,
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and that those who can live safely and happily in the community would be allowed to do so.

The keynote of a practical program for the management of mental defectiveness is to be found in the fact, which seems to have been proved, that those defectives whose defects are recognized while they are young children, and who receive proper care and training during their childhood, are, as a rule, not especially troublesome after they have been safely guided through the period of early adolescence.

Every child automatically comes under the control of the school authorities between the ages of 6 and 14. Every case of mental defect can be easily recognized during this period. Present methods of health examination of school children could easily be extended so as to ensure and require a mental examination of every child obviously retarded in school accomplishment. It would not be necessary to give a mental examination to all the school children. It would be sufficient to examine only those children who are 3 or 4 or more years retarded in school work, perhaps 2 or 3 per cent of the primary-school population.

In the large cities, the mental examinations could be made by special examiners and at mental clinics. The rapid development of out-patient mental clinics all over the country will soon furnish facilities for such examinations in all the large cities. Rural communities and small towns could be served by a traveling mental clinic, as a part of the State government. This clinical group, or even a single clinician, could examine the presumably defective children over a very large area. A visit to each small town once each year would be sufficient. Every institutional school for the feeble-minded should conduct out-patient mental clinics at the institution, and in the various cities and towns served by the school. At the time of the mental examination, the parents should be informed as to the mental condition of the child, and of his need for special training and protection.

Suitable manuals should be prepared by the State board of education, which could be placed in the hands of every teacher, especially in the rural schools, describing the methods of training and management which should be applied to these cases. It should be recognized that the defective child is entitled, even more than a normal child, to education according to his needs and capacity. The defective children who can not be taught in the regular schools should be referred to the special classes or the institutional schools.

Cities and towns of over five thousand population are likely to have groups of at least ten or more defective children. Such communities should be required to establish special classes for defective children. The proper authorities should decide upon the courses of study and the equipment of school materials which are necessary for these special
school classes. Provision should be made in the normal schools for training teachers of defective children. Every normal training school for teachers should be required to give suitable instruction to teachers, to enable them to recognize the probable cases of mental defect, and to give them a general idea as to the training and discipline of such children. The State board of education or some other branch of the State government should prepare simple manuals of facts for the use of the parents of feeble-minded children. This literature should be prepared in series with special articles for young boys, for young girls, for older boys, for older girls, and for other groups, and should kindly and tactfully instruct the parents as to the limitations of these children in the way of scholastic acquirements, and emphasize the importance of the development of habits of obedience and industry, and the necessity of protection against evil influences and companions during the formative period and of the possible need of institutional care in the future.

The great majority of mental defectives are of the moron group. If the plan suggested for the early recognition and the intelligent education and training of the moron in public schools and at home is carried out, many of this class can be safely cared for at home. We have begun to recognize the fact that there are good morons and bad morons, and that it is often possible in early life to recognize the moron with antisocial and criminalistic tendencies, who will probably need institutional care. Morons from families unable properly to protect and control their children will need institutional training and care. The fact should be emphasized that the neglected moron is the defective who makes trouble later in life, and that during the formative period of his life he should receive proper care and training either at home, with the special help of the regular teacher, or the special class, or in an institutional school.

The special public-school classes also serve as clearing-houses for the recognition of defective children who are markedly antisocial and immoral, and who need permanent institutional care. It is an easy step from the special class to the institution. The children who graduate from the special school classes should have the benefit of follow-up or after-care assistance and help.

In the majority of States, the only provision for mental defectives is furnished by an institutional school for the feeble-minded, providing care and protection for a limited number of idiots and imbeciles, education and industrial training for the morons, with permanent segregation for a certain number of defectives, and with special emphasis upon the life-long segregation of feeble-minded women of the hereditary group. It was formerly believed that it was possible and desirable to provide institutional care for practically all the mental defectives of
the State. This was before the actual extent of the problem was known, and its cost computed, and before the difficulty of securing the commitment to an institution of many of these cases was realized. In practice it has been found very difficult to ensure the life-long segregation of the average moron. The courts are as ready to release the defective as they are to commit him in the first place. However proper and desirable it may be in theory to ensure the life-long institutional segregation of large numbers of the-moron class, it is a fact that there is a deep-seated prejudice on the part of lawyers, judges, and legislators towards assuming in advance that every moron will necessarily and certainly misbehave to an extent that he should be deprived of his liberty. That such misgivings are well-founded is apparently shown by the studies made of discharged patients at Rome and Waverley. At Waverley, a careful study of the discharges for 25 years showed that a very small proportion of the discharged male morons had committed crimes, or had married or had become parents, or had failed to support themselves, or had been bad citizens.

It has been fairly well demonstrated that the average male moron, without naturally vicious tendencies, who has been properly trained in habits of obedience and industry, and who is protected from temptation and evil associations during his childhood, can be safely returned to the community when he has passed early adolescence, if his family are able to look after him and give him proper supervision. A very much larger proportion of these trained male defectives would be suitable for community life if the above-described extra-institutional control and supervision could be provided.

The average citizen is not yet convinced that he should be taxed to support permanently an individual who is capable of 30 or 50 or 70 per cent of normal economic efficiency, on the mere theory that he is more likely than a normal individual to become a social problem. Thousands of morons never give any trouble in the community.

The after-care studies of the female morons who have received training in the institutions were not so favorable, but many of these too led moral and harmless and useful lives after their return to the community. The study of discharged female cases at Waverley showed a surprisingly small number who became mothers or who married. While it is true that the defectives with undesirable habits and tendencies are not easily controlled, it is equally true that defectives who are obedient and moral and industrious are apt to continue these traits permanently. It is as difficult for them to unlearn as it was to learn. Those defectives whose tendencies are such as to make them undesirable members of the community should not be allowed their liberty, but should be permanently segregated in the institutions. No other class of human
beings so surely avenge neglect in their childhood, socially, morally, economically, and eugenically.

The defectives who develop markedly immoral or criminalistic tendencies in the institutional schools for the feeble-minded should not be retained permanently in the institutions devoted to the care and training of the average defective, for the feeble-minded are most suggestible and easily influenced, and should be protected from the companionship and influence of the defective with criminalistic tendencies. These "bad" defectives should be committed to and cared for in an institution especially for that type, where the discipline could be made more rigid, and permanent detention more certain.

If 25 per cent or more of the inmates of our penal and correctional institutions are feeble-minded, as has been shown, it should be required that a mental examination should be made of all inmates of such institutions, and that those criminals who are found to be mentally defective should not be automatically discharged to return to the community, but should be committed to a special institution for defective delinquents, and should be permanently segregated, and discharged only under the strictest sort of supervised parole. Provision should be made for the mental examination of all persons accused of crime when there is any suspicion as to the mentality of the accused.

There is no doubt that every State in the union needs greatly increased institutional facilities for the care of the feeble-minded, not only as a matter of justice and fairness to the feeble-minded themselves and to their families, but as an investment which would repay the cost many times over.

There is no panacea for feeble-mindedness. There will always be mentally defective persons in the population of every State and country. All of our experience in dealing with the feeble-minded indicates that if we are adequately to manage the individual defective we must recognize his condition while he is a child, and protect him from evil influences, train and educate him according to his capacity, make him industrially efficient, teach him to acquire correct habits of living, and, when he has reached adult life, continue to give him the friendly help and guidance he needs. These advantages should be accessible to every feeble-minded person in the State. Most important of all, so far as possible, the hereditary class of defectives must not be allowed to perpetuate their decadent stock. The program for meeting the needs of these highly varied and heterogeneous groups must be as flexible and complex as the problem itself. It will be modified and developed as our knowledge and experience increases.

To sum up, the program now possible includes the mental examination of backward school children; the mental clinic; the travelling clinic; the special class; directed training of individual defectives in
country schools; instruction of parents of defective children; after-care of special-class pupils; special training of teachers in normal schools; census and registration of the feeble-minded; extra-institutional supervision of all uncared-for defectives in the community; selection of the defectives who most need segregation for institutional care; increased institutional facilities; parole for suitable institutionally-trained adult defectives; permanent segregation for those who need segregation; mental examinations of persons accused of crime and of all inmates of penal institutions; and long-continued segregation of defective delinquents in special institutions.

The above program would require team work on the part of psychiatrists, psychologists, teachers, normal schools, parents, social workers, institution officials, parole officers, court officials, prison officers, etc. There would be highly centralized formulation of plans and methods and of authority, but much of the real work would be done in the local community. The degree of development of the program in a given State would depend upon existing knowledge and public sentiment on the subject in that State and this in turn would be measured by the wisdom and experience of the responsible officials. Nearly every suggestion in the proposed program is already being followed in some State. No one State has anything like a complete program.

DISCUSSION

Sir Cyril Jackson (Board of Education, England): The question of the feeble-minded has been studied for quite a long time, as you know. As early as 1881 we had the question of the mentally defective child brought before us in London. We started classes then. Dr. Fernald has told me that he has investigated some of our London classes, and I was very glad to hear that he thought well of them. I believe that we now have day classes for practically all mentally defective children. We have tried to work out a scheme for treating them differently from the treatment given those in the ordinary schools. I may say that so far as defective children are concerned we quickly discovered that it was not of the least use to attempt to put them upon the ordinary curriculum. We have put a great many of them on hand work and thus have made them utilize their fingers, and by that means utilize what brains they possess. We have been successful in that method.

Our difficulties have been the same as yours. There is, in the first place, the difficulty of knowing when the child is defective. I remember that one of my club boys came to me a short time ago because a son of his had been taken into the mentally defective class. As you well know, children are not always in the defective classes because they should be there, but because teachers are sometimes anxious to get rid of them. This father said that he discovered no signs of the child being mentally defective. The teacher had taken him to the doctor and the doctor had sent him to the mentally defective class. The child, perhaps, had refused to answer the questions which the doctor asked. As all of us know, if we do not tell the doctor our symptoms we cannot expect to be cured. This father said to me that if I would get his child out of the defective class he would teach him at home. I managed to do that and the father did teach his child. It was clear that that child should not have gone into a mentally defective class.
Some teachers are very kind, indeed, in these matters. I remember one teacher who produced a child who the doctor said should go into the defective class. She took particular pains to make this child come forward, and succeeded in improving him until she had him in the class of backward children instead of among the mentally defective.

There was a new act passed just before the war, which was to help us to deal with this problem better than ever before. But it has not yet had a fair chance. This new act is interesting because for the first time it really makes it the duty of the special authority, which is to be called the Public Control Board, to ascertain all mentally defective children and to supervise them in their homes, and, where necessary, to provide institutions for them. In the past we have ascertained these children through our ordinary school method, and I think probably, with tolerable success, have gotten most of them into special day schools, but the new act is going to see that everybody is supervised and that everybody who is neglected or uncared for is to be looked after either in the home or in an institution. It also gives new authority to provide a permanent institution for classes of cases which we have up to the present been unable to provide for and for which we have had to rely upon voluntary effort.

Just as in the States, so in England, in the rural districts there has been great difficulty in getting centers even for the ordinary mentally defective children which would take them away from the school and put them into proper classes. Where a teacher has been able to give personal attention no doubt the child has been as well off in the village school as in the special school. We have been gradually arriving at a scheme by which children in the country districts may be sent into the towns which have good schools under the guardianship of foster parents selected with extreme care so that the children may be in a position to attend day school and yet live in home surroundings.

We have in England, as you no doubt have here, a controversy between people who believe in the institution and people who hate the institution and who say the only thing to do is to place out the child with foster parents. I think the foster parents of defective children must be more carefully selected than those of any other child. Defective children are not pleasant company. They want both a mother and a specially trained teacher; and to find a foster mother able to fulfill those requirements is a difficult task.

**A Member:** Will Dr. Fernald tell us about the "Jim" whom he mentioned after closing his address?

**Dr. Fernald:** I can state "Jim's" case in one minute. "Jim" was a man 40 years of age. He had spent 30 years in an institution for the feeble-minded. At the beginning of the war when the young morons began to go out and get employment at good wages, Jim said, "I have been a good boy; I have been here for many years; why shouldn't I go out and earn my living?" We sent him out. Six months later his employer called me up on the telephone and said, "Jim wants to talk to you a little." He also said, "I want to tell you he is one of the best teamsters I have in my employ. He has only one fault; he will go to bed at 7:30 every night." You see the point? It is difficult for the feeble-minded to learn. Our psychological friends have told us it is equally difficult for them to forget. If we get the defective at an early age and bring him to manhood with good habits and keep him from bad associations, he will, in all probability, settle down and continue those good habits for the rest of his life. If, on the contrary, we allow that defective to roam about and to be influenced—and he is very easily influenced because he is suggestible—if we allow him to have bad associations and to get into bad habits, it is impossible for us to remove those bad habits.
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I am very fond of a remark of Ruskin to the effect that the important thing in this world is to know, not details, but the way things are going. Details are symptoms. The drift of things reveals the great formative forces that shape institutions and adapt them to new vision of ideals.

The world is moving in a way to show increasing solicitude for the welfare of children. Scholarship, as well as sympathy; insight into the future, as well as understanding of the present; respect for the natural and divine rights of childhood, rather than for worn-out social philosophy and fallacious property rights; these are conspicuous in the drift of the world to-day. This Child Welfare Conference is significant as an expression of new idealism and proof of new determination to cause the beneficent sun of justice to brighten the days of our children and secure to them the fuller life to which they have a right.

Rights are formulated usually after menaces present themselves. Rights are protective. We recognize that actual social conditions and ignorance are increasingly sources of danger to children. Definitions of children's rights are expanding in their content to meet these dangers with a force that is irresistible, and in obedience to the touch of an idealism which honors this epoch in the history of the world. I have in mind not only legal definitions of rights, but also the clearer expression of the moral sense of society and the finer conscience that is shaping itself under the stress of modern life.

The state is, however, showing an increasing interest in legal protection of childhood, because moral forces do not operate with a sanction sufficient to overcome the dangers which threaten it. The state is the highest form of physical power that we know. It is the most representative of society, since all the separate social interests that divide our life merge in it. It has power to make and to enforce definitions. Hence, we turn to it with increasing frequency for such action as may safeguard the endangered rights of childhood. We would be nobler were this not necessary. We would be more democratic were this accomplished by the moral and social forces of society, and not by the lower coercion of law. But this is not our happy lot, and hence we invoke the law, determined to do the best that is possible for our children.

One of the many dangers of this process is that of drifting into the
habit of legislating for social interests, instead of for human persons. An analogy may make the thought more clear. Division of labor promoted invention, by simplifying operations, and inventing mechanical devices to perform them. Synthesis then combined many mechanical devices into single, wonderful, complex machines that defy description, such is their ingenuity. Similarly, we are dividing the complex life of society, particularly of children, into great simple interests, such as those of health, recreation, economic efficiency, and education, and we legislate for the protection of these separate interests, while losing sight, perhaps, of the more delicate note of personality and individuality which is, or should be, the mark of real democracy. We tend, then, to synthesize these separate lines of legislation into codes, such as children's codes—in the hope of coming back to the real, whole, human view of life which we should ever have in mind.

This conference is to be given over to the serious study of standards of child care, to a review of what we are attempting, and a formulation of our larger purposes and ideals. Our work will be wisely done in proportion as we keep a whole view of life before us, and aim to coordinate all social forces in the protection of childhood. If democracy is primarily moral and social, and only secondarily political, as I believe it to be, we must count to the fullest on the power of all moral and social forces in safeguarding childhood. We must, in fact, have more laws, more adequate enforcement of laws, and more faithful understanding of their spirit. But we must not cease to endeavor to arouse all moral, religious, and social forces to the fullest realization of their concomitant or (perhaps better) prior duties, toward the childhood of the nation. If democracy means a maximum of order with a minimum of coercion, the ideal toward which we ought to work is that of doing the most for childhood with the least resort to law, and with supreme appeal to the higher sources of order and justice.
THE NEED FOR STANDARDIZATION

By FRANKLIN CHASE HOYT

Presiding Justice, Children's Court, New York City

The experience of all of us who are engaged in any form of social work has demonstrated beyond any argument, the vital necessity for the maintenance of certain minimum standards in the various fields connected with the training and protection of children. We have found too, that it is not enough to safeguard these standards in one direction, only to neglect them in another. They are all interdependent, and a break in the weakest link of the chain will cause disaster to the rest. If, for example, precautions for the health of our children and the barriers against their employment are swept away, what will become of their educational standards? If proper forms of recreation are to be denied them, what is the use of troubling any further about their health or their moral training?

In this connection, I quote from our annual report, which has not yet come out of the printer's hands:

"In our general satisfaction over the fact that New York City exhibited a definite decrease in juvenile delinquency during 1918, there is one interesting point that should not be overlooked. It may or may not be significant, but nevertheless it is disquieting. While delinquency decreased for the year as a whole, it increased in rather alarming proportions after the middle of November. In other words, it decreased during the war, but immediately increased after the signing of the armistice. In December, 1918, the arrests for delinquency jumped to 648 as compared with 371 in the same month in 1917. This increase may be due to the constant change which is normally to be expected from one month to another. Indeed it is customary for our monthly arraignments to show varying totals when compared with the same months in previous years. If so, it is without any special meaning, and can be dismissed from our consideration. I believe, however, that it may possess a very real significance and that it emphasizes a situation which deserves serious thought and attention. Since the summer of 1918 there has been a great drift among children away from school. The authorization of vacation working certificates made employment possible for those who could not obtain regular working papers. The wages were extremely high and out of all proportion to the real earning capacity of the children. Then too, the schools were greatly demoralized by the epidemic of influenza this past autumn, and many of the classes were suspended because of the illness of both teachers and pupils. As a consequence of these conditions many have refused to return to school, and being unable to continue to find legal employment have resorted to truancy and comparative vagrancy. The number of truants reported to the court during the past few months has been extremely large, and it is almost

impossible to cope with the situation as the truant schools are filled to overflowing. (It is not at all surprising that there should be a great increase of delinquency among this class, and that this economic unrest should result in ultimate social disorder.)

"There is but one way to meet this situation, and that is to cooperate in the 'back to the school' drive which is being organized on a national scale. If the children and their parents can be shown the desirability of continuing in school, and the child-labor laws raised and vigorously enforced, much of this threatened danger may be successfully averted."

Thus we find that the increase of juvenile delinquency during the past few months, can be definitely traced to the relaxation of child-labor laws a year ago, and the inability of the school authorities to deal adequately with the truancy situation. Our problems and those of education and child labor are closely related, and we are dependent upon the authorities in those fields for support and protection in meeting our own problems.

Cooperation is after all perhaps the most important feature in the maintenance of proper standards. Indeed the Children's Bureau has stated that cooperation may be called the keynote of the Children's Year. We are all aware of the lack of coordination now existing among the various social agencies dealing with child welfare. It is quite possible for one case alone to have received the attention of a great number of organizations and yet for these agencies never to compare or to harmonize their efforts. We have found families whose troubles have been known to the church, the school, the relief societies, the settlements, the hospitals, the courts, the institutions, the city departments, and yet except by fortunate accident their knowledge has never been brought together nor their activities coordinated. It has been said, "Each has groped oblivious of the others. Sometimes they have collided, but even this has not happened often, for the problem is vast. Each of these elements of social aid, of human hope and worth are moving, as it were, in avoid. The solitude of the desert surrounds them."

If we had a set of proper standards, such a state of affairs could not occur. If we could count upon the existence of minimum standards in the various fields of child-welfare work, and could feel sure that these standards would be observed and enforced, many of our problems could be simplified and in every case the children of the community would be the gainers.

The question of cooperation naturally suggests a kindred subject, and that is our crying need for a comprehensive Children's Code in New York State. We must have a thorough revision of existing laws relative to the protection and training of children.

There is a great need at present for a codification of these statutes, which as has been said, "are scattered about without systematic arrange-
ment, a condition which could hardly be avoided owing to sporadic amendment and spasmodic constructive legislation."

The cornerstone for our proposed Children's Code is to be found in the constitutional amendment now before the legislature, granting equity powers to children's courts and courts of domestic relations. I have not the time to discuss this amendment in detail, but I can say that until the Constitution permits the creation of courts with proper powers to administer social justice, the formulation of a satisfactory children's code will be impossible. To enforce the standards as provided by the code we must have as our first requisite a court of competent jurisdiction. I trust that every one interested in the cause of child welfare will do his utmost during the coming year to see that this amendment shall receive favorable action at the hands of the legislature in 1920.

The day of casual and indefinite methods in provisions for the protection and training of children is drawing to a close. Too long have we been satisfied with a sort of hit-or-miss system, which is pitifully suggestive of wasted effort, and indicative of wholesale demoralization. President Wilson said: "Attention is now being given to education and labor conditions for children by the legislatures of both France and England, showing that the conviction among the Allies is that the protection of childhood is essential to winning the war." Is it not our duty now that the strife is over to give our attention to these self-same problems, and to look upon the protection of childhood as essential to the finer development of the nation in the new era which lies before us? I am not a believer in the multiplication of laws and statutes which will deprive a man, or a child for that matter, of independent action or thought. I do not believe in making an individual a mere automaton in the operation of a super-socialistic State, but I do believe in comprehensive effort and planning for the protection and proper development of the children of our nation.
THE METHOD OF PROCEDURE

By C. C. CARSTENS

General Secretary, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children

During the early years of the war, from 1914 to 1917, one of the most striking facts in connection with public sentiment on all matters relating to the Great War and to our American attitude towards it was the lack of a strong public opinion, either for or against. This lack exists in many other matters relating to American civilization, and is particularly noticeable in the plans for social legislation which are being shaped by municipalities, by counties, or by States. When the United States finally cast in its lot with the Allies, it was because there had come into our thinking an expression of national ideals which had crystallized our thoughts and directed all our energies toward the accomplishment of one definite purpose.

There is more than a slight analogy between that situation and the one to which we are to give our attention.

Diversities of race, of language, and of political development in our various States have led to a complicated divergence in children's laws and in the organizations which care for the various groups that are the subject of our interest. In Michigan, Minnesota, Massachusetts, and certain other States a clear recognition that the State has a central responsibility for its wards is shown in the development of its institutions. In Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and many other States the State as a unit of administration gives little if any indication of the assumption of such responsibility, while New York, Ohio, and Indiana seem to lie between the two extremes. The fact of such diversity, which is recognized by all of us, is not to be lamented so much in itself as in the fact that it connotes a lack of clear thinking, of the proper adaptation of our institutions to our needs, and of such a minimum uniformity as is after all needed between States.

The Federal Government is giving increasing recognition to the social welfare of the people of this country. This has been evidenced in various ways, and in children's work particularly by the establishment of the Federal Children's Bureau and by the passage of a Federal law protecting children from exploitation through labor. But for the proper development of child-welfare standards and child-welfare institutions, the United States is still very largely in the position of a
group of forty-eight little republics each of which may learn from its neighbor but none of which needs modify its plans because of the existence of a better procedure in a neighboring State.

The task before any group who are urging the standardization of children's laws throughout the Nation resolves itself in large part into an effort to inspire groups in the various States to study good methods in children's work, to learn the weaknesses of the plans of their own State, and to work for the adoption of a new children's code, or to discover the next logical steps to take in the development of the State's child-welfare institutions. The method which has been pursued by several States with the greatest success has consisted in obtaining the appointment of State commissions by the governor, either with or without legislative sanction. Such commissions generally consist of a group of citizens interested in various forms of child welfare. An executive secretary is appointed to undertake the secretarial work and the direction of the various investigations that are needed. The Federal Children's Bureau has given great aid by providing not only an index of child-welfare legislation in the particular State, but also digests of certain types of laws in force in the various States. If a State cannot convince its governor or its legislature that a commission to revise and codify children's laws is desirable, a group of citizens who have become convinced of this need can make at least a preliminary investigation and can generally bring about the appointment of a commission at a later date, or can draft laws to submit to the legislature without the assistance of a commission.

The procedure of any such State commission may be outlined as follows: At the beginning it should determine how broad its field of work shall be. For instance, shall it deal with the needs of the various classes of handicapped children only? Or shall it concern itself with all children, and so include for instance the welfare responsibilities of the school, such as medical inspection, physical education, vocational guidance, continuation schools, and various other subjects that have such a large part in the life of the child and his training for the world's work? Then the field chosen must be carefully studied. There are in all our States at the present time colleges and universities, members of whose staffs are ready to take their share in making and directing investigations. Civic leagues; bureaus of research and child welfare; and family, neighborhood, and industrial agencies are also ready to help. The coordination of these various resources provides a means for making field and library investigations of great value. The Federal Children's Bureau has made important investigations, enunciated important principles and standards, and is becoming increasingly valuable in child-welfare work. In the gathering together of facts many different agencies can contribute, but in studying the results of the investigation
and making recommendations for changes, the commission must become a well-organized body in order to coordinate these recommendations with each other and with the body of child-welfare law already in existence in its State. When the law recommendations have been decided upon, there comes the important procedure of drafting the code or the separate bills. This is a service which law schools like to share with drafting departments of the universities of our various States.

There are certain clearly marked tendencies in the development of child-welfare legislation in our various States. While there are now but few States in the Union where a central board, such as a board of charity or a board of children's guardians, has assumed responsibility for the care of the children of that State, sentiment is growing in favor of legislation to establish such a body. Under whatever name such powers may be administered, it is essential that States should have such a board with State-wide power and responsibility. This body should be charged not only with the State's responsibility for the handicapped groups, but should consider also the welfare of the hundred per cent of children, and should be required to investigate untoward conditions and propose to the legislature needed changes in legislation without waiting to be specifically asked to do so.

Along with the development of such a central body there grows increasingly a sense of the need of a well-organized local public-service unit. In most parts of the United States this unit should cover the area of the county in which it would perform the various social functions in connection with probation, parole, recreation, protective, and other child-caring work. Although the county shows here and there a backward development, it offers the largest opportunities of usefulness. Some of our States have begun to organize county boards of public welfare. Missouri, Kansas, and North Carolina will shortly have lessons to teach us in this field, and Dutchess County, New York, has been carrying on an interesting experiment in developing a county social welfare unit.

The importance of these two, the State and local units of service, and their interrelation, will become increasingly appreciated as we come to add varying forms of social service. The lack of them has already led to the development of unrelated boards or the addition of administrative functions to juvenile courts in many States and cities.

Much of the impetus for new boards to administer mothers' pensions, industrial schools, probation, and such activities, has come because of the revolt against the word "charity" and the bald facts of charitable administration. A board of children's guardians avoids this objection and may easily undertake a variety of functions that are at foundation closely interrelated.

The scheme of having forty-eight individual republics independent
as far as State and local legislation is concerned, has some very decided advantages when once we have grasped certain national ideals in social service and education. In the different States it is possible to experiment with various forms of administration while the subject is still in the experimental stage.

Mothers' pensions a few years ago became a national ideal, to the development of which social workers had unconsciously contributed but in the shaping of which they had taken very little part. The administration of such laws was still in the experimental stage when the drive began. The administrative body was generally made a new kind of relief agency without any tying-up to agencies dealing with the same families. The sum total of mothers' pension legislation will be beneficial without doubt, but the procedure of our States in putting these laws on their statute books is largely a lesson in how not to do it.

Juvenile court legislation is another subject requiring constant study and revision. It is now twenty years since the first juvenile court law was passed. A well-developed State plan of service needs to be presented for criticism, adoption, and trial.

The interrelation of public and private child-welfare service is not one of the least important questions to be determined by a children's code commission, especially in all the eastern States. Upon the expression of that relationship will depend, on the one hand, the progressive development of the State's functions in child welfare, and, on the other hand, the encouragement of private effort and association in such a way that it will never hamper the public as it does now in certain States, but will remain as a friendly critic, a guide for greater public effort, and an anchor for good public service.

These are but a few of the many subjects that must have the consideration of a child-welfare commission. The drive is on. Minnesota has set the pace; Kansas and Missouri have gained part of their programs and are making another attempt; Indiana sends word that a commission has been authorized; in Pennsylvania a bill for a commission has been presented; what new State is sufficiently interested in its children's problems to be the next? Uniformity we shall probably never have. That is not our goal. But we would that certain national ideals in child welfare might be clearly enunciated and become the warp and woof of our child-welfare legislation in the various States.
The Minnesota Child Welfare Commission was the result of five years' agitation for a revision of laws relating to children. In 1911 our State Legislature was asked to appoint a commission for that purpose, but no action was taken. Two years later a bill providing for the appointment of a commission by the Governor passed the lower house but was defeated in the senate, probably because a small appropriation was included.

Meanwhile the State of Missouri had pointed a way out of preliminary legislative difficulties by inducing its Governor to appoint a commission without express statutory warrant. In 1916 various civic and philanthropic bodies in the state joined with a large number of social workers and interested persons in asking Governor Burnquist to name members of a group which should study our laws and make recommendations for general revision and codification. The request was granted in August, 1916.

Careful consideration had been given to the personnel of the commission, and the Governor approved many of the suggestions made by those interested. Twelve persons were appointed, nine men and three women. Of the men three were judges—two members of the district bench, assigned to the juvenile court, and the third a former justice of the supreme court; two were members of the legislature, one from each house; and the remaining four were an assistant secretary of a civic and commerce association of long professional training in philanthropic work, a member of the State board of control, which manages the institutions of the State, the superintendent of the State school for dependent children, and a Jewish rabbi who had taken an active interest in civic affairs. Of the women, one was active in the management of a social settlement in the largest city of the State, another was the director of the bureau of women and children of the State labor department; and the third was a woman of broad civic interests, long active in the advancement of suffrage.

While all the members of the commission displayed a keen interest in its work, a smaller group of six were mainly responsible for the results achieved.

Shortly after its appointment the commission organized by electing
Edward F. Waite, Juvenile Court Judge of Minneapolis and member of the Hennepin County District Court bench, chairman, and Otto Davis, Assistant Secretary of the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, secretary. The writer had the privilege of serving as executive secretary, and devoted his full time to the work. An office was established in the State Capitol, with stenographic assistance; the expenses of the commission, approximating in all about $2,500, were met by voluntary subscription throughout the State, though the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul gave the great bulk of the amount raised. The money was given largely as the result of letters of appeal. The State board of control and the State labor department contributed considerable service, and a small deficit was finally paid out of the Governor's contingent fund.

Our study was undertaken on the basis of four general subdivisions, suggested by the Federal Children's Bureau:

1. Defective children, with reference to the blind, the deaf, the crippled, and deformed, the feeble-minded and epileptic, and—as related matter—the protection of children from transmissible disease and the regulation of marriage.

2. Dependent and neglected children, touching upon courts, and procedure, illegitimacy, adoption, public relief at home, maternity hospitals, lying-in places, baby farms, placing-out agencies, institutional homes, abandonment, and desertion.

3. Delinquent children, including courts and procedure, correctional institutions, moral safeguards, and adults contributing to delinquency.

4. General child welfare, including birth registration, vital statistics, regulation of midwives, school attendance, regulation of employment, and crimes against children.

Four committees were appointed to study the field as outlined, and to report findings to the general body. Six months after its appointment, the commission transmitted its report, with forty-three proposed laws, to the Governor. The findings of the commission were adopted in almost every instance by a unanimous vote of that body. Where there was a division, a substantial majority had approved. As the legislature was then in session, the Governor promptly sent the report to the legislature, with his approval, and asked favorable consideration for the program as a whole, since it was closely interrelated as to details.

Persons friendly to the proposed legislation secured the consent of the speaker of the house and the president of the senate to the appointment of a joint committee on child welfare, with five members of the senate and seven members of the house. The writer, because of his
connection with the commission, was made clerk of this joint committee, which gave the commission important strategic advantages both in committee and on the floor of the houses when the bills were under discussion.

The joint committee reported favorably to the legislature thirty-five of the forty-three measures submitted. Eight were withdrawn, not because of the opposition of the committee, but because it was regarded as impossible to pass the entire program if these eight highly controversial measures were to be thrashed out in the short time remaining before adjournment. The measures withdrawn were not essential to the general scheme proposed, though they were in themselves of considerable importance. The thirty-five bills, bearing the double endorsement of the joint committees from both houses, were enacted into law by the legislature with but few and unimportant changes. This was accomplished by the skillful work of two members of the joint committee, one in each house, who led the fight and succeeded, in the face of a late introduction of the bills and the inevitable crush and confusion of the closing days of the session. The bills were made a special order of business in each house at intervals on four different days, and final action was taken within seven days of adjournment.

RESEARCH AND EXPERT ASSISTANCE

A careful survey of the laws of the State relating to children was undertaken by the commission as the first order of business. An index of Minnesota Laws prepared by the Federal Children's Bureau served as a basis for the inquiry, and the chairman of the commission made an intensive analysis of the various statutory provisions as they affected minors. The study of the laws of other States was facilitated by the large number of comparative studies already in existence on various subjects such as marriage, so-called mothers' pensions, child labor, recreation, dependent classes, etc. Whenever, in the course of investigation, it became necessary to study special points in greater detail, the executive secretary prepared summaries of the laws of other States, which were put at the disposal of the committees in need of them.

A considerable library was collected, consisting of reports from Federal, State and local agencies, and from the private agencies of the country doing children's work. Magazine articles, reprints of addresses, the proceedings of the National Conference, and of State conferences, (notably New York and Massachusetts), and other sources of a like character, proved of great assistance. Advice was sought from such authorities as Dr. H. H. Hart, Mr. C. C. Carstens, Mr. J. Prentice Murphy, Mr. Alexander Johnson, the Federal Children's Bureau, and others, on particular points as the various problems pre-
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I presented themselves. A lively correspondence was conducted with juvenile court judges and experienced child-welfare workers and institutional heads in our own State in an effort to get local reaction as to needed legislation.

No special expert assistance was employed. Three members of the commission and the executive secretary were lawyers. Occasionally mooted legal points were submitted to outside attorneys, who rendered opinions without remuneration. The problems were only incidentally legal; the inquiry was rather one of social facts, involving matters of policy and administration. In this regard the commission kept its objectives constantly free of confusion. It recognized that a legalistic conception was not the true one. Five members of the commission were of professional training in social fields, three were especially qualified in child welfare and administration. The problem was to discover and make proper use of the wealth of expert opinion available, both inside and outside the State.

EDUCATIONAL PROPAGANDA

The commission found that frequent public hearings served two purposes: opinions and criticisms were voiced and the discussion served as a means of propaganda. No less than twelve public hearings were held on the various issues raised, and these hearings were well attended by social workers, secretaries and boards of directors of children's homes, hospitals, and child-placing agencies, juvenile court judges, and professional men. Special invitations were sent to those most vitally affected by any proposed legislation, and a general invitation to others was extended through the press. As a result of the public hearings, sound objections could be met and future opposition in the legislature avoided. In addition the discussion of issues served to exploit the proposed legislation at the same time.

I have already spoken of the voluminous correspondence carried on for the purpose of seeking opinions and explaining the measures advocated by the commission. As rapidly as the various bills assumed their tentative final form, they were printed and sent over the State broadcast. The services of an expert press representative were obtained for special articles on the more fundamental changes proposed. This reporter was regularly stationed at the Capitol and was more or less familiar with the commission's work for that reason. His stories were written in the so-called feature style and were distinctly popular in their character, though conveying, to a marked degree, the essential points involved. This material was sent to all the newspapers of the State and was used quite freely, as our clipping service later disclosed.

When the work of the commission was completed, careful attention was paid to the character of its printed report. It contained, first, a
general summary of its investigation and conclusions, written briefly and with no attempt at details. The basic principles upon which the legislation was founded were explained and the scheme of administration outlined. Every proposed measure was printed in full, but each with a short preliminary paragraph of explanation and summary. The casual reader could thus get the gist of the measures with slight effort. The measures themselves were drawn in simple and non-technical language, so far as was consistent with accuracy and clarity.

The report was sent to an extensive mailing list, together with a letter requesting the addressee to write to his representatives in the legislature, urging the passage of the laws recommended. The report was placed in the hands of all the legislators, and hundreds of extra copies were left with the clerks of both houses. People who had not previously received a copy were then urged to write their representatives for copies, and over five hundred were thus disposed of by the legislature through its members. The various women's clubs of the State were enthusiastic and constant in their legislative agitation. The State educational convention considered the child-welfare program and endorsed it by resolutions which were forwarded to the legislature. One or two other conventions did likewise. The Civic and Commerce Association of Minneapolis was of constant help and assistance. Not a great deal was done in the way of public speaking. The executive secretary made perhaps fifteen addresses in the course of six months before various interested groups.

RESULTS ATTAINED

The commission set out to revise and codify the laws of the State relating to children. The result of its labor was extensive revision but only incidental codification in the technical sense of that word. The thirty-five measures enacted into law repealed one hundred fourteen sections of previously existing law and amended sixty sections. Only three of the thirty-five laws contained no repealing or amending clauses. Time did not permit the assembling of these measures in such a way as to make possible their passage as a code rather than as individual laws, but the existing statutes are now for the most part coherent, consistent, and inter-dependent. They seek to express the State's responsibility for its handicapped children as far as it seems possible to go at this time. The administration of the new child-welfare laws was centralized in the State board of control. That board was given unusually broad powers and was authorized to create a new division for this work and to organize county child-welfare boards in order that with centralization of responsibility might go, so far as possible, decentralization of administration. The board of control, which had previously managed all State institutions, was given more
complete control by the abolition of local advisory boards in the few instances where those advisory boards still existed.

Under the new laws, private homes for children, hospitals doing maternity work, child-helping and child-placing organizations are subjected to the supervisory power of the board of control. All placements of children in private families must be reported to that board for its investigation and approval. Restrictions of like nature are placed on the importation and exportation of children. Petitions for adoption are referred by the district court for report and recommendation after inspection of the homes of the petitioners. The board is made particularly responsible for the illegitimate child. In the language of the statute, the board "shall take care that the interests of the child are safeguarded, that appropriate steps are taken to establish his paternity, and that there is secured for him the nearest possible approximation to the care, support, and education that he would be entitled to if born of lawful marriage."

Feeble-minded persons under the new laws may be committed to the care and custody of the State board of control, and the board has full powers of guardianship and may make whatever disposition of the case seems best under the circumstances. Commitments are now possible even against the will of the patient, or of his parents, or guardians, whenever public policy makes such commitment necessary.

The so-called mothers' pension law has been entirely rewritten, with special reference to the requirement of careful preliminary and frequent subsequent investigation, and is made of more generous application. The board of control is given certain advisory functions in promoting efficiency, and the law is administered as before by the various Juvenile Courts of the State. The general purposes of the act are stated to be as follows:

"This act shall be liberally construed with a view to accomplishing its purpose, which is hereby declared to be to enable the State and its several counties to cooperate with responsible mothers in rearing future citizens, when such cooperation is necessary on account of relatively permanent conditions, in order to keep the mother and children together in the same household, reasonably safeguard the health of the mother and secure to the children during their tender years her personal care and training."

The law governing illegitimacy proceedings has been changed, and the responsibility of the adjudged father is declared to be the same as that of the father of a legitimate child. The board of control is authorized to accept and administer money settlements in behalf of illegitimate children. The abandonment of issue of fornication is made a felony and extradition is thus made possible without a previous adjudication of paternity.

The law relating to desertion and non-support has been quite
radically changed by raising the age of the child to be protected, making the provisions apply to fathers of illegitimate children, increasing the penalty, and making three months' failure to support presumptive evidence of intent to abandon.

On the side of health, the existing laws were amended to give the State board of health specific control over venereal disease and power to prescribe a prophylactic for the eyes of the newly born. The laws relating to vital statistics have been changed in order to protect illegitimate children in the matter of a public record of parentage.

There were other measures of less importance which need not be detailed here. It is worth recording that thirty-three of the above outlined measures passed the upper house of our legislature unanimously; the other two had but a single dissenting vote. In the lower house thirty-one passed unanimously and the largest vote against any of the other measures was four. Seven minor and relatively unimportant amendments to the whole program were adopted. This rather unusual result may be accounted for in a variety of ways. Of course the legislation was not of a commercial character; it did not therefore incur the opposition of private business or industrial interests. The subjects covered were quite outside the experience of the average legislator, and he took the program partly on faith, especially because of his trust in the standing and character of the commission and the thoroughness with which its work was done, and also because the legislation was largely centralized for administration in the hands of the board of control, which in our State has won the confidence of people and legislature. The joint-committee method of dealing with the subject and the adroit work of the members of that committee on the floor, backed by the considerable propaganda carried on by the commission, were also factors in the result.

I have discussed what was gained; let me conclude briefly with what was lost. A child-labor bill which strengthened and amplified our present law without making any far-reaching changes was withdrawn. The same fate befell our street-trades bill, which incurred the enmity of the large daily papers. A marriage bill providing for a decent period of hesitation between application and granting of license, and adding venereal disease and tuberculosis as disqualification, met the united opposition of the clerks of court, who deal in licenses. Two bills providing for inheritance by illegitimate children from adjudged fathers were sacrificed to the cry of "blackmail." Three other minor bills have since become law.
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DISCUSSION

Dr. Hastings H. Hart (Russell Sage Foundation, New York City): This Minnesota commission was to my mind, one of the most significant things of which I have ever known. I have never heard of a finer piece of team work than was done on that job.

I was called in consultation while that commission was sitting; and I told them frankly I thought it would be impossible for them to carry out their program; that the time was too short, and that they would not accomplish it. I advised them to wait until the next legislature, two years later. But they disregarded my advice and went ahead, for which I am very thankful; and they demonstrated the possibility of doing this work within six months, by the combination which they made and the admirable way in which they worked together.

I want to call your attention to one thing: the difference between the method followed in Minnesota and the method followed (at the same time) in Missouri, which also had a code commission. The Missouri code commission divided up into eight subcommittees, and each one of those subcommittees worked independently. The test came when they tried to get together. They could not coordinate their work; and the result was that they had to go before the legislature with a report upon which they could not unanimously agree. That, of course, weakened them considerably. They passed eleven bills out of forty-five, whereas Minnesota passed thirty-five out of forty-three.

Then, too, the character of this Minnesota legislation is very remarkable. They have tried some experiments which are of national significance, especially in this matter of dealing with the child of the unmarried mother, and also in the investigation of adoption applications by the State board of control.

Mr. J. Lawrence Solly (Executive Secretary of the Board of Children's Guardians, District of Columbia): I believe it is the duty of everybody in the District of Columbia at the present time to call the attention of the people from out of town to the fact that we have no vote in the District of Columbia, and that for our legislation we are entirely dependent on the representatives from your States who come here to Washington, and when they can spare the time occasionally pass legislation affecting our city and our district.

We have a board of children's guardians, and I, as the executive secretary, am perfectly willing to accept the responsibility of administering any laws that your representatives pass through Congress and put in our hands.

We have asked for many changes in our laws: For example, we asked for a mothers' pension law, to be administered by the board of children's guardians, but we did not get it. We had a commission appointed a few years ago, which drafted one bill which did not pass.

We are now having a survey made by the Russell Sage Foundation, which will probably be finished this summer, and when that survey is finished, we will call on those of you whom we know to help us get through the recommendations made in their report.
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COMMITTEES

The following committees were appointed by the Washington conference to formulate minimum standards of child welfare:

1. Committee to submit standards in regard to children entering employment:
   - Owen R. Lovejoy, Secretary, National Child Labor Committee, New York City.
   - Dr. Jessica B. Peixotto, Professor of Social Economics, University of California, Berkeley, California.
   - Miss Tracy Copp, Wisconsin Industrial Commission, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
   - Dean S. P. Breckinridge, University of Chicago.
   - Miss Agnes Nestor, President, Women’s Trade Union League, Chicago.
   - Miss Grace Abbott, Children’s Bureau.

2. Committees to submit standards for the protection of the health of children and mothers:
   (a) Committee on maternity—
       - Dr. Mary Sherwood, Chairman, Baltimore, Maryland.
       - Dr. S. Josephine Baker, Director, Division of Child Hygiene, Department of Health, New York City.
       - Dr. Henry J. Gerstenberger, Babies’ Dispensary and Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio.
       - Dr. Alan Brown, Toronto, Canada.
       - Dr. Anna E. Rude, Children’s Bureau.

   (b) Committee on infancy and the preschool child—
       - Dr. H. L. K. Shaw, Chairman, Division of Child Hygiene, State Board of Health, New York.
       - Dr. Henry F. Helmholz, Attending Physician, Children’s Memorial Hospital, Chicago.
       - Dr. Louis I. Dublin, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York City.
       - Dr. William R. P. Emerson, Boston, Massachusetts.
       - Dr. Dorothy Reed Mendenhall, Children’s Bureau.
(c) Committee on the school child and the adolescent child—
  Dr. Charles V. Chapin, Chairman, Superintendent of Health, Providence, Rhode Island.
  Dr. Ellen Stone, Superintendent of Child Hygiene, Health Department, Providence, Rhode Island.
  Dr. George P. Barth, Director, School Hygiene Bureau, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
  Dr. H. L. K. Shaw, Division of Child Hygiene, State Board of Health, New York.
  Dr. William R. P. Emerson, Boston, Massachusetts.
  Dr. Dorothy Reed Mendenhall, Children’s Bureau.

3. Committee to submit standards for the protection of children in need of special care:
  Edmond J. Butler, Executive Secretary, Catholic Home Bureau for Dependent Children, New York City.
  Dr. C. Macfie Campbell, Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Phipps Psychiatric Clinic, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland.
  C. C. Carstens, Secretary, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Boston, Massachusetts.
  Judge Victor P. Arnold, Cook County Juvenile Court, Chicago.
  J. Prentice Murphy, General Secretary, Children’s Aid Society, Boston, Massachusetts.
  C. V. Williams, Director, Children’s Welfare Department, Ohio Board of State Charities, Columbus, Ohio.
  Judge Kathryn Sellers, Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia.
  Miss Emma O. Lundberg, Children’s Bureau, Secretary.

At the close of the sessions, these committees submitted reports which, after discussion and amendment, were accepted by the Washington conference for reference to the consideration of the regional conferences to be held in Boston, New York, Cleveland, Chicago, Minneapolis, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle, and to the consideration of interested groups and citizens generally. An advisory committee to incorporate the suggestions for amendment thus offered and further to develop standards was appointed. On the following pages will be found the standards as submitted by the Washington conference.
MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR CHILDREN ENTERING EMPLOYMENT

AGE MINIMUM

An age minimum of 16 for employment in any occupation, except that children between 14 and 16 may be employed in agriculture and domestic service during vacation periods.

An age minimum of 18 for employment in and about mines and quarries.

An age minimum of 21 for night messenger service.

An age minimum of 21 for girls employed as messengers for telegraph and messenger companies.

Prohibition of the employment of minors in dangerous or hazardous occupations or at any work which will retard their proper physical development.

EDUCATIONAL MINIMUM

All children shall be required to attend school for at least nine months each year, either full time or part time, between the ages of 7 and 18.

Children between 16 and 18 years of age who have completed the eighth grade and are legally and regularly employed shall be required to attend day continuation schools eight hours a week.

Children between 16 and 18 who have not completed the eighth grade or who are not regularly employed shall attend full-time school.

Vacation schools placing special emphasis on healthful play and leisure time activities, shall be provided for all children.

PHYSICAL MINIMUM

A child shall not be allowed to go to work until he has had a physical examination by a public-health physician or school physician and has been found to be of normal development for a child of his age and physically fit for the work at which he is to be employed.

There shall be periodical medical examination of all working children who are under 18 years of age.

HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT

No minor shall be employed more than 8 hours a day. The maximum working day for children between 16 and 18 shall be shorter than the legal working day for adults.
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The hours spent at continuation schools by children under 18 years of age shall be counted as part of the working day.

Night work for minors shall be prohibited between 6 p.m. and 7 a.m.

MINIMUM WAGE

Minors at work shall be paid at a rate of wages which for full-time work shall yield not less than the minimum essential for the "necessary cost of proper living." During a period of learning they may be rated as learners and paid accordingly. The length of the learning period should be fixed on educational principles only.

PLACEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT SUPERVISION

There shall be a central agency which shall deal with all juvenile employment problems. Adequate provision shall be made for advising children when they leave school of the employment opportunities open to them, for assisting them in finding suitable work, and providing for them such supervision as may be needed during the first few years of their employment. All agencies working towards these ends shall be coordinated through the central agency.

ADMINISTRATION

EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATES

Provision shall be made for issuing employment certificates to all children entering employment who are under 18 years of age.

An employment certificate shall not be issued to the child until the issuing officer has received, approved, and filed the following:

1. Reliable documentary proof of the child's age.
2. Satisfactory evidence that the child has completed the eighth grade.
3. A certificate of physical fitness signed by a public-health physician or school physician. This certificate shall state that the minor has been thoroughly examined by the physician and that he is physically qualified for the employment contemplated.
4. Promise of employment.

The certificate shall be issued to the employer and shall be returned by the employer to the issuing officer when the child leaves his employment.

The school last attended, the compulsory education department, and the continuation schools shall be kept informed by the issuing officers of certificates issued or refused and of unemployed children for whom certificates have been issued.
MINIMUM STANDARDS

Minors over 18 years of age shall be required to present evidence of age before being permitted to work in occupations having an age prohibition.

Record forms shall be standardized and the issuing of employment certificates shall be under State supervision.

Reports shall be made to the factory inspection department of all certificates issued and refused.

COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE LAWS

Full-time attendance officers adequately proportioned to the school population shall be provided in cities, towns, and counties to enforce the school attendance law.

The enforcement of school attendance laws by city, town, or county school authorities shall be under State supervision.

FACTORY INSPECTION AND PHYSICAL EXAMINATION OF EMPLOYED MINORS

Inspection for the enforcement of all child-labor laws, including those regulating the employment of children in mines or quarries, shall be under one and the same department. The number of inspectors shall be sufficient to insure the regular observance of the laws.

Provision should be made for a staff of physicians adequate to examine periodically all employed children under 18 years of age.
MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE PUBLIC PROTECTION OF THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN AND MOTHERS

MATERNITY

1. Maternity or prenatal centers, sufficient to provide for all cases not receiving prenatal supervision from private physicians. The work of such a center should include:

   (a) Complete physical examination by physician as early in pregnancy as possible, including examination of heart, lungs, abdomen and urine, and the taking of blood pressure; internal examination and pelvic measurements before seventh month in primipara; examination of urine every four weeks during early months, at least every two weeks after sixth month, and more frequently if indicated; Wassermann test, when indicated.

   (b) Instruction in hygiene of maternity and supervision throughout pregnancy, through at least monthly visits to a maternity center until end of sixth month, and every two weeks thereafter. Literature to be given mother to acquaint her with the principles of infant hygiene.

   (c) Employment of sufficient number of public-health nurses to do home visiting and to give instructions to expectant mothers in hygiene of pregnancy and early infancy; to make visits and to care for patient in puerperium; and to see that every infant is referred to an infant-welfare center.

   (d) Confinement at home by a physician or a properly trained and qualified attendant, or in a hospital.

   (e) Nursing service at home at the time of confinement and during the lying-in period, or hospital care.

   (f) Daily visits through fifth day, and at least two other visits during second week by physician or nurse from maternity center.

   (g) At least ten days' rest in bed after a normal delivery, with sufficient household service to allow mother to recuperate.

   (h) Examination by physician before discharging patient, not later than six weeks after delivery.

2. Clinics, such as dental clinics and venereal clinics, for needed treatment during pregnancy.

3. Maternity hospitals, or maternity wards in general hospitals, sufficient to provide care in all complicated cases and for all women.
wishing hospital care; free or part-payment obstetrical care to be provided in every necessitous case at home or in a hospital.

4. All midwives to be required by law to show adequate training, and to be licensed and supervised.

5. Training and registration of household attendants to care, under the supervision of physician or public-health nurse, for sicknesses in the home and for the home during sickness.

6. Education of general public as to problems presented by maternal and infant mortality and their solution.

INFANTS AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

1. Complete birth registration by adequate legislation requiring reporting within three days after birth.

2. Prevention of infantile blindness by making and enforcing adequate laws for treatment of eyes of every infant at birth and supervision of all positive cases.

3. Sufficient number of children's health centers to give health instruction under medical supervision for all infants and children not under care of private physician, and to give instruction in care and feeding of children to mothers, at least once a month throughout first year, and at regular intervals throughout preschool age. This center to include a nutrition clinic.

4. Children's health center to provide or to cooperate with sufficient number of public-health nurses to make home visits to all infants and children of preschool age needing care—one public-health nurse for average population of 2,000.

Visits to the home are for the purpose of instructing the mother in:

(a) Value of breast feeding.

(b) Technique of nursing.

(c) Technique of bath, sleep, clothing, ventilation, and general care of the baby, with demonstrations.

(d) Preparation and technique of artificial feeding.

(e) Dietary essentials and selection of food for the infant and for older children.

(f) Prevention of disease in children.

5. Dental clinics; eye, ear, nose, and throat clinics; venereal and other clinics for the treatment of defects and disease.

6. Children's hospitals, or beds in general hospitals, or provision for medical and nursing care at home, sufficient to care for all sick infants and young children.

7. State licensing and supervision of all child-caring institutions or homes in which infants or young children are cared for.

8. General educational work in prevention of communicable dis-
ease and in hygiene and feeding of infants and young children, including compulsory course in child hygiene in the public schools.

SCHOOL CHILDREN

1. Proper location, construction, hygiene and sanitation of schoolhouse; adequate room space—no overcrowding.
2. Adequate playground and recreational facilities, physical training, and supervised recreation.
3. Open-air classes and rest periods for pretubercular and certain tuberculous children, and children with grave malnutrition. Special classes for children needing some form of special instruction due to physical or mental defect.
4. Full-time school nurse for not more than 1,000 children to give instruction in personal hygiene and diet, to make home visits to advise and instruct mothers in principles of hygiene, nutrition, and selection of family diet, and to take children to clinics with permission of parents.
5. Adequate space and equipment for school medical work and available laboratory service.
6. Part-time physician with one full-time nurse for not more than 2,000 children, or full-time physician with two full-time nurses for 4,000 children for:
   (a) Complete standardized basic physical examinations once a year, with determination of weight and height at beginning and end of each school year; monthly weighing wherever possible.
   (b) Continuous health record for each child to be kept on file with other records of the pupil. This should be a continuation of the preschool health record which should accompany the child to school.
   (c) Special examinations to be made of children referred by teacher or nurse.
   (d) Supervision to control communicable disease.
   (e) Recommendation of treatment for all remediable defects, diseases, deformities, and cases of malnutrition.
   (f) Follow-up work by nurse to see that physician's recommendations are carried out.
7. Available clinics for dentistry, nose, throat, eye, ear, skin, and orthopedic work; and for free vaccination for smallpox and typhoid.
8. Nutrition classes for physically subnormal children, and the maintenance of midmorning lunch or hot noonday meal when necessary.
9. Examination by psychiatrist of all atypical or retarded children.
10. Education of school child in health essentials.
11. General educational work in health and hygiene, including education of parent and teacher, to secure full cooperation in health program.
MINIMUM STANDARDS

ADOLESCENT CHILDREN

1. Complete standardized basic physical examinations by physician, including weight and height, at least once a year, and recommendation for necessary treatment to be given at children's health center or school.


3. Supervision and instruction to insure:

   (a) Ample diet, with special attention to growth-producing foods.
   (b) Sufficient sleep and rest and fresh air.
   (c) Adequate and suitable clothing.
   (d) Proper exercise for physical development.
   (e) Knowledge of sex hygiene and reproduction.

4. Full-time education compulsory to at least 16 years of age, adapted to meet the needs and interest of the adolescent mind, with vocational guidance and training.

5. Clean, ample recreational opportunities to meet social needs.

6. Legal protection from exploitation, vice, drug habits, etc.
MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN IN NEED OF SPECIAL CARE

1. GENERAL STATEMENT

Every child should have normal home life, an opportunity for education, recreation, vocational preparation for life, and for moral and spiritual development in harmony with American ideals and the educational and spiritual agencies by which these rights of the child are normally safeguarded. The Conference recognizes the fundamental role of home, religion, and education in the development of childhood.

Aside from the general fundamental duty of the State toward children in normal social conditions, ultimate responsibility for children who, on account of improper home conditions, physical handicap, or delinquency, are in need of special care devolves upon the State. Particular legislation is required for children in need of such care, the aim of which should be the nearest approach to normal development. Laws enacted by the several States for these purposes should be coordinated as far as practicable in view of conditions in the several States, and in line with national ideals.

2. HOME CARE

The aim of all provision for children in need of special care necessitating removals from their own homes, should be to secure for each child home life as nearly normal as possible, to safeguard his health, and provide opportunities for education, recreation, vocational preparation, and moral and spiritual development. To a much larger degree than at present, family homes may be used to advantage in the care of special classes of children.

3. ADEQUATE INCOME

Home life, which is, in the words of the Conclusions of the White House Conference, "the highest and finest product of civilization," cannot be provided except upon the basis of an adequate income for each family, and hence private and governmental agencies charged with the responsibility for the welfare of children in need of special care should be urged to supplement the resources of the family wherever the income is insufficient, in such measure that the family budget conforms to the average standard of the community.
4. INCORPORATION, LICENSING, AND SUPERVISION

A State board of charities, or a similar supervisory body, should be held responsible for the regular inspection and licensing of every institution, agency, or association, public or private, incorporated or otherwise, that receives or cares for children who suffer from physical handicaps, or who are delinquent, dependent, or without suitable parental care.

This supervision should be conceived and exercised in harmony with democratic ideals which invite and encourage the service of efficient, altruistic forces of society in the common welfare. The incorporation of such institutions, agencies, and associations should be required, and should be subject to the approval of the State board of charities or similar body.

5. REMOVAL OF CHILDREN FROM THEIR HOMES

Unless unusual conditions exist, the child's welfare is best promoted by keeping him in his own home. No child should be removed from his home unless it is impossible so to reconstruct family conditions or build and supplement family resources as to make the home safe for the child, or so to supervise the child as to make his continued presence safe for the community.

6. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING CHILD PLACING

This Conference reaffirms in all essentials the resolutions of the White House Conference of 1909 on the Care of Dependent Children. We believe they have been guides for communities and States that have sought to reshape their plans for children in need of special care. We commend them for consideration to all communities whose standards do not as yet conform to them, so that such standards may be translated into practice in the various States.

Before a child is placed in other than a temporary foster home adequate consideration should be given to his health, mentality, character, and family history and circumstances. Removable physical defects should be corrected.

Complete records of every child under care are necessary to a proper understanding of the child's heredity, development, and progress while under the care of the agency.

Careful and wise investigation of foster homes is prerequisite to the placing of children. Adequate standards should be required of the foster families as to character, intelligence, experience, training, ability, income, and environment.

A complete record should be kept of each foster home, giving the information on which approval was based. The records should also show the agency's contacts with the family from time to time for the...
purpose of indicating the care it gave to the child entrusted to it. In this way special abilities in the families will be developed and con-
served for children.

Supervision of children placed in foster homes should include ade-
quate visits by properly qualified and well-trained visitors and constant
watchfulness over the child's health, education, and moral and spiritual
development. Supervision of children in boarding homes should also
involve the careful training of the foster parents in their task. Super-
vision is not a substitute for the responsibilities which properly rest
with the foster family.

7. CARE OF CHILDREN OF ILLEGITIMATE BIRTH

The child of illegitimate birth represents a very serious condition
of neglect, and for this reason special safeguards should be provided
for these children.

Save for unusual reasons both parents should be responsible for the
child during its minority, and especially should the responsibility of
the father be emphasized. Care of the child by its mother during the
first nursing months is highly desirable, and no parents of a child of
illegitimate birth should be permitted to surrender the child outside
of its own family, save with the consent of a properly designated State
department or a court of proper jurisdiction. More adequate and
humane treatment of such cases in court procedure and otherwise will
result in greater willingness to have them considered, which is in line
with the protection needed. The whole treatment and care of the
unmarried mother and her child should include the best medical super-
vision and the widest opportunity for education under wholesome,
normal conditions in the community.

8. RURAL SOCIAL WORK

Social work for children in rural parts of the country has been
neglected. The essential principles of child-welfare work should be
applied to rural needs, and agencies for rural service encouraged.

9. RECREATION

The desire for recreation and amusement is a normal expression of
every child and an important avenue for moral education and for the
prevention of delinquency. It should be the concern of the State that
wholesome play, recreation, and amusement be provided by cities and
towns and that commercialized recreation be supervised and safe-
guarded.

10. JUVENILE COURT

Every locality should have available a court organization providing
for separate hearings of children's cases, a special method of detention
for children, adequate investigation for every case, provision for super-
vision or probation by trained officers, and a system for recording and filing social as well as legal information. In dealing with children the procedure should be under chancery jurisdiction, and juvenile records should not stand as criminal records against the children. Whenever possible such administrative duties as child-placing and relief should not be required of the juvenile court, but should be administered by existing agencies provided for that purpose, or in the absence of such agencies, special provision should be made therefor; nor should cases of dependency or destitution in which no questions of improper guardianship or final and conclusive surrender of guardianship are involved, be instituted in juvenile courts.

The juvenile victims of sex offenses are without adequate protection against unnecessary publicity and further corruption in our courts. To safeguard them, the jurisdiction of the juvenile court should be extended to deal with adult sex offenders against children, and all safeguards of that court be accorded to their victims.

In all cases of adoption of children, the court should make a full inquiry into all the facts through its own visitor or through some other unbiased agency, before awarding the child's custody.

11. MENTAL HYGIENE AND CARE OF MENTALLY DEFECTIVE CHILDREN

The value of the first seven years of childhood from the point of health, education and morals, and formative habits cannot be overestimated. Throughout childhood attention should be given to the mental hygiene of the child—the care of the instincts, emotions, and general personality of the child, and of environmental conditions. Special attention should be given to the need for training teachers and social workers in mental hygiene principles.

Each State should assume the responsibility for thorough study of the school and general population for the purpose of securing data concerning the extent of feeble-mindedness and subnormality, and should make adequate provision for such mentally defective children as require institutional care, and provide special schools or classes with qualified teachers and adequate equipment for such defective children as may be properly cared for outside of institutions. Custodial care in institutions for feeble-minded children should not be resorted to until after due consideration of the possibility of adjustment within the community.

12. SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

There is urgent need of a more adequate body of scientific literature dealing with principles and practice in the children's field of social work, and the meeting of this need is a responsibility resting on those so engaged. Careful interpretation and analysis of methods and results
of care and the publishing of these findings must precede the correcting of many present evils in practice. Boards of directors, trustees, and managers should particularly consider participation in the preparation of such a body of facts and experience as being a vital part of the work of their staff members.

13. CHILD WELFARE LEGISLATION

The child-welfare legislation of every State requires careful reconsideration as a whole at reasonable intervals in order that necessary revision and coordination may be made, and that new provisions may be incorporated in harmony with the best experience of the day. This Conference recommends that in States where children's laws have not had careful revision as a whole within recent years, the governor be requested to take the necessary steps for the creation of a child-welfare committee or commission. It is also urged that the President of the United States be asked to call a conference during the next year in conjunction with the governors of the various States, to consider the whole question of the child-welfare legislation.