

.20  
2.65

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR  
CHILDREN'S BUREAU

JULIA C. LATHROP, Chief

COURTS IN THE UNITED STATES  
HEARING CHILDREN'S CASES

RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY  
COVERING THE YEAR 1918

By

EVELINA BELDEN



DEPENDENT, DEFECTIVE, AND DELINQUENT CLASSES SERIES No. 8

Bureau Publication No. 65



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
1920



362.7  
U58C  
\*65

## CONTENTS.

	Page.
Letter of transmittal.....	5
The juvenile court movement.....	7-19
Fundamental principles.....	7
Present status.....	10
Significant tendencies.....	15
Method of study.....	21
Total number of courts and number furnishing information, together with areas served.....	25
Classification of courts.....	29-32
Method of classification.....	29
Specially organized courts.....	29
Courts not reporting specially organized juvenile work.....	31
Significant aspects of the legal jurisdiction under which children's courts operate.....	33
Judges and methods of hearings.....	37-43
Specialized judges.....	37
Referees.....	38
Women assisting in hearing delinquent girls' cases.....	39
Separate hearings for children's cases.....	39
Disposition of cases.....	40
Informal handling of complaints.....	42
Commitments to and release from institutions.....	43
Detention.....	45-49
Methods of detention.....	45
Detention homes and rooms.....	46
Family homes or homes of court officials.....	48
Other expedients.....	48
Jails.....	49
Probation.....	51-58
Amount of probation service.....	51
Types of probation service.....	53
Appointment of probation officers.....	56
State supervision of probation work.....	56
Records and reports.....	59-61
Legal and social records.....	59
Annual reports.....	61
Provision for physical and mental examinations.....	63-69
Physical examinations.....	63
Number and types of courts reporting mental examinations.....	63
Standards of mental examinations.....	64
Resources for mental examinations.....	64-69
Court clinics and examiners.....	65
Institutions and public departments.....	66
County and city clinics.....	67

Provision for physical and mental examinations—Continued.	
Resources for mental examinations—Continued.	Page.
Universities, colleges, and normal schools.....	67
Elementary schools.....	68
Other clinics or examiners.....	68
Other examiners reported.....	68
States in which no court reported mental examinations.....	69
Cooperation of the court with the community.....	71-74
Local and county boards or agencies.....	71
State-wide agencies.....	73

## TABLES.

Table I. Number and per cent of courts replying to all or part of questionnaire inquiry, by population of largest city in area served.....	25
Table II. Number and per cent of courts replying to questionnaire for judge, by population of largest city in area served.....	25
Table III. Number and per cent of courts replying to questionnaire for probation officer, by population of largest city in area served.....	26
Table IV. Number of courts replying to all or part of questionnaire inquiry, by State.....	26
Table V. Courts serving specified areas by States.....	27
Table VI. Specially organized courts and general courts, by population of largest city in area and type of area served.....	30
Table VII. Comparison of dispositions of delinquency cases in the Chicago court and in other courts in Illinois during one year.....	41
Table VIII. Types of detention homes and rooms reported used in 1918, by courts serving specified areas.....	46
Table IX. Total courts and courts with and without probation service by State and type of area served.....	52
Table X. Number and per cent of courts with probation service, and courts with specified type of service, by population of largest city in area served....	54
Table XI. Courts reporting mental examinations, by population of largest city in area served.....	64
Table XII. Total courts reporting mental examinations in clinics or by mental examiners, with area served, by type of clinic or examiner.....	65

## APPENDIXES.

Appendix A. Charts.....	75-101
Chart I. Juvenile courts established by special laws, and court systems having jurisdiction over children's cases of delinquency and neglect, by States.....	75
II. Methods of appointment of probation officers reported from the various States.....	79
III. Courts reporting special organization for hearing children's cases, 1918.....	82
Appendix B. Questionnaire forms.....	103
Appendix C. Reports relating to work of courts hearing children's cases.....	109

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

---

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,

*Washington, September 16, 1919.*

SIR: I transmit herewith a report on courts in the United States hearing children's cases, the results of a questionnaire study covering the year 1918.

Miss Evelina Belden had charge of the planning of the study and the collection and analysis of the material. The material for the report was assembled by Miss Belden and was completed for publication by Miss Emma O. Lundberg. Miss Ruth Bloodgood, Miss Mina Sessions, Miss Angelina Brockmeier, and Miss Marion Schaffner gave especially valuable assistance in analyzing the data.

Respectfully submitted.

JULIA C. LATHROP, *Chief.*

HON. W. B. WILSON,  
*Secretary of Labor.*

UNITED STATES FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

DATE: [Illegible]

[Illegible text]

# COURTS IN THE UNITED STATES HEARING CHILDREN'S CASES.

## THE JUVENILE COURT MOVEMENT.

### FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.<sup>1</sup>

Twenty years ago the Illinois Legislature passed a law authorizing the establishment of a special kind of court for the hearing and disposition of children's cases.<sup>2</sup> This law, in accordance with which a juvenile court was established in the city of Chicago in July, 1899, marked the beginning of the juvenile court movement in this country. Previous to that time certain States, following the lead of Massachusetts, had provided for the hearing of children's cases apart from those of adults and had made some progress in developing other special features. But the Illinois law was the first attempt at serious modification of court procedure so far as it related to children. In 1901 the system under which the Denver Juvenile Court operates was established, in part under the authority of the school law of 1899.<sup>3</sup> In 1903 the Colorado Legislature passed a special juvenile court law.<sup>4</sup> Since then a great body of legislation affecting children who come before the courts has been enacted, and in communities representing every section of the country special courts have been created or special divisions have been established, and new methods have been introduced for the treatment of children's cases under existing court systems.

The jurisdiction of the juvenile court covers neglected and, in many States, dependent or destitute children, as well as children whose conduct is in conflict with the law. It is in regard to the latter class that the juvenile court movement introduced a new legal concept to the effect that the delinquent child is not to be proceeded against as one who has committed an offense against the State for which the State must mete out punishment, but is a subject for the State's special protection, care, and guardianship in exactly the same degree as the child who is neglected or homeless. The power of the court

<sup>1</sup> The sections on "Fundamental Principles" and "Significant Tendencies" were written by Katharine F. Lenroot.

<sup>2</sup> Laws 1899, p. 131. Approved April 21, 1899; in force July 1, 1899.

<sup>3</sup> Session Laws 1899, C. 136, p. 342. Approved Apr. 12, 1899. Lindsay, Judge Ben B.: *The Law and the Court*. In "The Problem of Children and How the State of Colorado Cares for Them: A Report of the Juvenile Court of Denver, 1904." Denver, pp. 28-29, 36.

<sup>4</sup> Session Laws 1903, C. 85, p. 178. Approved Mar. 7, 1903.

to extend this protection to the delinquent child is the same power which the courts in England and in the United States have long exercised in respect to destitute or neglected children and is derived from the capacity of the State to act as the ultimate parent of its children.<sup>1</sup>

Since the fundamental purpose of juvenile court procedure is not to determine whether or not a child has committed a specific offense, but to discover whether he is in a condition requiring the special care of the State, it follows that the chancery or civil, rather than the criminal, procedure is best adapted to the end in view. Under the criminal procedure—with apprehension by warrant and arrest, trial on specific charges, strict application of the rules of evidence, conviction, and sentence—the punitive aspects of the process are repeatedly emphasized. The judgment must depend upon the technical evidence presented, and the vital social facts of home and environmental conditions and the child's physical and mental make-up can be given, at best, limited consideration. In contrast to this complicated legal machine is the simple chancery procedure, under which the judge in an informal hearing can utilize all the information that has been obtained about the child and his family, decide whether or not the child is in a condition of delinquency or neglect, and apply the remedies best suited to the correction of the condition.

In some jurisdictions the essential features of the juvenile court have been developed under a procedure which remains criminal in form but which is in substance a chancery proceeding, the strict limitations of the criminal process having been relaxed. Most authorities agree, however, that the true chancery proceeding is preferable.

The special modifications of court methods and court procedure which have been necessary in the development of the juvenile court have been designed to make possible the practical application of the fundamental principle that the child is a ward of the court, to be protected and safeguarded. The modifications may be grouped under three headings: (1) Methods of hearing and detention; (2) evidence; (3) judgment and disposition.

The first step in the special organization of courts for hearing children's cases was the provision that hearings for children should be separate from those for adults. As before stated, this measure preceded in some States the enactment of more complete laws for the protection of children before the courts. In modern juvenile court procedure of the best type children are given the advantage not only of separate hearings but also of hearings from which persons not

<sup>1</sup> See Mack, Julian W. (formerly judge of the juvenile court of Cook County, Ill.): "Legal Problems Involved in the Establishment of the Juvenile Court," in Breckinridge and Abbott, "The Delinquent Child and the Home," Charities Publication Committee, New York, 1912, pp. 181-188; and Flexner, Bernard, and Baldwin, Roger N., "Juvenile Courts and Probation," New York, 1916, pp. 7-9.



having a legitimate interest are excluded. Proceedings in chancery, including the use of petition and summons; a method of detention separate from adults for such children as can not remain in their own homes pending the disposition of their cases; and special attention to cases of delinquent girls: these are essential to the fullest realization of the protective ideal of the court.

One of the fundamental distinctions between the juvenile court procedure and the usual criminal procedure lies in the matter of evidence. Since the youthful offender is not considered a criminal but a child in need of protection, the problem of the judge is not fundamentally to decide whether or not the child has committed a specific wrong, but, in the words of a former juvenile court judge, is to determine: <sup>1</sup> "What is he, how has he become what he is, and what would best be done in his interest and in the interest of the State to save him from a downward career?" Hence, legal evidence must be accompanied by complete social evidence, the result of a thoroughgoing investigation of the child's family history and circumstances, personal history and characteristics, and examination of his physical and mental condition. In order to utilize the results of the investigations and examinations, a system for recording and filing social as well as legal information is necessary.

Since the purpose of court action is protective rather than penal, purely punitive dispositions, such as fines, are done away with under the best practice. The judge must determine whether the child is in need of special care, and if the decision is in the affirmative, what provision would be best suited to his needs. A probation service equipped to give careful supervision to children in family homes is an essential feature of adequate juvenile court organization.

The cooperation of the court with other agencies in the community is of great assistance, particularly in the supervision of children through the probation department. Probation or supervision is not a negative force designed merely to prevent the recurrence of anti-social conduct, but a constructive effort to secure for the child the fulfillment of those essentials of physical well-being, mental health, home life, education, and social activities which may be lacking. This effort can result in successful accomplishment only through the fullest utilization of the resources of the community.

Juvenile court acts and similar statutes have been upheld by the courts as against various constitutional objections, such as deprivation of liberty without due process of law, denial of the right of trial by jury, and violation of the guaranty of a public trial.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mack, Julian W.: "Legal Problems Involved in the Establishment of the Juvenile Court," in Breckinridge and Abbott, "The Delinquent Child and the Home." Charities Publication Committee, New York, 1912. p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> "Supplement to Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the year 1914." Washington, D. C., 1915, pp. 23-35.

The fundamental principles of the juvenile court, as expressed in the first juvenile court law, have been sustained by a large number of judicial decisions. That proceedings instituted under juvenile court acts and similar statutes are not criminal in their nature has frequently been affirmed by the courts.<sup>1</sup> In an Illinois decision the court said:<sup>2</sup>

Our statute and those of a similar character treat children coming within their provisions as wards of the State to be protected rather than as criminals to be punished, and their purpose is to save them from the possible effects of delinquency and neglect liable to result in their leading a criminal career.

In a Utah case<sup>3</sup> it was held that—

Such laws are most salutary, and are in no sense criminal and not intended as a punishment, but are calculated to save the child from becoming a criminal. The whole and only object of such laws is to provide the child with an environment such as will save him to the State and society as a useful and law-abiding citizen, and to give him the educational requirements necessary to attain that end.

The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania<sup>4</sup> has stated—

The act is not for the trial of a child charged with crime, but is mercifully to save it from an ordeal, with the prison or penitentiary in its wake, if the child's own good and the best interests of the State justify such salvation. Whether the child deserves to be saved by the State is no more a question for a jury than whether the father, if able to save it, ought to save it. \* \* \* The act is but an exercise by the State of its supreme power over the welfare of its children.

As summarizing the main features usually considered essential to the organization of a juvenile court, the following may be specified:

1. Separate hearings for children's cases.
2. Informal or chancery procedure, including the use of petition or summons.
3. Regular probation service, both for investigation and for supervisory care.
4. Detention separate from adults.
5. Special court and probation records, both legal and social.
6. Provision for mental and physical examinations.

#### PRESENT STATUS.

In order to ascertain how widespread has been the movement during the 20-year period that has elapsed since the organization of the first special juvenile court and to secure as accurate a picture as possible, by the means available, of the types of development in various sections of the country, the Children's Bureau undertook in 1918 a survey—by means of questionnaires and correspondence—of

<sup>1</sup>"Supplement to Annual Report of The Attorney General of the United States, for the year 1914." Washington, D. C., 1915, pp. 17, 18.

<sup>2</sup>*Lindsay v. Lindsay*, 257 Ill., 328, 333.

<sup>3</sup>*Mill v. Brown*, 31 Utah, 473, 481.

<sup>4</sup>*Commonwealth v. Fisher*, 213 Pa. St. 48, 54.

juvenile courts and other courts in the United States hearing children's cases. This study was made at the request of the National Probation Association and others active in child welfare work, and was designed to serve as the basis for further and more intensive studies of juvenile court methods and results. The study purposed to describe not the legislation permitting or requiring special courts or special procedure for children's cases but the actual machinery which was in operation. It aimed to discover the number, types, and location of courts having jurisdiction in children's cases and the amount and character of organization, including any special features developed in the courts or in cooperation with them which would reveal the trend of the juvenile court movement. Information was sought from every court having authority to hear children's cases involving delinquency or neglect, excluding courts serving areas of less than 5,000 inhabitants, and also excluding, for various reasons, a few other courts; courts in every State were addressed. The questionnaire consisted of three parts, sent to judges, probation officers, and clerks, respectively. Following is a brief summary of the main findings of the survey.

A total of 2,391 courts were addressed. All or part of the information desired was returned from 2,034, or 85 per cent. Definite reports of the number of children's cases heard during one year were received from 1,601 courts, 332 of which stated that no children's cases had been heard in the year reported upon. The remaining 1,269 courts reported a total of 140,252 cases heard.<sup>1</sup> A total of 79,946 cases of juvenile delinquency was reported by 1,088 courts; 556 courts reported hearing delinquency cases but did not specify the number; 390 reported no delinquency cases heard. For neglect and dependency, 37,387 cases were reported by 791 courts; 663 other courts did not specify the number; 581 reported no such cases. Of other cases, including truants not heard as delinquents, mental defectives, and children sent to hospitals for physical treatment, 11,111 were reported. For 11,829 cases classification was not possible. It is probable that the number of children's cases annually coming before the courts of the United States approximates 175,000.

In 22 States two-thirds or more of the courts having jurisdiction over children's cases served only rural areas, 9 of these States having within their boundaries no large or medium-sized cities.<sup>2</sup> Many of the courts serving cities of specified sizes served also smaller cities

<sup>1</sup> It was impossible to determine the number of children coming before these courts, because of differences in the methods of recording statistics in the various courts.

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this study, "large city" was defined to mean a city having a population of 100,000 or more; "medium-sized city," a city of 25,000 but less than 100,000 population; "small city," a city, town, or village of 5,000 but less than 25,000 population. The populations as given in the 1910 census were used.

and rural areas. The numbers of courts serving areas of specified types <sup>1</sup> were as follows:

	Number of courts.
Areas containing large cities .....	57
Areas containing medium-sized cities.....	173
Areas containing small cities.....	742
Only rural areas.....	1,419

Ninety per cent of the courts addressed served areas in which there was no city of 25,000 or more inhabitants. The importance of the problem of court organization for the small town and the rural community is evident.

Courts were grouped under two main heads—specially organized courts and courts not specially organized so far as known. Only courts reporting (a) separate hearings for children, (b) officially authorized probation service, and (c) the recording of social information were classified as specially organized. In practically all cases these courts had some system of detention other than jail. The definition was based upon the primary and most common elements of juvenile-court organization. Many courts had other special features which might be considered essential to successful work with children. The minimum degree of specialization defined above was reported for 321 courts in 43 States and the District of Columbia—16 per cent of the 2,034 courts from which information was obtained. Of these 321 courts, 22 were juvenile courts established by special laws and independent of other court systems. Undoubtedly the number of specially organized courts is understated, though the work of some of the courts may be less valuable than appeared from the replies to the questionnaires. It is clear that in the majority of jurisdictions in the United States special provision for children coming before the courts has not yet been made.

All the courts from which replies were received serving cities of 100,000 or more inhabitants were specially organized; 71 per cent of the courts serving areas containing medium-sized cities; 16 per cent of the courts serving areas containing small cities; and 4 per cent of the courts serving only rural areas.

The majority of the courts which heard children's cases reported separate hearings for juveniles. A considerable number of the smaller courts, however, reported that hearings were not separate. The amount of privacy of these separate hearings could not be determined by the questionnaire method. The large courts in each State reported the use of special rooms or private offices or the judge's chambers for children's hearings.

Many courts reported that a woman was present at hearings for girls. She was in most instances a probation officer, though some-

<sup>1</sup> The area served was classified according to the largest city contained.

times members of advisory boards were called in. In six large cities especially qualified women served as referees for girls' cases. In one city, Washington, D. C., the judge of the juvenile court was a woman, and in seven counties of Kansas the probate judges, who also heard children's cases, were women.

From at least one court in every State in the Union came reports of detaining children in jails. The practice was much more general in some States than in others. Thirty-seven courts in 18 States reported that no effort was made to separate children detained in jails from adult offenders, though in many of these States such separation is required by law.

A total of 212 detention homes or rooms, in 38 States and the District of Columbia, were reported. A considerable number of courts used as a method of detention the boarding of children in family homes or placing them in the custody of court officials. Except for Massachusetts, this method was used to the largest extent in States having much rural territory. A further development of standardized placing out during detention seems to be needed, especially in small communities where the number of cases is too small to warrant the maintenance of a special detention home.

Every State in the Union except one had legislation providing for juvenile probation. Less than half the courts having jurisdiction over children's cases—45 per cent—were known to have had probation service during the year for which the report was made. All the courts serving cities with a population of 100,000 or more had probation service. Ninety-four per cent of the courts serving areas containing medium-sized cities; 66 per cent of those serving areas containing small cities; and 25 per cent of the courts serving only rural areas reported probation service. Only 8 States reported a recognized worker for every court. In 15 States, so far as known, only a fourth or less of the courts had official probation work.

Less than half the courts reporting probation work, and less than one-fifth of all courts having jurisdiction over children's cases, had regular officers, giving full-time service paid for by the court. For the other courts the probation work was done by persons authorized by the court who gave part-time service, by officially recognized agents of public or private organizations who combined the work of probation with their other duties, or by volunteers officially authorized as probation officers.

In 6 States agencies were reported which were supervising juvenile probation work throughout their respective States, thus tending to standardize the work of the various courts. These States were Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Utah. In 8 other States the courts were responsible in a limited way to the State board of charities or some similar body. In 4

additional States annual reports were made by the courts to a State board or to the governor.

The returns indicated that in many courts social records were quite inadequate. There was a general lack of uniformity and a wide difference in definition, both in laws and in court usage. In the States having State supervision of probation work statistical reports are sent at regular intervals to the supervising body, which prepares statistics for the State. The supervising commission or other body also assists the local courts in developing good records and in many other ways. In other States the methods of compiling statistics frequently differed in the various courts, and comparable data were not available even for the courts within a single State. Fair comparisons of any one State with other States are thus practically impossible.

Physical examinations of children before the courts frequently disclose conditions of health the improvement of which may result in the removal of important contributing causes of delinquency. Of 909 courts replying to the questionnaire sent the probation officer, 671 reported provision for physical examinations. Many of the examinations were probably those required by law before commitment to institutions. In the majority of places where the examination was part of the investigation and was not made merely in connection with commitment, only those children were examined who gave evidence of abnormal physical conditions. In 23 courts, of which 21 were special courts serving large cities, physical examinations were made by physicians attached to the staff of the court or regularly making this examination for the court.

Of the 2,034 courts replying to the questionnaire, 145, or 7 per cent, reported mental examinations in clinics organized for that purpose or by persons having some psychiatric or psychological knowledge. The courts having special provision for mental examinations often examined only cases presenting special problems, or repeaters. In only 13 courts were there clinics maintained as a part of the court organization, where examinations were made by psychiatrists or psychologists definitely attached to the court. These clinics were all located in cities of 100,000 or more population. In two States departments had been established by law for the mental diagnosis of children brought to them from the courts of the State. For the other courts examinations were made through the cooperation of social or civic agencies and institutions or by private individuals having some special qualification.

Although special court organization for the hearing of children's cases was found in certain communities representing every section of the country, in many small towns and rural communities, as has been indicated, children were still subjected to the unsocialized

court procedure that the juvenile court movement was designed to replace. Even where attempts have been made so to modify the judicial machinery that it may be more humane and effective in dealing with children, the development has not been uniform. Among the courts included in this study may be found illustrations of all stages of development away from the old and toward the new ideals and methods. Many courts had arranged for separate hearings for children's cases, but still maintained the old attitude and imposed the old punishments. Lack of an adequate probation service, the absence of any method of detention other than the jail, failure to secure adequate social information and to provide a method for recording and utilizing these facts, judges who were not well qualified for their work and who failed to grasp its fundamental principles, unnecessary publicity of hearings—one or more of these and other defects in organization were frequently found.

Courts serving cities of 100,000 or more population had developed the primary features of special organization for children's work, though some of these courts were much in advance of others. Courts serving small towns and rural communities as a rule were poorly equipped for children's work. Yet 90 per cent of the courts addressed in the course of the study served areas in which there was no city of 25,000 or more inhabitants. The child from the village or rural community who is brought before the court has an equal right with the city child to be treated as a ward in need of protection, rather than as an offender to be punished. There is as great need in the former case as in the latter for adequate knowledge of home conditions, family circumstances, physical and mental condition, and personal characteristics. Detention in jail is as bad for the rural child as for the child in the city; probationary oversight as much needed.

It was estimated that 175,000 children's cases were brought before courts in the United States in 1918. Of these, approximately 50,000 came before the courts not adapted to the handling of children's cases. Statistics can not adequately reveal the injury done these children through their association with adult offenders, their trial under the old criminal processes, and the absence of equipment for the study of their needs or for proper oversight and protection.

#### SIGNIFICANT TENDENCIES.

The wisdom of dealing with the child offender not as a wrongdoer but as one in special need of care and protection has been fully borne out in practical experience. But the development of the juvenile court has necessarily varied in the different States, in accordance with differences in the density and character of the population

and the original governmental structure. To a large extent existing court systems have been utilized, and established methods of organization and practice have necessarily had their influence. The juvenile court movement is still in a formative period, and standardization of methods and definition of common principles are in progress. Some of the significant tendencies as brought out by the questionnaire study are summarized below.

*The extension of juvenile court organization.*—Increasing recognition is being given to the importance of the extension and development of juvenile court organization, that all children who come before the courts may have an equal chance. The problem for the immediate future is the working out of practical methods by which the principles of the juvenile court may be universally applied.

The area served is of primary importance in connection with the development of special organization. In the majority of the States the courts hearing children's cases serve entire counties or districts composed of several counties. A court having jurisdiction over a district sufficiently large to permit specialization has a great advantage over one or more small courts serving small areas. In order that such a court may operate promptly in any part of the district when need arises, referees are sometimes authorized to act in the absence of the judge. In North Dakota, for example, where the district system prevails, juvenile court commissioners are provided to act as referees and to assist generally in children's work. In Missouri the law authorizes the court to appoint a referee having specified qualifications to hear such cases as may be referred to him. In New York State a beginning in this direction has been made in one county through the recent law establishing a children's court as a part of the county court of Chautauqua County. Under this act the county judge, who is also the judge of the children's court, is authorized to appoint "a lawyer or other suitable person" to hear cases and report his recommendations to the court.<sup>1</sup> Where the county system is used, a unified probation service, a detention home, and a clinic for child study may be developed to serve the entire county.

Courts serving small towns or rural areas and hearing relatively small numbers of cases each year find it difficult to develop effectively their work for children. An organized probation staff, a detention home, and provision for physical and mental examinations are often impracticable. By the development of a county plan for probation, detention, and child study, and the utilization by all the courts in the county of these unified services, the children may be given the kind of care needed. In Erie County, N. Y., a successful experiment has been made along these lines. The Chil-

<sup>1</sup> Laws 1918, ch. 464, in force July 1, 1918, establishing the children's part of the county court in Chautauqua County, N. Y.



dren's Court of Buffalo serves only the city of Buffalo, and in the rest of the county children's cases are still being heard by justices of the peace. But a county-wide probation system has been organized, and a regular staff of probation officers makes investigations and supervises children on probation throughout the county.

One of the problems which courts hearing relatively few children's cases have found difficult to solve is the provision of a suitable method of detention for children who can not be left in their own homes pending the disposition of their cases. It is, however, sometimes impracticable to maintain a detention home. In such a case boarding children in carefully selected and supervised family homes has been found a satisfactory substitute. In Massachusetts this method has been widely used. It has been found to be successful, even in the city of Boston. This method would seem best adapted to courts serving small towns and rural communities.

The cooperation of the court with other social agencies in the community often makes it possible to develop a greater amount of special organization than could otherwise be obtained. If the volume of work does not warrant the employment of a full-time probation officer at an adequate salary, the duties of a probation officer may be combined with those of a school attendance officer, a county relief agent, or the secretary of a welfare association. In a number of counties such coordination of duties had been found practicable.

*Medico-psychological work.*—The importance of knowledge of the child's physical and mental condition, of his home, and of his family and personal history is recognized as essential to successful work by the court, though the development of facilities for diagnosis has been relatively slow. The Juvenile Psychopathic Institute of Chicago, now a part of the State-wide Juvenile Psychopathic Institute of Illinois, was the pioneer in the thorough-going study of children before the courts. The next court to take up this work, the Seattle Juvenile Court, did so by establishing a "department of social diagnosis," which is still maintained as such.

Investigation of home conditions and family and personal history is usually a part of the regular investigations made by the probation officers. Physical examinations are given much more generally than mental examinations. In 13 courts mental clinics were maintained as a part of the court organization. In some of these clinics the examinations of physical and mental conditions, and the studies of social histories were parts of a unified program for the diagnosis of the children's needs and possibilities. Frequently the only children given the intensive study indicated are those presenting especially difficult problems, though the present feeling among many familiar with the work is that all children coming before the courts

should have the benefit of such consideration. In the Judge Baker Foundation in Boston a large proportion of children before the juvenile court are given thorough physical examinations, their mental condition is carefully studied, and especially qualified investigators attached to the staff of the foundation gather the social data. All the information in a given case is then assembled and studied at a staff conference, and the diagnosis of the child's condition and the recommendation as to the kind of treatment needed is made by the director or his assistant.

*Coordination of the trial and treatment of juvenile and family cases.*—The socialization of the courts dealing with children has pointed the need for the socialization of other courts, especially those dealing with family life in its various aspects. Frequently juvenile courts are given jurisdiction in cases involving adults contributing to the delinquency or neglect of children. This is held by many to be essential to successful juvenile court work.

There is a movement looking toward the coordination of the trial and treatment of juvenile and family cases, including desertion and nonsupport, contributing to delinquency or dependency, divorce, illegitimacy cases, adoption, and guardianship. The National Probation Association has gone on record in favor of such consolidation of court work touching closely the family life, holding that all these cases should be dealt with in much the same manner as children's cases.<sup>1</sup> In the report of the committee of the National Probation Association on domestic relations courts in 1918, in which the case for the family court is strongly stated, the chairman emphasized the necessity for preserving the juvenile court organization.<sup>2</sup> He states that "the principle of the juvenile court is the foundation upon which the family court must be constructed," and defines the relation of the juvenile court and the family court as follows:

The family court is not intended to limit or restrict the jurisdiction incident to juvenile courts. In fact, the juvenile court will become an integral part, or division, of the family court. By reason of the organization of family courts, we believe that the administration of the juvenile court will become more effective and significant and better understood not only by those connected with the juvenile court but by the public generally.

*State supervision of juvenile court and probation work.*—The State probation commissions of New York and Massachusetts have done notable work in supervising juvenile probation and standardizing and centralizing the work of the courts. In some other States there are supervising agencies of various types. Such activities contribute

<sup>1</sup>Report of the committee on courts of domestic relations, in "Social Problems of the Courts," the annual report and proceedings of the National Probation Association, 1917, pp. 82-86. Albany, 1918.

<sup>2</sup>Domestic Relations Courts. Report of the Committee by Hon. Charles W. Hoffman, judge of the Court of Domestic Relations of Cincinnati, chairman, in "The Social Work of the Courts," the annual report and proceedings of the National Probation Association, 1918, pp. 134-136. Albany, 1919.

greatly to the extension of the juvenile court organization, the maintenance of efficient probation service, the systematizing of the records, and the general application of the principles of the juvenile court movement.

*Community cooperation.*—The growth of the juvenile court has been to a great extent dependent upon the cooperation and assistance of other social agencies in the community. In many instances private effort has demonstrated the need for certain features, such as probation work, a method of detention, and child-study departments, which have later become a part of the regular organization, supported from public funds.

In many courts a definite method for cooperation with the community has been developed. Provision is made by law in a number of States for the establishment of county or other local boards which serve the court in an advisory and auxiliary capacity. In Alabama, for example, the juvenile law provides for the compulsory appointment of advisory boards for juvenile courts. The boards serve, without compensation, in a general advisory capacity. They may inspect institutions and make reports. In Minnesota the duties of the county boards of child welfare, working under the direction of the State board of control, include among others those of investigating cases, instituting proceedings, and giving the courts advice and assistance in all matters pertaining to the welfare of children.

In other States cooperating boards have been established without special statutory provision. Often State boards of charities or child welfare bureaus actively cooperate. A number of private societies doing protective work or child-placing give the courts valuable assistance.

As the work of the juvenile court develops, some of the underlying causes and conditions of child delinquency and neglect become more evident. The results of intensive studies of individual children have indicated the varieties of provision which must be made. The need for the early recognition and treatment of abnormalities in the child's physical, mental, or moral development has been conclusively demonstrated. In this field the responsibility reverts to the home, the school, and the other social forces of the community. The adequate fulfillment of these obligations will result in the prevention of a considerable amount of juvenile delinquency and in the consequent reduction of the number of children who come before the courts.



## METHOD OF STUDY.

This study of courts in the United States hearing children's cases was conducted by means of questionnaires and correspondence. The limitations of the questionnaire method were recognized, but it offered the best means of securing general information in regard to the situation in the country as a whole, which would serve as a basis for further studies of the methods of dealing with children before the courts.

Information was sought from every court having authority to hear children's cases involving delinquency or neglect (with certain exceptions enumerated below), regardless of variations in definition. Courts in every State were addressed. The questionnaire, which was prepared by the Children's Bureau in collaboration with the committee on children's courts of the National Probation Association, and other experts in children's work, consisted of three parts, of which one was sent to judges, one to probation officers, and one to clerks.<sup>1</sup> The questions addressed to judges were concerned with jurisdiction, organization and method of trial and the questions to probation officers, with methods of investigation and probation work. Those sent to clerks asked for the number of cases and the dispositions. When replies were not received, follow-up letters were sent.

It was difficult to prepare lists of judges and probation officers and sources varied greatly in the different States. In two States, lists were furnished by a State commission concerned with the supervision of probation work. Fairly complete lists were furnished in more than half the States by a correspondent of the National Probation Association or by some State board or official. In several States there was no list of judges hearing children's cases or of probation officers and no organization or official in the State kept such information currently. The names of judges for specified courts could sometimes be secured from a State manual or a tax list or from some State official. Often it was necessary to address a court without the name of the judge.

The type of court having jurisdiction in children's cases is, in general, clear from the laws of a State, but in several States it could not be determined from the law without further inquiry. For example, in four States the judge hearing children's cases was selected from several court systems in the county, but in certain counties no

---

<sup>1</sup> See Questionnaire forms, Appendix B.

selections had been made and it was not possible to discover who was doing the work. In certain other States, one judge was assigned for juvenile cases from among a number of similar power. Or, again, concurrent powers were given two or more systems of courts, but not all these courts assumed jurisdiction in juvenile cases. It was frequently necessary to write to several courts in order to discover which one had assumed such jurisdiction.

Lists of probation officers were secured from State correspondents of the National Probation Association and others having special knowledge of probation and court work. Publications often gave the names of probation officers in charge. These returns were supplemented by names secured from the questionnaires addressed to judges; each judge was asked to state the number and kind of probation officers attached to his court. Some additional names were secured during the process of verification of the State analyses.

Every effort was made to avoid such misunderstandings and inaccuracies as are likely to occur in a questionnaire study. The three replies requested from each court (two if the court had no probation officer), though concerned with different phases of the work, served to supplement and clarify one another. Record forms and published or manuscript reports were secured when available, and were carefully compared with the questionnaire material. The summarizing of material was facilitated by explanatory letters sent to the bureau with many of the replies. Reports of State boards or commissions and of State institutions for juvenile delinquents and the provisions of the juvenile court laws were also studied. As opportunity offered, representative workers from various States were consulted in personal interviews, and the working summary of each State was submitted by correspondence to one or more persons in the State who were familiar with conditions.

The following courts were omitted from the study, though having jurisdiction over cases of delinquency and neglect: (1) Courts serving counties, districts, or cities, the population of which (in 1910) was less than 5,000; (2) a few courts serving counties formed since 1910; (3) justice of the peace or mayor's courts in small communities; (4) courts of appeal; (5) courts receiving juvenile cases through criminal indictment by a grand jury; and (6) courts with concurrent jurisdiction in juvenile cases but known not to be using this power. The replies received from the areas under 5,000 population showed little or no organization for juvenile court work. Most of the counties formed since 1910 were small, and information in regard to population was difficult to secure. However, 18 newly chartered counties in Idaho, comprising a large part of the State, have been included because they appeared to be doing work similar to that done elsewhere in the State. Justices of the peace or mayor's courts in small com-

munities were disregarded because such information as was received indicated that these courts rarely attempted special work and usually had insufficient records to furnish the information desired; also because the decision was often preliminary to a hearing by a judge with power to pronounce judgment. Cases before courts of appeal and cases brought through grand jury indictments were for the most part of exceptional character and few in number. Judges of the appellate courts who were addressed did not consider that their juvenile work was of the kind to be included in this study.

The facts presented in this report relate in general to the year 1918, during the spring and summer of which replies to the questionnaires were received. Changes resulting from later legislation have not been incorporated, though laws affecting methods of handling children's cases have been passed in several States during the 1919 sessions of the legislatures.





## TOTAL NUMBER OF COURTS AND NUMBER FURNISHING INFORMATION, TOGETHER WITH AREAS SERVED.

The total number of courts included in the inquiry was 2,391.<sup>1</sup> More than half these courts had no recognized probation officer so far as known; the number of chief probation officers or officers in charge to whom questionnaires were sent was 1,071.

All or part of the information desired was returned from 85 per cent of the courts—2,034 out of 2,391. Percentages of replies from judges and from probation officers—80 and 85 per cent, respectively—show a slightly greater interest and response from probation officers. No separate percentage was computed for replies from clerks, because in many courts the judge or probation officer acted in that capacity and in some States a number of clerks returned replies for several counties within one court area.

TABLE I.—*Number and per cent of courts replying to all or part of questionnaire inquiry, by population of largest city in area served.*

Population of largest city in area served. <sup>a</sup>	Total courts.	Courts replying.	
		Number.	Per cent.
Total.....	2,391	2,034	85
100,000 or over.....	57	56	98
25,000-100,000.....	173	166	96
5,000-25,000.....	742	659	89
Under 5,000.....	1,419	1,153	81

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

TABLE II.—*Number and per cent of courts replying to questionnaire for judge, by population of largest city in area served.*

Population of largest city in area served. <sup>a</sup>	Total courts.	Courts replying.	
		Number.	Per cent.
Total.....	2,391	1,917	80
100,000 or over.....	57	53	93
25,000-100,000.....	173	149	86
5,000-25,000.....	742	594	80
Under 5,000.....	1,419	1,121	79

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

<sup>1</sup> If a district or circuit judge rotated over several counties, his complete circuit was considered to be one court and information from his various counties was combined. In Georgia, where one judge was to be designated for each county, and it was not always possible to discover who had been designated, a court was counted for each county even though it was presided over by a superior court judge who also rotated for several other counties. If two judges served one court, both were addressed, but the combined reply was tabulated as for one court.

TABLE III.—*Number and per cent of courts replying to questionnaire for probation officer, by population of largest city in area served.*

Population of largest city in area served. <sup>a</sup>	Total courts having probation service.	Courts replying.	
		Number.	Per cent.
Total.....	1,071	909	85
100,000 or over.....	57	53	93
25,000-100,000.....	162	150	93
5,000-25,000.....	493	427	87
Under 5,000.....	359	279	78

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

All or part of the information desired was received from every court addressed in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and North Dakota; from every court but one addressed in Delaware (two courts out of three), Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Nevada, Rhode Island, and South Dakota; and from all but two in Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Vermont. For the number of courts addressed and replying in each State, see Table IV.

TABLE IV.—*Number of courts replying to all or part of questionnaire inquiry, by State.*

State.	Total courts.	Courts replying.	State.	Total courts.	Courts replying.
Total.....	2,391	2,034	Montana.....	16	14
Alabama.....	67	57	Nebraska.....	80	78
Arizona.....	12	10	Nevada.....	9	8
Arkansas.....	75	61	New Hampshire.....	14	14
California.....	51	49	New Jersey.....	21	18
Colorado.....	37	31	New Mexico.....	8	6
Connecticut.....	37	34	New York.....	73	66
Delaware.....	3	2	North Carolina.....	112	77
District of Columbia.....	1	1	North Dakota.....	12	12
Florida.....	45	35	Ohio.....	88	84
Georgia.....	59	47	Oklahoma.....	75	63
Idaho.....	37	35	Oregon.....	26	21
Illinois.....	102	98	Pennsylvania.....	67	61
Indiana.....	68	62	Rhode Island.....	12	11
Iowa.....	26	25	South Carolina.....	43	34
Kansas.....	85	82	South Dakota.....	49	43
Kentucky.....	117	73	Tennessee.....	93	65
Louisiana.....	31	17	Texas.....	165	125
Maine.....	39	34	Utah.....	15	12
Maryland.....	12	11	Vermont.....	15	13
Massachusetts.....	71	71	Virginia.....	47	28
Michigan.....	77	76	Washington.....	32	25
Minnesota.....	86	83	West Virginia.....	31	26
Mississippi.....	27	18	Wisconsin.....	74	71
Missouri.....	38	34	Wyoming.....	11	8

Many replies evidenced a lack of understanding of the law. For example, several judges wrote that no juvenile courts existed in their counties, even though under the law the men who wrote the statements were themselves the juvenile judges when hearing juvenile cases. From one county the probation officer wrote that the judge selected had refused to act because he was already overworked and was too old to undertake anything additional. One judge wrote,

"It is confusing where two men have the same power, each one expecting the other to do it."

The differences in method of organization developed in city courts and in rural courts made it desirable to attempt a classification of the courts included in this study according to the population of the largest city in the area served. For this purpose the cities and rural areas in the United States have been roughly divided into four groups according to their population as shown in the Census of 1910:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Large cities with population of 100,000 or over..... 50
- (2) Medium-sized cities with population of 25,000, but less than 100,000..... 179
- (3) Small cities, towns, and villages with population of 5,000, but less than 25,000..... 1,000
- (4) Rural areas containing no city or town of 5,000 or over.

The number of courts reported as serving these four types of areas do not correspond with the number of areas because, on the one hand, certain large or medium-sized cities were each served by more than one court, and on the other hand certain courts serving a city served also surrounding territory, which may have included both rural areas and one or more smaller cities. Moreover, courts serving areas with less than 5,000 total population have been omitted entirely.

In 22 States, two-thirds or more of the courts included in the study served only rural areas. Nine States—Arizona, Idaho, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming—had no large or medium-sized cities. Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio each had 10 or more courts serving areas containing medium-sized or large cities, Massachusetts having 31 courts serving such areas.

TABLE V.—*Courts serving specified areas, by States.*

State.	Total courts.	Courts serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size. <sup>a</sup>			
		100,000 or over.	25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.
Total.....	2,391	57	173	742	1,419
Alabama.....	67	1	2	9	55
Arizona.....	12	.....	.....	5	7
Arkansas.....	75	.....	1	7	67
California.....	51	3	3	16	29
Colorado.....	37	1	2	8	26
Connecticut.....	37	2	5	30	.....
Delaware.....	3	.....	.....	.....	2
District of Columbia.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....
Florida.....	45	.....	2	6	37
Georgia.....	59	1	3	11	44
Idaho.....	37	.....	.....	5	32
Illinois.....	102	1	10	36	55
Indiana.....	68	1	4	36	27
Iowa.....	26	.....	9	13	4
Kansas.....	85	.....	3	19	63
Kentucky.....	117	1	3	14	99
Louisiana.....	31	1	1	8	21

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

<sup>1</sup> Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910, vol. 1, pp. 64, 65.

TABLE V.—*Courts serving specified areas, by States—Continued.*

State.	Total courts.	Courts serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size.			
		100,000 or over.	25,000–100,000.	5,000–25,000.	Under 5,000.
Maine.....	39		4	30	5
Maryland.....	12	1		7	4
Massachusetts.....	71	12	19	34	6
Michigan.....	77	2	7	29	39
Minnesota.....	86	2	1	18	65
Mississippi.....	27			15	12
Missouri.....	38	2	3	15	18
Montana.....	16		1	8	7
Nebraska.....	80	1	1	18	60
Nevada.....	9			1	8
New Hampshire.....	14		2	12	
New Jersey.....	21	3	5	8	5
New Mexico.....	8			3	5
New York.....	73	5	16	52	
North Carolina.....	112		4	31	77
North Dakota.....	12			5	7
Ohio.....	88	5	9	43	31
Oklahoma.....	75		2	12	61
Oregon.....	26	1		5	20
Pennsylvania.....	67	3	15	29	20
Rhode Island.....	12	1	4		
South Carolina.....	43		2	11	30
South Dakota.....	49			6	43
Tennessee.....	93	2	2	6	83
Texas.....	165		8	29	128
Utah.....	15		2	2	11
Vermont.....	15			9	6
Virginia.....	47	1	5	22	19
Washington.....	32	2	1	8	21
West Virginia.....	31		4	13	14
Wisconsin.....	74	1	7	23	43
Wyoming.....	11			8	3

Classifying the courts addressed according to the largest city within the jurisdiction of each, we find 57 courts serving large cities, of which 56, or 98 per cent, replied; 173 courts serving medium-sized cities, of which 166, or 96 per cent, replied; 742 courts serving small cities, of which 659, or 89 per cent, replied; and 1,419 serving only rural areas, of which 1,153, or 81 per cent, replied (see Table I, p. 25). Enough replies were received from courts serving the various types of areas and representing all the systems of jurisdictions in each of the States to reveal the principal facts about specialization and organization.

## CLASSIFICATION OF COURTS.

### METHOD OF CLASSIFICATION.

In order to discover the number and distribution of the courts which were specially organized for handling children's cases, all courts from which replies were received were roughly grouped under two main heads: (1) Specially organized courts, (2) courts not specially organized so far as known. Classifications were made according to features reported on the questionnaires, and in some courts the amount of specialization may not have been fully reported. This division is suggestive as a method of classification rather than as an accurate presentation. Probably the number of courts which had special organization is understated, though on the other hand the work of some of the courts doubtless is less specialized and also less valuable than would appear from the replies.

### SPECIALLY ORGANIZED COURTS.

Courts were considered as specially organized if they reported any significant amount of specialization and organization for work with children. Such specialization was reported for 321 courts in 43 States and the District of Columbia. Included in this classification were those courts which reported separate hearings for children, officially authorized probation service, and a system of legal and social records. In practically all cases these courts had some system of detention other than jail. In addition, a considerable number reported having informal or chancery procedure, a special judge giving all or the major part of his official time to children's work, a special court room or a definite arrangement for hearings in the judge's chambers, special attention to cases of delinquent girls, or provision for physical and mental examinations. Complete information on special methods used by the various courts could hardly be obtained in a questionnaire inquiry; this requires intensive field study. Of the courts from which reports were received, all the 56 serving areas in which there were cities of 100,000 or over were specially organized; 118 of the 166 serving areas with medium cities; 105 of the 659 serving areas with small cities; and 42 of the 1,153 serving only rural areas. It is probable that the majority of the courts not returning the questionnaires were not specialized, judging by other courts of similar areas and jurisdiction in the same States.

Of the 321 courts reporting special organization in accordance with the foregoing definition, 21 were juvenile courts created by special law and independent of other court systems. The special provisions of individual laws and the independence from other court systems usually permitted a larger amount of specialization than was otherwise possible.

TABLE VI.—*Specially organized courts and general courts, by population of largest city in area and type of area served.*

Population of largest city in area <sup>a</sup> and type of area served.	Total courts.	Courts replying.		Courts not replying.
		Specially organized courts.	General courts.	
Total courts.....	2,391	321	1,713	357
Urban only.....		45		
Urban and rural.....		234		
Rural.....		42		
Large city (100,000 or over).....	57	56		1
Urban only.....		19		
Urban and rural.....		37		
Medium-sized city (25,000-100,000).....	173	118	48	7
Urban only.....		15		
Urban and rural.....		103		
Small city (5,000-25,000).....	742	105	554	83
Urban only.....		11		
Urban and rural.....		94		
Only rural area (under 5,000).....	1,419	42	1,111	266

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

A small number of courts reported some coordination in the trial and treatment of juvenile cases and family cases involving one or more of the following: Nonsupport, desertion, contributing to delinquency or dependency, divorce, illegitimacy, adoption, or guardianship. Twelve of the 21 juvenile courts created by special law also handled some domestic relations cases. Occasionally this coordination of juvenile and domestic relations work was specified in the law creating the courts. In other cases jurisdiction in juvenile cases was given to a court that already handled domestic relations cases. This coordination was sometimes effected by the judge through a combination of his duties as juvenile judge and judge of a court having jurisdiction over other types of cases. The judge in Los Angeles, for example, developed such a working method through having authority both as superior and as juvenile judge. Coordination in probation work for both types of cases was effected in some places which did not have combined trials. Undoubtedly more courts could, if they desired, effect such coordination without change in legislation.

Almost half the specially organized courts were in five States. In Massachusetts, 41 of the 71 courts hearing children's cases were

classed as specially organized; 29 of the 51 courts in California; 37 of the 77 courts in Michigan; 30 of the 88 courts in Ohio; and 19 of the 67 courts in Pennsylvania. The 321 courts with special organization represent 13 per cent of the 2,391 courts covered by the questionnaire study, and 16 per cent of the courts from which replies were received.

#### COURTS NOT REPORTING SPECIALLY ORGANIZED JUVENILE WORK.

All courts not reporting specially organized juvenile work were called "general courts." In this classification were included the courts whose judges devoted most of their time to other duties than their work for children and whose work was not organized as previously described. A few of these had some provision for probation, clerical work, and detention, though not giving enough recognition of these particular phases as they concerned children to be included in the previous classification.

At the outset of any statement of the number of general courts, it should be clearly understood that this classification does not necessarily imply inadequate results secured by the courts. Work of a high order might have been performed even without a special juvenile law or special machinery, if the need were realized and the court officers possessed a natural genius for children's work. Judges of general power sometimes were known to be settling informally many cases of minor importance, disciplining parents instead of children, working out preventive measures, themselves taking children on probation if there was no probation officer, informally holding children in a private home pending a hearing, and in other ways treating the children who came to their attention as wards of the court.

Reports from general courts, however, frequently showed not only a lack of organization but also implied a lack of realization of the significant possibilities of the work. The attitude of the judges in the less populous centers and consequently in the general courts was variously referred to in correspondence received during the course of the study. To quote from seven States in different sections of the country—

\* \* \* unlikely that you will get replies from a very large proportion of these judges as in many counties they scarcely know that they are the judges of the juvenile court.

The whole juvenile delinquency and probation is exceedingly crude and primitive.

Very little juvenile court or probation work is done outside of the larger counties.

The juvenile work in the small counties is so primitive and the county judges have such a variety of cases and such small salaries that it is not considered very important.

Most of them [the judges] think there is no need for such a court because of the sparsely settled communities in the judicial circuits.

Juvenile matters are handled in the same way as all other cases \* \* \* the truth of the business is the courts are doing nothing. Their entire activities can be summed up by saying that cases are heard and disposed of upon first hearing.

It has been repeatedly noted at gatherings when lawyers and judges meet that some judges are ignorant of the provisions of the juvenile court law. I regret that I must admit that this is the case. \* \* \* Very many judges regard it as an unnecessary trouble.

Most of the general courts were for small or rural places; 1,111 were in purely rural areas; 554 served areas with small cities; only 48 served areas with medium-sized cities. Even with allowance for a possible overstatement of the total and for the excellent personal work accomplished in some unorganized courts, this number offers a challenge to the smaller centers to consider whether their work is adequate to their needs. From the number and character of cases reported from some of these localities, especially those that lacked probation service, there would appear to be problems of delinquency and neglect that are left undetected or uncared for, until they reach a serious stage and can be handled only by institutional commitment. The importance of suitable methods for detecting such needs and providing a workable method of dealing with them continually suggested itself in the study of the replies received for these small places. Unorganized courts presided over by judges already occupied with other duties undoubtedly depend for their development of standards upon State advice or supervision.



## SIGNIFICANT ASPECTS OF THE LEGAL JURISDICTION UNDER WHICH CHILDREN'S COURTS OPERATE.

Some of the laws under which courts hearing children's cases operate are codified statements of all the important provisions for the treatment of the children's cases within the court's jurisdiction. The replies indicated that such a codified statement of law relating to the classification, apprehension, detention, trial, and disposition of children coming before the courts makes for greater precision and uniformity in planning and developing the work.

Independent courts had been created by special law for 21 localities in 12 States and the District of Columbia; the remainder of the specialized courts and all the general courts hearing children's cases were parts of other court systems. The independence of the court or the system into which the juvenile work has been grafted inevitably has certain significant effects upon the spirit and work of the court.

In but 10 States—Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, New York, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada—was the session of the court system dealing with children termed in the statutes "juvenile court" or "children's court," though in all but two States, Maine and Wyoming, special statutory provision has been made for the trial of some or all juvenile cases.

Of the courts operating as parts of other judicial systems the leading types were county courts, 832; probate, 398; superior, 216; and district, 204. Similarly named systems in different States do not always have like powers.

Only through study of the special powers conferred upon these courts by the juvenile law could the extent of the criminal or chancery procedure be determined, and this would also require a study of the actual procedure used. For example, in one State it was discovered incidentally from some replies of judges that even though the county court was given original and exclusive jurisdiction with certain chancery power, these judges had referred children's cases to another system of courts, where the children were indicted and tried on felony charges.

In 10 States—Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming—

two or more systems of courts had concurrent jurisdiction. In Georgia, Maryland, Ohio, and Wisconsin a judge selected from one of several courts might be appointed as the juvenile judge.

This inquiry could not go into the details of these very complicated judicial systems or their effect upon the hearings of children's cases. Much explanation of legal procedure and constitutional differences and of the historical evolution of the courts would be needed to clarify the subject. To persons familiar with the courts of the States, the types of systems suggest in a general way the types of judges, the usual procedure, the personnel of the court, and the type of other cases also heard which would influence the method of trial and the attitude of the officer. All these matters are important in view of the fact that the majority of judges hearing children's cases were devoting most of their time to other cases.

One significant aspect of the legal jurisdiction is the unit of areas served by the court. If rural children are to come within the protection of the most advanced legislation, they must necessarily be within the jurisdiction of a court which can and will specialize for their care. A court serving a city unit of jurisdiction leaves the rural children under the charge of justices of the peace. If a court with one "rotating" judge and no referees serves a large district there may be uncertainties as to time and place of hearing—great distances to be traveled and lack of local cooperation. On the other hand, a court serving a district might be so organized with certain special provisions as to afford unusual opportunities for rural children. An understanding of areas is significant in any discussion of standardization, particularly that relating to probation service and its supervision, detention systems, advisory boards, and cooperation with other community enterprises for public welfare.

It is noteworthy that the most prevalent system was the county unit; in 21 States the county system was the only one used; in 9 States the county system was used in only part of the State. In these States probation service, advisory boards, and detention homes may be part of the county plan. Certain financial benefits may come to such courts because their area of jurisdiction coincides with the taxing and governing unit, especially the unit for distributing poor relief and providing funds for detention homes and probation officers.

In the next largest number of States the courts served a district or circuit unit. Not only the "district courts" but in a few States the chancery and circuit courts also served district units. North Dakota has provided in connection with its district courts juvenile court commissioners to act as referees and to be available for chil-

dren's work at any time or place. In some States the county probation officer remains in the county, though the judge rotates.

The city or municipal system was the least common. In a few places a court for a city unit had concurrent power with one for a county or district. New York appears to be the only State in which the city unit system is used to any considerable extent. Except in three counties the courts dealing with children are either city, village, or town courts. In this State, with the exception of the three counties referred to, all the rural work is done by town justices of the peace or village police justices.



## JUDGES AND METHODS OF HEARINGS.

### SPECIALIZED JUDGES.

The judiciary and the public have recognized the importance of a special judge for children's work, at least for the larger courts in which the amount of work warrants either the appointment of a specially qualified person or the designation of one of a number of judges for the juvenile court work. In most of the statutes creating the independent courts, qualifications required for a juvenile court judge are specified.

Twenty-three judges in the United States were reported to be devoting their entire official time to their work in connection with special juvenile or special juvenile and domestic relations courts. Eighteen presided over courts in large cities; four in medium-sized cities; and one in a smaller place. All were in special juvenile courts. In some other courts the judges were reported as devoting the major part of their time to juvenile court work.

The method of appointment of the judges who heard children's cases depended upon whether the court was part of a State system or was a special court created by law. The judges of the courts specially created by law were variously appointed by a juvenile court commission, governor or mayor, or elected by popular vote; the judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is appointed by the President of the United States.

If the court is part of a State system, the judge takes up his juvenile work as a result of his appointment as judge. In certain States, one of the judges of a system of courts assumed juvenile work as a result of assignment to it by his associate justices. In other States the selection was by vote of all the judges of courts of record in the locality. In some places the juvenile judge was designated by another judge who has been given the power of making such an assignment. For example, the judge of the Juvenile Court of Cook County (Chicago) is chosen from the circuit system by his associates; the judge in Milwaukee is chosen by a vote of all the judges of courts of record in the county; in Georgia the superior court judge may designate one of the judges of a court of record in a county to act as juvenile judge. It was known that 31 of the 321 organized courts had specially assigned judges.

## REFEREES.

The laws in several States have provided for referees to assist in the hearing of children's cases, either as an arrangement for providing more specialized hearings, or for the purpose of hearing cases during the judge's absence.

In Colorado the law (A. 1909, C. 158) provides for the appointment by the judge of two or more persons in each city or town or justice of the peace precinct to be "masters of discipline." They receive petitions, hear cases, and make findings of facts with recommendations. They have powers and duties similar to those of masters in chancery. The court may approve the recommendation and act thereon, or may review the case. Only one Colorado court which replied to the questionnaire referred to the appointment of such a "master of discipline." This court, for Adams County, had five such persons to perform the work for its outlying districts.

In North Dakota the district judge may appoint a juvenile commissioner who has power to receive complaints, issue warrants, and investigate cases, and who has the general powers of a referee in civil cases. Seven such commissioners were reported appointed. They have also been appointed to act as probation officers, two also being clerks of the court. They travel over their districts as often as necessary. Such a system makes the juvenile court accessible to the rural parts of the district as well as to the county seat.

In Missouri the law provides that the circuit judge may appoint a referee to hear cases as provided by law in the hearing of civil suits. This law took effect in July, 1917, and it was, therefore, too early to expect many appointments by the time of the questionnaire study. The three courts which reported having such assistance had combined the office of probation officer with that of referee. In one place the officer did not find this a satisfactory plan. One of the judges wrote that juvenile matters were completely in the hands of referees, one in each county. In four of the counties served by this judge they were paid \$100 a year and in the other county \$600 a year for their services. One of the appointments was for a purely rural circuit. One judge who did not report using a referee wrote:

As I have six counties in my district I must necessarily depend upon referees to a large extent, but the law provides that referees shall serve without pay and suitable persons will not serve.

In two towns in Alabama the judges reported the appointment of referees; one, an attorney, virtually performed the duties of the juvenile judge; the other referee was appointed to be legal advisor on juvenile cases.

**WOMEN ASSISTING IN HEARING DELINQUENT GIRLS' CASES.**

In a few courts especially qualified women were acting as referees for delinquent girls' cases, hearing cases and recommending dispositions. Their recommendations were passed upon by the judges. In Denver and Los Angeles a woman was specially appointed as referee; in Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Philadelphia a woman probation officer was selected to serve as referee in girls' cases; in Wilmington, Del., the judge appointed women as referees when needed.

New Mexico had legal provision for women referees, but no appointments were reported.

There was one woman judge of a special juvenile court in the United States—the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. In seven counties of Kansas the probate judges who also heard children's cases were women. Three of these counties had populations under 5,000 in 1910.

Many courts reported that a woman was present at hearings for girls. These were usually probation officers, though sometimes members of the advisory boards were called in. In the State of California the law requires that so far as possible no case of a girl shall be heard without the presence of a woman in the court room. In some courts in the State the person present was a woman probation officer or a woman member of the county committee on probation.

**SEPARATE HEARINGS FOR CHILDREN'S CASES.**

The majority of courts in the country which heard children's cases reported separate hearings for juveniles. A considerable number of the smaller courts, however, reported that hearings were not separate. The lack of separate hearings was most often found in places without probation officers.

The degree to which children were protected from the contaminating influences of police court trials, court rooms full of curious hangers on, and contact with adult prisoners could not be determined through the questionnaire. Neither could the amount of privacy of these separate hearings be discovered by this method. It is known that courts frequently arranged for a separate hearing by having the bench or desk placed at a distance from the seats for the audience, or in other informal ways. The law may not permit exclusion of the public from the court room, but the hearings may be made practically private through some informal arrangement.

The large courts in each State reported the use of special rooms, private offices, or the judge's chambers for children's hearings. All the large courts which had their own buildings or sections of buildings used this method for protecting the children from contact with older prisoners, and practically all the special courts reported special

court rooms or chambers. Those which did not report evidently failed to understand the purpose of the question. How separate these rooms were could not be determined. It is known that hearings were not always held in these rooms if the judge had a busy calendar. Wherever women referees were hearing girls' cases these were heard separately, in private rooms or anterooms.

In the Manhattan branch of the New York City Children's Court there are two kinds of hearings, one a formal hearing in a special court room for the bringing in of evidence and the listening to facts from the police and witnesses; the second and informal hearing for cases requiring social investigation, in an anteroom, for the reception of social information and disposition of the case. No other city reported similar arrangements.

Courts in practically all localities reported a definite effort to have parents of children present at hearings. The laws in most of the States required that a summons be sent to the parent or guardian of the child.

#### DISPOSITION OF CASES.

The attitude of the judges, the amount of organization, the effectiveness of probation service, all have considerable influence upon the number of children who are brought before a judge for delinquency or neglect and the proportion dismissed immediately, placed under supervision, or committed to institutions. A marked difference was reported between the number of cases brought before courts in cities of similar size in the same or different sections of the country. This difference was due in large part to the varied presence in the community of contributing causes, but may also be attributed in a considerable measure to the variation in the amount of organization of the respective courts and their differing methods of work.

Statistical reports on numbers and dispositions of cases did not permit of much analysis, for reasons stated in the discussion of records. An analysis was, however, attempted for Illinois, a State for which information was fairly complete. The dispositions of cases were compared for the highly organized court in Chicago and 62 of the 101 courts outside Chicago, which gave comparable figures. Most of these smaller courts had some probation work, and 3 had enough organization to be classified as specially organized courts.

The comparisons indicated that the highly specialized court in Chicago was placing a much larger proportion of delinquent children on probation and sending a much smaller proportion to institutions, and that a much smaller proportion of minor cases was being brought into court than elsewhere in the State. Table VII shows the comparative percentages.



TABLE VII.—Comparison of dispositions of delinquency cases in the Chicago court and in other courts in Illinois during one year.

Disposition of case.	Delinquency cases in Illinois courts. <sup>a</sup>									
	In Chicago.		Outside Chicago.							
			Total.		In courts serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size.					
	Number.	Per cent distribution.			Number.	Per cent distribution.	25,000-100,000		5,000-25,000	
Number.			Per cent distribution.	Number.			Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.
Total.....	3,007	100.0	974	100.0	405	100.0	437	100.0	132	100.0
Dismissed.....	193	6.4	185	19.0	78	19.2	87	19.9	20	15.2
Probation.....	1,371	45.6	273	28.0	96	23.7	134	30.6	43	32.6
Committed.....	766	25.5	457	46.9	195	48.2	202	46.3	60	45.4
Other, pending, and not reported.....	767	22.5	59	6.0	36	8.9	<sup>c</sup> 14	3.2	<sup>d</sup> 9	6.8

<sup>a</sup> Based on Chicago court and 62 of the 101 courts outside Chicago.

<sup>b</sup> Includes 216 guardians appointed to place child in home; 459 continued generally; 2 committed to county agent to be deported as nonresident.

<sup>c</sup> 10 pending and 4 not reported.

<sup>d</sup> Pending.

Some insight into the attitude of many judges of general power in the disposition of the children who come before them was gained from their reports. These frequently failed to differentiate between the case of a child and of an adult or to recognize the cardinal principle of juvenile courts—that the purpose is not punishment but education and discipline suited to the needs of the child. The terminology used in the replies frequently linked children with criminals.

Judges of general powers sometimes referred to their own methods in terms which imply little realization of the distinction, as illustrated by the following quotations:

\* \* \* all cases against children are held at same court as against adults, no distinction.

There is no juvenile court in this county, nor is there any probation officer appointed to look after children. Children are tried before the same court as adults, but when they are of tender years are sent to the State reformatory.

I never shut the door of hope to the young offenders and my rule is not to send them to the State penitentiary, and I place them on the county farm, as the adults are placed. I usually make some arrangements with the man and wife in charge of county farm by which these children can be looked after and given some training.

In this State the county judge acts as probate judge, but in all cases where misdemeanor or crime has been committed the cases are handled by the judge of the criminal court. He sometimes lets them go on probation and sometimes sends them to the reform school. The only cases as a rule that are handled by the county judge are when the parents bring in disobedient and willful children and request that they be committed to the reform school.

We have a State reform school to which delinquents are sent from circuit court. Can't be sent to reform school till found guilty of felony and sentenced to penitentiary. Ought to be accessible to parent or citizen in juvenile court without criminal procedure.

Cases were based upon a criminal information signed by the county and prosecuting attorney charging the delinquent with the commission of a crime. When delinquents are found guilty of a crime, they are sent to the industrial school.

One judge spoke of State institutions, or schools, for criminal and incorrigible children, and that prosecutions for commitments to an institution must go through the criminal division under the criminal code. The lists of cases reported for several courts in one State referred to "felonies" and "misdemeanors."

Two judges wrote: "A child under 16 is never placed in prison unless he commits a very grave offense, or is a hardened criminal and beyond control," and "young criminals in this State are carefully looked after by the judges."

In three States the judges referred to whipping as one method of disposition of the cases. One judge said his method in dealing with truants was: "First, lectured; second, ordered whipped by parents; third, turned over to the State board of charities and correction." Among the dispositions listed in the published statement in a report of a State board of charities, whipping was reported for four courts for 121 children, both white and colored. In another State a judge said that in a great many cases where nothing serious has been done the parents of the child or children are required to give them a whipping.

A report sent in by one court is an interesting commentary on the methods still existing in some parts of the country. Of the children brought before the court in the year for which the report was made, 65 were sent to jail; 40 were placed in a chain gang; 12 were sent to a reformatory and 1 to an orphanage; 156 were fined; 156 were dismissed; judgment was suspended for 25; and only 51 were placed on probation.

A judge from another State wrote of methods of handling juvenile delinquencies and criminals among children, saying: "In such cases when the circumstances warrant we usually send them to the State reformatory, State farm, or parole them under the care of some person who may be interested enough to give them proper care and attention. In some cases the individual, though a minor, sometimes is sent to the chain gang or penitentiary."

Fines were not generally imposed upon children, though a few courts in 32 States reported using this form of punishment.

#### INFORMAL HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS.

In many courts complaints were received informally and investigated by the probation office without a petition or warrant having been filed. By this means many cases were settled without a formal court hearing. Informal handling of complaints appeared to be more usual in some States than in others. Some States did not permit probation officers to make investigations preceding the trial. But in States where this was allowed the large, well-organized probation offices frequently reported handling on informal complaints as many children as were reported brought into court on formal complaint.

The method of procedure in a well-organized complaint department is described by the Chicago court:<sup>1</sup>

The head of the complaint department receives all complaints, so that none are received that do not rightfully belong to the court. The complaint is then registered with the social service registration bureau, so that when the officer receives it he or she can immediately get information from the various philanthropic agencies of the city with which the family has come into contact. The officer then proceeds to ascertain what the facts in the case are, reporting every visit made to the head of the department. If possible, the children are not brought into court, but the case is settled out of court by the visiting of the investigating officer or by referring it to the proper public or private agency or person.

It is interesting to note that in courts which made a practice of handling complaints informally the percentage of cases dismissed on court hearing was low. A tentative comparison was made for the court in Chicago and the courts in other parts of Illinois. This showed that the Chicago court dismissed only a third as large a proportion of its cases as the other courts in the State (6.4 per cent for Chicago, 19 per cent outside Chicago).

#### COMMITMENTS TO AND RELEASE FROM INSTITUTIONS.

An attempt was made to discover through the questionnaire the relationship of the court to the institutions to which children were committed, and the number of States in which the court retained control of the child after commitment, including authority over his release from institutional care. Because of the legal difficulties involved in this question and the evident misunderstanding by many judges, no reliable summary could be made. The judges frequently considered that they had ultimate authority over commitments, because their original order stated the term during which the child was under the supervision of the institution, frequently until majority or until 21. Other courts operating under the same law considered the release to be within the hands of the institution if the institution determined the time and circumstances of parole. The same misunderstanding occurred in the interpretation of the question relating to whether a commitment to an institution was determinate or indeterminate, and very little was secured from the replies to this question.

<sup>1</sup> Juvenile Court and Juvenile Detention Home (Cook County, Ill.), Annual Reports, 1916. Chicago, 1917. p. 6.



## DETENTION.

### METHODS OF DETENTION.

Methods of detention varied not only in different sections of the country but within a single State. They reflect, in a measure, the degree to which the modern principles of children's work are appreciated, for some suitable arrangement for the separate detention of children awaiting hearing and disposition is an essential factor in the organization of a juvenile court. The actual methods used were different in various communities and depended, in part, upon the number of children to be considered and the type of area served. While distinctive plans had been developed by some courts in their detention homes and boarding-out systems, a large number of smaller courts had paid little attention to this important feature. Some had no method of detention other than the jail.

This questionnaire inquiry has attempted merely to enumerate the prevailing methods used, and to indicate roughly the extent to which those most approved have been reported. No attempt has been made to tabulate the method used in each court in the country, because of the varied combinations of methods reported by individual courts and the large number of indefinite replies which could not fairly be classified. Further study would be needed to determine the standards of care maintained by detention homes or the adequacy of supervision of private-family homes. It was not even possible to test all the methods reported by the minimum requirement of separation of children from contact with adult prisoners or paupers.

In all courts children frequently are permitted to remain at home with their parents either after the formality of signing a bond or after the parent or probation officer has promised to produce the child in court for the hearing. In a few instances the judges wrote that every case was disposed of immediately and consequently no method of detention was necessary.

The methods reported for detaining children who do not remain at home pending hearing fall into five groups as follows:

- (1) Publicly supported detention home or room connected with the court.
- (2) Privately supported detention home.
- (3) Family home and home of court official.
- (4) Other expedient.
- (5) Jail or police station, with or without separation from adults.

## DETENTION HOMES AND ROOMS.

Two kinds of detention homes for children are used: those termed in this report "publicly supported detention homes," maintained especially for the temporary detention of children for the court, and those termed "privately supported detention homes," maintained by a society primarily for its own use, though they may also be used by special arrangement for the temporary detention of court children. Occasionally where homes are not established, rooms with more or less equipment are provided. These do not include rooms in which children could be kept only during the day.

A total of 212 detention homes and rooms was reported, of which 163 were publicly supported detention homes, 23 were privately supported detention homes, 24 were rooms. In two cases the type and management were not specified. It is possible that a few of the "homes" reported were family homes. These homes and rooms were in 38 States and the District of Columbia. The replies from 10 States—Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming—did not report even one detention home or room within the State; and from about half these States the information on other methods of detention also showed little attention paid to this important feature.

TABLE VIII.—Types of detention homes and rooms reported used in 1918, by courts serving specified areas.

Type of detention home or room.	Total detention homes or rooms.	For courts serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size. <sup>a</sup>			
		100,000 or over.	25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.
Total.....	212	47	61	75	29
Publicly supported detention home.....	163	38	43	50	23
Publicly supported detention room.....	24	.....	4	14	6
Privately supported detention home.....	23	9	12	2	.....
Detention home, type not known.....	2	.....	2	.....	.....

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

These 212 detention homes and rooms were about evenly divided between courts serving areas in which there were large or medium-sized cities and courts serving only small cities or rural areas. Detention homes serving courts in areas containing cities of more than 25,000 population were not restricted to any one section of the country; but homes serving rural areas or areas in which there were only small cities were reported from only 24 States.

Of the 50 large cities, 41 were known to have in all 47 detention homes. From one large city in New Jersey no reply to the questionnaire was received, and from three courts serving large cities no reply to the question on method of detention. The remaining five

large cities were served by courts which regularly boarded the children in supervised family homes.

Of the 179 cities with a population of 25,000 to 100,000, there were 74 in which there was a detention home in the city or in the court area in which it was located. This represents a total of 61 homes in medium-sized cities. Three homes located in medium-sized cities and six located in large cities also served medium-sized cities in their court area. No report in regard to the method of detention was received from 17 medium-sized cities, 13 where the court was located in the city, and four where the court was elsewhere in the area. In 86 cities in which a court was located in the city and in two for which the court was located elsewhere in the area, the reports stated that there were no detention homes.

A considerable proportion of the detention homes located in large or medium-sized cities served courts which also included in their jurisdiction other cities or rural districts. It is, therefore, impossible to determine satisfactorily the extent to which detention homes were actually provided for small cities and rural areas. Seventy-five detention homes were reported for cities having a population of from 5,000 to 25,000 and 29 for courts serving rural areas only. In a few cases the area served by a detention home could not be clearly determined, but it appears that at least 86 detention homes in large or medium-sized cities and 72 in small cities received children from the rural districts served by courts in these cities.

Determination of the actual provision made for children requiring detention is complicated by the fact that some homes were used for certain classes of children only. In 10 cities the detention home received girls only or boys only, white but not colored, or colored but not white, or delinquents but not dependents, or vice versa. In a number of cities and rural areas reporting detention homes, certain children were detained in jail, either because they were above some specified age or because they were exceptionally difficult.

It has been noted above that the great majority of the special detention quarters were managed especially for the court. All the 29 detention homes or rooms located in purely rural areas and all but 2 of the 75 located in small cities were publicly supported detention homes or rooms. Of the 108 detention homes or rooms in cities with more than 25,000 population, 23 were privately managed, usually by a protective society. But more than half the private detention homes were supported in part from public funds. New York City depended upon four shelters managed by the four local Societies for Prevention of Cruelty to Children and six other cities in New York State used shelters managed by humane societies. Three cities and one county in the State maintained publicly supported detention homes. A private detention home managed jointly by all

the children's societies was reported from Philadelphia as used for dependent and neglected children before the court, while a detention home managed by the court was provided for delinquents; homes maintained by child-protective societies were used in Massachusetts to supplement boarding homes.

The replies to the questionnaire do not indicate to what extent the detention homes provided for the examination and physical care of the children; whether the homes were used also for other purposes; and, if so, whether court children were kept from associating with other children.

#### FAMILY HOMES OR HOMES OF COURT OFFICIALS.

A considerable number of courts used as a method of detention the boarding of children in family homes or placing them in the custody of court officials. Often family homes were used to supplement other forms of detention. Except for Massachusetts, this was done to the largest extent in States having much rural territory—Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota.

In Massachusetts this method of detention was used in the central Boston court and in the courts in three medium-sized cities, as well as in small cities and rural areas. In Boston the homes were found by the Boston Children's Aid Society, and elsewhere, through the State board of charity.

What standards of family care were required, and whether children temporarily boarded for the court were placed with families who were not boarding other children also, can not be determined from the replies to the questionnaire.

In Michigan the law requires that a detention home or room shall be maintained at public expense in each county. For 6 courts it was reported that children were placed in charge of a county agent who was usually the probation officer and that he kept them until the time of the hearing. His home was used for detention quarters and his wife was appointed as matron. In Kansas 16 courts stated that children were detained at the homes of probation officers, some of whom also held the office of sheriff.

A further development of standardized placing out during detention seems to be needed, especially in small communities where so few children come before the courts that a special detention home with a trained matron devoting full time to the work would not be feasible, and where cooperation with other communities or existing institutions is not practicable or desirable.

#### OTHER EXPEDIENTS.

Many courts which did not have regular detention homes reported arrangements for holding children temporarily in some near-by institution. The institutions used in this way included orphanages,



receiving homes of children's agencies, Salvation Army homes or lodges, working boys' homes, a home for the friendless, a Florence Crittenton Home, and a Y. M. C. A. Six rural courts representing six States used the local hotel as a temporary place of detention. Three courts in one State detained extremely difficult children in the State reform school. A number of judges from six States reported using the almshouse, one the county farm, three in as many States the county hospital.

A few courts using one or another of these expedients have been classed with the specially organized courts as having a method of detention better than the jail. In general it may be said that most of these expedients offer many difficulties of separation, classification, and supervision, which unless removed render this alternative inadequate. Great care has to be exerted to protect from contaminating influences children placed in institutions concerned primarily with adult paupers or delinquents, and, on the other hand, to protect the children living in orphanages and homes for the permanent care of dependent children from undersirable companionship with delinquent children from the courts.

#### JAILS.

Detention in jail may mean detention in a local or county jail, or in the sheriff's or jailer's home, if this is in connection with the jail, or in a police station. From at least one court in every State in the Union came reports of detaining children in jails. The practice, however, was much more general in some States than in others.

A large proportion of the courts in Alabama, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas mentioned jail detention. Three hundred and seventy courts in the 48 States reported having no better provision for detention than the jail or the almshouse. Many of these were, of course, small courts which handled few cases and, therefore, neglected to arrange a better method of detention. But of the 244 specially organized courts reporting 50 or more cases, which had arrangements for detention in a special detention home or in a family home or in some institution, 65 reported using the jail for the detention of certain children.

Many of the States permitting jail detention have a law requiring that children be kept apart from adults. Therefore separate rooms, matron's quarters, or juvenile wards were reported by a large number of the courts which used the jail. Thirty-seven courts, scattered through 18 States, definitely reported that no effort was made to separate children from adult offenders, though in many of these States the law required separation. A few courts used for children both separate quarters and quarters not separate from those in which adult prisoners were placed.

*[Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]*

## PROBATION.

Without definite provision for the investigation and supervision of children's cases an attempt to socialize the treatment of children who reach the courts would be fruitless. Every court should have such help available, either through a regular staff of its own, which is to be preferred, or through other persons who are officially delegated to bear this responsibility. A judge who decides the fate of a child requires more than legal facts of evidence. And, if the court is to place children under reformatory care, there must be available not only good institutions but persons especially qualified to care for children outside institutions.

The term "probation service" refers to the provision for supervising children brought before the court. Children who are not sent to institutions may be placed in charge of probation officers, whose duties usually include also investigations of the cases preliminary to hearing or disposition.

In this study is included only the probation service which is a part of the court machinery or is authorized by the court. As probation workers are included persons appointed to serve either with or without compensation and other individuals or agents of societies formally associated with the court. If from time to time a judge informally requests one person or another to supervise an individual child, but does not require reports of the child's progress or of the termination of his probation, that court is not considered to have probation service. Valuable as such work may be, it does not constitute a part of the actual legal organization of the court. To the court has been given the legal responsibility for the disposition of children, and it is the court which is ultimately responsible to the community for results.

No summary has been made of the total number of persons acting as probation officers for children's cases. All the large cities had organized staffs, ranging from 2 to 87 workers. Some of these courts had not only a chief probation officer but also several specialized departments under the charge of supervisors. On the other hand, a county or a district of several counties often had but one officer.

### AMOUNT OF PROBATION SERVICE.

Every State in the Union except one (Wyoming) had legislation providing for juvenile probation. Yet the data secured in this study indicated that less than half the courts having jurisdiction

over children's cases had probation officers during the year of the study. Of the 2,391 courts known to have assumed jurisdiction over children's cases, only 1,071 (45 per cent) had probation workers, so far as known; 58 of these courts had only part of their areas served.

Table IX gives the number of courts in each State with and without probation service according to the type or area served. All the 57 courts in the 50 cities of 100,000 population or more had probation service. In areas containing medium-sized cities 162 of the 173 courts, and in areas containing small cities 493 of the 742 courts, had probation service. Of the 1,419 courts serving only rural areas probation service was reported for 359. In terms of percentages probation service was reported for 94 per cent of the courts serving areas containing medium-sized cities, 66 per cent of the courts serving areas containing small cities, and 25 per cent of the courts serving only rural areas.

The 321 courts which were considered as having special organization, and 750 of the 2,070 courts not so classified, were known to have recognized probation service.

TABLE IX.—Total courts and courts with and without probation service by State and type of area served.

State.	Total courts.	Courts with probation service.					Courts without probation service so far as known.			
		Total.	Serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size. <sup>a</sup>				Total.	Serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size. <sup>a</sup>		
			100,000 or over.	25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.		25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.
Total.....	2,391	b 1,071	57	162	493	359	1,320	11	c 249	d 1,000
Alabama.....	67	10	1	2	5	2	57		4	53
Arizona.....	12	10			5	5	2			2
Arkansas.....	75	4		1	3		71		4	67
California.....	51	51	3	3	16	29				
Colorado.....	37	19	1	2	7	9	18			18
Connecticut.....	37	32	2	5	25		5		5	
Delaware.....	3	1		1			2			2
District of Columbia.....	1	1	1							
Florida.....	45	11		2	3	6	34		3	31
Georgia.....	59	11	1	3	4	3	48		8	40
Idaho.....	37	19			5	14	18			18
Illinois.....	102	73	1	10	29	33	29		7	22
Indiana.....	68	54	1	4	32	17	14		5	9
Iowa.....	26	17		8	7	2	9	1	6	11
Kansas.....	85	73		3	18	52	12		1	98
Kentucky.....	117	11	1	3	6	1	106		8	20
Louisiana.....	31	8	1	1	5	1	23		3	4
Maine.....	39	26		4	21	1	13		9	1
Maryland.....	12	7	1		3	3	5		4	
Massachusetts.....	71	71	12	19	34	6				
Michigan.....	77	77	2	7	29	39				
Minnesota.....	86	27	2	1	9	15	59		9	50
Mississippi.....	27	3			3		24		12	12
Missouri.....	38	33	2	3	12	16	5		3	2
Montana.....	16	11		1	7	3	5		1	4
Nebraska.....	80	15	1	1	8	5	65		9	56
Nevada.....	9	2			1	1	7			7

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 Census.

<sup>b</sup> The following number of courts have only part of area served: Indiana 9, Iowa 11, Louisiana 4, Mississippi 2, Missouri 15, Montana 1, Nebraska 3, New Mexico 2, Virginia 4, West Virginia 7.

<sup>c</sup> Twenty-one courts reported no cases last year.

<sup>d</sup> Two hundred and sixty-two courts reported no cases last year.

TABLE IX.—Total courts and courts with and without probation service by State and type of area served—Continued.

State.	Total courts.	Courts with probation service				Courts without probation service so far as known.				
		Total.	Serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size.				Total.	Serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size.		
			100,000 or over.	25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.		25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.
New Hampshire.....	14	14	.....	2	12	.....	.....	.....	.....	
New Jersey.....	21	18	3	5	7	3	3	.....	2	
New Mexico.....	8	2	.....	.....	1	1	6	.....	4	
New York.....	73	58	5	16	37	.....	15	.....	.....	
North Carolina.....	112	11	.....	.....	10	1	101	4	76	
North Dakota.....	12	12	.....	.....	5	7	.....	.....	.....	
Ohio.....	88	78	5	8	42	23	10	1	8	
Oklahoma.....	75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	75	2	61	
Oregon.....	26	13	1	.....	3	9	13	.....	11	
Pennsylvania.....	67	50	3	15	24	8	17	.....	12	
Rhode Island.....	12	12	1	4	7	.....	.....	.....	.....	
South Carolina.....	43	4	.....	2	2	.....	39	9	30	
South Dakota.....	49	2	.....	.....	1	1	47	.....	42	
Tennessee.....	93	20	2	2	3	13	73	3	70	
Texas.....	165	18	.....	7	6	5	147	1	123	
Utah.....	15	15	.....	2	2	11	.....	.....	.....	
Vermont.....	15	15	.....	.....	9	6	.....	.....	.....	
Virginia.....	47	14	1	4	8	1	33	1	18	
Washington.....	32	13	2	1	7	3	19	.....	18	
West Virginia.....	31	13	.....	3	6	4	18	1	10	
Wisconsin.....	74	12	1	7	4	.....	62	19	43	
Wyoming.....	11	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11	8	3	

Only eight States reported a recognized probation officer for every court: Four States in New England—Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont—and four others—California, Michigan, North Dakota, and Utah. In the three last named States, part of the service was secured through a plan of cooperation which delegated this responsibility to another public official. In Michigan, the county agent for dependent children automatically becomes probation officer if none other is appointed for the county; in North Dakota the juvenile commissioner, and in Utah the superintendent of schools usually acts also as probation officer when appointed as juvenile judge. The adequacy of such service could not be determined by this inquiry.

Fifteen States had, so far as known, only a fourth or less of their courts officially served. These were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin. Two States, Oklahoma and Wyoming, had no official probation service for delinquent children, though in both these States the courts were aided by agents of humane societies or by other county officials.

#### TYPES OF PROBATION SERVICE.

Probation workers were classified as regular, irregular, school-attendance probation officers, police probation officers, and volun-

teers. Regular officers were those giving full-time service paid for through the court. Some officers dealt with both children and adults. Irregular probation officers were persons authorized by the court who gave part-time service, or officially recognized agents of public or private organizations, who combined probation with their other duties. If a school-attendance officer was definitely attached to the court as part-time probation officer, he was termed a school-attendance probation officer; if a sheriff, bailiff, police matron, marshal, or police officer combined recognized probation work with his other duties, they were termed police probation officers. Volunteer probation officers were officially authorized workers giving full or part time service without compensation.

Where there were several probation officers the kind of probation service in a court was defined according to the duties of the chief probation officer or the person giving the most important type of service. Preference was given in this order: Regular, irregular, school-attendance probation, police probation, volunteer.

Of the 1,071 courts with probation service, 457 had regular, and 375, irregular probation service. In 42 courts there were school-attendance probation officers; in 43, police probation officers; and in 58, volunteers. The probation service in 96 courts could not be classified because of insufficient information.

All the courts serving large cities had regular probation officers. Of the 162 courts serving areas containing medium-sized cities and having probation service, 129 reported regular probation officers. Regular officers also served 203 of the 493 courts serving areas containing small cities and 68 of the 359 courts with probation service serving only rural areas. All courts in Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Vermont were considered to have regular service. Many of the probation officers in these States devoted a part of their time to adult work.

TABLE X.—Number and per cent of courts with probation service, and courts with specified type of service, by population of largest city in area served.

Population of largest city in area served. <sup>a</sup>	Total courts.	Courts with probation service.							
		Number.	Per cent.	Type of service.					
				Regular.	Irregular.	School-attendance probation.	Police probation.	Volunteer.	Not reported.
Total.....	2,391	b 1,071	45	457	375	42	43	58	96
100,000 or over.....	57	57	100	57	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
25,000-100,000.....	175	162	94	129	23	4	2	1	3
5,000-25,000.....	742	493	66	203	185	17	14	39	35
Under 5,000.....	1,419	359	25	68	167	21	27	18	58

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

<sup>b</sup> Fifty-eight of these have only part of their area served.

In a number of States the judge frequently appointed as probation officer one of the officials attached to the court or police department. In some places such persons probably did little special work for children. In many places they received fees but no salary. Kansas had the largest number of police probation officers of any State. In Oklahoma, county bailiffs, though not appointed probation officers, appeared to the judges to be worthy of mention in this connection. It is evident from the character of the replies of many of the police probation officers that they considered their duties in connection with children to be limited to conveying a child to an institution or jail, arresting or swearing out a petition against him, or presenting evidence in court. The constructive side of case work for children under their supervision did not appear in many of their reports. A number of large cities with organized staffs of regular probation workers also used police officers for particular phases of the work of the court, but they had other probation workers to supervise the children.

Besides the combination of probation work with the duties of a police or school-attendance officer, there is a significant movement, especially in rural places, to combine this work with that of other social work of the community. Many counties appointed the same individual to several offices. In a county in Illinois the probation officer was also county relief agent and school-attendance officer. In another county he was school-attendance officer and secretary of the associated charities. In a town in Iowa the probation officer was school-attendance officer and secretary of the welfare association, which was concerned with public health, family rehabilitation, relief and employment, friendly visitation, and juvenile work. In Alabama, Colorado, and Minnesota the advisory board, board of county visitors, or county child-welfare board often included as part of its regular activity the investigation of juvenile cases and such supervision as the judge desired. Most of the volunteer probation officers reported for Minnesota were members of county child-welfare boards. In Colorado, masters of discipline may be appointed by judges, both as probation officers and as referees with certain authority in hearing cases. Reference has been made previously to the combination of duties of the juvenile commissioners in North Dakota and the superintendents of schools in Utah. The combination of probation work with the work of private societies undoubtedly raises the standard of case work, and such coordination of work is often a necessary expedient in small or rural communities in order to secure trained workers.

**APPOINTMENT OF PROBATION OFFICERS.<sup>1</sup>**

The majority of probation officers were reported appointed by a judge and serving during his pleasure; in 37 States and the District of Columbia all or most of the appointments were made by judges. In one county in West Virginia the county commissioner appointed on recommendation of the judge. In Baltimore the judges of the supreme bench made the appointment.

Civil service was used generally throughout the States of New Jersey and New York, for 26 of the 88 courts in Ohio, and in three cities—Los Angeles, St. Louis, and Milwaukee. In Chicago a citizens' committee appointed by the judge gives a written and oral examination and the appointments are made from the resultant eligible list.

The governor appointed the probation officers in Florida, in Maine outside Cumberland County, and in Birmingham, Ala. In Michigan the largest share of probation work was done by county agents who were appointed by the governor; other probation officers in the State were appointed by the judges. In Utah the juvenile court commission, and in Vermont and Rhode Island the State probation officer, appointed the probation officers.

**STATE SUPERVISION OF PROBATION WORK.**

The questionnaires from six States reported agencies which were supervising juvenile probation work throughout their respective States, thus tending to standardize and centralize the work of the various courts. Two States, New York and Massachusetts, had State probation commissions, and two, Rhode Island and Vermont, had State probation officers; Utah had a juvenile-court commission; and Connecticut had a prison association authorized by law to collect data on probation work.

The New York State Probation Commission exercises general supervision over the work of probation officers throughout the State. This commission promotes probation work throughout the State; advises concerning the work of individual courts; inspects the work of officers; conducts conferences of probation officers; aids in conducting civil-service examinations; helps to standardize probation work and incidentally some of the court procedure; and furthers the passage of desirable legislation. The commission has introduced a uniform system of record keeping in a large number of courts. It publishes an annual report which contains statistics concerning the work of the courts and discussions of pertinent subjects, a manual for probation officers, and other literature.

In Massachusetts the commission on probation supervises all probation work and has authority "to make such inquiries as it

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A, Chart II, p. 79.



considers necessary in regard to the same."<sup>1</sup> One of the duties of the commission is "To prescribe the form of all records and reports from probation officers."<sup>2</sup> The commission publishes annual reports in which are included recommendations for legislation, better cooperation of courts, and other pertinent subjects.

The State Penal and Charitable Commission of Rhode Island, which has charge of all State institutions, has a department of probation work employing a State probation officer. He appoints and supervises all probation officers in the State, their salaries being fixed by the State penal and charitable commission and paid from a State fund. The records in this State would not appear to be well systematized, since most of the officers reported that they kept records only in personal notebooks. The State probation officer, however, reported that a card index of records was kept in his office.

Vermont has also inaugurated a system of State supervision. The secretary of the State board of charities and probation is also the State probation officer. He has deputy probation officers working under his direction in all counties of the State. In addition to his duties as probation officer, he acts as parole agent for institutions, and placing-out agent for the courts. Permanent records of probation, parole, and child care are kept in the central office of the State probation officer.

Utah has a juvenile court commission, consisting of the governor, attorney general, and State superintendent of public instruction, which has general control and supervision of juvenile courts and probation officers. This commission appoints the juvenile judges and probation officers and has the power of fixing salaries. All probation officers make monthly and annual reports to the commission, which publishes them in a biennial report.

The Connecticut statute reads:

The probation service of the State shall be under the general supervision of the Connecticut Prison Association whose officers shall prepare such blanks for reports and such books of record \* \* \* as may be required for the efficiency of the service, and said books and blanks shall be \* \* \* furnished to all probation officers at the expense of the State \* \* \*. Every probation officer shall make a quarterly report to said prison association in such form as said prison association shall direct.<sup>3</sup>

The association has given a great deal of its time to research on problems of courts and probation work.

In addition to these States in which there was more or less actual supervision of probation work by agencies organized for that purpose, there were eight other States where the courts were respon-

<sup>1</sup> Massachusetts, Acts of 1906, C. 413, S. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Massachusetts, Acts of 1908, C. 465, S. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Public Acts 1903, C. 126, amended by 1905, C. 142, S. 10, amended by 1913, C. 68.

sible in a limited way to the State board of charities or some similar body. These States were: California, Colorado, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, and Virginia. In many parts of these States, to judge from the questionnaire replies, the supervision over probation work did not extend much beyond the required reports, though these State bodies exercised supervision over agencies which frequently performed important work for the court. In two States, California and Virginia, the State boards had prepared uniform sets of records, which they were endeavoring to have the courts of the State adopt.

The Louisiana and Nebraska laws require that annual reports from all juvenile courts be made to their State boards, but the replies of the courts did not show whether or not the laws were complied with. Idaho and Kansas judges stated that they made annual reports to the governor.

A number of States, among them California, Illinois, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, have State probation officers' associations. In New York State also conferences of probation officers are held annually.

## RECORDS AND REPORTS.

One of the essential features of a modern juvenile court is a system of records giving not only statistical data but full information about the study and supervision of individual children by the court. Without such records a court is unable to estimate its progress from year to year or to compare its work with that of other courts.

### LEGAL AND SOCIAL RECORDS.

The questionnaire asked the clerk of each court to state the number and disposition of cases coming before the court during the last preceding fiscal year. It asked the probation officer whether records of investigations were kept and, if they were, whether in permanent or temporary form. Copies of all forms used were also requested.

From 233 courts came the statement that the duties of a clerk were performed by the judge or the probation officer; in 216 of these courts, in 23 States, by the judge; in 17 courts, in 8 States by the probation officer.

Two letters received illustrate how inadequate a record of children's cases was kept in many courts. The judge of a court serving a medium-sized city wrote that it took three days to compile the information for the clerk's questionnaire, because no statistics had been compiled previously. A letter from another State said that there was supposed to be a juvenile docket in the court serving the largest city of the State, but the clerk had entered thereon only four cases in two years. All other children's cases had been entered on the regular criminal docket, and, since their ages had not always been noted, the clerk had to depend upon his memory to determine which cases were those of children.

In the States with State supervision of probation work, statistical reports are sent at regular intervals to the supervising body, which prepared a summary for the State. In other States, the methods of compiling statistics frequently differ in the various courts, and comparable data are not available even for the courts within a single State. For the country as a whole, available figures give only the roughest kind of totals for all courts reporting numbers of cases, and fair comparisons of any one State with other States are practically impossible.

A general lack of uniformity, in addition to incompleteness of the records, confuses the data. In the first place, there is wide difference in definition, both in laws and in court usage. For example, truants are sometimes included as delinquents, sometimes are classified separately. The definition of the term "dependent children" varies; sometimes it includes also neglect cases; sometimes also the mothers' pension cases. In some States, dependent children do not come before the court, or they come before a court other than that which hears cases of delinquency. A few courts call all children wards of the court and do not classify their records to show the causes which brought the children into court. In the second place, courts arrive at their totals in different ways. Some count the complaints entered, others the petitions or warrants taken out, and others the number of hearings, excluding all those settled out of court or never brought to trial. A few courts report only the number of commitments. And the figures vary still further in that, whatever the basis, some totals refer to the number of cases and others to the number of children concerned.

The questionnaire returns indicated that in many courts social records were quite inadequate. In one of the special juvenile courts serving a large city the probation officer reported keeping social records only in his personal notebook.

Reference has previously been made to the work of the State probation associations in Massachusetts and New York in introducing and promoting uniform systems of record keeping.

Only 255 courts, representing 39 States and the District of Columbia, sent copies of the record forms in use. The most general response came from courts in California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, and New York—5 of the 14 States with State supervision of probation work. The forms received vary from one small sheet with simple headings to an elaborate set of forms for recording special items of legal or social information. Several probation officers of small courts reported using a record sheet prepared as a page of a loose-leaf notebook. Such sheets sometimes served both for a docket and as a social history. Blanks received from large cities included not only legal forms for petition, summons, commitment and custody, but also social history records for each child, forms for mental or physical examinations, and daily and monthly report forms.

A number of probation officers in the smaller towns and rural communities wrote of their attempt to gather social facts concerning their cases, and of the difficulties of framing a simple and adequate record system. One wrote that he had ordered, at a cost of about \$60, a full set of forms like those used in a large city in his State, but he found them altogether too cumbersome for the work in his

district. It is evident that a definite distinction should be drawn between the records which are desirable for a "one-man court," as one rural officer described it, and those for a large court which must subdivide its work and arrange methods to facilitate supervision of work and current classification of material. Each court should endeavor to provide a record system which would be adequate for the needs of the court, and yet not too great a burden upon the staff.

#### ANNUAL REPORTS.<sup>1</sup>

Probation officers were asked to send copies of published or unpublished annual reports of the court relating to probation work. The 232 reports received came from courts in 40 States and the District of Columbia.

The reports published by themselves or included in other published reports were mainly from special juvenile courts or courts having special juvenile sessions. Separately published reports of the work of the court as a whole or of the probation work were submitted by 31 courts representing 18 States and the District of Columbia. Reports included with the report of a State board or with the annual report of a city or town gave statistics for 113 courts representing 12 States. Typewritten reports or reports published only in newspapers were sent in by 48 special courts or courts with special juvenile sessions and by 40 general courts, representing in all 32 States. From 22 States no formally published report was received, and from 8 States no annual report of any kind.

---

<sup>1</sup> For list of published annual reports and other reports containing statistics on courts, see Appendix C.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD  
DATE: [Illegible]

[Illegible text block]

[Illegible text block]

1W  
1111

## PROVISION FOR PHYSICAL AND MENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

### PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS.

Physical examinations of children before the courts frequently disclose conditions, the improvement of which may result in the removal of important contributing causes of delinquency. Many of the examinations reported were probably those required by law for commitment to institutions, rather than for the purpose of securing complete information in regard to the case in hand. In the majority of places where the examination was part of the investigation of the case and not made in connection with commitment, only those cases were examined which offered evidence of abnormal physical conditions. In some of the places in which there were physicians regularly attached to the court, every child who passed through the detention home was given a physical examination. In a few places a cursory physical examination was part of the routine investigation.

All courts with probation service were asked concerning physical examinations. Of the 909 replying to the probation officer's questionnaire, 671 reported provision for physical examinations. In 23 courts, of which 21 were courts serving large cities, these examinations were made by physicians attached to the staff of the court or regularly making this examination for the court. In the remaining 648 courts, examinations were made by private practitioners or physicians holding some public office, such as city or county physician or health officer.

### NUMBER AND TYPES OF COURTS REPORTING MENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

The relation of delinquency, dependency, and truancy to mental condition is becoming better known, and an encouraging number of courts which hear children's cases have shown an appreciation of the value of mental examinations in deciding upon the proper disposition of cases. One hundred and forty-five courts, or 7 per cent of the 2,034 which replied to the questionnaire, reported mental examinations in clinics organized for that purpose or by persons having some psychiatric or psychological knowledge. These courts were located in 34 States and the District of Columbia. Doubtless in many communities there were facilities other than the ones reported, which might be utilized by the courts were they aware of the aid in comprehending a child's behavior which scientific knowledge of his mental make-up gives.

Table XI gives the number and distribution of courts reporting mental examinations, according to type of area served.

TABLE XI.—*Courts reporting mental examinations, by population of largest city in area served.*

Population of largest city in area served. <sup>a</sup>	Courts replying to questionnaire.				
	Total.	Reporting mental examinations.		Not reporting mental examinations.	
		Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Total.....	2,034	145	7	1,889	93
100,000 or over.....	56	43	77	13	23
25,000-100,000.....	166	46	28	120	72
5,000-25,000.....	659	44	7	615	93
Under 5,000.....	1,153	12	1	1,141	99

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

The number of courts reporting mental examinations were practically the same for areas containing large cities, medium-sized cities, and small cities, with about one-fourth as many in rural areas as in each of the others. According to the number of courts in each of these types of areas, there was, however, a great divergence in the proportion reporting mental examinations. For the courts in large cities, the percentage reporting examinations was 77, and for courts serving areas containing medium-sized cities, 28, as against 7 per cent for courts serving areas with small cities and 1 per cent in the purely rural areas.

In many courts very few cases were reported examined during their last fiscal year. The courts having special provision for mental examination often examined only problem cases or repeaters.

#### STANDARDS OF MENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

A scientific definition of a clinic was not attempted, nor was it possible to establish standards or classify types of mental examinations. Some courts reported examinations for mental diseases, others for mental defect. It is not known how many courts have the advantage of examinations by persons with a knowledge of both conditions. Some examiners reported were evidently experienced in their fields, while others were as evidently amateurs. Courts which reported examinations made by teachers, probation officers, or nurses were not credited as having provisions for mental examinations, unless it was specified that some of the accepted psychological tests were used.

#### RESOURCES FOR MENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

The clinics and examiners reported may be classified, according to their connections and the source of their support, as follows: (1) Court clinics or examiners who were a part of the court organization;



(2) clinics or examiners connected with or supervised by institutions, usually State institutions for the insane or feeble-minded; (3) clinics maintained by the county or city; (4) clinics connected with universities, colleges, or normal schools, or examiners who were in most instances associated with the psychology departments of these institutions; (5) laboratories or examiners connected with elementary school systems for the study of subnormal and unusual children; (6) others, including mental hygiene societies, a miscellaneous group variously reported as "experts," "specialists," "psychiatrists," "psychologists," and "alienists," with no explanation of their identity or connection, and a group of school teachers, probation officers, and public health nurses who had some knowledge of and made mental tests.

Table XII shows the distribution of mental clinics or examiners according to the type of area served by the court.

TABLE XII.—Total courts reporting mental examinations in clinics or by mental examiners, with area served, by type of clinic or examiner.

Type of clinic or examiner.	Total courts reporting clinics or mental examiners.	Courts serving areas whose largest cities were of specified size. <sup>a</sup>			
		100,000 or over.	25,000-100,000.	5,000-25,000.	Under 5,000.
Total.....	145	43	46	44	12
Court.....	15	14		1	
Institution and public department.....	b 46	8	20	13	5
County or city.....	4	1	1	2	
University, college, or normal school.....	c 20	4	4	11	1
Elementary school.....	b 14	8	5	1	
Mental hygiene society.....	2			1	1
Specialists, auspices not specified (psychiatrists, psychologists, "experts").....	b 31	7	11	10	3
School teachers, probation officers, and nurses who give mental tests.....	b 13	1	5	5	2

<sup>a</sup> According to 1910 census.

<sup>b</sup> One additional court which secured mental examiners from this source has been classified under another heading.

<sup>c</sup> Two additional courts which secured mental examiners from this source have been classified under other headings.

### Court clinics and examiners.

In 13 courts there were clinics working in connection with the court organization, where examinations were made by psychiatrists or psychologists. Two outside courts, in addition to the 13 reported, used these court clinics. The 13 clinics were located in the following cities, all of which have a population of more than 100,000:

Boston, Mass. (Judge Baker Foundation).

Buffalo, N. Y.

Chicago, Ill. (Juvenile Psychopathic Institute).

Cincinnati, Ohio.

Detroit, Mich.

Los Angeles, Calif.

Memphis, Tenn.

Newark, N. J.

New York, N. Y.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

San Francisco, Calif.

Seattle, Wash.

### Institutions and public departments.

Forty-seven courts in 11 States reported the cooperation of institutions or public departments in making mental examinations of children brought before the courts. The majority of these were State institutions for the feeble-minded or the insane.

In Illinois and Ohio, State departments have been established by law for the mental diagnosis of any children brought to them from any court in the State. The Illinois Juvenile Psychopathic Institute is a department of the department of public welfare and includes the Cook County (Chicago) juvenile court clinic. The Ohio Bureau of Juvenile Research is under the direction of the State board of administration.

Both organizations have staffs of workers and, in addition to the examinations, are engaged in research work on special problems. However, the facilities of neither were reported used by the courts of the State to the extent which would be desirable. Only three courts in addition to the Chicago Juvenile Court referred to the Illinois Institute, and only one to the Ohio Bureau. Both departments had been recently established, however, and had not yet been able to extend their work very far.

In three States—Michigan, New York, and Massachusetts—the State hospitals for the insane held out-patient clinics which were utilized by certain courts. In three Michigan counties—Jackson, Kent (Grand Rapids), and Kalamazoo—the courts reported that physicians were sent from the Kalamazoo State Hospital to hold clinics in their respective communities at stated times and that children were sent by the courts to be examined in these clinics. The Detroit court clinic was under the direction of the superintendent of the State Psychopathic Hospital at Ann Arbor, but had a local psychiatrist in charge.

Four courts in New York (Binghamton, Poughkeepsie, Newburgh, and Yonkers) reported that children had been examined in out-patient clinics of three State hospitals. The Municipal Psychopathic Hospital of Syracuse held regular out-patient clinics, where children from the court of that city were examined.

In Massachusetts, the psychopathic department of the Boston State Hospital holds out-patient clinics and also receives patients on commitment of 10 to 30 days for observation. Thirteen Massachusetts courts in the vicinity of Boston reported children examined at this hospital. One other Massachusetts court reported cases examined in the out-patient clinic of a State hospital for insane, and another mentioned school clinics attended by doctors from a State hospital.

Massachusetts was the only State in which out-patient clinics of a State institution for feeble-minded were reported. The Massachu-

setts School for the Feeble-minded at Waverley held weekly out-patient clinics at the institution, and three courts reported sending children to this clinic. Two other courts reported having children examined in out-patient clinics held by members of the staff of the Waverley institution in their respective cities. One of these was in cooperation with physicians from a State hospital for the insane.

Sixteen additional courts in nine States—California, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, and South Dakota—reported that they occasionally availed themselves of the services of members of the staffs of various kinds of institutions. One industrial school for boys, one reformatory, and one private institution for the feeble-minded were reported, each by one court. In four cases, State institutions were specified, without stating the class of patients for which they provided. The remaining nine courts reported examinations made by public institutions for the feeble-minded and insane. Six of the sixteen courts were in Massachusetts.

#### County and city clinics.

Two county agencies were referred to, each by one court. The Monmouth County (N. J.) court referred to the county supervisor of child study as giving mental examinations, and the court in White Plains, N. Y., mentioned the psychiatric clinic under the commissioner of charities and corrections of Westchester County. Indianapolis, Ind., and Springfield, Mo., each reported court cases examined in free city clinics.

#### Universities, colleges, and normal schools.

The universities of the country were also cooperating with the courts in the matter of mental examinations. Twenty-two courts reported that examinations had been made either in organized clinics at universities or by teachers and professors who were in most cases connected with the psychology departments. Seventeen colleges, normal schools, and universities were reported as rendering this service. A list follows:

California.....	Leland Stanford University, Department of Education. Leland Stanford University Medical School. University of California.
Colorado.....	University of Colorado. State Teachers' College.
Indiana.....	University of Indiana.
Iowa.....	Iowa State University Medical School.
Kansas.....	University of Kansas.
Maryland.....	Phipps Psychiatric Clinic of Johns Hopkins University.
Massachusetts.....	Westfield Normal School.
Ohio.....	Ohio State University.
Pennsylvania.....	University of Pennsylvania. Wilson College.

Tennessee.....	University of Tennessee.
Virginia.....	Medical College of Virginia. Hampton Institute.
Washington.....	University of Washington.

### Elementary schools.

Reports from numerous cities in which provision was made by boards of education for special study and instruction of backward and defective children in the public schools, showed that courts often made use of the equipment thus provided for mental examination of children. Fifteen courts reported such examinations by school psychologists or in school clinics. These courts included the following cities in their jurisdiction:

Oakland (also serving Berkeley and San Diego), Calif.  
 Hartford, Conn.  
 Dorchester, Brighton, and Springfield, Mass.  
 Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.  
 St. Louis, Mo.  
 Rochester, N. Y.  
 Cleveland and Cincinnati, Ohio.  
 Racine and Madison, Wis.  
 Everett, Wash.

### Other clinics or examiners.

Two courts, one in a rural county of Maryland and the other in a small Illinois city, reported examinations made by physicians secured through, or clinics held by, mental hygiene societies.

In addition to the more or less organized methods of examination, there were 32 courts which reported examinations made by individuals whom they specified as psychiatrists, alienists, psychologists, specialists, or experts, without stating whether or not they were connected with any organization or institution.

Three courts reported examinations made by probation officers, and three by school nurses who had received some training in mental testing. Teachers of subnormal children in ungraded rooms were reported as making examinations for eight courts.

### Other examiners reported.

In addition to the 145 courts definitely reporting that mental examinations were made by clinics or specifically qualified examiners, 269 courts reported mental examinations by physicians who, according to the reports, appeared to be general practitioners. Some of them were specified as health officers.

There was no evidence that these physicians had any particular knowledge of mental diseases or defects, and these courts were not classified as having provision for mental examination. There were also a number of courts which reported lunacy commissions as giving these examinations. It is probable, however, that in most cases

these were the examinations necessary in connection with commitment to institutions and were not made in order that the court might have scientific knowledge of the case in hand as a guide to its disposition.

#### STATES IN WHICH NO COURT REPORTED MENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

From 14 States there was no report of mental examinations in clinics or by persons having some special psychiatric or psychological knowledge. The 14 States are:

Alabama.	Nevada.
Arizona.	New Mexico.
Delaware.	North Carolina.
Idaho.	Oklahoma.
Maine.	Rhode Island.
Mississippi.	West Virginia
Montana.	Wyoming.

The probation officer of one court reported frankly that since no institution would accept children known to be feeble-minded, the court was not anxious to be definitely informed as to the mental status of those whom it wished to commit. This state of affairs probably existed in other courts as well, but it would seem to be a short-sighted policy in the end since it should be the aim of courts to do the best thing for each individual child.



## COOPERATION OF THE COURT WITH THE COMMUNITY.

The court can hardly maintain a high degree of efficiency without a definite method for cooperation with the community, as represented by other official departments, public and private agencies and individuals. Several items in the questionnaires for both judges and probation officers gave an opportunity to secure some facts as to this important feature. Replies from a large number of courts, representing practically every State in the Union, gave evidence of such methods of cooperation. Information regarding cooperation with official departments related only to that with State boards and commissions, and the police; it has been discussed in connection with probation service. Most of the facts secured related to local, county, and State boards and agencies.

Many courts secured advice and help from boards and agencies which were established for this particular purpose or from others which cooperated on special phases of work. In some States the law provided for county boards with specified duties in connection with the court or other child welfare work of the county.

### LOCAL AND COUNTY BOARDS OR AGENCIES.

Practically all the local and county boards were reported by the judges as serving in an advisory as well as in an auxilliary capacity. There were 266 of these boards reported for 263 courts in 32 States. In many States there were but one or two. Only 7 States reported more than five each.

In 17 of the 32 States the advisory board was established through statutory provision. At least 3 States had legal provision for such boards but none was reported appointed under this law. In many States the judges, on their own initiative, had organized committees to aid and advise them, or they used some existing organization which had volunteered assistance.

From 18 courts in 12 States judges or probation officers wrote of the important assistance given by local committees, appointed to cooperate with the court, or by local juvenile protective associations or committees of local civic or social agencies. In only one place was such assistance provided by law. This was the Juvenile Court and Probation Association at Wilmington, Del., which was created to look after the detention home, cooperate with the judge, and to sug-

gest legislation. The other committees were voluntary, acting either as permanent standing committees or on special appointment as the need arose. In 4 States—Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and Virginia—the local agencies were called “Juvenile Protective Associations.” Success in securing the assistance of citizens of a community most able to help in the court work was illustrated by one judge who had formed what he called a juvenile protective association, which met once a month, looked after the interests of delinquent children, inspected the county reformatory for delinquent boys, and made recommendations according to findings. This judge made a special point of including all public school teachers in this association and secured their cooperation especially with delinquent children of school age. Other places referred to “Society of social welfare,” the “Ladies auxiliary,” “Civic organization of the women’s club,” and a “Committee for dependent children and families of the United Charities.”

Various kinds of cooperating county boards were reported for 170 courts in 13 States. They were called variously “Boards of county visitors,” “Advisory boards,” “Child-welfare boards,” “Boards of children’s guardians,” “Probation committees,” and “Juvenile boards.” There is wide variation in their duties and importance. In many replies the description of work is too meager to judge as to the nature of the activities, and it is known through correspondence with persons familiar with the State work that frequently the boards had been organized but were very inactive.

The most common among the county boards were “Boards of county visitors,” whose duties were to inspect institutions and report to the judge with recommendations. They were reported from 7 States—Arkansas, Colorado, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, Washington, and Wisconsin—but in only 2—Colorado and Ohio—are they at all general. In Colorado 6 boards were definitely reported and 5 others were evidently of the same type. Fifty-six such boards were reported from Ohio, though a correspondent wrote that many of them were unimportant factors in the juvenile court work.

Boards with general advisory duties were second in prevalence. Alabama reported 11 such boards serving the courts. A correspondent, however, reported these boards inactive except in four counties. Seven other States—Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, and New Jersey—each reported from one to five such boards, but gave no information as to their usefulness.

Three States—Arizona, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—reported county boards of child welfare, which had been authorized by recent acts of their respective legislatures, and so had not had time to become very prevalent or active. Twenty-two such boards



were reported on the questionnaires as established in Minnesota. Their duties were to investigate cases, institute proceedings, and advise and assist the court in all matters pertaining to the welfare of children. They were appointed by the State board of control to serve without compensation, but were allowed to have a paid executive if the county commissioners approved. In Arizona two and in Wisconsin ten county boards were reported, whose duties were to look after mothers' pension cases.

Three other States each reported boards of different types established by law, which were doing important work. In Indiana 39 county boards of children's guardians were reported in as many counties as aiding and advising the courts. These boards investigate cases of dependent and neglected children, institute court proceedings, receive such children from the court, and place and visit them in homes. They report monthly to the State board of charities.

In California, 42 courts reported the services of probation committees. These committees are each composed of seven citizens whose duties are to investigate institutions and societies that receive children and report their findings to the court and State board of charities. They also control the detention homes and can be called upon for investigation by the court. Practically all these committees seem to be taking an active part in the work of the juvenile court.

In Texas the law provides for a juvenile board in counties with a population over 100,000 and containing a city of 75,000 or over. This board is made up of the judges of the civil and criminal district courts, together with the county judge. It is required to hear such facts as are brought to its attention, and is empowered to recommend to the court concerning the care and custody of children. They have power to file complaints, to be present at hearings and to direct probation officers. Three of the four counties having the designated population requirements (Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties) reported such boards.

#### STATE-WIDE AGENCIES.

State-wide agencies which concern themselves primarily with the work of the courts existed in only a few States and have already been described as agencies supervising probation work. From practically every State, the questionnaires reported State-wide agencies organized primarily for work other than that of the courts, as cooperating most frequently in the matter of placing children in homes.

The assistance of children's home and aid societies, whose activities were either State-wide or extending over a large part of the

State, was reported for 23 States. These societies received children from the courts for placing and often exercised all supervision of them after they were placed.

Seven States reported the State board of charities as actively cooperating in the work of the courts. The child-welfare department of the Ohio Board of State Charities wrote that it had received children for placement from the juvenile courts in 45 counties. The Connecticut State Board of Charities had recently established a child-welfare department which placed out dependent and neglected children committed by the courts to the county temporary homes for placing.

In Massachusetts agents of the State board of charity cooperate in many of the activities of the courts. These agents, by order of the board, attend all hearings of delinquent and most of the hearings of neglected children. They also make investigations of many of these cases. All cases of dependents are referred directly to them by the overseers of the poor without going through the juvenile courts. Many Massachusetts courts use the family homes of the State board of charity for detention, and courts having no other provision may make arrangements through the board for mental examinations.

The Indiana State Board of Charities has direct supervision of all county boards of children's guardians, which take charge of most of the placing of dependent and neglected children in family homes. New Hampshire, Vermont, and Virginia courts may commit dependent and neglected children to the care of the State boards of charities for placing in family homes. The courts in New Jersey and the District of Columbia reported that boards of children's guardians received children from the courts for placing.

Three States—Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming—reported bureaus of child and animal protection, which were doing some work in cooperation with the courts. Six other States—Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and West Virginia—had societies for prevention of cruelty to children or humane societies operating over all or a large part of their respective States, reported by the courts as cooperating.

## APPENDIX A. CHARTS.

CHART I.—*Juvenile courts established by special laws, and court systems having jurisdiction over children's cases of delinquency and neglect, by States.*

State.	Special juvenile courts with independent jurisdiction. <sup>a</sup>	Court systems given jurisdiction over children's cases.			
		County court or court serving county.	District court or circuit court.	City court or court for police district.	Other courts.
Alabama.....	Juvenile court of Jefferson County (Birmingham); Juvenile court of Mobile County (Mobile).	Probate court (except independent courts).		Recorder's court (2).	
Arizona.....		Superior court			
Arkansas.....		County court			
California.....		Superior court (3)			
Colorado.....	Juvenile court of Denver County (Denver).	County court (except independent court).			
Connecticut.....				Town, City, or Borough; Police; Justice of peace (1 and 5).	District court of Waterbury; Superior court (1).
Delaware.....	Juvenile court of Wilmington.	Court of general sessions; superior court (except independent court).		Municipal; Justice of peace (except independent court).	
District of Columbia.	Juvenile court of District of Columbia (Washington).				
Florida.....		County court			
Georgia.....	Juvenile court of Fulton County (Atlanta); Juvenile court of Bibbs County (Macon); Juvenile court of Chatham County (Savannah) (5).	Court of record to be designated by Superior court (except independent courts).			
Idaho.....		Probate court			
Illinois.....		Circuit court; Circuit court for Cook County (7).	County court (1).		
Indiana.....	Juvenile court of Marion County (Indianapolis) (8).	(See independent court.)	Circuit court (except independent court).		
Iowa.....			District court (1) (9).	Superior court (1).	
Kansas.....		Probate court			
Kentucky.....		County court			
Louisiana.....	Juvenile court of the Parish of Orleans.	(See independent court.)	District court (except independent court).		
Maine (no juvenile court law).		Probate court (10a)		Municipal police; Justice of peace; Superior court (10b).	

<sup>a</sup> Only courts reporting in regard to their work are included.

CHART I.—*Juvenile courts established by special laws, and court systems having jurisdiction over children's cases of delinquency and neglect, by States—Continued.*

State.	Special juvenile courts with independent jurisdiction.	Court systems given jurisdiction over children's cases.			
		County court or court serving county.	District court or circuit court.	City court or court for police district.	Other courts.
Maryland.....	Juvenile court of Baltimore; Juvenile court of Allegany County (Cumberland).		Circuit court (except independent courts).	Police justice..	
Massachusetts.....	Boston juvenile court (central).			Police, District, or Municipal court or Trial justice (1) (except independent court); supreme; superior (appellate).	
Michigan.....		Probate court.....			
Minnesota.....		Probate court (12); District court.			
Mississippi.....			Circuit court (1); Chancery court.		
Missouri.....			Circuit court (13).		
Montana.....			District court		
Nebraska.....		County court (14).....	District court		
Nevada.....			District court		
New Hampshire.....				Municipal court, Justice of peace (15).	
New Jersey.....	Juvenile court of Essex County (Newark) (16); Juvenile court of Hudson County (Jersey City).	Common pleas court (except independent courts).			
New Mexico.....			District court		
New York.....	Children's court of New York City (17a); Children's court of Buffalo.	Montroe County children's court (17b); Ontario County children's court; Chautauqua County children's court (law effective July 1, 1918).		Special sessions, Police, City, Justices of peace (except special courts).	
North Carolina.....			Superior court (1).	Recorder's courts and like courts (1).	
North Dakota.....			District court		
Ohio.....		Selected from Probate, Insolvency, Common pleas, Superior (18) except as follows: Court of common pleas, division of domestic relations for Hamilton County, Mahoning County, Montgomery County, Summit County; Court of domestic relations for Lucas County.			
Oklahoma.....		County court.....			
Oregon.....		County court.....			
Pennsylvania.....		Courts of quarter sessions (19); Allegheny County; Municipal court in Philadelphia.			
Rhode Island.....			District court		

CHART I.—*Juvenile courts established by special laws, and court systems having jurisdiction over children's cases of delinquency and neglect, by States—Continued.*

State.	Special juvenile courts with independent jurisdiction.	Court systems given jurisdiction over children's cases.			
		County court or court serving county.	District court or circuit court.	City court or court for police district.	Other courts.
South Carolina.....		Probate court (except as indicated in column 5).		Recorder's court (20).	
South Dakota.....		County court.....		See column 3.	
Tennessee.....		County, City, or Recorder's court (21).			
Texas.....		County court and district court (for county) (1).			
Utah.....	Juvenile court of the second judicial district (Ogden); Juvenile court of the third judicial district (Salt Lake City).		District court (22).		
Vermont.....		City and Municipal courts for county (1).		City and municipal courts and justices of peace.	
Virginia.....	Juvenile and domestic relations court of Richmond (22); Juvenile and domestic relations court of Norfolk (established Jan. 1, 1919).		Circuit court	Police and justice courts (except independent court).	Other courts of general criminal jurisdiction.
Washington.....		Superior court.....			
West Virginia.....		Common pleascourt (1 and 23a).	Circuit court (1).		Intermediate court; Criminal court (1 and 23b).
Wisconsin.....		Selected from Courts of record (24).			
Wyoming (no juvenile court law).			District court (1).	Justice of peace and Police court.	

(1) Concurrent jurisdiction.

(2) *Alabama*.—Concurrent jurisdiction only in case of violation of city ordinances.

(3) *California*.—In every county and city and county having more than one judge of the superior court those judges shall designate one of their number to hear all causes under juvenile court act.

(4) *Colorado*.—Special court in each county and municipality known as a city and county having population of 100,000 or more.

(5) *Connecticut*.—Cities having a population of 20,000 or more may provide for a juvenile court to be conducted by a judge of police or city court.

(6) *Georgia*.—A special court in counties having a population of 60,000 or more. Counties having between 35,000 and 60,000 may establish a special court.

(7) *Illinois*.—In counties having a population of more than 500,000 (Cook County) the judges of the circuit court may designate one of their number to hear all cases under juvenile court law.

(8) *Indiana*.—Every county containing a city of 100,000 inhabitants (Marion County) shall establish a special juvenile court.

(9) *Iowa*.—In counties having a population of 100,000 or more (Polk County) the district judges shall select one of their number to act as judge of the juvenile court.

(10) *Maine*.—(a) Jurisdiction of dependency or neglect. (b) In case of delinquency any court or trial justice having jurisdiction of offense.

(11) *Maryland*.—Justices of peace have jurisdiction where the judges of the district court have not designated one of their number as judge for juvenile causes and where there is no independent juvenile court.

(12) *Minnesota*.—District court in counties having a population of more than 33,000; probate court in all other counties.

(13) *Missouri*.—Criminal division of circuit court in counties containing city of the first class.

(14) *Nebraska*.—County court has concurrent jurisdiction in absence of judge of district court.

(15) *New Hampshire*.—In municipalities of less than 2,000 where no municipal court has been established.

(16) *New Jersey*.—A separate court in counties of first class.

(17) *New York*.—(a) In New York City a separate division of court of special sessions. (b) Jurisdiction conferred upon county court, children's part.

(18) *Ohio*.—Judges of these courts designate one of their number.

(19) *Pennsylvania*.—In Allegheny County, the county court.

(20) *South Carolina*.—In cities having a population of from 20,000 to 50,000.

(21) *Tennessee*.—City court in counties of 148,000 or more; recorder's court in counties having between 33,600 and 33,700.

(22) *Utah*.—The law provides for a special juvenile court in each judicial district.

(23) *Virginia*.—City of 30,000 or more may establish a special juvenile and domestic relations court.

(24) *West Virginia*.—(a) Having chancery jurisdiction. (b) If no court with chancery jurisdiction.

(25) *Wisconsin*.—Judges to designate one of their number.

CHART II.—*Methods of appointment of probation officers reported from the various States.*

Civil service:

- California .....1 court, Los Angeles.
- Missouri.....1 court, St. Louis.
- New Jersey.....All regular probation officers.
- New York.....All regular probation officers.
- Ohio.....22 courts regular, 4 courts irregular.
- Wisconsin .....1 court, Milwaukee.

Governor:

- Alabama .....1 court, Birmingham.
- Florida.....On recommendation of county commissioners.
- Maine .....Except Cumberland County.
- Michigan.....County agents, on recommendation of State board of charities and corrections; judges appoint other probation officers.

State board or State probation officer:

- Rhode Island.
- Vermont.

Judge:

- Alabama .....Except Birmingham.
- Arizona.
- Arkansas.
- California.....Except Los Angeles; on recommendation of probation committee.
- Colorado.
- Connecticut.
- Delaware.
- District of Columbia.
- Georgia.
- Idaho.
- Illinois.
- Indiana.
- Iowa
- Kansas.
- Kentucky.
- Louisiana.
- Maine.....In Cumberland County only.
- Maryland.....Except Baltimore City.
- Massachusetts.
- Michigan .....4 courts—regular probation officers other than county agents.
- Minnesota.
- Mississippi.....1 court.
- Missouri .....Except St. Louis.
- Montana.
- Nebraska.
- Nevada.

## Judge—Continued.

New Hampshire.

North Dakota.

Ohio.....Except 26 courts.

Oregon.

Pennsylvania.

South Dakota.

Tennessee.

Texas.

Virginia.

Washington.

West Virginia.....Except 1 court.

Wisconsin.....Except Milwaukee.

## Other methods and special systems:

Illinois.....1 court, Cook County—Competitive examination given  
by committee of citizens, especially appointed by  
judge when examination is to be given.

Maryland.....Baltimore City—appointed, by law, by judges of su-  
preme bench.

Utah.....State juvenile court commission.

West Virginia.....1 court, county commissioners on recommendation of  
judge.



135315°—20—6

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

	Location. <sup>c</sup>	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population. <sup>b</sup>	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
ALABAMA.						
1	Birmingham.....	Juvenile court of Jefferson County.	Independ-ent.	County .	289,293	189,716
2	Mobile.....	Juvenile court of Mobile County.	...do....	...do....	94,074	59,201
3	Montgomery.....	Juvenile court of Montgomery County.	Probate...	...do....	89,573	44,039
ARIZONA.						
4	Tombstone..... <i>Bisbee.</i>	Juvenile court of Cochise County.	Superior..	County .	53,089	*9,019
ARKANSAS.						
5	Little Rock.....	Juvenile court of Pulaski County.	County...	County .	106,083	58,716
6	Pine Bluff.....	Juvenile court of Jefferson County.	...do....	...do....	61,320	17,777
CALIFORNIA.						
7	Fresno.....	Juvenile court of Fresno County.	Superior..	County .	103,245	36,414
8	Los Angeles.....	Juvenile court of Los Angeles County.	...do....	...do....	747,816	535,485
9	Napa.....	Juvenile court of Napa County.	...do....	...do....	22,244	7,072
10	Oakland.....	Juvenile court of Alameda County.	...do....	...do....	230,758	206,405
11	Redwood City.....	Juvenile court of San Mateo County.	...do....	...do....	37,162	6,247
12	<i>San Mateo.</i> Sacramento.....	Juvenile court of Sacramento County.	...do....	...do....	83,784	68,984
13	San Bernardino.....	Juvenile court of San Bernardino County.	...do....	...do....	77,711	17,616
14	San Diego.....	Juvenile court of San Diego County.	...do....	...do....	82,288	56,412
15	San Francisco.....	Juvenile court of San Francisco County.	...do....	...do....	471,023	471,023
16	San Jose.....	Juvenile court of Santa Clara County.	...do....	...do....	100,563	39,810
17	San Rafael.....	Juvenile court of Marin County.	...do....	...do....	31,985	7,434
18	Santa Barbara.....	Juvenile court of Santa Barbara County.	...do....	...do....	34,164	15,360
19	Santa Rosa.....	Juvenile court of Sonoma County.	...do....	...do....	55,630	8,652
20	Stockton.....	Juvenile court of San Joaquin County.	...do....	...do....	61,882	36,209
COLORADO.						
21	Colorado Springs.....	County court of El Paso County.	County...	County .	51,874	38,965
22	Denver.....	Juvenile court of Denver County.	Independ-ent.	...do....	268,439	268,439
23	Pueblo.....	County court of Pueblo County, juvenile division.	County...	...do....	65,198	56,084
CONNECTICUT.						
24	Bridgeport.....	City court of Bridgeport.....	City.....	Part of county.	N. R.	124,724

<sup>a</sup> Excluding courts reporting less than 50 children's cases heard during the year. Courts not reporting the exact number of cases heard but which were known to have more than 50 cases are entered as "N. R." (not reported).

<sup>b</sup> Estimated as for July 1, 1917. Department of Commerce, United States Bureau of the Census Bulletin 138. Estimates of population. For towns having less than 8,000 population in 1910 estimates were made by the Children's Bureau. Figures starred are for Apr. 15, 1910; it was impossible to make estimates in these cases, either because the towns had not been incorporated in 1900 or because there had been a decrease in population between 1900 and 1910.

for hearing children's cases, 1918. <sup>a</sup>

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year. <sup>c</sup>		Special court room. <sup>f</sup>	Frequency of sessions. <sup>g</sup>	Probation service. <sup>d</sup>		Method of detention. <sup>d</sup>			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular Probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
1,380	880	✓	Daily.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	1
273	160	✓	3/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	2
454	291	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	.....do.....	3
*1,030	*300	C.	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	4
559	415	✓	3/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Psychologist..	5
415	140	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	6
145	N. R.	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Psychologist..	7
1,232	N. R.	✓	N. R.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic...	8
**84	N. R.	C.	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	9
473	160	✓	5/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Psychologist..	10
98	N. R.	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	University clinic.	11
*125	N. R.	—	1-3/wk	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	12
108	57	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	13
N. R.	N. R.	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	School psychologist.	14
1,283	902	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic....	15
142	109	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	University clinic.	16
116	32	C.	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	17
N. R.	N. R.	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Psychologist..	18
60	34	—	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	University clinic.	19
145	N. R.	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	20
152	53	C.	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	21
N. R.	N. R.	C.	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	University clinic.	22
76	65	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	23
N. R.	N. R.	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	N. R.....	24

<sup>c</sup>\*Approximate number estimated by court. <sup>\*\*</sup>Approximate number estimated by Children's Bureau on basis of partial reports sent in by courts.

<sup>d</sup> Preference is given to the best type.

<sup>e</sup> City named in italics is largest city in area served.

<sup>f</sup> "C" indicates that hearings are in the judges' chambers.

<sup>g</sup> "1/wk." means once a week. "1-3/wk." means one to three times a week. "Nec." means when necessary. "1/wk. and nec." means once a week and oftener when necessary.

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	CONNECTICUT—Con.					
25	Hartford.....	City police court of Hartford, juvenile division.	Police....	Part of county.	N. R.	112,831
26	New Haven.....	City court of New Haven.....	City.....	do.....	N. R.	152,275
27	Waterbury.....	City court of Waterbury.....	do.....	do.....	N. R.	89,201
	DELAWARE.					
28	Wilmington.....	Juvenile court of Wilmington..	Independent.	City....	95,369	95,369
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.					
29	Washington.....	Juvenile court of District of Columbia.	Independent.	District.	369,282	369,282
	FLORIDA.					
30	Jacksonville.....	Juvenile court of Duval County.	County....	County..	101,026	79,065
31	Tampa.....	County court, as juvenile court of Hillsboro County.	do.....	do.....	83,682	56,251
	GEORGIA.					
32	Atlanta.....	Juvenile court of Fulton County.	Independent.	County..	221,800	196,144
33	Augusta.....	Juvenile court of Richmond County.	City.....	do.....	62,645	50,642
34	Columbus.....	Juvenile court of Muscogee County.	do.....	do.....	40,891	26,306
35	Macon.....	Juvenile court of Bibb County.	Independent.	do.....	61,152	46,099
36	Savannah.....	Juvenile court of Chatham County.	do.....	do.....	85,859	69,250
	IDAHO.					
37	Boise.....	Juvenile court of Ada County.	Probate...	County..	41,884	35,951
38	Lewiston.....	Probate court of Nez Perce County.	do.....	do.....	21,742	*6,043
39	Pocatello.....	Probate court of Bannock County.	do.....	do.....	24,746	12,806
	ILLINOIS.					
40	Bloomington.....	County court of McLean County.	County....	County..	68,127	27,462
41	Chicago.....	Juvenile court of Cook County.	Circuit....	do.....	2,818,751	2,547,201
42	Danville.....	Juvenile court of Vermillion County.	County....	do.....	87,018	32,969
43	Decatur.....	County court of Macon County.	do.....	do.....	61,618	41,483
44	Geneva..... <i>Aurora.</i>	County court of Kane County.	do.....	do.....	101,402	34,795
45	Peoria.....	County court of Peoria County.	do.....	do.....	108,756	72,184
46	Rockford.....	County court of Winnebago County.	do.....	do.....	74,326	56,739
47	Springfield.....	County court of Sangamon County.	do.....	do.....	105,206	62,623
48	Waukegan.....	County court of Lake County..	do.....	do.....	70,060	20,917
	INDIANA.					
49	Crown Point..... <i>Hammond.</i>	Circuit court of Lake County..	Circuit....	County..	115,691	27,016
50	Elkhart.....	Circuit court (Elkhart County and La Grange County).	do.....	2 counties.	N. R.	22,273

\*Approximate number estimated by court.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home. or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
672	558	✓	6/wk. and nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	School psychologist and mental specialist.	25
437	366	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Specialist.....	26
524	429	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	27
957	844	✓	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	28
2,152	1,391	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Mental specialist.	29
633	487	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Mental specialist.	30
*309	238	—	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	31
*1,673	1,209	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	32
*281	250	✓	1/wk..	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	33
*100	100	C.	Nec. . .	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	34
107	104	—	Nec. . .	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	35
N. R.	N. R.	✓	Nec. . .	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	36
253	N. R.	✓	Nec. . .	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	37
142	7	—	Nec. . .	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	38
137	56	—	Nec. . .	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	School nurse..	39
77	15	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution....	40
6,165	3,007	✓	5/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic...	41
162	32	✓	1/wk. and Nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	State clinic....	42
114	58	—	Nec. . .	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Specialist.....	43
N. R.	N. R.	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	44
2 81	103	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	N. R.....	45
*91	*27	—	Nec. . .	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	Psychologist and general practitioner.	46
*236	*68	N. R.	N. R..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Mental specialist.	47
108	28	C.	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	Mental hygiene society.	48
429	227	C.	1/wk. and Nec.	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	State clinic (Illinois).	49
54	15	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	50

CHART III.—Courts reporting special organization

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	INDIANA—continued.					
51	Evansville.....	Circuit court for Vanderburgh County.	Circuit....	County..	81,576	76,981
52	Fort Wayne.....	Circuit court for Allen County	...do.....	...do....	105,149	78,014
53	Indianapolis.....	Juvenile court of Marion County.	Independent.	...do....	312,153	283,622
54	South Bend.....	Juvenile court of St. Joseph County.	Circuit....	...do....	102,874	70,967
55	Terre Haute.....	Circuit court of Vigo County...	...do.....	...do....	106,830	67,361
	IOWA.					
56	Davenport <sup>a</sup> .....	District court for seventh judicial district.	District...	4 counties.	N. R.	49,618
57	Des Moines.....	Juvenile division, district court, ninth judicial district.	...do.....	1 county.	130,740	104,052
58	Sioux City <sup>a</sup> .....	District court for fourth judicial district.	...do.....	2 counties.	N. R.	58,568
59	Waterloo <sup>a</sup> .....	District court for tenth judicial district.	...do.....	4 counties.	N. R.	36,987
	KANSAS.					
60	Kansas City.....	Juvenile court of Wyandotte County.	Probate...	County..	119,660	102,096
61	Topeka.....	Juvenile court of Shawnee County.	...do.....	...do....	67,821	49,538
62	Wichita.....	Juvenile court of Sedgwick County.	...do.....	...do....	94,305	73,597
	KENTUCKY.					
63	Covington.....	Juvenile court of Kenton County.	County...	County..	75,293	59,623
64	Lexington.....	Juvenile court of Fayette County.	...do.....	...do....	51,834	41,997
65	Louisville.....	Juvenile court of Jefferson County.	...do.....	...do....	285,089	240,808
66	Newport.....	Juvenile court of Campbell County.	...do.....	...do....	63,126	32,133
	LOUISIANA.					
67	Monroe.....	Sixth judicial district court...	District...	2 parishes.	49,751	13,698
68	New Orleans.....	Juvenile court of Parish of Orleans.	Independent.	Parish...	377,010	377,010
69	Shreveport.....	First judicial district court....	District...	...do....	68,200	37,064
	MARYLAND.					
70	Baltimore.....	Juvenile court of City of Baltimore.	Independent.	City.....	594,637	594,637
71	Bel Air.....	Juvenile Court of Harford County.	Circuit....	County..	*27,965	4,788
72	Cumberland.....	Juvenile court of Allegany County.	Independent.	...do....	68,774	26,686

<sup>a</sup> Court is also held at county seats of other counties in the district.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
*70	40	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	51
283	215	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	52
1,145	602	✓	3/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	City clinic.....	53
90	61	✓	1/wk..	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	54
420	379	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	—	55
*272	83	C.	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R. (Scott County); general practitioner (Muscatine County).	56
345	167	✓	1-2/wk	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	57
109	59	C.	6/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Special teacher of subnormals.	58
*59	*30	C.	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	Teacher of ungraded room.	59
N. R.	N. R.	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	60
64	34	N. R.	N. R..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	61
N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R..	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	—	62
**200	152	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	—	—	—	63
*461	461	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	64
1,951	1,251	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Probation officer.	65
59	47	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	66
N. R.	N. R.	C.	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	67
2,334 and over 500 truancy.	N. R.	✓	2/wk and Nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Psychologist and mental specialist.	68
90	84	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	69
3,833	N. R.	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	University clinics.	70
69	6	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution....	71
94	68	—	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	72

\*Approximate number estimated by court.

\*\*Approximate number estimated by Children's Bureau on basis of partial reports sent in by courts.

CHART III.—Courts reporting special organization

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.					
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.			
					Of total area.	Of largest city.		
	MARYLAND—continued.							
73	Towson.....	Juvenile Court of Baltimore County.	Circuit....	County..	145,411	N. R.		
	MASSACHUSETTS.							
74	Barnstable.....	First district court of Barnstable County.	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	4,903		
75	Boston.....	Boston juvenile court.....	Independent.	Part of city.	767,813	767,813		
76	Boston (East Boston district).	East Boston district court....	District....	do....				
77	Boston (Brighton district).	Municipal court of Brighton district.	City.....	do....				
78	Boston (Charlestown district).	Municipal court of Charlestown district.	do.....	do....				
79	Boston (Dorchester district).	Municipal court of Dorchester district.	do.....	do....				
80	Boston (Roxbury district).	Municipal court of Roxbury district.	do.....	do....				
81	Boston (South Boston district).	Municipal court of South Boston district.	do.....	do....				
82	Boston (West Roxbury district).	Municipal court of West Roxbury district.	do.....	do....				
83	Brockton.....	Police court of Brockton.....	Police....	Part of county.			N. R.	69,152
84	Brookline.....	Municipal court of Brookline..	Municipal.	City....			33,526	33,526
85	Cambridge.....	Third district court of eastern Middlesex.	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	114,293		
86	Chelsea.....	Police court of Chelsea.....	City.....	2 cities..	72,334	48,405		
87	Chicopee.....	Police court of Chicopee.....	Police....	City....	29,950	29,950		
88	Dedham.....	District court of northern Norfolk.	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	10,618		
89	Fall River.....	Second district court of Bristol County.	do.....	do....	N. R.	129,828		
90	Fitchburg.....	Police court of Fitchburg.....	City.....	do....	N. R.	42,419		
91	Gloucester.....	District court of eastern Essex.	District...	do....	N. R.	*24,398		
92	Holyoke.....	Police court of Holyoke.....	Police....	City....	66,503	66,503		
93	Lawrence.....	Lawrence district court.....	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	102,923		
94	Leominster.....	District court of Leominster..	do.....	City....	21,365	21,365		
95	Lowell.....	Police court of Lowell.....	Police....	Part of county.	N. R.	114,366		
96	Lynn.....	Southern district court of southern Essex.	District...	do....	N. R.	104,534		
97	Malden.....	First district court of eastern Middlesex.	do.....	do....	N. R.	52,243		
98	New Bedford.....	Third district court of Bristol.	do.....	do....	N. R.	121,622		
99	Newton.....	Police court of Newton.....	Police....	City....	44,345	44,345		
100	Pittsfield.....	District court of central Berkshire.	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	39,678		
101	Plymouth.....	Third district court of Plymouth.	do.....	do....	N. R.	14,001		
102	Quincy.....	District court of eastern Norfolk.	do.....	do....	N. R.	39,022		

\* Approximate number estimated by court.



for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home. or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
*1,000	N. R.	N. R.	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	University clinic and State institution.	73
53	37	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	74
1,181	1,097	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	Court clinic...	75
N. R.	N. R.	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	Institution clinic.	76
N. R.	N. R.	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	School clinic..	77
195	142	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	General practitioner.	78
278	247	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	School clinic..	79
374	295	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	Institution clinic.	80
397	352	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Court clinic...	81
148	141	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	Institution clinic.	82
124	84	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	83
158	149	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	84
475	444	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	85
428	366	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	86
118	59	C.	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	87
57	53	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	General practitioner.	88
N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	89
72	60	C.	1/wk.& nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	90
65	39	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	91
186	140	Clerk's office.	1/wk.& nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	92
357	276	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	93
71	65	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner and school nurse.	94
N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	95
164	94	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	96
204	174	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	97
213	174	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	98
133	117	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	99
76	58	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	Institution clinic.	100
55	41	C.	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	101
195	180	✓	2/mo.& nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	102

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
		Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
				Of total area.	Of largest city.
MASSACHUSETTS—con.					
103 Salem.....	First district court of Essex...	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	49,346
104 Somerville.....	Police court of Somerville.....	Police.....	City....	88,618	88,618
105 Springfield.....	Police court of Springfield.....	..do.....	Part of county.	N. R.	108,668
106 Taunton.....	First district court of Bristol..	District.....	..do.....	N. R.	36,610
107 Waltham.....	Second district court of eastern Middlesex.	..do.....	..do....	N. R.	31,011
108 Woburn.....	Fourth district court of eastern Middlesex.	..do.....	..do....	N. R.	16,076
109 Worcester.....	Central district court of Worcester County.	City.....	..do....	N. R.	166,106
MICHIGAN.					
110 Allegan.....	Allegan County probate court.	Probate...	County.	40,555	3,968
111 Alpena.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Alpena County.	..do.....	..do....	21,213	13,365
112 Ann Arbor.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Washtenaw County.	..do.....	..do....	*44,714	15,041
113 Bay City.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Bay County.	..do.....	..do....	72,515	48,390
114 Detroit.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Wayne County.	..do.....	..do....	665,025	619,648
115 Escanaba.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Delta County.	..do.....	..do....	34,653	15,854
116 Grand Rapids.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Kent County.	..do.....	..do....	180,626	132,861
117 Houghton.....	Probate court of Houghton County.	..do.....	..do....	104,181	12,573
118 Hancock.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Ionia County.	..do.....	..do....	*33,550	*5,030
119 Jackson.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Jackson County.	..do.....	..do....	57,225	35,996
120 Kalamazoo.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Kalamazoo County.	..do.....	..do....	72,191	50,408
121 Lansing.....	Juvenile division of the probate Court of Ingham County.	..do.....	..do....	63,157	44,499
122 Manistee.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Manistee County.	..do.....	..do....	*26,688	*12,381
123 Menominee.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Menominee County.	..do.....	..do....	*25,648	*10,507
124 Monroe.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Monroe County.	..do.....	..do....	33,035	8,243
125 Muskegon.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Muskegon County.	..do.....	..do....	43,161	27,434
126 Port Huron.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of St. Clair County.	..do.....	..do....	*52,341	*18,863
127 St. Joseph.....	Probate court of Berrien County.	..do.....	..do....	56,874	11,099
128 Benton Harbor.....	Juvenile division of the probate court of Saginaw County.	..do.....	..do....	95,179	56,469

\* Approximate number estimated by court.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
196	145	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	103
*269	269	C.	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	104
327	263	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	✓	✓	✓	School clinic..	105
76	66	✓	1/wk. & nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	106
49	49	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	107
76	75	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Institution clinic.	108
294	241	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	109
72	25	—	Nec...	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	110
73	31	—	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	111
73	29	—	Nec...	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	—	112
333	187	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	113
2,126	1,811	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic...	114
65	41	—	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	115
N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Institution clinic.	116
72	59	✓	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	117
77	31	—	Nec...	—	✓	✓	—	—	—	N. R.....	118
194	124	✓	1/wk..	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	Institution clinic.	119
128	49	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Institution clinic.	120
95	74	—	2/wk..	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	121
150	75	—	Nec...	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	122
138	77	—	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	123
200	60	—	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	124
163	65	✓	1-2wk.	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	Teacher ungraded room.	125
*141	*58	C.	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	126
*80	*30	—	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	—	—	N. R.....	127
388	45	—	6/wk..	—	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	128

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	MINNESOTA.					
129	Duluth.....	Juvenile court of St. Louis County (eleventh judicial district court; southern half of county).	District...	Part of county.	N. R.	97,077
130	Minneapolis.....	Juvenile court of Hennepin County (fourth judicial district court).	...do.....	County..	410,227	373,448
131	St. Paul.....	Juvenile court of Ramsey County (second judicial district court).	...do.....	...do.....	262,450	252,465
132	Virginia.....	Juvenile court of St. Louis County (eleventh judicial district court; northern half of county).	...do.....	Part of county.	N. R.	15,954
	MISSOURI.					
133	Joplin.....	Juvenile court of Jasper County (division of circuit court; twenty-fifth judicial circuit).	Circuit....	1 county	93,799	33,400
134	Kansas City.....	Juvenile court of Jackson County (division of circuit court; sixteenth judicial circuit).	...do.....	...do.....	347,997	305,816
135	St. Joseph.....	Juvenile court of Buchanan County (division 3 of circuit court; sixth judicial circuit).	...do.....	...do.....	101,331	86,498
136	St. Louis.....	Juvenile court (division of circuit court; eighth judicial circuit).	...do.....	City.....	768,630	768,630
137	Springfield.....	Juvenile court of Greene County (circuit court; twenty-third judicial circuit).	...do.....	1 county	71,946	41,169
138	Clayton..... <i>Wellston.</i>	Juvenile court of St. Louis County (division 1 of circuit court; thirteenth judicial circuit).	...do.....	...do.....	106,049	*7,312
	MONTANA.					
139	Butte.....	Juvenile court second judicial district (Silver Bow County).	District...	1 county	59,574	44,057
	NEBRASKA.					
140	Lincoln.....	Juvenile court of Lancaster County (third judicial district court).	District...	1 county	80,331	46,957
141	Omaha.....	Juvenile court of Douglas County (fourth judicial district court).	...do.....	...do.....	188,954	177,777
	NEW HAMPSHIRE.					
142	Nashua.....	Municipal court of Nashua....	City.....	County.	135,875	27,541
	NEW JERSEY.					
143	Jersey City.....	Juvenile court of Hudson County.	Independent.	County.	647,589	312,557
144	Mays Landing..... <i>Atlantic City.</i>	Atlantic County juvenile court (court of common pleas).	Common pleas.	...do.....	90,501	59,515
145	Newark.....	Juvenile court of Essex County.	Independent.	...do.....	625,178	418,789

\*Approximate number estimated by court.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
213	167	✓	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	129
1,011	668	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	School psychologist.	130
*1,021	578	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	131
164	118	✓	2/mo. and nec.	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	—	132
471	460	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	133
451	193	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	—	134
*100	100	—	2/mo..	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	—	135
N. R.	N. R.	✓	4/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	✓	✓	School clinic..	136
N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	City clinic.....	137
239	158	✓	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	138
*219	*49	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	139
N. R.	N. R.	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Specialist.....	140
814	592	✓	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	✓	—	N. R.....	141
54	54	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	142
2,180	1,976	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	143
*88	*85	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	144
1,261	1,062	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic...	145

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	NEW YORK.					
146	Albany.....	Police court of Albany.....	Police.....	City.....	106,632	106,632
147	Binghamton.....	City court of Binghamton.....	City.....	do.....	54,864	54,864
148	Buffalo.....	Children's court of Buffalo....	Independ-ent.	do.....	475,781	475,781
149	Canandaigua.....	County court of Ontario County, children's part.	County...	County..	54,242	13,915
150	Cohoes.....	Court of special sessions (police court).	Police.....	City.....	25,292	25,292
151	Lackawanna.....	City court of Lackawanna.....	City.....	do.....	16,219	16,219
152	Mount Vernon.....	Court of special sessions, juvenile branch (city court).	do.....	do.....	37,991	37,991
153	New Rochelle.....	City court of New Rochelle.....	do.....	do.....	39,192	39,192
154	New York.....	Children's court of the city of New York.	Independ-ent.	5 coun-ties; city.	5,737,492	5,737,492
155	Niagara Falls.....	Police court of Niagara Falls..	Police.....	City.....	38,466	38,466
156	Rochester.....	Monroe County court, children's division.	County.....	County..	330,920	264,714
157	Schenectady.....	Police court of Schenectady...	Police.....	City.....	103,774	103,774
158	Syracuse.....	Court of special sessions, juvenile division.	do.....	do.....	158,559	158,559
159	Troy.....	The city police court of Troy (children's part).	do.....	do.....	78,094	78,094
160	Watertown.....	City court of Watertown.....	City.....	do.....	30,404	30,404
161	Yonkers.....	Court of special sessions (city court).	do.....	do.....	103,066	103,066
	NORTH CAROLINA.					
162	Asheville.....	Police court of Asheville.....	Police.....	City.....	25,656	25,656
163	Winston-Salem.....	Municipal court of Winston-Salem.	Municipal.	do.....	33,136	33,136
	NORTH DAKOTA.					
164	Fargo.....	Juvenile division of district court, third judicial district.	District...	3 coun-ties.	a 60,280	17,872
165	Grand Forks.....	District court, first judicial district.	do.....	2 coun-ties.	a 38,989	16,342
166	Minot.....	District court, eighth judicial district.	do.....	4 coun-ties.	a 54,157	9,773
167	Rugby.....	District court, ninth judicial district.	do.....	3 coun-ties.	a 43,990	2,465
	OHIO.					
168	Akron.....	Common pleas court of Summit County, juvenile and domestic relations division.	Common pleas.	County..	134,924	93,604
169	Bowling Green.....	Juvenile court of Wood County	Probate...	do.....	*46,330	5,335
170	Cadiz.....	Juvenile court of Harrison County.	do.....	do.....	*19,076	2,128
171	Cincinnati.....	Hamilton County court of common pleas, domestic relations division.	Common pleas.	do.....	498,143	414,248
172	Circleville.....	Probate court of Pickaway County.	Probate...	do.....	*26,158	*6,744
173	Cleveland.....	Juvenile court of Cuyahoga County.	Insolvency	do.....	782,179	692,259
174	Columbus.....	Juvenile court of Franklin County.	Probate...	do.....	263,253	220,135
175	Dayton.....	Court of common pleas of Montgomery County, division of domestic relations.	Common pleas.	do.....	188,300	128,939

a State Census, Apr., 1915. No estimate for 1917 because of redivision of State into counties. From Department of Commerce, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Bulletin 138, p. 38.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
N. R. 60	N. R. 48	✓ C.	1/wk... Nec...	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	—	146
*1,114	952	✓	3/wk... Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Institution clinic. Court clinic...	147
57	45	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	—	—	—	148
119	104	—	Nec...	—	—	—	✓	—	—	—	149
N. R. *110	N. R. 88	✓	2/wk... 1/wk...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	150
142	103	C.	1/wk... 6/wk...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	Special teachers. N. R. Court clinic...	151
15,656	7,357	✓	6/wk...	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	—	152
59	50	C.	3/mo... 3/wk...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	153
518	223	✓	3/wk...	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	School clinic...	154
*514	464	✓	1/wk... 6/wk...	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	—	155
488	306	✓	6/wk...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Institution clinic.	156
N. R.	N. R.	✓	3/wk...	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	—	157
*150	*100	✓	Nec... 2/wk...	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	N. R. State hospital clinic.	158
*790	600	✓	2/wk...	✓	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	159
**200	N. R.	—	1/wk...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	160
N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	N. R.	✓	—	—	—	—	—	N. R.	161
*259	N. R.	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Mental specialist.	162
N. R.	N. R.	✓	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	N. R.	163
*245	130	N. R.	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	164
N. R.	N. R.	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Nec.	165
**220	163	✓	2/wk...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.	166
66	40	✓	Nec... Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R. Specialist.	167
57	22	—	Nec... Nec...	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	—	168
984	680	✓	3/wk...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic, school clinic.	169
N. R.	N. R.	—	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	170
*4,803	2,473	✓	6/wk...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	School psychologist.	171
2,997	1,092	—	2/wk...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	University clinic.	172
979	353	✓	2/wk...	✓	—	✓	—	✓	✓	Mental specialist.	173
											174
											175

\* Approximate number estimated by court. \*\* Approximate number estimated by Children's Bureau on basis of partial reports sent in by courts.

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	OHIO—continued.					
176	Elyria.....	Juvenile court of Lorain County.	Probate...	County .	91,497	33,266
177	Lorain..... Findlay.....	Probate court of Hancock County.	..do.....	..do.....	*37,860	*14,858
178	Hamilton.....	Juvenile court of Butler County.	..do.....	..do.....	80,054	41,338
179	Lima.....	Juvenile court of Allen County.	..do.....	..do.....	62,860	37,145
180	Lisbon.....	Juvenile court of Columbiana County.	..do.....	..do.....	82,480	22,941
181	East Liverpool..... Mansfield.....	Juvenile court of Richland County.	..do.....	..do.....	50,132	23,051
182	Marion.....	Juvenile court of Marion County.	..do.....	..do.....	37,835	24,129
183	Newark.....	Juvenile court of Licking County.	..do.....	..do.....	61,809	30,317
184	Ravenna.....	Probate court of Portage County.	..do.....	..do.....	31,079	6,264
185	Springfield.....	Court of common pleas of Clark County, juvenile division.	Common pleas.	..do.....	71,907	52,296
186	St. Clairsville..... Bellairé.....	Juvenile court of Belmont County.	Probate...	..do.....	88,520	14,575
187	Toledo.....	The court of domestic relations for Lucas County.	Common pleas.	..do.....	221,318	202,010
188	Troy.....	Juvenile court of Miami County.	Probate...	..do.....	46,464	14,275
189	Wapakoneta..... St. Marys.....	Juvenile court of Auglaise County.	..do.....	..do.....	31,285	6,004
190	Warren.....	Probate court of Trumbull County.	..do.....	..do.....	57,271	13,308
191	West Union.....	Juvenile court of Adams County.	..do.....	..do.....	*24,755	1,115
192	Youngstown.....	Court of common pleas, division of domestic relations for Mahoning County.	Common pleas.	..do.....	149,742	112,282
193	Zanesville.....	Juvenile court of Muskingum County.	Probate...	..do.....	60,628	31,320
	OKLAHOMA.					
194	Ardmore.....	County court of Carter County.	County....	County .	*a 25,358	10,963
	OREGON.					
195	Portland.....	Juvenile department of the county court of Multnomah County.	County....	County .	316,114	308,399
	PENNSYLVANIA.					
196	Chester.....	Juvenile court of Delaware County.	Quarter sessions.	County .	134,800	41,857
197	Easton.....	Juvenile court of Northampton County.....	Common pleas.	..do....	148,089	30,854
198	Erie.....	Juvenile court of Erie County.	Quarter sessions.	..do....	127,960	76,592
199	Harrisburg.....	Juvenile court of Dauphin County.	..do.....	..do.....	151,998	73,276
200	Hollidaysburg..... Altoona.....	Juvenile court of Blair County	..do.....	..do.....	126,202	59,712
201	Johnstown.....	Juvenile court of Cambria County.	..do.....	..do.....	210,874	70,473

<sup>a</sup> Population as for Apr. 15, 1910. No estimate made for 1917 as population for 1900 was not available.



for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
178	132	—	2/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	176
54	38	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	177
*183	*94	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	N. R.....	178
155	121	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	179
*70	*40	✓	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	180
69	48	—	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	181
250	171	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	182
82	36	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	.....do.....	183
98	33	—	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	184
*245	151	✓	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	185
145	73	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	.....do.....	186
N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N. R..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	187
81	29	—	1/wk..	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	University clinic.	188
58	15	✓	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	189
174	150	—	2-4/wk.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	190
50	10	✓	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	—	191
**990	N.R.	✓	3/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	State clinic....	192
563	214	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	193
218	148	—	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	194
2,650	1,965	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Psychologist..	195
N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N. R..	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	University clinic.	196
92	23	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	197
*165	126	—	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	198
108	104	C.	Quarterly and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	199
*87	*61	C.	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	200
67	58	C.	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	General practitioner.	201

\* Approximate number estimated by court. \*\* Approximate number estimated by Children's Bureau on basis of partial reports sent in by courts.

CHART III.—*Courts reporting special organization*

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	PENNSYLVANIA—Contd.					
202	New Castle.....	Juvenile court of Lawrence County.	Quarter sessions.	County..	79,512	41,915
203	Norristown.....	Juvenile court of Montgomery County.	...do.....	...do....	191,779	31,969
204	Philadelphia.....	Municipal court of Philadelphia.	County...	City.....	1,735,514	1,735,514
205	Pittsburgh.....	Juvenile court of Allegheny County.	...do.....	County..	1,196,138	586,196
206	Reading.....	Juvenile court of Berks County	Quarter sessions.	...do....	200,454	111,607
207	Scranton.....	Court of quarter sessions, juvenile branch, Lackawanna County.	...do.....	...do....	307,556	149,541
208	Washington.....	Court of quartersessions, Washington County, juvenile department.	...do.....	...do....	181,271	22,076
209	West Chester.....	Juvenile court of Chester County.	...do.....	...do....	119,082	13,403
210	Wilkes-Barre.....	Juvenile court of Luzerne County.	...do.....	...do....	406,009	78,334
211	Williamsport.....	Juvenile court of Lycoming County.	...do.....	...do....	84,571	34,123
212	York.....	Juvenile court of York County	...do.....	...do....	150,997	52,770
	RHODE ISLAND.					
213	Pawtucket.....	Juvenile court of the tenth judicial district.	District...	City.....	60,666	60,666
214	Providence.....	Juvenile court of the sixth judicial district.	...do.....	1 city, 1 town.	267,048	259,895
215	Woonsocket.....	Twelfth judicial district court	...do.....	...do....	48,266	45,365
	SOUTH CAROLINA.					
216	Columbia.....	Juvenile department municipal court.	City.....	City.....	35,165	35,165
	SOUTH DAKOTA.					
217	Sioux Falls.....	Juvenile division of county court of Minnehaha County.	County...	County..	33,795	16,887
	TENNESSEE.					
218	Clarksville.....	Juvenile court of Clarksville...	City.....	City.....	*8,548	*8,548
219	Knoxville.....	Juvenile court of Knox County	County...	County..	108,702	59,112
220	Memphis.....	Juvenile court of Shelby County	City.....	...do....	219,090	151,877
221	Nashville.....	Juvenile court of Davidson County.	...do.....	...do....	168,942	118,136
	TEXAS.					
222	Austin.....	Juvenile court of Travis County.	County...	County..	61,631	35,612
223	Dallas.....	Juvenile court of Dallas County.	...do.....	...do....	174,451	129,738
224	El Paso.....	Juvenile court of El Paso County.	...do.....	...do....	70,801	69,149
225	Fort Worth.....	Juvenile court of Tarrant County.	...do.....	...do....	149,593	109,597
226	Houston.....	Juvenile court of Harris County	...do.....	...do....	153,582	116,878
227	San Antonio.....	Juvenile court of Bexar County	...do.....	...do....	156,360	128,215

\* Approximate number estimated by court. \*\* Approximate number estimated by Children's Bureau on basis of partial reports sent in by courts.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
59	53	✓	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	General practitioner.	202
133	88	—	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	University clinic.	203
6,657	250	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic...	204
1,464	1,036	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	.....do.....	205
221	135	✓	2/mo..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	206
718	453	—	1/mo. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	207
101	88	—	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	N. R.....	208
208	51	C.	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	209
689	471	C.	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	210
137	73	—	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	✓	✓	Physician and school nurse.	211
99	67	—	1/mo..	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	Physician.....	212
*70	59	—	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	213
682	614	✓	6/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	214
182	136	✓	1/wk..	—	✓	✓	—	—	—	N. R.....	215
529	N. R.	✓	1/wk and nec.	—	✓	✓	—	—	—	Psychologist..	216
*120	*78	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	217
N. R. 349	N. R. 257	✓	2/wk.. 1/wk..	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	218
**1,090	768	C.	3/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	University clinic.	219
1,080	824	C.	4/wk. and nec.	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	Court clinic...	220
95	62	—	Nec...	✓	—	—	✓	—	✓	Specialist.....	222
265	N. R. 156	✓	1/wk.. 3/mo..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	223
256		✓		✓	—	—	—	✓	—	N. R.....	224
N. R.	N. R.	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	N. R.....	225
312	263	—	2/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	Mental specialists.	226
**250	N. R.	✓	N. R..	✓	—	✓(girls)	—	✓	—	General practitioner.	227

CHART III.—Courts reporting special organization

	Location.	Name of court.	Jurisdiction.			
			Court system.	Area served.	Population.	
					Of total area.	Of largest city.
	UTAH.					
228	Ogden.....	Juvenile court of the second judicial district.	Independ-ent.	3 coun-ties.	57,001	32,343
229	Salt Lake City.....	Juvenile court of the third judicial district.	...do.....	...do.....	N. R.	121,623
	VIRGINIA.					
230	Norfolk.....	Juvenile court of Norfolk.....	Independ-ent.	City.....	91,148	91,148
231	Richmond.....	Juvenile and domestic relations court of Richmond.	...do.....	...do.....	158,702	158,702
232	Roanoke.....	Police court of Roanoke.....	Police.....	...do.....	46,282	46,282
	WASHINGTON.					
233	Bellingham.....	Superior court of Whatcom County (juvenile department).	Superior..	County..	68,048	34,362
234	Everett.....	Superior court of Snohomish County (juvenile department).	...do.....	...do.....	84,946	37,205
235	Seattle.....	Juvenile court of King County.	...do.....	...do.....	412,077	366,445
236	Spokane.....	Juvenile court of Spokane County.	...do.....	...do.....	199,160	157,656
237	Tacoma.....	Juvenile court of Pierce County	...do.....	...do.....	168,476	117,446
238	Yakima.....	Superior court of Yakima County (juvenile department).	...do.....	...do.....	62,043	22,058
	WEST VIRGINIA.					
239	Morgantown.....	Juvenile court of Monongalia County.	Circuit....	1 county	28,192	14,444
240	Wheeling.....	Criminal court for Ohio County	Criminal..	County..	64,541	43,657
	WISCONSIN					
241	Beloit.....	Juvenile branch of municipal court of Beloit.	Municipal.	Part of county	N. R.	18,547
242	Madison.....	Superior court of Dane County.	Superior..	County..	83,275	31,315
243	Milwaukee.....	Juvenile court of Milwaukee County.	County.....	...do....	508,496	445,008
244	Oshkosh.....	Municipal court of Oshkosh and Winnebago County.	Municipal.	...do....	64,956	36,549
245	Racine.....	Juvenile court of Racine County	...do.....	...do....	66,023	47,465
246	Superior.....	Superior court of Douglas County.	Superior..	...do....	55,515	47,167

\*Approximate number estimated by court.

for hearing children's cases, 1918—Continued.

Number of cases reported in last fiscal year.		Special court room.	Frequency of sessions.	Probation service.		Method of detention.			Physical and mental examination.		
Total.	Delinquent.			Regular probation officers paid through court.	Other.	Publicly supported detention home or room.	Privately supported detention home.	Other.	Physical examination.	Mental examination, by whom given.	
N. R.	N. R.	✓	3/wk..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	228
1,491	1,191	✓	3/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R.....	229
N. R.	N. R.	✓	N. R..	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	N. R.....	230
1,711	1,604	✓	3/wk..	✓	—	✓ 2 for white and colored.	—	—	✓	University clinic.	231
280	N. R.	N. R.	N. R..	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	—	232
89	48	C.	2/mo..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	N. R., physician.	233
80	56	—	Nec..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	School psychologist.	234
822	551	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Court clinic....	235
N. R.	N. R.	✓	2/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Specialist.....	236
210	186	C.	Nec...	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	237
75	38	C.	Nec....	—	—	✓	—	—	✓	—	238
*54	26	C.	3-4/wk. and nec.	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	General practitioner.	239
*72	*61	✓	Nec...	✓	—	—	—	✓	—	—	240
69	69	C.	Nec...	—	✓	—	✓	—	✓	General practitioner.	241
*112	N. R.	✓	2/mo..	✓	—	—	—	—	✓	N. R.....	242
2,845	1,582	✓	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	✓	Mental specialist.	243
88	88	—	Nec...	—	✓	—	—	—	✓	Psychologist..	244
169	121	C.	1/wk..	✓	—	✓	—	—	—	....do.....	245
N. R.	N. R.	—	1/wk. and nec.	✓	—	—	—	✓	✓	—	246



## APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE FORMS.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, CHILDREN'S BUREAU, WASHINGTON.

JUVENILE COURTS OR COURTS HEARING JUVENILE CASES.

*Questionnaire to be answered by judge.*

(We will welcome details about your court. If more space is desired please use an additional sheet.)

Official name of court.....  
City, town, or village..... District.....  
County..... State.....

### I. JURISDICTION.

1. Is there a special judge giving his whole time to children's cases? .....
2. Is there a woman referee to assist the judge in girls' cases? .....
3. Indicate by a check which of the following classes of cases were heard in your juvenile sessions during your last fiscal year:
  - (a) Delinquent children.
  - (b) Neglected children.
  - (c) Destitute or dependent.
  - (d) Truant children.
  - (e) Questions of adoption.
  - (f) Other children (specify).
  - (g) Child labor.
  - (h) Nonsupport or desertion.
  - (i) Contributing to neglect or delinquency.
  - (j) Divorce or alimony.
  - (k) Mothers' pensions.
  - (l) Other adult (specify).
4. Is there any effort being made in your community to combine in one court all family and child problems? .....
5. Does your court have an advisory board of citizens? .....
- If so, how is this board secured? ..... What are its duties? .....

### II. PROBATION OFFICERS.

1. How many paid probation officers are there who give full time to children's cases:
  - (a) Men? .....
  - (b) Women? .....
2. Are officers appointed by (a) civil service examination? ..... (b) The judge? .....
- (c) Other method of examination or appointment? .....
- Is the examination written, oral, or both? .....
3. How long is the term of office? .....
- Are officers paid yearly salaries? ..... How much? .....
- If not yearly salaries, how are they paid and how much? .....
4. Are there other persons officially authorized to make investigations or do probation work for the court? .....
- (a) Paid probation officers who give part time? .....
- (b) Volunteers? .....
- (c) Agents from private societies? .....
- (d) Public officials such as sheriff, truant officer, public relief agent, police, etc. (specify)? .....

- 5. Does the court require regular reports of the child's progress from special or volunteer officers? .....
- 6. Are children placed on probation to the judge? .....

III. HEARINGS.

- 1. Are children's cases heard separately from adults? .....
  - 2. Is there a special court-room for children's cases? .....
  - 3. How often are children's sessions held? .....
  - 4. Are delinquent, neglected, or destitute cases heard in separate sessions? .....
  - 5. Are hearings open to the public without restriction? .....
  - 6. Is a parent or guardian of the child always present at the hearing? .....
  - 7. Are the children detained before hearing or during continuance in—
    - (a) Special detention home? .....
    - (b) Jail or lock-up? ..... If so, what provision for separation from adults? .....
    - (c) Any other place (specify)? .....
  - 8. If a special detention home is provided, is it supported by public or private funds? .....
- Who appoints the matron? .....

IV. DISPOSITION OF CASES.

- 1. Are fines or costs assessed against children? .....
- If so, (a) may they be paid in installments? ..... (b) Are parents expected to pay them for the children? .....
- 2. Is restitution for damages or reparation for injury ordered by the court? .....
- 3. Are commitments to institutions indeterminate? .....
- 4. Are children released without the consent of the court from institutions—
  - (a) For delinquents? .....
  - (b) For neglected children? .....
  - (c) For destitute or dependent children? .....
  - (d) For truant children? .....
- 5. Are any judgments given when the judge has not seen the child (please give illustration)? .....
- 6. What disposition does your court make of truant children? .....
- 7. Are complaints against children dealt with informally without a court hearing? ..
- 8. Does the judge inform the parents and the child of his decision so that they may realize the situation? .....

V. RELATION TO PROBATION AND CHILD WELFARE.

- 1. Are there any special features of your court to which you would like to call attention? .....
- 2. Does the court take an active part in preventing delinquency and neglect by systematically cooperating with the schools, police, and other agencies, or by promoting legislation? (Please give details of such work done by your court.) .....

Signature of the judge.....

Official title.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, CHILDREN'S BUREAU, WASHINGTON.

JUVENILE COURT.

Questionnaire for probation officer.

(We will welcome details about your court. If more space is desired please use an additional sheet.)

Official name of court.....

City, town, or village.....District.....

County.....State.....



## I. INVESTIGATIONS.

1. Are all cases investigated before the judge renders his decisions?.....
2. What cases, if any, are not investigated?.....
3. Who makes the investigation?.....
4. Does the investigation include:
  - (a) An interview with the child?.....
  - (b) A visit to his home?.....
  - (c) A visit to his school?.....
  - (d) Conference with social agencies?.....
5. Is the person making the investigation present at the hearing?.....
6. What provision is made for physical examination of children?.....  
 Who makes the examination?.....  
 Who determines what cases are to be examined?.....  
 How many court cases were examined last year?.....  
 (Give estimate, if exact figures are not obtainable.)
7. What provision is made for mental examination of children?.....  
 Who makes the examination?.....  
 Who determines what cases are to be examined?.....  
 How many cases were examined last year?.....  
 (Give estimate if exact figures are not obtainable.)

## II. SUPERVISION AND PROBATION WORK.

1. How often do officers make visits to homes of probationers?.....
2. Do delinquent boys report to officers?..... How often?..... Where?.....  
 Do delinquent girls report to officers?..... How often?..... Where?.....
3. Are probationary periods indeterminate?.....
4. Who terminates probation: (a) The court?..... (b) Probation officer?.....
5. Does the court place out children in family homes:
  - (a) Delinquent?..... Number last year?.....
  - (b) Neglected or destitute?..... Number last year?.....
6. Are such homes secured by: (a) The court?..... (b) A private agency?.....  
 (c) Public agency?..... (d) Who supervises the child while placed out?.....
7. Is there any agency doing a definite part of the work of the court?.....  
 Specify.....

## III. RECORDS AND REPORTS.

1. Is a written record made of each investigation?.....
2. Are later visits to the child or reports from him recorded in writing?.....
3. Are such records kept in permanent form?..... Or in a personal notebook of probation officer?..... Are they considered confidential?..... (Please send copies of all forms used. Official mail label is inclosed.)
4. Does the court send the institution to which a child is committed a report of the investigation and history of the case?.....
5. (a) Does the court compile an annual report of its work?.....  
 (b) Is this published?..... (Please send last report; or if it is not published as a separate document, please state where it may be obtained.)

IV. ORGANIZATION OF PROBATION STAFF.

(This section is to be answered only for courts employing more than one probation officer.)

- 1. If there are several probation officers, are cases assigned:
  - (a) By district?.....
  - (b) By race or color?.....
  - (c) By qualifications of certain officers for handling certain types of children?.....
  - (d) Are girls assigned only to women?.....
  - (e) Are older boys assigned only to men?.....
  - (f) Does the same officer handle both adults and children?.....
- 2. Are there officers (a) Of different races?.....  
 (b) Speaking foreign language (specify what language)?.....
- 3. Is the work of probation officers supervised and directed by: (a) Chief probation officer?.....(b) Judge?.....(c) Other (specify)?.....  
 How many supervising officers, if any?.....  
 How many cases are assigned to one officer?.....  
 Signature of probation officer.....  
 Official title.....

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, CHILDREN'S BUREAU, WASHINGTON.

JUVENILE COURTS OR COURTS HEARING JUVENILE CASES.

Questionnaire for clerk of court.

Special note to the clerk.—These questions refer to juvenile cases, and adult cases heard in your juvenile court during the last fiscal year of the court. If no statistics have been compiled, please give estimates.

- Name of court.....
- City, town, or village..... District..... County..... State.....
- 1. Delinquent cases:
  - (a) Number of cases heard.....
  - If possible give also:
    - (b) Number dismissed upon hearing.....
    - (c) Number placed on probation.....
    - (d) Number committed to institutions.....
- 2. Neglected cases:
  - (a) Number of cases heard.....
  - If possible give also:
    - (b) Number of families from which these children came.....
    - (c) Number dismissed upon hearing.....
    - (d) Number placed under supervision.....
    - (e) Number committed to institutions.....
- 3. Dependent cases:
  - (a) Number of cases heard.....
  - If possible give also:
    - (b) Number of families from which children came.....
    - (c) Number placed under supervision.....
    - (d) Number committed to institutions.....
- 4. Other children's cases, e. g., Number of truant cases, Cases of mental defectives, etc.....

5. Adult cases heard in juvenile sessions or family court:

Number of cases of the following classes:

- Child labor.....
- Nonsupport or desertion.....
- Contributing to neglect or delinquency.....
- Divorce or alimony.....
- Mothers' pensions.....
- Other adult (specify).....

Please state if figures given are estimates: .....  
Yes. No.

Signature of clerk.....



## APPENDIX C. REPORTS RELATING TO WORK OF COURTS HEARING CHILDREN'S CASES.

- ALABAMA. Child Welfare in Alabama, "Juvenile Courts and Probation," by Mrs. W. L. Murdoch, pp. 147-162. National Child Labor Committee, New York, 1918.
- CALIFORNIA. San Francisco. Annual Report San Francisco Juvenile Court, 1916, and Report of the San Francisco Juvenile Detention Home, 1916-17.
- COLORADO. Denver. Report of the Juvenile Court, City and County of Denver, Colorado, 1909-10.
- CONNECTICUT. Bailey, William B., Ph. D. Children Before the Courts in Connecticut, pp. 35-53, 71-88. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 43, Dependent, Defective, and Delinquent Classes Series No. 6, Washington, 1917.
- Report of the Connecticut Prison Association Concerning the Operation of the Probation Law, 1915 and 1916. Hartford, 1917.
- Hartford. Melvin, Anna D. (Juvenile Probation Officer): Hartford Children and Hartford Courts.
- Manchester. Annual Reports of the Selectmen and Town Officers of the Town of Manchester, 1917.
- New Britain. Municipal Record, New Britain, Connecticut, 1916-17, pp. 107-108.
- DELAWARE. Richardson, C. Spencer: Dependent, Delinquent, and Defective Children of Delaware, pp. 10-16. Department of Child-Helping, Russel Sage Foundation, New York City, March, 1918.
- Wilmington. Report of the Wilmington Juvenile Court and Probation Association, 1916-17.
- DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. Reports of Clerk and Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court, District of Columbia, 1916-17. U. S. House of Representatives, 64th Cong., 1st sess., Document No. 594, Washington, 1918.
- ILLINOIS. Chicago (Cook County). Juvenile Court and Juvenile Detention Home, Cook County, Ill. Annual Reports of Chief Probation Officer, and Superintendent Juvenile Detention Home, 1917.
- INDIANA. Indianapolis (Marion County). Biennial Report of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of Marion County, Ind., 1910-1912.
- IOWA. Davenport (Scott County). Financial Report of Scott County, Iowa, for the Year 1917, pp. 58-60. County Auditor.
- LOUISIANA. New Orleans. General Summary of Work in the Juvenile Court of New Orleans, 1917.
- MAINE. Calais (Washington County). Report of the Probation Officer to County Commissioners. (In other document.) 1917. Foster, George M., Probation Officer.
- Portland. Report of Probation Officer to County Commissioners. (In other document.) 1917. Grover, George W., Probation Officer.
- MARYLAND. Baltimore. Report of the Juvenile Court of Baltimore City, 1912-13.
- Report of the Board of Police Commissioners for the City of Baltimore for the Year 1917, pp. 38-39.
- Cumberland (Allegany County). Report of the Juvenile Court in and for Allegany County, 1912-13.

- MASSACHUSETTS.** Boston. Baker, Judge Harvey H.: "Procedure of the Boston Juvenile Court." In *The Survey*, vol. 23 (Feb. 5, 1910), pp. 643-652.
- Boston and all other courts in State. Second Annual Report of the Bureau of Prisons of Massachusetts, 1917, pp. 150-153. Public Document No. 115, Boston, 1918.
- Tenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Commission on Probation, Year Ending September 30, 1918. Public Document No. 85, Boston, 1919.
- Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Thirty-eighth Annual Report, 1917-18, Boston.
- MICHIGAN.** Bay City (Bay County). Report of the Probation Officer for Bay County, 1916-17.
- MINNESOTA.** Minneapolis (Hennepin County). The Juvenile Court of Hennepin County, Minn., 1916-17.
- St. Paul (Ramsey County). The Twelfth Annual Report of the Chief Probation Officer of Ramsey County, 1916-17.
- MISSOURI.** Kansas City (Jackson County). Eighth Annual Report of Juvenile Court, Jackson County. Kansas City, Mo., 1911.
- St. Louis. Report of the Juvenile Court and Probation Office for the Years 1914 and 1915. St. Louis, 1917.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE.** Twelfth Biennial Report of the New Hampshire State Board of Charities and Corrections, 1917-18, pp. 75-77.
- Franklin. Twenty-third Annual Report of the Municipal Government of the City of Franklin for the Financial Year 1917, p. 81.
- NEW JERSEY.** Jersey City (Hudson County). Report of the Probation Officer of the County of Hudson, N. J., 1911 and 1912.
- Newark (Essex County). Seventeenth Annual Report of the Probation Officer of the County of Essex, State of New Jersey, 1917-18.
- NEW YORK.** Eleventh Annual Report of the New York State Probation Commission for the year 1917, Albany, 1918.
- Albany (Cohoes, Watervliet, Rensselaer, Troy). Condensed Report of the Mohawk and Hudson River Humane Society, 1917, p. 11.
- Buffalo. Seventh Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1918.
- Gloversville. Mayor's Annual Message with the Annual Reports to the Common Council of the City of Gloversville, 1917, p. 60.
- Lackawanna. Annual Report of the City Court and Probation Office, Lackawanna, N. Y., 1916.
- New York City. Annual Report of the Children's Court of the City of New York, 1917.
- Ogdensburg (St. Lawrence County). Annual Report of John M. Nichols, Probation Officer, St. Lawrence County, 1916-17.
- Syracuse. Special Sessions Court, Syracuse, N. Y. Annual Report of the Children's Court and Chief Probation Officer, for the year ending November 30, 1918.
- Yonkers. Report of the Chief Probation Officer of the Court of Special Sessions of Yonkers, N. Y., 1918.
- NORTH CAROLINA.** Child Welfare in North Carolina, "Dependency and Delinquency," by Mabel Brown Ellis, pp. 9-105. National Child Labor Committee, New York, 1918.
- Winston-Salem (Forsyth County). First Annual Report of the Chief Probation Officer, Winston-Salem and Forsyth County, March 1, 1918, to February 28, 1919.

- OHIO. Cincinnati (Hamilton County). First Annual Report, Court of Common Pleas, Division of Domestic Relations, Hamilton County, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1915.
- Columbus (Franklin County). Fifth Annual Report of the Juvenile Court, Franklin County, Ohio, 1910-11. Columbus.
- Dayton (Montgomery County). First Annual Report, Court of Common Pleas, Montgomery County, Division of Domestic Relations, 1917.
- OKLAHOMA. Child Welfare in Oklahoma, "Juvenile Courts and Probation," by Mabel Brown Ellis, pp. 141-163. National Child Labor Committee, New York, 1917.
- OREGON. Slingerland, W. H., Ph. D.: Child Welfare Work in Oregon, pp. 10-14, 32-34, 103-106. Extension Division, University of Oregon, Salem, 1918.
- PENNSYLVANIA. Allentown (Lehigh County). Report of the Probation Officer of Lehigh County, Pa., 1917.
- Media (Delaware County). Fifteenth Annual Report of the Juvenile Court Committee of Delaware County, Pa., 1916-17.
- Norristown (Montgomery County). Thirteenth Annual Report of the Probation Officer of the Juvenile Court of Montgomery County, 1917.
- Philadelphia. Fourth Annual Report of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia. 1917.
- Pittsburgh (Allegheny County). Annual Statement of the County Court of Allegheny County, Pa., 1917.
- Reading (Berks County). Seventeenth Annual Financial Report of Berks County, Pa., 1917, pp. 44-46, County Comptroller.
- UTAH. Biennial Report of the Clerk of the Juvenile Court Commission, 1915 and 1916. Salt Lake City, Utah, 1917.
- VIRGINIA. Alexandria, Clifton Forge, Danville, Lynchburg, Portsmouth, Norfolk, Richmond, Roanoke. Ninth Annual Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections, 1916-17, pp. 70-80, Richmond, 1918.
- Richmond. Third Annual Report of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of the City of Richmond, Va., 1918.
- WASHINGTON. Seattle. The Seattle Juvenile Court Report for the Year 1918.
- WISCONSIN. Milwaukee (Milwaukee County). A Report of the Juvenile Court of Milwaukee County, Wis., 1910-11.
- WYOMING. Biennial Report of the Wyoming Humane Society and State Board of Child and Animal Protection 1915-16, pp. 11 38, 50-51.





## INDEX.

- Adoption cases, 18, 31.  
Advisory boards, 19, 71.  
Agencies, cooperation with, 9, 17, 19, 71.  
    (See also Boards, bureaus, children's home and aid societies, humane societies, juvenile protective associations, Juvenile Court and Probation Association of Wilmington societies for prevention of cruelty to children, State boards.)  
Almshouses as places of detention, 49.  
Annual reports, 61.  
Areas served by courts, 11, 16, 27, 34.  
Boarding in family homes, 13, 48.  
Boards:  
    Advisory, 19, 71.  
    Child-welfare, 72.  
    Local and county, 9, 17, 19, 71.  
    Of children's guardians, 73, 74.  
    Of county visitors, 72.  
    State boards of charities, 19, 57, 58, 73, 74.  
Boston State Hospital, Psychopathic Department, 66.  
Bureaus of child and animal protection, 74.  
Cases, juvenile:  
    Annually before courts, 11.  
    Number reported, 11.  
Chancery procedure, 8, 29, 33.  
Chicago Juvenile Court:  
    Complaint department, 43.  
    Establishment of, 7.  
    First juvenile court, 7.  
    Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, 65.  
Chief probation officers, 25.  
Child:  
    A ward of the court, 8, 31.  
    Treated as a criminal, 41.  
Child-welfare boards, 72.  
Children's home and aid societies, 73.  
Circuit courts, areas served by, 34.  
City clinics, 67.  
City courts as juvenile courts, 35, 75.  
Civil procedure in juvenile cases, 8.  
Civil service appointment of probation officers, 56.  
Classification of courts:  
    According to organization, 29.  
    According to population of area served, 27.  
Clinics, 64.  
    (See also Mental examinations.)  
College clinics and examiners, 67.  
Colorado:  
    Juvenile court law, 7.  
    Masters of discipline, 38, 55.  
Commissions on probation, 18, 56.  
Commissioners, juvenile court:  
    North Dakota, 34, 38.  
    Utah, 56, 57.  
Commitment to institutions, 43.  
Community cooperation, 19.  
Complaints, handling of:  
    Chicago Juvenile Court, 43.  
    Informal, 42.  
Concurrent jurisdiction, 34.  
Conferences of probation officers, 58.  
Connecticut Prison Association, 56, 57.  
Contributing to delinquency or neglect, 18, 30.  
Cooperation of court with social agencies, 9, 17, 19, 71.  
County boards:  
    And agencies, 71.  
    Of child welfare, 19, 72.  
    Of children's guardians, 73, 74.  
County clinics, 67.  
County courts as juvenile courts, 33, 34, 75.  
County organization, possibilities of, 16.  
County system:  
    Advisory boards, 16, 34.  
    Chautauqua County, 16.  
    Clinics, 16, 34.  
    Detention homes, 16, 34.  
    Erie County (N. Y.) probation system, 16.  
    Financial benefits resulting from, 34.  
    Of courts, 33, 34.  
    Of probation, 16, 34.  
    Possibilities of, 16.  
    Prevalence, 33, 34.  
Court clinics and examiners, 65.  
Court systems having jurisdiction over children's cases, 75.  
Courts:  
    City, 35, 75.  
    County, 33, 34, 75.  
    District, 33, 34, 75.  
    Established by special laws, 37, 75.  
    General or not specially organized, 12, 29, 31.  
    Independent, 12, 30, 33, 75.  
    In rural areas, 15, 32, 35.  
    Juvenile cases reporting, number, 11.  
    Municipal, 35, 75.  
    Number handling children's cases, 25.  
    Omitted from the study, 22.  
    Replying to questionnaires, 11, 25, 26, 28.  
    Specially organized, 12, 29, 82.  
    Systems having juvenile jurisdiction, 33, 75.  
Criminal, child treated as, 41.  
Criminal procedure in juvenile cases, 8, 33.  
Delinquent children:  
    Girls' cases, 9, 29, 39.  
    Jurisdiction of court, 7.  
    Number of cases reported, 11.  
Denver Juvenile Court, establishment of, 7.  
Dependent children:  
    Jurisdiction of court over, 7.  
    Number of cases reported, 11  
Desertion cases, 18, 30.

## Detention:

- Almshouse, 49.
- Area served, 46, 47.
- Family homes or homes of court officials, 48.
- Homes and rooms, 13, 46.
- Institutions, 48, 49.
- Jails, 13, 45, 49.
- Methods of, 17, 29, 45.
- Other expedients, 48.
- Parental homes, 45.
- Provision limited to certain classes of children, 47.
- Requirements for, 9.
- Support of homes, 46, 47.
- Determinate commitment, 43.
- Development of specialization, 15.
- Disposition of cases, 40.
  - Commitments, 43.
  - Comparison of, in Chicago and other Illinois courts, 40.
  - Fines, 9, 42.
  - Punitive in nature, 9, 41. (See also Probation.)
- District courts:
  - Areas served, 34.
  - As juvenile courts, 33, 75.
- Divorce cases, 18, 30.
- Domestic relations cases, 18, 30.
- Elementary schools, mental clinics and examiners in, 68.
- Erie county (N. Y.) county plan of probation, 16.
- Evidence, legal and social, 9.
- Family cases, 18, 30.
- Family courts, 18.
- Family homes as places of detention, 48.
- Filing system for legal and social information, 9.
- Fines, 9, 42.
- Forms for record-keeping, 60.
- General courts, 31.
  - Areas served, 32.
  - Lack of organization, 31.
  - Results secured, 31.
- General practitioners as mental examiners, 68.
- Girls' cases, 13, 39.
- Guardianship cases, 18, 30.
- Hearings:
  - Children separate from adults, 8, 12, 29, 39.
  - Girls' cases, 9, 12.
  - New York City Children's Court, Manhattan branch, 40.
- History of juvenile court movement, 7.
- Homes of court officials as places of detention, 48.
- Humane societies cooperating with courts, 74.
- Illegitimacy cases, 18, 30.
- Illinois:
  - Comparison of dispositions, Chicago and rest of State, 40.
  - Juvenile court law, 7.
  - Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, 65, 66. (See also Chicago Juvenile Court.)
- Independent juvenile courts, 12, 30, 33, 75.
- Indeterminate commitment, 43.

Informal handling of complaints, 42.

## Institutions:

- As places of detention, 48, 49.
  - Commitments and release, 43.
  - Mental examinations, provision for, 66.
- Investigation, 17.

Jails as places of detention, 13, 45, 49.

Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, 18, 72.

## Judges:

- Lists obtained for study, 21.
- Method of appointment, 37.
- Replying to questionnaire, 25.
- Rotating, 34.
- Specialized, 37.
- Specially assigned, 22, 29, 34.
- With general powers, attitude of, 41.
- Women, 39.

## Jurisdiction:

- Concurrent, 34.
- Juvenile court, 7.
- Juvenile boards, 72, 73.
- Juvenile court acts upheld by courts, 9, 10.
- Juvenile court movement:
  - History, 7, 8, 15.
  - Origin, 7.
  - Tendencies, 15.
- Juvenile Court Commission of Utah, 56, 57.
- Juvenile Court and Probation Association of Wilmington, Del., 71.
- Juvenile courts established by special laws, 75.
- Juvenile protective associations, 71.
- Juvenile Psychopathic Institute of Illinois, 17, 65, 66.

## Laws:

- Codification of juvenile, 33.
- Establishing first juvenile courts, 7.
- Interpretation of, 26.
- Under which children's courts operate, 33.
- Legal records, 29, 59, 60.
- Local boards and agencies, 9, 17, 19, 71.

Masters of discipline, Colorado, 38, 55.

Medico-psychological work in courts, 17.

## Mental examinations:

- Bureau of Juvenile Research, Ohio, 66.
- City and county clinics, 67.
- College clinics and examiners, 67.
- Court clinics, 14, 17, 65.
- Courts reporting mental examinations, 14, 63.
- Elementary school clinics, 68.
- General practitioners as examiners, 68.
- Institution clinics and examiners, 66.
- Judge Baker Foundation, 18.
- Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, Illinois, 65, 66.
- Mental hygiene societies, 68.
- Normal school clinics and examiners, 67.
- Other examiners, 68.
- Out-patient clinics, 66.
- Resources for, 64.
- Standards of, 64.
- States reporting none, 69.
- University clinics and examiners, 67.
- Method of conducting survey, 11, 21.
- Municipal clinics as juvenile courts, 35, 75.

- National Probation Association:**  
 Committee on Domestic Relations Courts, 18.  
 Committee on Children's Courts, 21.  
 Survey made at request of, 11.
- Neglected children, jurisdiction over, 7.
- New York City Children's Court, hearings in Manhattan branch, 40.
- Nonsupport cases, 18, 30.
- Normal schools, provision for mental examinations, 67.
- Number of juvenile cases annually before courts, 11.
- Ohio Bureau of Juvenile Research, 66.**
- Organization:**  
 City and rural courts, 27.  
 For hearing children's cases, 8.  
 Probation staffs, 51.
- Out-patient clinics of State hospitals, 66.
- Petition and summons, 9.
- Physical examination, 14, 17, 63.
- Police probation officers, 55.
- Prevention of juvenile delinquency, 19.
- Probate courts as juvenile courts, 33.
- Probation commissions, State, 18, 56.
- Probation committees, 72, 73.
- Probation officers:**  
 Classification, 13, 53.  
 Duties, 51.  
 Lists obtained for study, 21.  
 Method of appointment, 56, 79.  
 Police, 55.  
 Replying to questionnaire, 25, 26.  
 School attendance officers, 55.  
 State conferences, 58.
- Probation service:**  
 Amount, 13, 51.  
 County plan, 16, 34.  
 Courts without, 13, 52.  
 Disposition of cases in Chicago and rest of State, 40.  
 Erie County (N. Y.) plan, 16.  
 Necessity for, 9, 51.  
 Organized staffs, 51.  
 State supervision, 56.  
 States reporting, 53.  
 Types, 53.
- Procedure in juvenile cases:**  
 Elimination of criminal aspects, 8, 10.  
 Indicated by laws, 33.  
 (See also Hearings.)
- Purpose of survey, 10.
- Purpose of juvenile court action, 8, 9, 41.
- Questionnaire:**  
 Forms used, 103, 104, 106.  
 Method of study, 10, 21.  
 Replies, 26.
- Records:**  
 Forms, 60.  
 Inadequate in many courts, 14, 59.  
 In rural courts, 60.
- Records—Continued.**  
 Legal and social, 29, 59, 60.  
 State supervision of probation, 59.  
 Uniformity, lack of, 60.
- Referees:**  
 Authorization, 16, 38.  
 For girls' cases, 13, 39.  
 In various States and cities, 16, 38, 39.  
 Juvenile court commissioners in North Dakota, 34, 38.  
 Masters of discipline in Colorado, 38.
- Release from institutions, 43.
- Reports:**  
 Annual reports, 61.  
 List of, received by Children's Bureau, 109.  
 (See also Records.)
- Rotating judges, 34.
- Rural areas:**  
 Advantages of county plan, 16.  
 Children in, 34.  
 Courts in, 15, 32, 34, 35.  
 Detention homes serving, 46.  
 Mental examinations, 64.  
 Probation service, 52, 54, 55.  
 Proportion of courts serving, 11, 27.  
 Record system for courts, 60.
- Small-town courts, necessity for organization, 15.
- Social evidence necessary for proper disposition of child, 9.
- Social records, inadequacy of, 14.
- Socialization of courts dealing with family cases, 18.
- Societies for the prevention of cruelty to children, 47, 74.
- Specialization:**  
 Development of, 15.  
 Judges, 37.
- Specially organized courts, 12, 29, 82.
- State boards of charities:**  
 Cooperation of, 19, 74.  
 Reports required by, 73, 74.  
 Supervision of probation work, 57.
- State hospitals, out-patient clinics, 66.
- State institutions, mental clinics and examiners, 67.
- State Prison Association, Connecticut, 56, 57.
- State probation commissions, 18, 56.
- State probation officers, 56, 57.
- State probation officers' associations, 58.
- State supervision of juvenile court and probation work, 13, 14, 18, 56.
- State-wide agencies, 73.
- Superior courts as juvenile courts, 33.
- Supervision of probation work. (See State supervision.)
- University clinics and examiners, 67.
- Wards of the court, 8, 31.
- Whipping, 42.
- Women:**  
 Assistants in hearing girls' cases, 39.  
 Judges, 13, 39.  
 Referees, 12, 39.

