

sick of your own people, but also because of your broader interest in the problem of the chronic sick, and the consistent leadership which you have extended in this connection. An institution which is sufficiently alive and growing, to change its program from time to time, to adapt its services to meet changing needs and to take advantage of advances in our knowledge of social and physical ills, is to be highly commended.

I am especially happy to visit the Hebrew Home for Aged and Infirm at Levindale today, and to observe what this institution has accomplished toward the solution of a problem with which we are all very deeply concerned.

This demonstration which you have given here of what can be accomplished on behalf of the sick and the aged is but another indication of the manner in which private philanthropy has furnished leadership through many decades. I think it is important to recognize that the long term objectives of both public and private welfare agencies are the same, though the role which each must play may be different. One method of social organization is through voluntary endeavor; another is through government.

This does not mean overlapping of services, duplication of effort, nor dissipation of money in unnecessary or inefficient activities. It does mean that such an institution as the Hebrew Home for the Aged and Infirm acts for the group of people which it has chosen to serve, and government must extend to the larger community the benefits of the experiences of this and like institutions. It does mean that the State and voluntary associations must work out a comprehensive view of the total picture, embracing all the people and all of their problems. When this is done a clear-cut definition of the sector in which each is to operate can be made.

Setting public agencies on one side and private agencies on the other is meaningless. You cannot build a wall between them, because both are concerned with the welfare of the family, the security of the aged, with safeguards of childhood, with protection against illness and disease and with other nationwide social problems. The line where they divide, and that of course means also the line where their services must meet and supplement each other, cuts across all these human needs.

Our government must accept responsibility for basic security; public provisions are designed to carry the heavy burden of mass protection, to lay a broad foundation for the welfare of all the people. This is a legitimate function of democratic government. The fact that it is a function of government, however, places upon it certain limitations. Public provisions necessarily represent a kind of lowest common denominator, below which individuals should not fall. But by and large the interpretation of need must be social rather than individual. And because the provisions which are made are part of our established legal structure their mobility is somewhat restricted. They can go only as far as the law allows; where special problems or needs develop, there must be further legal sanctions before further advances can be made.

This is not so to the same extent of private philanthropy. Here you have an opportunity to forge ahead beyond the boundaries of our present knowledge. Historically, you have made a lasting and permanent contribution to the cause of human welfare. Groups of citizens, coming together for a common purpose on behalf of their fellowmen, have recognized, in advance of the general populace, the best way to meet a special need and have been able to make that