

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE CHILD-SAVING MOVEMENT.

BY THE REV. HASTINGS H. HART, LL. D.

THERE is in progress in the United States an *organic* Child-Saving Movement. It is not a plan devised and put in execution by some wise individual or society. It is an evolution, developed by inward and unseen forces; but certain principles are now clearly defined and generally accepted.

## THE STATE RESPONSIBLE.

The first principle underlying the child-saving movement is this: The great mother state is responsible for the welfare of the dependent and neglected child. When the natural protectors of the child fail to meet their obligation, either through death, misfortune, incapacity, or depravity, then the community, collectively or individually, must assume the burden: first, because the child has a natural right to an opportunity for normal and healthy development; second, because the care of such children is essential to the preservation of the community. The hopelessness of stemming the tide of pauperism, vice, and crime by remedies applied to adult dependents and delinquents has long been recognized, while experience has demonstrated the efficacy of wisely directed efforts for the rescue of children. It is true that even these efforts do not go to the roots of the social problem: they do not remedy the social conditions from which these children spring. Nevertheless, they offer the most immediate and practical means yet devised for the prevention of pauperism, vice, and crime.

## IMPORTANCE OF ENVIRONMENT.

The second principle underlying the child-saving movement is this: Environment, rather than heredity, controls the destiny of the normal child. There is a fraction of the children in the community which includes children who inherit feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, syphilis, etc., condemned by hereditary conditions to dependency. There is a very small fraction which includes children who are "moral imbeciles"—children born without the sense of right and wrong; whose viciousness is apparently inherent, and unaffected by their environment. It has been fashionable to ascribe to heredity all of the vices and virtues of the community; but within the past few years there has been a remarkable change in the tone of medical writers and students of sociology alike. Physicians are much more cautious in their claims as to hereditary diseases. Consumption, for example, is no longer recognized as a hereditary disease. The effort of certain sociologists who demonstrate the existence of a criminal type has not been successful.

Heredity must be recognized as a powerful force in the making of human character; but experience has demonstrated, that, in the case of the great majority of children of unfortunate antecedents, if taken in time, a good environment will overcome a bad heredity. This fact has been abundantly shown by the experience of the children's aid societies of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, and other similar organizations, which for many years have followed the plan of changing the environment of young children. The testimony of these organizations is, that children of unfavorable heredity, if placed in a favorable environment before the age of four or five years, turn out fully as well as the average children of the community. The disadvantage of the unfavorable heredity is overbalanced by the great advantage of being able to select choice homes with

people of character, wisdom, and patience. The homes secured by a careful society are far above the average homes in a community, in these respects.

However strongly people may believe theoretically in the power of heredity to control the destiny of the child, in practice, nineteen parents out of twenty believe in the controlling power of environment. How many parents have sufficient confidence in the good heredity of their own children so that they would be willing to expose their young children, for even a fortnight, to the influences and the vicissitudes of the slums? It is unanimously recognized among wise people, that the contagion of vice is so dangerous that it is utterly inexcusable to expose a child of tender years to it. It is instinctively recognized that a bad environment will infallibly overcome a good heredity if continued for only a brief time. But the converse is almost equally true, namely, that a good environment, if continued for a sufficient time, will infallibly overcome a bad heredity, if the child be young enough.

It must be borne in mind that there is a tendency to ascribe to heredity many influences which really belong to environment. Even the prenatal influences which affect the welfare of a child, belong in part to environment. For example, malnutrition of the mother, and efforts to produce abortion, may handicap the child from its birth. In like manner, neglect of a child by an inexperienced or vicious mother, exposure in a baby farm, or a foundling hospital, or an orphan asylum, may start the child in life with an unfavorable bias which is to be ascribed, properly, not to heredity, but to environment.

Thousands of cases have clearly established the fact that children of questionable parentage often develop into as beautiful, wholesome, and useful members of the community as their more favored competitors.

## LARGE INSTITUTIONS UNDESIRABLE.

The third principle underlying the child-saving movement is this: The family home—the ordinary family home of virtuous, industrious people—is the best institution under the sun for the care of homeless, orphaned, and neglected children. This principle is by no means self-evident. For fifty years an earnest and sometimes bitter discussion was carried on between the advocates of the institutional plan of bringing up dependent children and the plan of placing such children in family homes. The abuses of the apprenticing system and the wrongs suffered by bound boys and girls were vividly set forth. It was shown that in many cases the societies and individuals engaged in the placing-out plan had placed children in homes with little discrimination, and that the foster parents often sought either to gratify their personal pleasure; or, in the case of older children, took them with a view to financial gain, by securing unpaid servants. On the other hand, the advantages of the institutional plan were set forth. It was formerly believed by many that institutions could be created which would be superior to the ordinary family home. There was present at the meeting of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, several years ago, a delegate from Kansas. She said: "We are engaged in the State of Kansas in building up a new institution for girls. We have a large tract of land where we expect to provide accommodations for five thousand girls, and we shall create a new race of women to become the mothers of the next generation." She said: "The ordinary mother is unfit to bring up a child. Mothers do not understand the principles of child-study, child-nurture, child-training, and all that sort of thing. We shall employ as matrons, caretakers, and teachers, choice, selected women, who shall be free from the foibles and weaknesses of the ordinary mother, and we shall achieve results that will astonish the

world." Some time ago the writer received a letter from this same woman, who was then engaged in carrying on a home for old people in the State of Indiana. That ideal institution for girls which was to be so much superior to the ordinary family home did not materialize.

It is not the purpose of this article to decry institutions; they have their place and their work to do. Institutional care is needed for defective children, the deaf, the blind, the feeble-minded, the epileptics, the crippled, the diseased, and the moral imbeciles. Experience has demonstrated that a large proportion of these children can be more wisely and tenderly provided for in institutions built with reference to their special needs and directed by trained superintendents and employes. Institutional care is needed, temporarily, for many delinquent children; those who have become so far perverted that they cannot be successfully redeemed by such training as they can receive in the ordinary home. It has come to be seen, however, that institutional care for such children is needed in only the minority of cases, and that it is not necessary to protract it. As a rule, not more than a year or two of temporary institutional care is required. Institutional care is needed for many children whose parents are in temporary distress. As a matter of fact, a large proportion of the orphan asylums and children's homes have become, largely, children's boarding-houses, where parents who are in temporary distress can pay a small sum, from fifty cents to two dollars per week, to have their children cared for until such time as they themselves may be able to resume their charge. It has come to be recognized that children who have good parents ought not to be ruthlessly separated from them, if there is a fair probability that the parents will be able to resume their care within a reasonable time; and some of the most useful and helpful work of institutions is done along this line.

On the other hand, it has come to be recognized by wise observers, and especially by those who have themselves been engaged in institutional work, that there are grave dangers involved in the institutional care of children. Hon. William P. Letchworth, of New York, and Bishop George D. Gillespie, of Michigan, pointed out many years ago the evil tendency of institutionalism—that the children of the institution lead an artificial life; that the tendency of institutional life is to repress individuality, to destroy initiative, and to render the child permanently dependent.

One of the best examples of modern institutions is the New York Catholic Protectory. The Protectory is located on a large farm at Westchester, in the suburbs of New York. The buildings are arranged to accommodate three thousand children. The institution is admirably organized and administered; the brothers and sisters in charge are apparently devoted and consecrated men and women. The industrial departments are efficiently organized with practical instruction in carpentry, metal working, printing, bookbinding, sewing, cooking, dressmaking, etc. The children appear clean, wholesome, and well-trained.

In visiting this magnificent institution one was painfully impressed with the necessary thoroughness of the organization. Three hundred boys were marched out on the parade ground, and performed a beautiful military drill. Of these boys perhaps one hundred were old enough to do military service. These boys were lodged in immense barracks, resembling in outward appearance summer hotels. One open dormitory for girls contained two hundred and forty-six beds. The playgrounds were thronged with children so crowded together as to restrict free and spontaneous action. The playroom for little boys, supplied with toys, appeared a sad and dreary place. The little children of the kindergarten age were kept in suitable buildings surrounded by beautiful grounds. When the visitors ap-

proached, the little ones came thronging about them, clung to their knees, and begged to be taken up. It was apparent that each one of them was heart-hungry for personal attention and individual care. The impression received was that, notwithstanding the best efforts of the administrators, there was a lack of that personal and individual care and supervision which is essential to the normal development of a child.

The writer visited some years ago a "soldiers' orphans' home" (it is remarkable that after thirty-five years several States are still providing special institutions for the care of the orphans of soldiers of the War of the Rebellion). In this institution there was a recognition of the evils of institutionalism, and the children were not massed in immense dormitories. They were grouped in "cottages," accommodating fifty children, each cottage being under the special care of a house-father and a house-mother. Notwithstanding these efforts, there was an unavoidable massing of the children. They were marched to school, eight hundred strong, in platoons, twelve abreast; they ate their meals in immense dining-rooms; the management and care was largely on the wholesale plan. It was stated that, at the age of thirteen or fourteen years, children were placed in the industrial department, where they were trained to such industries as would enable them to support themselves or to perform successfully the domestic duties of the home. The girls' sewing department was accommodated in a large airy room, about thirty by forty feet. The room was supplied with modern sewing-machines run by electricity. At one side of the room was a table with a large knife fixed above it. It was explained that this was a machine for cutting out boys' clothing. The material was laid upon the table in twelve or fifteen thicknesses, the patterns were marked, and all of the garments cut at one time. Probably each of these girls upon setting up housekeeping, would

immediately obtain one of these convenient machines. There was a machine for making buttonholes and a machine for sewing on buttons. In answer to inquiry, the superintendent explained that it was necessary to have these machines, in order to get through the great mass of work necessary to provide clothing for eight hundred children; but the department had become practically a factory.

There is no more helpless member of the community than the boy or girl sent out from the best of such institutions into the country at the age of fifteen or sixteen years. In the institution the cooking was done by steam, the washing was done by steam, the house was heated by steam. The bell rang for the child to rise in the morning, to say his prayers, to go to his meals, to return from his meals, to go to his studies and his play; all day long the bell, the bell! What does that mean? It means that some one else is doing his thinking for him; some one else is planning his life for him. He is practically without a will of his own. Take a girl of sixteen who has been brought up from childhood in a large institution, place her in a family home in the country. She arrives at night, and is given an unheated room. She wakes on a cold winter morning. She is accustomed to a steam-heated building; she gets out shivering, breaks the ice in her pitcher, washes herself, and goes down to the kitchen. She looks about for the range which runs day and night in the institution; she sees a cooking-stove, but the fire is out, and the boy forgot to bring in the kindling. She goes out, picks the wood from under the snow, kindles the fire with difficulty, and looks about for the hot-and-cold-water faucet, but there are no faucets. She takes the bucket, goes to the well or spring at the foot of the hill, comes back, slipping and stumbling, and spills the water in her shoe. Before the breakfast is ready, she is homesick, heartsick, and discouraged. Had

the child been introduced into the same family at the age of five or six years she would have grown up naturally in these surroundings, and would have thought nothing of these inconveniences.

The controversy which raged for fifty years between the advocates of the institutional plan of caring for dependent children, and the plan of placing such children in family homes, was finally closed in 1899. The National Conference of Charities and Correction met that year at Cincinnati. The committee on the "Care of Destitute and Neglected Children" was a very representative one. The chairman of the committee was Hon. Thomas M. Mulry, President of the St. Vincent de Paul Society of the City of New York. The committee included representatives of state institutions for children, child-saving societies, state boards of charities, orphan asylums, etc. A very careful report was prepared by the chairman, and was submitted to each member of the committee in advance. After careful revision, the report was brought in signed by every member of the committee. It was perhaps the first time in the history of the conference that a unanimous report was presented by this committee. In this report the committee said: "The finding of family homes for children has been taken up enthusiastically and with excellent success in many localities. . . . All workers agree that the home is the natural place to properly develop the child. . . . The earlier they are placed in such families the better it is for the child, as the motive which induces one to take a child of tender years is apt to be more disinterested than when they are old enough to be utilized. . . . The placing-out system needs the most careful supervision. . . . The main difficulty is to find homes for children from seven to eleven years of age and, in large communities, it will be found difficult to secure desirable homes for all dependent children. This does not, however, mean that any effort should

be spared to place as many children as possible in good homes; and this committee is strongly in favor of renewed activity in this direction. . . . There are homes in abundance throughout our cities, our towns, our farming sections, for every orphan child, if the people will but open their hearts, and brighten their homes by studying in what way they may best show their love for their less fortunate fellow-beings."

This is a most significant declaration, for the reason that it represents the complete agreement of those who were formerly at variance with reference to the care of dependent and neglected children. The report recognized the value of the institution as a means of preparing children for family homes, but it recognized, also, that the mission of the institution for children of sound mind and body is temporary, and that such children should not be kept too long under institutional care. Nearly all of those who are engaged in placing children in family homes utilize institutions for the temporary care of children pending placement in homes. The only important exceptions to this rule, I believe, are the Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society of Philadelphia, and the Wisconsin Children's Home Society, which make use of family homes for that purpose.

#### THE WORK OF CHARLES LORING BRACE.

The great prophet of the child-placing system in the United States was Mr. Charles Loring Brace, the founder of the New York Children's Aid Society, who took issue with the managers of the institutions fifty years ago, declaring that the best place for the children of the slums was on farms. Mr. Brace began very early sending companies of children to the West. The records of the society (report of 1900) show 22,121 children placed in permanent family homes, of whom there were sent to Ohio 1,631, Indiana 2,827, Michigan 1,352, Illinois 1,541, Iowa 2,606,

Missouri, 1,726, Kansas 1,510, Minnesota 1,352, and Virginia 1,067. In the early years of this work, children were sent out in large companies, from twenty to fifty in each party, and were placed without careful discrimination. In his book on the "Dangerous Classes of New York," Mr. Brace said: "The children are not indentured, but are free to leave if ill-treated or dissatisfied, and the farmers can dismiss them if they find them useless or otherwise unsuitable. This apparently loose arrangement," he adds, "has worked well." Mr. Brace said before the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1876,<sup>1</sup> "The employers agree to send the children to school, and, of course, to treat them kindly. Beyond this there is no agreement, and no indenture is made out; the relation is left much to the good feeling of both parties."

In recent years the methods of the New York Children's Aid Society have been materially modified. Children are sent out in small companies, homes are more carefully and deliberately selected, and a more efficient supervision is maintained. Admirable records are kept.

The New York Juvenile Asylum has maintained an Illinois agency for placing children in homes. Their work has been quietly done. The children have been placed with care, and comparatively little criticism has arisen. Other institutions in the Eastern cities have done somewhat similar work. Recently some of the Catholic institutions of New York City have been sending children to the West.

In 1880 there was organized in Chicago the Visitation and Aid Society, under Catholic auspices. This society acts as a clearing-house for a number of Catholic institutions for children, and also places a considerable number of children in homes. In the City of New York in 1898, there was organized a similar society, known as the Cath-

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings, p. 139.

olic Home Bureau for dependent children, the object of which is to provide homes in families for destitute Catholic children. The two societies are a distinct departure from the policy of bringing up children in institutions, which has been followed for many years by the Roman Catholic organizations. The most efficient orphan asylums and children's homes throughout the United States have greatly extended the plan of placing children in homes; as a result there has been a sharp check in the building of orphan asylums and children's homes, and there has been a steady diminution in the average of the children found in such institutions. For example, about the year 1875, the Cleveland Protestant Orphan Asylum adopted a new policy. Instead of retaining children to the age of fifteen or sixteen, the managers began to advertise in the religious papers of the Central States for homes for children. In a single year they received 1,200 applications; homes were selected with great care, after thorough correspondence; and ever since that time, the asylum, with a capacity of less than one hundred children, has been placing in homes about one hundred children per year. As a result of this policy, the institution has been able to care for four or five times as many children with the same investment as it was able to care for under the old plan. A similar policy is pursued by such institutions as the Rose Orphan Home at Terre Haute, Indiana, the Chicago Orphan Asylum, the Washburn Memorial Orphan Asylum in Minneapolis, and many like institutions.

#### STATE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

An era in the child-saving movement was marked by the opening in Michigan, in 1874, of the "State Public School." The suggestion for this school was received from the State Primary School established in Massachusetts in 1860. The State Primary School, however, was de-

signed to receive both delinquent and dependent children for temporary care until they could be placed in family homes. The Michigan State Public School was restricted to the care of dependent children—those who would otherwise be sent to a county poorhouse. An efficient state agency was established for placing and supervising the children; the state agency was supplemented by a system of county agents, who coöperated with the school in the selection of homes and in the supervision of children, and who also served as probation officers in the cases of children brought before the courts. The law establishing the Michigan State Public School was framed by Hon. C. D. Randall, of Coldwater, Michigan. It expressly provided that the school should not be a permanent home for children, but simply a temporary resting-place until they could be placed in family homes. When the State Public School was established, there were five hundred children in the almshouses of Michigan. In three or four years, the almshouses were emptied of children, and in two or three years more the State Public School had shrunk from a population of three hundred to a population of two hundred children. The results of this work found general approval, and similar schools have since been established in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Colorado.

In the States of Ohio and Indiana the same results were aimed at by the establishment of county homes, which were expected to facilitate the work of placing children in homes; but the results were not equally satisfactory. The county homes showed an irresistible tendency to increase in size. The county officials did not show the expected disposition to place the children in homes, and the counties did not prove to be sufficiently large, territorially, for placing-out work. Many children need to be placed at a greater distance from their birthplaces, in order to escape proximity to unworthy relatives. Several thousand chil-

dren accumulated in the county homes, and for several years a vigorous effort has been on foot in both States to get the children out of the county homes, and into family homes. In Indiana, this result has been sought by the establishment of a state agency under the control of the State Board of Charities, which is doing admirable work. The work of the State Board of Charities is further supplemented by the establishment of county boards of guardians, whose purpose is similar to that of the Board of Children's Guardians of the District of Columbia, and the New Jersey State Board of Children's Guardians. A similar effort is being made in the State of New York by the State Charities Aid Association under state authority.

#### THE CHILDREN'S HOME SOCIETIES.

In 1883 Rev. M. V. B. Van Arsdale, of Bloomington, Illinois, organized the "American Educational Aid Association," which subsequently became the "Children's Home Society." From a very small beginning this society has had a surprising growth, having extended into twenty States. This society was similar in its purposes to the children's aid societies of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, but it was unique in some of its features: first, it was devoted, originally, almost exclusively to the placing of children in family homes; second, it dealt with children individually, and not in the mass; third, it was not a local organization, but was organized on a comprehensive basis to cover whole States. The State was divided into districts, with district superintendents and a system of local advisory boards, one in each important town, composed of representative citizens.

The children's home societies are not sectarian, but they keep in close touch with the Protestant churches of all denominations. The district superintendents find ready access to most of the churches. Their financial support

comes largely from the churches, and the local advisory boards are usually appointed from the churches. These societies usually require that the persons receiving children shall be church-going and Sabbath-keeping people; they do not insist that they shall be members of churches, but in practice the great majority of the children are placed in the homes of church-members. In the early years of this work it was regarded with some suspicion by the most judicious and careful charity workers. The societies were new, and were meagerly supported. The workers received very inadequate compensation. The demand for money placed some of the societies under temptation to receive children for a consideration, without too careful scrutiny. This fact placed some of the societies under the suspicion of being used to cover up immorality. The poverty of the societies led to the adoption of the commission system of compensating district superintendents, who were given a percentage of their collections (usually fifty per cent), out of which they were required to defray their personal traveling expenses. This was a convenient system for the societies, since it threw the risk upon the worker; but it was an undesirable system, for the reason that it established a false criterion, the work being judged by the amount of money raised rather than by the efficiency of the work done in behalf of the children. The system tended to create prejudice among the contributors, many of whom objected decidedly to an assessment of fifty per cent upon their contributions for the benefit of the collectors. The poverty of the societies made it necessary to push the financial part of the work at the expense of the visitation and supervision of children.

As these societies have grown older and stronger, their methods have improved; the commission plan is being discarded, and regular salaries are being established. Children are received with more discrimination; homes are

more carefully investigated, and a more thorough supervision of the children is maintained. For example, the Wisconsin Children's Home Society employs four district superintendents, who receive salaries of \$1,500 per year each. They are competent men of first-rate ability, who earn their salaries. The work of the society commands the respect and confidence of the community.

In the eighteen years since the first children's home society was organized, the work has attained large proportions. Last year the twenty societies expended about \$100,000, received about two thousand children for the first time, and did considerable work in replacing children for whom change became necessary. These societies hold an annual convention for the study of their work, and most of the people engaged in the work show an earnest disposition to improve it.

Several of the children's home societies have enlarged their scope so as to include the general work of aiding unfortunate children as well as placing children in homes. They make temporary provision for children whose parents are in temporary distress; provide hospital care, surgical treatment, etc. The Illinois Society furnishes probation officers for the Juvenile Court; the Wisconsin society is undertaking similar work.

The several state societies are federated in the National Children's Home Society, of which Professor Charles R. Henderson, of the Chicago University, is president. The National Society holds an annual convention, but does no executive work. The children's home society movement has enlisted the coöperation of such men as President William McKinley, who is president of the Ohio Society; Hon. A. O. Wright, President of the Wisconsin Society; Hon. Lyman J. Gage, who was formerly vice-president of the Illinois Society; Joseph P. Byers, who is secretary of the Ohio Society; and many other prominent and careful people.

The children's home societies are still very young, but their work is steadily improving in quality and increasing in quantity. The societies of Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Michigan, Indiana, and West Virginia maintain receiving homes for their children, with a capacity of from fifteen to forty children. The Iowa Society has a receiving home with a capacity of about seventy-five children. Most of the other societies provide care for their wards in family homes until they can be permanently located. The children's home societies practically command the field in the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri, and are rapidly gaining ground in several other States. Their plan of organization is simple, but comprehensive, and its efficiency has been demonstrated by the readiness with which it has adapted itself to the needs of many different States.

#### THE BOARDING-OUT PLAN.

As communities grow older and richer, and their social conditions become more artificial, it becomes increasingly difficult to find suitable homes for dependent children. This difficulty was formerly overcome by sending the surplus dependent children into the younger sections of the country. This method is pursued in the immense work of Dr. Barnardo's Society in London, which has sent many thousands of children to Canada, Australia, etc. This plan has become less and less practicable in the United States in recent years, partly because the Central and Western States have themselves become older and richer; partly because of the prejudice which has arisen in the younger States in consequence of careless methods of work. In recent years, the difficulty has been relieved by paying board of children, temporarily, in private families. This method is employed in the State of Massachusetts, both by the Commonwealth in dealing with public wards, and by

the Boston Children's Aid Society. A similar plan has been practiced extensively by the Pennsylvania Children's Aid Society of Philadelphia. A considerable number of children of the delinquent class have been boarded out in families, instead of being sent to reformatories, with very encouraging results. A great many children, after being boarded for a time, are accepted by their foster parents without further payment. In the State of Massachusetts, the results of this plan have been to greatly diminish the number of dependent and delinquent children cared for in institutions. The official reports of the Massachusetts State Board of Charities for 1900, with reference to the children who are wards of the State of Massachusetts, show that there were, in the custody of the State, September 30, 1866, 2,065 children, of whom 1,437, or seventy per cent, were in institutions, and 628, or thirty per cent, were in family homes. There were, in the custody of the State, September 30, 1900, 3,742 children, of whom 556, or fifteen per cent, were in institutions, and 3,184, or eighty-five per cent, were being boarded in family homes at state expense. This report includes dependent and neglected children and juvenile offenders.

#### THE OUTLOOK.

The plan of placing children in family homes is no longer an experiment. It is recognized as the best plan by students of sociology. It is embedded in the constitution of the State of New York, notwithstanding the great institutions still in operation there. It is recognized by the statutes of the United States, the States of Massachusetts, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Colorado, and numerous others.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Illinois children's law of 1899, commonly called the Juvenile Court Law, is summarized in its last section as follows: "Sec. 21.—This act shall be liberally construed, to the end that its purpose may be car-

This policy has been definitely adopted by nearly all of the great interior States, and is already producing valuable results. In those States, orphan asylums and children's homes are no longer used as permanent homes in which to bring up children to adult years, but simply as training-schools, hospitals, and temporary refuges. The interior cities contain a much smaller number of institutions for children, relatively, than are found in the older cities, whose policy was established before this system came into general use. For example, the city of New York has about 24,000 children in institutions of various kinds, while the city of Chicago has only about 4,000 in institutions.

From an economic point of view, the placing-out system has very great advantages; for example, the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, only eighteen years old, has 2,100 wards under its care in family homes, children under eighteen years of age. This society has three small receiving homes with a joint capacity of about ninety children. There is invested in these three homes about \$20,000. The entire expenditures of the society for all purposes for last year were \$36,000; but should the society decide to return to the old plan of bringing up children in institutions, it must first build for the accommodation of these children at a cost of not less than \$300 per bed, or \$630,000.<sup>1</sup> Provision must then be made for the maintenance of these children at an annual cost of not less than \$100 per child, or \$210,000 per year. The economic advantage of the child-saving plan is apparent.

ried out, to-wit: That the care, custody, and discipline of a child shall approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by its parents, and in all cases where it can be properly done, the child shall be placed in *an approved family home*, and become a member of the family by legal adoption, or otherwise."

<sup>1</sup>Such institutions as the Cleveland Orphan Asylum, the Chicago Orphan Asylum, and the Minnesota State Public School have plants costing from \$700 to \$1,000 per bed.

No cost is too great if necessary in order to save neglected children, but the children who can be placed and kept successfully in carefully selected family homes are better off than they can be in even the best institutions. The outlook for the homeless child was never so full of hope as at the beginning of the twentieth century. Great social betterment is coming from the wiser care society is learning to give its waifs.