

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK

A STUDY OF THE ORGANIZATION
AND METHODS OF TEN COURTS

By

KATHARINE F. LENROOT

and

EMMA O. LUNDBERG



Bureau Publication No. 141



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1925

SINGLE COPIES OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE
OBTAINED FREE UPON APPLICATION TO THE
CHILDREN'S BUREAU. ADDITIONAL COPIES MAY
BE PROCURED FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF
DOCUMENTS, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

AT

45 CENTS PER COPY



362.7
U58C
*141

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Letter of transmittal.....	VII
Progress of the juvenile-court movement.....	1
Method of study.....	4
Jurisdiction of the courts:	
Court system.....	6
Area served.....	6
Type of jurisdiction.....	8
Classes of cases.....	9
Court room and probation offices:	
Location.....	16
Arrangement of court room.....	17
Arrangement of probation offices.....	18
Staff of the court:	
The judge.....	19
Probation staff.....	22
Physicians and mental specialists.....	34
Clerical staff.....	34
Staff of detention home.....	36
Other employees of the court.....	37
Advisory boards.....	37
Preliminary steps in court procedure:	
Cases referred by individuals, schools, and social agencies, and by police.....	40
Reception of complaints.....	41
Relation between police and juvenile court.....	42
Investigation prior to filing of petition or complaint.....	50
Legal processes prior to hearing.....	50
Detention:	
Principles governing detention in children's cases.....	52
Methods of detention in the courts studied.....	55
Extent to which detention facilities were used.....	56
Detention in police stations and jails.....	62
Equipment and management of detention homes.....	67
The Boston plan of detention.....	78
Study of the case:	
Importance of adequate study.....	88
Social investigation.....	88
Study of the child.....	94
Correlation of physical, mental, and social findings.....	100
Recommendations as to treatment and follow-up work.....	101
Children studied by the Judge Baker Foundation of Boston.....	103
Cases adjusted without formal court action:	
Policy of informal treatment of delinquency problems.....	109
Methods of informal adjustment in the courts studied.....	109
Extent to which cases were adjusted without formal court action.....	114
Comparison of formal and informal cases.....	115
Dispositions in cases adjusted informally.....	118
Success of informal adjustment as a method of treatment.....	119

Hearings:	Page.
Socialization of procedure.....	123
Frequency of hearings.....	123
Privacy of hearings.....	124
Provision for children awaiting hearing.....	125
Delinquency hearings.....	126
Hearings in girls' cases.....	129
Dependency hearings.....	130
Jury trials.....	132
Appeals.....	134
The court order:	
Orders in delinquency cases.....	137
Orders in cases of dependency and neglect.....	155
Provision for mentally defective children.....	158
Adequacy of the court's resources.....	159
Probation:	
Organization of the probation staff.....	161
Number of cases under supervision of one officer.....	171
Conditions of probation.....	172
Planning individual treatment.....	175
Reports by probationers.....	175
Home visits.....	179
Safeguarding health of children on probation.....	182
Relation of probation officer to school.....	184
Relation of probation to recreation.....	186
Advising in choice of occupation and supervising employment of children on probation.....	186
Supervision of case work.....	188
Length of probation periods and termination of probation.....	191
Results of probation.....	194
Records and statistics:	
Importance of records and reports.....	199
Legal records.....	200
Social records.....	205
Reports and statistics.....	209
Administrative work of the court:	
Mothers' allowances.....	216
Placing children in family homes.....	219
Management of institutions.....	220
Relation of juvenile court to adult criminal cases involving children:	
Adult cases dealt with by juvenile court.....	221
Cooperation of juvenile court with other courts.....	224
The court and the community:	
The school and the court.....	226
Relation of the court to social-service agencies and institutions.....	244
Participation of juvenile court in child-welfare movements.....	246

APPENDIXES.

Appendix I.—Juvenile-court standards.....	251
Appendix II.—Selected forms used by courts studied.....	257
Petitions.....	257
Notices and summons.....	260
Warrant.....	264
Waiver of service.....	265

Appendix II—Continued.	Page.
Detention order.....	266
Promise to appear.....	266
Findings and orders.....	267
Indexes.....	271
Police reports and complaints.....	273
Investigations.....	276
Reports of physical and mental examinations.....	285
Detention-home forms.....	289
Records of supervision.....	291
Other probation forms.....	295
Report on application for custody of child.....	300
Monthly and daily reports.....	301
Appendix III.—Outline used by Children's Bureau in juvenile-court inquiry.	307

ILLUSTRATIONS.

	Facing page.
Juvenile court and detention home, Seattle, Wash.....	56
Children's building (juvenile court and detention home), St. Louis, Mo..	56
Juvenile Hall (detention home), Los Angeles, Calif.....	57
Juvenile court and detention home, San Francisco, Calif.....	57
Detention home, Denver, Colo.....	80
Private homes used for detention, Boston juvenile court.....	80
Hearing, juvenile court of Denver County, Colo.....	81
Hearing, juvenile court of King County [Seattle], Wash.....	81
Hearing, juvenile court, St. Louis, Mo.....	128
Hearing, juvenile court of the District of Columbia.....	128
Hearing, children's court of Buffalo, N. Y.....	129
Referee's hearing, juvenile court of Los Angeles County, Calif.....	129

CHARTS AND FLOOR PLANS.

	Page.
Urban and rural distribution of the population of the United States and proportions served by courts with special organization for children's cases.....	2
Juvenile court of St. Louis [plan of organization].....	20
Hennepin County juvenile court—Minneapolis [plan of organization].....	25
King County juvenile court—Seattle [plan of organization].....	26
Juvenile court—District of Columbia [plan of organization].....	29
Los Angeles County juvenile court [plan of organization].....	32
Juvenile court of the City and County of San Francisco [plan of organization].....	35
First-floor plan, King County [Seattle] juvenile court and detention home..	53
Second-floor plan, King County [Seattle] juvenile court and detention home.....	54
First-floor plan, City of St. Louis children's building.....	66
Typical floor and eighth floor, juvenile court and detention home, City of San Francisco.....	75
Comparison of formal and informal cases of delinquency in four courts, 1920.....	111
The juvenile court in relation to social forces of the community.....	227
Percentages of truancy cases among delinquency cases dealt with by eight juvenile courts.....	229
Delinquent children: Parental homes of 10,845 children dealt with during one year by seven city juvenile courts.....	236

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1924.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a report on Juvenile Courts at Work, by Katharine F. Lenroot and Emma O. Lundberg, which is based on a study of the organization and methods of work of 10 juvenile courts in different parts of the country, serving cities of more than 100,000 but less than 1,000,000 population. The study was directed primarily toward discovering successful methods of juvenile-court work.

The inquiry led to conferences on juvenile-court standards and to the formulation by a committee of judges, probation officers, and others directly concerned with juvenile-court work, of the standards which should govern juvenile-court organization and administration. The report of the committee, which was approved by a national conference held under the joint auspices of the National Probation Association and the Children's Bureau, was published by the bureau in 1923.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

VII

STATE OF MISSOURI

IN SENATE

January 10, 1907.

REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

FOR THE YEAR 1906.

ALBION B. HARRIS, GOVERNOR.

W. W. WATSON, COMMISSIONER.

ST. LOUIS: PUBLISHED BY THE STATE OF MISSOURI, 1907.

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK.

PROGRESS OF THE JUVENILE-COURT MOVEMENT.

In the 25 years since the first juvenile courts were established every State but one has adopted legislation providing for one or all of the characteristic features of juvenile-court organization. Every city having 100,000 or more inhabitants has a court especially organized for children's work. As a result of the activities of State agencies which have undertaken to promote the organization and development of juvenile courts marked progress has recently been made in their extension to rural areas. Nevertheless, in all parts of the country many rural communities and small towns are without facilities for dealing with children in need of the protection that a juvenile court can give. Even in the larger cities the staff of the court is often inadequate, means for the intensive study of the child are lacking, and results are obtained chiefly by the "trial and error method"¹ and are not based upon scientific study followed by treatment adapted to the needs discovered.

Juvenile-court studies were among the first undertaken by the Children's Bureau, and in 1918 certain facts for the entire United States were obtained through questionnaires and correspondence² from 2,034 courts having authority to hear children's cases that involved delinquency or neglect. The purpose of that survey was to discover the status of the juvenile-court movement and to secure a basis for more intensive inquiries. In order to be able to measure in a general way the extent of special organization for children's work, a very simple standard was formulated, including only: (a) Separate hearings for children, (b) officially authorized probation service, and (c) the recording of social information. Courts having these features were classed as specially organized for dealing with children's cases.


Only 321 of the 2,034 courts from which information was obtained could be classified as specially organized for juvenile-court work. In half of the 48 States less than a fourth of the population was within reach of the courts equipped for children's work according to the minimum standard adopted for the purpose of the study, and in several States no court with special organization was reported. Specially organized courts were found in all the cities with populations of 100,000 or over and were available to 70 per cent of the total population living in cities of 25,000 to 100,000. Courts with special equipment for dealing with children were available to 29 per cent of the total population of cities of 5,000 to 25,000 and to only 16 per cent of the population of rural communities. (See chart, p. 2.)

¹ For a discussion of the "common sense" versus the scientific method of dealing with delinquents, see *The Practical Value of Scientific Study of Juvenile Delinquents*, by William Healy, M. D., p. 10 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 96, Washington, 1922).

² Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases, by Evelina Belden. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 65. Washington, 1920.

Although the problem of extending juvenile-court work to small towns and rural communities urgently demands consideration, it is chiefly the older and better-equipped courts in the larger cities that offer the most fruitful field for study of methods of application of juvenile-court principles. Accordingly, the inquiry which forms

URBAN AND RURAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND PROPORTIONS SERVED BY COURTS WITH SPECIAL ORGANIZATION FOR CHILDREN'S CASES



the basis of this report covered the organization and methods of work in 10 juvenile courts in different parts of the country, serving areas containing populations of 162,000 to 936,000.

The inquiry into the work of representative courts not only furnished the basis for this report but also led to a series of monographs

by experts in special fields,³ to conferences on juvenile-court standards held under the joint auspices of the Children's Bureau and the National Probation Association,⁴ and to the formulation by a committee appointed by the Children's Bureau of a statement of the standards which should govern juvenile-court organization and administration. This statement was adopted, after discussion and amendment, by a national conference held by the Children's Bureau and the National Probation Association in May, 1923.⁵ A committee of the National Probation Association has drafted a standard juvenile-court law, based on these standards, which was approved at the eighteenth annual conference of the association in June, 1924.

³ Probation in Children's Courts, by Charles L. Chute (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 80, Washington, 1921); The Practical Value of Scientific Study of Juvenile Delinquents, by William Healy, M. D. (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 96, Washington, 1922); The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court, by Bernard Flexner and Reuben Oppenheimer (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 99, Washington, 1922).

⁴ Proceedings of the Conference on Juvenile-Court Standards Held under the Auspices of the U. S. Children's Bureau and the National Probation Association, Milwaukee, Wis., June 21-22, 1921. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 97. Washington, 1922.

⁵ The standards are published in full on p. 251ff.

METHOD OF STUDY.

The selection of the 10 courts to be included in the study was determined largely by the information secured from the earlier questionnaire inquiry which covered the entire United States. Courts representing various types of jurisdiction, procedure, and equipment, and various sections of the country, were chosen. The study was directed primarily toward discovering successful methods of court work and was descriptive rather than statistical, though a considerable amount of statistical data was obtained in order to supplement and verify the observations made and the information secured through interviews. The courts included are shown in Table 1, together with the areas served and their population.

TABLE 1.—*Areas served by courts studied and population of areas in 1920.*¹

Name of court.	Areas served.	Population, 1920. ¹
Boston juvenile court.....	Central district of Boston.....	² 162,091
Children's court of Buffalo.....	City.....	506,775
Juvenile court, city and county of Denver.....	County.....	256,491
Juvenile court of the District of Columbia.....	District of Columbia.....	437,571
Juvenile court of Los Angeles County.....	County.....	936,455
Juvenile court of Hennepin County (Minneapolis).....	County.....	415,419
Juvenile court for Parish of Orleans (New Orleans).....	Parish (county).....	387,219
Juvenile court of the city and county of San Francisco.....	County.....	506,676
Juvenile court of King County (Seattle).....	County.....	389,273
Juvenile court of St. Louis.....	City.....	772,897

¹ Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, Vol. III, Population, pp. 114, 118, 142, 178, 396, 512, 562, 690, 1088.

² United States Census returns for the city of Boston, by judicial districts (unpublished figures).

The writers of this report spent from three to four weeks in each city. The study of the first court began in March, 1920, and the inquiry continued, with intermissions, until May, 1921. At the close of the study of each court the principal findings and the charts were reviewed with court officials. The Children's Bureau has kept in touch with the work of these courts since the original field study was made; in 1924 the report was sent to each court, and statements as to changes in organization or method have been incorporated in footnotes. The secretary of the National Probation Association, Mr. Charles L. Chute, kindly gave the Children's Bureau access to reports of studies of probation in Minneapolis and St. Louis made by him in 1924.¹

The study involved repeated attendance at hearings; interviews with the judge, chief probation officer, all or most of the members of the probation staff, the clerk of the court, the persons making physical and mental examinations, and the superintendent of the detention home; visits to the detention home; and reading of records and compiling of statistical data, with special attention to facts

¹ The St. Louis report has been published in *The Community Courier* [published by the Community Council of St. Louis], vol. 3, No. 9 (May, 1924).

that were not included in the annual report of the court and to points needing verification. In order to ascertain the relation of the court to the police, the schools, and the social agencies of the community, information was secured from officials and workers in these departments and agencies. Although as many as possible of the institutions and agencies utilized by the court in caring for children were visited, no detailed studies of their equipment or methods were made.²

² See Appendix III, p. 307, for schedule used.

JURISDICTION OF THE COURTS.

COURT SYSTEM.

The juvenile court may be an independent court established especially for work with children, or it may be a branch or division of a court. Independent courts are not practicable in communities where the number of cases is too small to require the full time of the court staff. Some difference of opinion exists with regard to whether in populous communities, the juvenile court should be independent. The principal arguments in favor of an independent court are that the judge can be selected with special reference to his qualifications for work with children and that he can give full-time service to the juvenile court. If the necessary provisions are inserted in the law these conditions can also be obtained when the juvenile court is a division of another court and not an independent unit.

In 12 States special juvenile courts, independent of other courts, have been created for the larger cities or counties and in the District of Columbia an independent court has been established. In most States jurisdiction over children's cases has been vested in county or district courts, though in some States police or municipal courts or justices of the peace have been given such jurisdiction.¹

Five of the 10 courts included in this study were independent courts; namely, the courts in Boston (central district), Buffalo, Denver, New Orleans, and the District of Columbia. Three—those in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle—were branches of the superior court of the county; in Minneapolis the juvenile court was a branch of the district court, and in St. Louis of the circuit court. These three court systems represented—the superior, circuit, and district—were similar in jurisdiction.

During the last few years the tendency has been to enlarge the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and, in some localities, to unite the jurisdiction over juvenile and domestic-relations cases in one court. While some of the courts represented in this study had jurisdiction over nonsupport and desertion, no court designated as a court of domestic relations was included.² This policy was followed chiefly because a special study of courts of domestic relations was planned and is now under way.

AREA SERVED.

The area served by the court is of great importance in considering methods by which juvenile-court facilities can be extended to all the children of the country. The 1918 survey showed the county unit to be the most prevalent system.³ Courts with jurisdiction includ-

¹ See *Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases*, by Evelina Belden, p. 33 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 65), and *The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court*, by Bernard Flexner and Reuben Oppenheimer, p. 12 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 99). Washington, 1920 and 1922.

² In St. Louis, under the terms of a law passed in 1921 (Laws of 1921, p. 225), a court of domestic relations has been created, with jurisdiction over divorce and civil actions relating to the custody of children. The new court includes two divisions of the circuit court, and the judge of one of the divisions is also judge of the juvenile court.

³ *Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases* (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 65), p. 34.

ing only urban population were the least common. The advantages of the county unit are greatly lessened if, as often happens, the needs of the children living outside the city are lost sight of in the press of urban work.

The county was the unit of jurisdiction for 6 of the 10 courts included in this study,⁴ but in 3 cases the city and county were co-extensive. In Buffalo and St. Louis the unit was the city, and in Boston the jurisdiction extended only over the central district, which included 21.7 per cent of the population of the city. The population of the District of Columbia is urban. Only three of the courts, therefore, served any considerable population outside the cities in which they were located.

Excluding the district served by the Boston juvenile court, the total population of the areas over which the courts had jurisdiction ranged from 256,000 to 936,000. The part of Boston over which the Boston juvenile court had jurisdiction included the most congested residence sections and the business section. Over 30 per cent of the children coming before the court resided in other districts but had committed offenses within the central district. Hence, the problems dealt with affected, both in extent and type, a population much larger than that resident in the central district.

Courts in cities of over 1,000,000 inhabitants were excluded from this study; the organization of these courts is so complex and the volume of work so large that their methods can not readily be adapted to the needs of smaller communities.⁵

The populations of the different communities varied widely as to race and nationality. The types of problems coming before the courts and the forms of organization of the staff reflected to some extent these differences. Table 2 shows the distribution of the populations of the communities served by the courts included in the study, according to race and nativity.

⁴ The parish in Louisiana corresponds to the county in other States.

⁵ The Children's Bureau has issued a separate study of the Chicago juvenile court—The Chicago Juvenile Court, by Helen Rankin Jeter (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 104, Washington, 1922). Descriptive and statistical material on the work of the children's court of the City of New York and the municipal court of Philadelphia, of which the juvenile court is a branch, is included in the annual reports of these courts.

TABLE 2.—Race and nativity of populations served by courts studied.¹

Court.	Popula- tion of area served (1920).	Per cent of population of specified race and nativity.				
		White.			Negro.	Other races.
		Total.	Native, of native parent- age.	Native, of for- eign or mixed parent- age.		
Boston juvenile court.....	² 162, 091					
Buffalo children's court.....	506, 775	99. 1	32. 6	42. 5	24. 0	0. 9 (3)
Denver juvenile court (county).....	256, 491	97. 3	56. 4	26. 3	14. 7	2. 4 0. 3
District of Columbia juvenile court.....	437, 571	74. 7	54. 7	13. 4	6. 5	25. 1 0. 2
Los Angeles juvenile court (county).....	936, 455	95. 5	55. 1	22. 6	17. 8	2. 0 2. 5
Minneapolis juvenile court (Hennepin County).....	415, 419	99. 0	35. 7	40. 6	22. 7	1. 0 (3)
New Orleans juvenile court (county).....	387, 219	73. 8	49. 2	17. 9	6. 7	26. 1 (3)
San Francisco juvenile court (county).....	506, 676	96. 7	33. 0	36. 0	27. 7	0. 5 2. 8
Seattle juvenile court (King County).....	389, 273	95. 8	44. 0	28. 4	23. 4	0. 8 3. 4
St. Louis juvenile court.....	772, 897	90. 9	46. 5	31. 0	13. 4	9. 0 (3)

¹ Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, Vol. III, Population, pp. 114, 118, 142, 178, 396, 512, 562, 690, 1088.

² Unified States Census returns for the city of Boston by judicial districts (unpublished figures).

³ Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

TYPE OF JURISDICTION.

In general the jurisdiction exercised over children by juvenile courts is chancery or equity and not criminal in nature. Higher courts have repeatedly held that juvenile-court proceedings are not criminal.⁶ In a few States the juvenile procedure retains many of the characteristics of criminal procedure, though the aim of the proceeding is held to be the protection and not the punishment of the child. When the juvenile court is given jurisdiction over parents and over other adults who contribute to delinquency or commit an offense against a child, it is of course necessary that the court have criminal as well as equity jurisdiction.

The procedure in children's cases was in the nature of chancery or equity procedure in 6 of the 10 courts studied—the courts of Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Minneapolis, Seattle, and St. Louis.⁷ In New Orleans the procedure was quasi criminal but partook more of the nature of civil than of criminal action. In Buffalo and in Washington, D. C., the juvenile court was hampered by the limitations of the criminal procedure, though in both these courts the hearings were informal and as free from technicalities as the judges believed they could be made and still conform to the legal requirements. The Massachusetts law⁸ provided that proceedings under the act in the cases of delinquent and wayward children should not be

⁶ The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court, p. 9.

⁷ The law governing the St. Louis court [Missouri, Rev. Stat., 1919, sec. 2592 (Laws of 1911, p. 177, sec. 2)] provides as follows: "The practice and procedure prescribed by law for the conduct of criminal cases shall govern in all proceedings under this act in which the child stands charged with the violation of the criminal statutes of the State, and in such proceedings the child, his parent, or any person standing in loco parentis to him may on his behalf demand a trial by jury. In all other cases the trial shall be before the court without a jury, and the practice and procedure customary in proceeding in equity shall govern except where otherwise provided by the act." Jury trials were very seldom demanded, and in hearings without jury no difference was found in the procedure in the two types of cases.

⁸ Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, sec. 53 (Acts of 1906, ch. 413, sec. 2).

deemed criminal, but some aspects of the procedure were criminal in form; the action in neglect cases was civil.

The question of exclusive and concurrent jurisdiction has been dealt with in another publication of the Children's Bureau.⁹ All the courts included in this study had by law or by consent of the authorities exclusive jurisdiction in children's cases, with certain exceptions defined in the laws under which some of the courts operated. With respect to adults, the jurisdiction, when it covered such cases, was often concurrent with that of other courts.

CLASSES OF CASES.

In Boston the jurisdiction of the court was confined, in practice, to delinquent and neglected children.¹⁰ The court had jurisdiction concurrent with that of the municipal court over cases of contributing to delinquency, but it was seldom exercised. The jurisdiction of the St. Louis court was practically the same as that of the Boston court, being limited to delinquent and neglected children, except that the court also had jurisdiction over adoptions. The other eight courts had jurisdiction over dependent, neglected, and destitute children, and also over certain types of adult cases.

Delinquency.

The jurisdiction of the courts over delinquent children differed with respect to the nature of the offense and the age limits.

Nature of offense.—In the two California courts included, and in Denver, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Seattle, the law did not restrict the jurisdiction of the juvenile court with reference to the seriousness of the offense.^{10a} In California and Colorado the court might determine, upon hearing or thereafter, that the person was not a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under the juvenile court law and might then dismiss the petition and direct that the person be prosecuted under the general law.¹¹ The Minnesota law had a similar provision applicable only to children 12 years of age or over.¹² Under the law of the State of Washington the juvenile court might order a child arrested upon the charge of having committed a crime to be turned over to the proper officers for trial under the provisions of the criminal code.¹³

The law under which the New Orleans court operated gave the court jurisdiction over all except capital offenses, and even in the case of such offenses the preliminary statements were taken in the juvenile court. The Boston juvenile court had jurisdiction over all offenses except those punishable by death or life imprisonment.

⁹ The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court, p. 14.

¹⁰ In the Massachusetts law a separate classification is made of "wayward" children—a wayward child being defined as "a child between 7 and 17 years who habitually associates with vicious or immoral persons, or who is growing up in circumstances exposing him to lead an immoral, vicious, or criminal life." The "wayward" complaint was seldom used in the Boston juvenile court, the children being brought in as delinquent or neglected.

^{10a} The Colorado law has since been amended so that the definition of delinquency applies to children under 18 instead of under 16 as formerly, and the amendment provides that the act shall not apply to crimes of violence punishable by death or imprisonment for life when the accused is over 16 years of age. (Colorado, Laws of 1923, p. 197, ch. 75.) However, such cases may be tried under criminal procedure in the juvenile court.

¹¹ California, Laws of 1915, ch. 631, sec. 4c; Colorado, Comp. Laws, 1921, sec. 660. The Colorado provision is, however, applicable only in cases where the delinquency charged would constitute a felony.

¹² Minnesota, Laws of 1917, ch. 397, sec. 21.

¹³ Washington, Remington's Comp. Stat., 1921, sec. 1987-12 (Laws of 1913, ch. 160, sec. 12).

The law provided that in any case of a child violating a law or ordinance, if the court was of the opinion that his welfare and the interests of the public required that he be tried for the offense instead of being dealt with as a delinquent, the court might, after hearing, order the delinquency complaint dismissed.¹⁴ The Buffalo children's court had jurisdiction over all charges against children of the grade of misdemeanors, charges against children permitted to be tried as misdemeanors, and charges for which children could be found guilty of juvenile delinquency.

The juvenile court of the District of Columbia was limited in jurisdiction to offenses against the United States or against the District of Columbia "not capital or otherwise infamous and not punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary" and not including libel, conspiracy, and violations of the post-office and pension laws of the United States.¹⁵ Preliminary examination might be made by the juvenile court in any case of an offense committed by a child. In order to bring under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court children committing offenses classified as "infamous," the charge was usually reduced by agreement between the court and the police and prosecuting authorities. For instance, a charge of larceny was usually lessened to that of "taking property of another."

Truancy was usually included in the definition of delinquency, truant children being dealt with as delinquents. However, in Boston truants and in the District of Columbia truants and incorrigible children also constituted special classes. In the District of Columbia truancy cases^{15a} and cases involving incorrigible children were heard under chancery procedure on a special day.

The California juvenile court law was unique in that the classifications of delinquency and dependency did not appear. The law defined 14 conditions which brought a child under the jurisdiction of the court, including conditions usually covered by definitions of delinquency and of dependency and, in addition, insanity or mental defect.

Age limitation.—The California courts had jurisdiction over children under 21 years of age, but jurisdiction was exclusive only up to the age of 18 years. It was within the discretion of the prosecuting authorities to bring minors above this age to the attention either of the juvenile court or of some other court having jurisdiction. Proceedings in a superior court involving a person between the ages of 18 and 21 years accused of a felony or misdemeanor other than a capital offense or attempt to commit a capital offense might be dropped, and the court, after investigation, might deal with the person under the juvenile court act.¹⁶

The Minneapolis and Seattle courts had jurisdiction over delinquent children under the age of 18 years.^{16a} In Minneapolis children

¹⁴ Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, sec. 61 (Acts of 1906, ch. 413, sec. 11).

¹⁵ 34 Stat. 73.

^{15a} In the case of *Brown v. Sellers* (Fed. Reporter 292, pp. 655-657), decided Apr. 3, 1923, the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia held that the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia does not have jurisdiction in truancy cases. Petition for writ of certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court (263 U. S. Reports 702, Oct. 8, 1923).

¹⁶ In the San Francisco juvenile court in 1919-20, 128 boys, or 18 per cent of those dealt with by the boys' department, and 57 girls, or 25 per cent of those dealt with by the girls' department, were 18 years of age or over. In the Los Angeles juvenile court in 1919, 27 boys and 36 girls, or 2 per cent and 8 per cent, respectively, of the total number, were between the ages of 18 and 21 years. The smaller percentages in Los Angeles are partly due to the fact that dependency cases were included in the totals for Los Angeles and not for San Francisco.

^{16a} The Denver and St. Louis courts in 1923 were also given jurisdiction over delinquent children under the age of 18 years.

could not be continued on probation beyond the maximum age, except in case of stay of commitment to a State institution, but in Seattle jurisdiction over children declared wards continued during minority. The laws under which the St. Louis and Denver courts operated contained provisions giving the juvenile court concurrent criminal jurisdiction over minors above the delinquency age. In St. Louis the definition of delinquency applied to children under 17 years of age.¹⁷ Children over this age might be proceeded against as delinquents if jurisdiction had been acquired while they were under 17, but such jurisdiction was concurrent and not exclusive. By a law passed in 1917—one of the bills proposed by the Missouri Children's Code Commission—and amended in 1919, boys above the age of 17 but under 21 and girls 17 but under 18 years of age (then the age of majority for girls),¹⁸ who had committed acts which would constitute delinquency if the children were under 17, might be tried as for a misdemeanor in any court of record having jurisdiction over misdemeanors. The juvenile court came within this definition and might therefore exercise jurisdiction over minors of the ages specified. A few cases had been brought into court under this law.

The Colorado law limited jurisdiction in delinquency cases to children under 16 years of age, but under a law of 1897, which was still in effect, girls 16 and 17 years of age might be brought in as incorrigible, so that the delinquency jurisdiction of the court in practice applied to girls under the age of 18 years.¹⁹ The court had concurrent criminal jurisdiction over boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21 years, and this jurisdiction was sometimes exercised.²⁰ It was possible also to bring in minors of that age under chancery proceedings provided by the "redemption of offenders act" of 1909.²¹ Probation might be continued beyond the upper age limit, but not for a longer period than two years.

Laws passed in Colorado in 1923^{21a} raised the age of delinquency for both boys and girls to 18 years, and the Denver juvenile court now has exclusive jurisdiction, subject to appeals and writs of error, in cases concerning delinquent children and in all cases concerning the adoption, custody, or disposition of persons under 21 years of age and their protection from neglect, cruelty, and abuse.^{21b}

This has been interpreted by the Denver juvenile court to mean that it has exclusive jurisdiction in the first instance as to the custody and disposition of all children under the age of 21 years—whether the case be one of delinquency or a criminal case—but it may direct that children under 21 not included in the definition of delinquency, who are brought to court on criminal charges be tried either in the criminal court or under criminal procedure in the juvenile court. The Supreme Court has pending before it cases in

¹⁷ The age is now 18. Missouri, Laws of 1923, p. 153.

¹⁸ By Missouri Laws of 1921, p. 399, the age of majority for girls was raised to 21 years, and the provision now applies to girls as well as to boys above the juvenile-delinquency age but under the age of 21 years.

¹⁹ Colorado, Laws of 1897, ch. 15. However, in the case of a girl 16 years of age or over it was impossible to file a charge of contributing to delinquency.

²⁰ Colorado, Comp. Stat., 1921, secs. 5796, 5797 (Laws of 1903, p. 188, sec. 9, p. 189, sec. 11) authorized probation in the case of minors. Comp. Stat., 1921, sec. 5811 (Laws of 1907, p. 325, sec. 2) gave the juvenile court original jurisdiction in all criminal cases or other actions or proceedings in which the disposition, custody, or control of any child or minor was involved.

²¹ Colorado, Comp. Stat., 1921, secs. 6508-6515.

^{21a} Colorado, Laws of 1923, pp. 197, 208.

^{21b} It also has exclusive jurisdiction in neglect and dependency cases and in cases of other types, and coordinate jurisdiction in proceedings concerning the annulment of marriage where either of the parties is under the age of 21 years, and in cases under the redemption-of-offenders act.

which it will be called upon to pass on this interpretation of the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.^{21c}

In Boston the juvenile court had jurisdiction over children under 17 years of age, and its jurisdiction continued until they were 18 years of age if they became 17 while adjudication was pending or during continuance, or after cases were placed on file. The Massachusetts law was peculiar in that acts relating to juvenile offenders, dating back in some instances to 1847, were still in force, and some of their provisions paralleled those of the delinquency law passed in 1906. It was within the discretion of the court to try children 14 years of age and over under a delinquency complaint or under the criminal procedure provided by the acts relating to juvenile offenders.²² Children under 14 might also be proceeded against as juvenile offenders if a delinquency complaint had first been made and dismissed. The Boston juvenile court used the delinquency procedure in almost every case, but some of the other courts in the State frequently used the other form. The principal difference in the two proceedings was that under the delinquency act it was impossible to impose a fine or to sentence to jail or to a house of correction except for violation of probation. The procedure under the juvenile offenders act constituted a criminal record against the child.²³

The Buffalo juvenile court had jurisdiction only over children under 16 years of age. However, children on probation might be kept under supervision until the age of 18 years. The courts in New Orleans and the District of Columbia had jurisdiction over children under the age of 17 years. In the District of Columbia children could not be continued under supervision beyond the maximum age limit.

Neglect and dependency.

The jurisdiction of the court over neglected and dependent children extended in Los Angeles and San Francisco to 21 years, in Minneapolis and Seattle to 18, in the District of Columbia,^{23a} New Orleans, and St. Louis²⁴ to 17, and in Boston, Buffalo, and Denver^{24a} to 16 years. The jurisdiction of the Boston, Buffalo, and St. Louis courts did not include dependency cases that involved no question of neglect;²⁵ in these cities public provision for dependent children was made without recourse to the court.

The courts of Denver, Minneapolis, and Seattle administered the law providing public aid for dependent children in their own homes. The Denver court had worked out a plan of cooperation with the bureau of charities of the city and county department of health and

^{21c} See Brief and Argument of Petitioners in No. 11009, *People ex rel. Buchanan and White v. District Court of City and County of Denver*. A case involving the same question, No. 10997, *People ex rel. Manue Cruz v. Clarence J. Morley*, Judge of the Fifth Division of the District Court, Second Judicial District, City and County of Denver, was decided July 7, 1924, in favor of the respondent. The attorney general of the State and a number of Denver lawyers joined in a petition for rehearing as "*amicus curiae*" on behalf of all the children of the State, whose rights are seriously involved, and on November 19, 1924, the Supreme Court withdrew its opinion and granted a rehearing.

²² Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, secs. 61, 74 (Acts of 1906, ch. 413, sec. 11).

²³ The "juvenile offenders" procedure was not strictly criminal, since the child and witnesses were "examined" and the law specified that commitments were to be for the child's welfare; moreover, the parents were made parties to the proceeding. Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, secs. 73-77.

^{23a} Destitute children under 17 might be committed to the national training schools, but children above 16 could not be committed to the Board of Children's Guardians. (31 Stat. 266; 27 Stat. 268.)

²⁴ Raised to 18 by act of April 5, 1923. Missouri, Laws of 1923, p. 153.

^{24a} In 1923 the age was raised to 18 years. Colorado, Laws of 1923, p. 204.

²⁵ For distinction in Massachusetts between dependent and neglected children, see *Commonwealth v. Dee*, 222 Mass. 184.

charities whereby mothers' compensation cases were investigated and supervised by that bureau, as agent of the court. The California juvenile courts had power to order county aid to dependent children in their own homes and to obtain State aid for certain classes of cases. In San Francisco a separate widows' pension bureau had been established, but the classes of cases eligible for aid through this bureau were very limited and the court granted county aid to many children in their own homes. In Los Angeles such aid was granted by the court in a smaller number of cases, the general plan being for the county department of charities to deal with cases of dependency.

Adoptions.

In Denver²⁶ and St. Louis the juvenile court had jurisdiction over adoption cases, and in Seattle the court, with the written consent of the parents or other person having the right to dispose of a dependent or delinquent child, might make an order or decree of adoption without the personal appearance of the parent or guardian. The judge of the Los Angeles juvenile court heard adoption cases in his capacity of superior-court judge.

Mentally defective children.

The two California courts had jurisdiction over insane and feeble-minded children and had authority to place them in institutions or under supervision.^{26a} The Los Angeles court was utilizing boarding homes for the care of feeble-minded children.²⁷ The Seattle court had authority to commit mentally defective children to the State school for the feeble-minded.

Contributing to delinquency or dependency.

All the courts studied except the St. Louis court had jurisdiction over cases of contributing to the delinquency or neglect of children, but the two California courts conducted the preliminary hearing only, holding the defendant to another branch of the superior court if the evidence was sufficient. In San Francisco the defendant was often placed under supervision at the time of the preliminary hearing, the case being continued and the defendant agreeing to the conditions prescribed. In some of the courts the jurisdiction over cases of contributing to delinquency or dependency was seldom exercised.

The contributing to delinquency laws differed in their scope and efficacy. In Massachusetts, for instance, the law applied only to parents or guardians or persons having custody, and in some courts the child had to be found delinquent before complaint could be made. The District of Columbia court was greatly hampered by the fact that a child had to be "found guilty" more than once before prosecution for contributing to delinquency could be initiated. The procedure under the laws relating to contributing to delinquency was criminal except in the Denver court. Colorado had two such laws—one providing for criminal and the other for chancery proceedings. When the contributing to delinquency law applies to others than parents and guardians it can often be used effectively in cases in which the outcome of rape proceedings in the criminal court would be doubtful.

²⁶ The jurisdiction of the Denver court in adoption proceedings involving persons under 21 years is now exclusive. Colorado, Laws of 1923, p. 208.

^{26a} In 1923 the Denver juvenile court was given exclusive jurisdiction in proceedings concerning feeble-minded children under 21 years of age. Colorado, Laws of 1923, p. 208.

²⁷ See p. 158.

Offenses against children.

The Buffalo children's court had the jurisdiction of a court of special sessions, and the judge had concurrent jurisdiction over charges against adults for the violation of any section of the penal law amounting to a felony, when such violation necessarily involved a child. The court also had concurrent jurisdiction with the city court over charges of the grade of misdemeanors when the charge appeared to have contributed to the misdemeanor of a child or to involve a child.²⁸ Under this law any offense against a child might be brought before the children's court, and many such cases were heard, thereby making it unnecessary for child witnesses to be subjected to the surroundings of the criminal court. The New Orleans court had similar jurisdiction, including offenses against children not punishable by death or hard labor. The District of Columbia court, under laws in existence prior to the passage of the juvenile court law, was given jurisdiction over specific offenses, including among others the exposure of a child under 14 with intent to abandon and the abuse and maltreatment of a child under 18. This jurisdiction has seldom been exercised. The Denver court from 1907 to 1915 exercised concurrent jurisdiction in all cases of offenses against children. By a supreme-court decision in 1915²⁹ it was held that jurisdiction did not extend to cases of statutory offenses, but this jurisdiction has been restored by an act passed in 1923.

Violations of child-labor laws.

Three of the courts—those in Buffalo, Denver, and New Orleans—had jurisdiction over violations of the State child labor law, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia had such jurisdiction in the District.

In Seattle the judge was charged with the duty of issuing employment certificates to certain classes of children, but this duty had been delegated by him to the school-attendance department. The New Orleans court granted theatrical permits to children under 16, the cases first having been investigated by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. The judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia was given power under the child labor law to issue a permit to a child between the ages of 12 and 14 years upon satisfactory evidence that the labor of the child was necessary for his support or for the support of a disabled or invalid father or mother, a widowed mother, or a younger sister or brother. The court might also waive the schooling certificate required before children between the ages of 14 and 16 years could be granted employment certificates.³⁰

Nonsupport and desertion.

The Denver,³¹ New Orleans,³² and District of Columbia³³ juvenile courts had broad jurisdiction over cases of nonsupport and deser-

²⁸ New York, Laws of 1911, ch. 561, sec. 516, as amended by Laws of 1917, ch. 571.

²⁹ *Collas v. People*, 60 Colo. 230; 153 Pac. 224.

³⁰ 35 Stat. 420.

³¹ Colorado, Comp. Stat., 1921, secs. 5566, 5569, 5811, and 5812. In 1923 a plan was worked out with the district attorney whereby the juvenile court will investigate all nonsupport cases in which the fathers fail to pay for the support of their children. If court action is justified charges of contributing to dependency are filed in the juvenile court under chancery procedure. In seriously contested cases or extradition cases criminal procedure is resorted to.

³² Louisiana, Constitution of 1921, Art. VII, sec. 96. Acts of 1921 (extra session), No. 126, sec. 2, p. 317.

³³ 37 Stat. 134.

tion.³⁴ The California statute³⁵ gave the juvenile court original jurisdiction in cases of willful failure to provide food, clothing, shelter, or medical attendance, but this jurisdiction was not exercised by the Los Angeles court and was exercised by the San Francisco court only in cases in which the children were already wards of the court. The San Francisco court had worked out a special system for the collection of support in such cases. The juvenile courts of Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Seattle had power to order parents to support their children who had been adjudged delinquent or dependent.

In Denver the juvenile court was dealing with a considerable number of children involved in divorce cases. Children whose custody was in controversy were considered as coming under that section of the law which gave the juvenile court jurisdiction in all criminal cases or other actions or proceedings in which the disposition, custody, or control of any child or minor might be involved under the acts concerning delinquent, dependent, or neglected children or other acts concerning the person, control, or disposition of any infant child or minor.³⁶

Other jurisdiction.

In the District of Columbia the juvenile court had jurisdiction over cases involving the determination of paternity and the support of children born out of wedlock. The Minnesota law included illegitimate children in the definition of dependency, and many illegitimate children were brought before the Minneapolis court for the purpose of having guardians appointed; but proceedings for the determination of paternity were not held in the juvenile court.

The St. Louis juvenile court had jurisdiction over all cases of transfer of custody or control of a child under a law providing as follows:

No person shall surrender control or custody of a child, or transfer the control or custody of a child to another, and no person shall take possession or charge of a child so transferred, without having first filed a petition before a juvenile court having jurisdiction, praying that such surrender or transfer may be made, and having obtained such an order from such juvenile court, approving or ordering transfer of custody.³⁷

The New Orleans court had jurisdiction over the violation of any law "now in existence or hereafter enacted" for the protection of the physical, moral, and mental well-being of children not punishable by death or hard labor.³⁸

³⁴ In the case of *United States v. Moreland* (258 U. S. 433), April 17, 1922, it was held that inasmuch as the punishment which may be imposed under the nonsupport statute, viz, imprisonment at hard labor, is infamous within the meaning of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, such cases must be brought by indictment or presentment by a grand jury and not by information—as are cases brought before the juvenile court. The juvenile court has since been without jurisdiction in these cases.

³⁵ California Penal Code, sec. 270 as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 911, p. 1723.

³⁶ Colorado, Comp. Stat., 1921, sec. 5811. See answer and opinion of the Juvenile Court of Denver in No. 10817 in the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, in which the court sustained the contention of the Denver Juvenile Court, *People ex rel. Heyer v. Juvenile Court of Denver*, decided June 2, 1924 (not yet published). The Supreme Court in this case held that even though the custody of a child was given to the father by the district court in a divorce or separate-maintenance case, the juvenile court in a dependency case could give the custody of the same child to the mother without conflicting with the jurisdiction of the district court; that the jurisdictions of the two courts over the custody of the child are not conflicting nor concurrent but simultaneous, that of the juvenile court being superior to that of the district court.

³⁷ Missouri, Rev. Stat., 1919, sec. 1103.

³⁸ Louisiana, Acts of 1921 (extra session), No. 126, sec. 2, p. 317.

COURT ROOM AND PROBATION OFFICES.

In considering the location and arrangement of the court room and the probation offices, several points must be borne in mind. These include: (1) The extent to which the children are protected from contact with the participants and onlookers in criminal proceedings; (2) the accessibility of the court room and probation offices to the population served; (3) convenience in the work of the judge and the probation staff; and (4) the adequacy of the space allotted for the probation offices.

LOCATION.

In most cities the court room and the probation offices are located either in the courthouse or in the detention home. Of the courts included in this study the offices (i. e., court rooms, chambers, and probation offices) of five—Boston, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New Orleans—were in the county courthouse. However, in Los Angeles all girls' cases and all cases of boys under the age of 13 years were heard in a room of the detention home. In Buffalo, San Francisco, Seattle, and St. Louis the court room and probation offices were in the detention home. In the District of Columbia a separate building, a remodeled private residence, was devoted to the court and the probation staff. The Buffalo court had extensive adult jurisdiction and was required by law to hear children's cases and adult cases in separate buildings. The adult court room and the offices of the judge, clerk, reporter, and adult probation officer were in an office building in the business district, some distance from the detention home where children's cases were heard.

When the court room is in the detention home or in a building devoted to juvenile-court purposes, the danger of subjecting the children to criminal-court surroundings is usually entirely removed. However, in one city included in the study the juvenile-court and detention-home building was on the tract of land occupied by the city hall, courthouse, and jail, and the windows of one side of the children's building faced the jail.

The court room used for the children was entirely separate from the rooms used for adult hearings in three of the five courts located in the county courthouse. In Los Angeles the court room used for cases of boys 13 years of age and over was also used for superior-court cases heard by the judge who was assigned to the juvenile court; but at the time of the study the judge was assigned only psychopathic cases and adoption cases in addition to his juvenile-court work, and the psychopathic cases were heard at the county hospital. The judge of the Minneapolis court was assigned no criminal cases, and the court room was used only for children's cases and for civil cases.

In New Orleans the juvenile-court room was on the first floor of the courthouse and was reached by a separate entrance. Practically the same condition existed in Boston. In Minneapolis, Denver, and Los

Angeles the children had to go through halls and use elevators frequented by those interested in the various courthouse activities.

The building used by the juvenile court of the District of Columbia was at some distance from the courthouse and from the detention home, in a residence district fairly convenient to those districts which contributed the greatest proportion of juvenile delinquency. The detention homes of Buffalo, Los Angeles (used for hearings of girls' cases and cases of boys under 13), and Seattle also were at some distance from the downtown districts. The St. Louis juvenile-court building was one of a group of city buildings near the center of the city. The San Francisco juvenile-court and detention-home building was in a business district several blocks from the county courthouse.

When the juvenile-court judge gives only part of his time to the work of that court, placing the juvenile-court room and the probation offices in the courthouse results in economy of the judge's time and in his greater accessibility to the probation offices in cases of emergency and for purposes of consultation. It often happens, moreover, that the courthouse is conveniently located with reference to car lines and center of population. These advantages are offset if the children can not be protected from the surroundings of the criminal court. Especially if children on probation are expected to report to the probation office, it is undesirable that the office be in the courthouse. This difficulty is sometimes met by arrangements whereby children report at settlement houses, libraries, or other places convenient to their homes.

A point to be considered in the location of the court room is the transportation of children from the detention home to the place where the hearing is held. This question is solved if the court is in the detention-home building.

ARRANGEMENT OF COURT ROOM.

In children's cases a small court room is preferable to a large one, for it is impossible in such a room to have many present at the hearings. Some of those engaged in juvenile-court work consider it desirable to preserve something of the arrangement of a formal court room, as it is believed that such a plan tends to impress the child and his parents with the dignity of the court. It is more commonly held that the arrangement of the juvenile-court room should approximate that of a small office. The descriptions and pictures of hearings given later in this report will show the simplicity of the Buffalo court room and of the room used by the Los Angeles referee.¹ In Seattle the court room was small and very simple in its appointments. In Boston all the hearings were in the judge's office and in the District of Columbia the judge's chambers were used for all delinquency hearings. In Denver, also, most of the hearings were in the judge's office. The children's building in St. Louis was designed especially for the purpose it served, and the court room, though small, had in modified form some of the features of the ordinary court room. A similar situation existed in San Francisco, and the court room there was far less desirable because it combined in one room the waiting

¹ See p. 123. The illustration of the Buffalo hearing shows a room of a building no longer used by the court. The new court room is more comfortable and quite as informal as the old.

room and the court room.² In New Orleans some cases were heard in the judge's chambers. For the hearings of older boys in Los Angeles and for all the hearings in Minneapolis an ordinary court room was used, though in Minneapolis the arrangement of the room had been changed by the removal of the usual court-room benches, and persons awaiting hearing remained in an adjoining room.³

ARRANGEMENT OF PROBATION OFFICES.

In planning probation offices it is important that the amount of space allotted to each officer be adequate and that the arrangement be such as to insure privacy in interviewing children, parents, and others concerned in the cases. It is essential that each officer have a desk of his own. If more than one officer must occupy a single office, the hours should be so arranged that only one is holding consultations at any given time. Large offices, even with enough space between desks so that simultaneous consultations may be practically private, are not so conducive to frankness and confidence as are small, single rooms. How to secure space and privacy was found to be a serious problem in several of the courts studied.

A waiting room located conveniently to all the probation offices, space for files and records, and office room for the clerical and stenographic staff are essential parts of the probation-office plan. In addition, the offices should be near the court room. In one court studied the probation offices were in the basement of the courthouse and the court room was on the second floor, an arrangement causing much loss of time and energy. This situation has since been remedied.

Sketches of the floor plans of the St. Louis and Seattle probation offices are given on pages 53 and 66.

² Girls' cases were heard in a separate room in another part of the building.

³ The Minneapolis court room has since been further modified by the removal of the lawyer's bar and the raising of the bench only 6 or 8 inches from the floor.

STAFF OF THE COURT.

THE JUDGE.

Amount of time devoted to juvenile work.

The courts of Boston, Buffalo, Denver, New Orleans, and the District of Columbia were served by judges devoting full time to juvenile-court work. Four of these courts had adult jurisdiction which required a considerable amount of time, but the Boston court served the smallest population of any of those studied and dealt only with delinquent and neglected children. The frequent sessions of this court also tended to keep at a low figure the number of children detained.

The juvenile-court judge in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Minneapolis, and St. Louis was one of the judges of the superior, district, or circuit court and devoted only part of his time to children's work. In Los Angeles at the time of the study the judge gave four half days a week to the juvenile court and the referee gave full time. In Minneapolis juvenile sessions consumed two and one-half days, but the extra time bestowed upon the work by the judge probably brought the total up to considerably more than half of each week.¹ In St. Louis the judge gave the major part of the forenoon four days a week to the juvenile court and devoted some other time to special appointments connected with the court. The Seattle judge spent two days a week in the juvenile court and whatever additional time was needed. The San Francisco court—one of the largest included in the study—had the least amount of time from the judge, regularly only one day and a half each week, though extra time was frequently devoted to consultations in chambers on juvenile-court matters, and the referee hearing girls' cases gave one day a week to the court.

Method of appointment and term.


Of the five judges selected especially for juvenile-court service, three—those in Buffalo, Denver, and New Orleans—were elected by popular vote, the first for a 10-year term and each of the others for 4 years.² The judge of the Boston court was appointed by the governor for life, and in the District of Columbia the judge was appointed by the President of the United States for a term of six years.

In the five courts which were branches of other court systems, the judge was designated by the full bench for service in the juvenile branch of the court.³ The term was usually one year, but in all the courts except that of St. Louis it was the custom for the judge to be continued in his assignment for several years. In St. Louis it was the practice at the time of the study to change the assignment every year, but later a law was passed providing for not less than

¹ The judge in Minneapolis is now appointed under the act of 1923 authorizing a special judge assigned to juvenile cases. He sits two days a week and occasionally, in chambers, on other days.

² In 1921 the term of office of the judge of the New Orleans court was made eight years.

³ By a Minnesota law passed in 1923 (ch. 387) an additional judge of the district court for the fourth judicial circuit (which includes Minneapolis), with juvenile-court assignment, has been authorized. This will mean that the juvenile-court judge will be elected by popular vote.



two-year terms. Under this law the same judge presides over the juvenile court and one branch of the domestic-relations court.

Previous experience and interests.

All but one of the judges were lawyers. One of them, in addition to law, had studied both medicine and psychology, and was particularly interested in psychology and the care of the psychopathic. Several of the judges had taken an active part in general child-welfare movements. One of them had contributed notably to the popular understanding of the aims and methods of the juvenile court, in this and in other countries. Another had served as chairman of a commission in his State which revised the laws relating to children and had taken part in State and local child-welfare activities. One judge had been a member of the school board for a number of years, part of the time serving as president; he was also an officer of a boy-scout organization.

Use of referees.

Juvenile courts with chancery jurisdiction have power to appoint referees with authority to hear cases and to make findings of fact and orders, subject to approval by the judge. Some of the juvenile-court laws have specific provisions relating to referees, and a few contain clauses providing for the appointment of a woman to hear girls' cases. The Colorado law authorized the judge to appoint masters of discipline with powers similar to those of masters of chancery. A petition for review of the proceedings might be filed within 10 days. The California law provided that in counties of the first class—of which Los Angeles was the only one in the State—a woman referee should be appointed wherever possible to hear girls' cases and that paid referees might be employed by the court.

In only two of the courts studied—Los Angeles and San Francisco—was the work of referees part of the regular routine, at the time of the inquiry.⁴ The Los Angeles court was the only one having a paid referee for girls' cases. She heard all girls' cases and all cases of boys under 13 years of age, and gave full time to this work. In San Francisco a member of the probation committee—an unpaid board of citizens—served in all girls' cases as referee, without compensation. In the District of Columbia the judge was a woman, so that the need for a woman referee did not exist. In Denver the clerk of the court, a woman, was authorized to act as referee or "master of discipline" and sometimes entered minor orders, but all official cases were heard by the judge.

A judge of the St. Louis court in 1914 appointed two of the women probation officers as referees or advisers to hear all girls' cases jointly and to make recommendations to him. Later a plan was adopted by which one of the women sat with the judge. After a year, a new judge having been assigned to the court, the arrangement was discontinued.

The Los Angeles court not only had a woman referee, but a beginning had been made in carrying out a plan for appointing referees for

⁴ In Minneapolis the chief probation officer now (1924) acts as referee in cases of truancy (unless repeated), incorrigibility, trespass, and minor offenses. Petitions are filed, but a majority of these cases are settled without court appearance.

outlying districts. The territory served by this court was large, and some difficulty had been encountered in securing the transfer of cases from the lower courts outside the city, to the juvenile court. The justice, recorders', and police courts, instead of immediately suspending proceedings when it appeared that a child was under 18, as the law required, sometimes heard the evidence and placed the child on informal probation, thus depriving the child of the benefit of supervision by a trained worker. To avoid this difficulty the plan was conceived of having some of the local magistrates appointed as referees of the juvenile court, thereby bringing them under the supervision of the court and making the court's probation facilities available to the children. Only one such magistrate had been appointed at the time of the study. The plan was to have this referee and an attorney who had also been appointed referee, hear cases in their districts involving boys 13 years of age and over. The plan had not been in operation sufficiently long to determine its success and has since been abandoned.

PROBATION STAFF.

Number of officers.

The 10 courts varied greatly in respect to the size of the probation staff, and these differences did not always correspond to variations in the volume of work. Including those doing administrative work, investigation, or supervision of children's cases but not including officers specializing in aid-to-mothers cases, the smallest number of paid officers engaged in probation work in any of the 10 courts was 4 and the largest number was 26. Table 3 shows for each court the number of children's cases and the size of the paid probation staff. The numbers of aid-to-mothers cases, adoption cases, and adult cases are not shown. In Boston and Minneapolis private agencies, and in the District of Columbia, a public agency, did most of the investigation and supervision of neglect cases, and in San Francisco many cases of dependency and neglect were investigated and supervised by private agencies cooperating with the court.

TABLE 3.—Number of children's cases in one year and size of probation staff.

Court.	Number of children's cases during one year.			Probation officers dealing with children's cases. ¹				
	Total.	Delinquency.	Dependency and neglect.	Total.	Chief probation officer and department supervisors.		Officers engaged in investigation and supervision of cases.	
					Men.	Women.	Men.	Women.
Boston juvenile court ²	1,015	952	63	4	1		2	1
Buffalo children's court ³	1,176	1,143	33	4	1		2	1
Denver juvenile court ⁴	3,358	(⁴)	301	6	1		5	6
District of Columbia juvenile court ⁷	2,000	1,641	359	12	1	1	3	7
Los Angeles juvenile court ⁸	1,787	1,314	473	26	2	1	12	11
Minneapolis juvenile court ⁹	1,549	1,000	549	6	1			5
New Orleans juvenile court ¹⁰	1,612	1,434	78	4	1		2	1
San Francisco juvenile court ¹¹	1,825	795	1,030	13	2	2	3	6
Seattle juvenile court ¹²	1,345	997	348	5	1		1	3
St. Louis juvenile court ¹³	2,064	1,708	356	17	1		8	8

¹ Not including probation officers dealing only with adult or mothers' aid cases.

² Year ended Aug. 31, 1920. Figures compiled from court records.

³ Calendar year 1920. Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1920, pp. 19, 20.

In 1923 there were 973 delinquency cases and 75 cases of dependency and neglect. (Report for 1923, p. 23.)

⁴ Year ended June 30, 1920. Manuscript report of court. Delinquency cases not given separately for the reason that the total number of children coming before the court informally on other than dependency and neglect charges (1,770) included a great many children who applied to the court for assistance in finding work or for advice. The majority of the children dealt with by the Denver Juvenile Court come voluntarily, frequently on their own initiative. (See description of the informal work of the court, p. 110.)

The number of delinquency cases in which petitions were filed during the year was 287.

⁵ One officer gave most of his time to adult cases.

⁶ One officer employed on half time. There are now (1924) 6 probation officers giving their time to delinquency, dependency, and domestic-relations cases.

⁷ Year ended June 30, 1920. Manuscript report of court. Cases dealt with informally not included, as probation work was not done in these cases. The clerk of the court, formerly the chief probation officer, now (1924) acts as director of administrative work, including the work of the probation office. The chief probation officer and the assistant chief probation officer are both women. The probation staff handling children's cases now consists of 1 investigating officer, 3 white and 2 colored men probation officers, 2 white women probation officers, and 1 colored woman probation officer. In the year ended June 30, 1924, the number of official delinquency cases was 1,904, and the number of dependency and neglect cases was 279.

⁸ Calendar year 1919. Annual report, Los Angeles County Probation Department, for the Year Ending December 31, 1919, p. 9. Number given represents only new cases filed, and cases dealt with informally are not included, as probation work was not done in these cases. Dependency cases include 21 insane or feeble-minded. In 1922 there were 1,744 cases of delinquency and 178 cases of unfit home, no proper guardianship, no parental control, or mental defect or disorder (manuscript report for the year ended Dec. 31, 1922).

⁹ Calendar year 1919. The Juvenile Court of Hennepin County, Minn., 1918-1919, pp. 13, 15, 24. The staff now (1924) consists of the chief probation officer and 6 probation officers—5 men and 1 woman. The person designated as chief probation officer serves as complaint clerk and court assistant.

¹⁰ Calendar year 1920. Annual Report, Juvenile Court for the City of New Orleans, 1920, p. 8.

¹¹ Year ended June 30, 1920. Manuscript report of court. Cases dealt with informally not included, as probation work was not done in these cases. Dependency cases include 86 dealt with by the boys' and girls' departments and 944 dealt with by the family-relations department.

¹² Calendar year 1921. The Seattle Juvenile-Court Report for the Years 1920-1921, p. 11. Includes cases in which petitions were filed and cases dealt with informally. In 1922 the number of delinquency cases was 1,138 and of neglect cases, 507 (The Seattle Juvenile-Court Report for 1922, p. 9); in 1923 there were 1,189 delinquency cases and 420 neglect cases (Report for 1923, p. 9).

¹³ Calendar year 1920. Report of the Juvenile Court and Probation Office for the Years 1916 to 1920, inclusive, p. 38. Cases dealt with informally not included, as probation work was not done in these cases. In 1922 there were 1,564 delinquent children and 421 neglected children before the court (manuscript report).

Method of selection.

In nine courts the probation officers were appointed by the judge,⁵ but in Los Angeles the judge had no control over appointments. The chief probation officer was appointed by the county board of supervisors from a civil-service list, and he in turn appointed his subordinates, also from a civil-service list. In St. Louis the chief probation officer was appointed by the judge, and other probation officers were appointed by the judge in consultation with the chief probation officer

⁵ In the Minneapolis court the power of appointment rested with the judges of the district court, but in practice appointments were left to the juvenile-court judge.

In only three courts—those of Buffalo, Los Angeles, and St. Louis—were probation officers appointed as a result of competitive examinations. In Buffalo the city civil-service commission, composed of three attorneys in private practice, conducted the examinations with the aid and advice of the State probation commission. The judge was required to select from the first three on the list. The Los Angeles County civil-service commission conducted examinations for juvenile-court probation officers and for the referee. In St. Louis a special board of examiners of three members was appointed by the circuit judges to conduct competitive examinations for probation officers.

In the San Francisco court appointments were made by the judge upon the nomination of the probation committee—an advisory committee of seven members appointed by the judge.⁶ A form was filled out by each applicant interviewed by the committee. Personality was given the greatest weight in considering qualifications. In Boston the State probation commission was usually consulted before appointments were made. The commission kept on hand a list of applicants, but no formal examination was held.


Save for a requirement sometimes found, specifying that the probation officers must be "of reputable character" or "discreet persons of good character," none of the laws governing the juvenile courts studied specified the qualifications which probation officers should have. Where competitive examinations were held no minimum requirements were specified with regard to education or experience, except that in Buffalo graduation from grammar school was required. It was generally recognized that the personality of the officer was of fundamental importance.


In Buffalo 30 points were allowed for the written examination, 30 for the oral, and 40 for education and experience. In the examination for chief probation officer 40 per cent was allowed for the written examination and 30 per cent for each of the other subjects. One point was given for each year in high school and from two to four points for college education. For the purpose of rating, experience was divided into two parts—general experience and special experience giving a knowledge of juvenile-court problems. Candidates for the position of chief probation officer were expected to have a greater amount of education and experience and to show executive ability. In the last examination prior to the time of the inquiry the State probation commission assisted in the preparation of the questions and in the oral examinations.

Fifty points were allowed for the written examination and 50 for education, experience, and personality in St. Louis. A special examination was given for chief probation officer.

The examination given in 1920 for deputy probation officer in Los Angeles allowed four points for the written test and six points for education, experience, and training, verified by personal interview and references. Candidates had to attain at least 70 per cent in education, experience, and training. The announcement stated that candidates must possess a good education and be well informed concerning methods of dealing with wayward and delinquent juveniles. The written examination included practical questions and a

⁶ See p. 37.





mental test. For chief probation officer a special examination was given; three points were assigned to the written test and seven to education, experience, and training.

The term of office for probation officers was almost always indefinite, the judge having the power of removal except in Los Angeles, where such authority rested with the chief probation officer and the county board of supervisors. In San Francisco a term of two years was specified and in Minneapolis a term of four years, in both cases subject to removal for cause within that period. In practice, however, the tenure of office was indefinite. A probation officer could not be removed in San Francisco without the approval of the probation committee.

Salaries.

Great variation in the salaries of the probation officers was found in the courts studied. Table 4 shows the salaries of various classes of officers, as reported in 1920 or 1921.

TABLE 4.—Salaries of probation officers in 1920 or 1921.

Court	Yearly salaries.			
	Chief probation officer.	Assistant chief probation officer and supervisors of departments.	Investigators.	Assistant probation officers.
Boston.....	\$2,500			\$1,700-\$2,100
Buffalo.....	2,040			1,800
Denver.....	1,800			1,500-1,620
District of Columbia ²	2,240	\$1,740	\$1,440	1,240-1,440
Los Angeles ³	\$2,700-3,300	\$2,160-2,400	2,040	1,680-1,920
Minneapolis ⁴	2,000			1,080-1,380
New Orleans.....	1,500			1,080-1,200
San Francisco ⁵	3,600	1,800-2,400		1,800
Seattle.....	3,000		1,800	1,680-1,800
St. Louis ⁶	2,500		1,500	1,000-1,500

¹ Not including salary of a probation officer giving part time to adult and part time to children's work nor salary (\$600) of a half-time officer.

² The probation officers of the District of Columbia court come within the provisions of the classification act of 1923. The salaries of the chief and assistant chief have been placed in grade 2 of the professional and scientific service, with a range of \$2,400 to \$3,000. The investigating officer has been placed in grade 1 (\$1,860-\$2,400) and the assistant probation officers in the subprofessional service, grade 5 (\$1,680-\$2,040).

³ The salary of the chief probation officer of the Los Angeles court on July 1, 1924, was \$4,500; of the assistant chief probation officer, \$2,700; of the supervisors of the boys' and girls' departments, \$2,280-\$2,520; and of assistant probation officers, \$1,800-\$2,100.

⁴ The salary of the chief probation officer of the Minneapolis court, who under a recent consolidation has charge of the district-court and the juvenile-court probation offices, is now (1924) \$3,600. The assistant chief probation officer receives \$2,400 and the deputy probation officers from \$1,080 to \$1,800.

⁵ The salary of the assistant chief probation officer in San Francisco is now (1924) \$2,700, and the assistant probation officers receive \$2,100.

⁶ The salary of the chief probation officer in St. Louis is now (1924) \$3,000, and the maximum salary of deputy probation officers is \$2,000; 14 of the 16 deputy probation officers are receiving this maximum.

Salaries of chief probation officers varied from \$1,500 and \$1,800 to \$3,000 and \$3,600.⁷ Assistant chief probation officers or supervisors of departments were found in three courts, their salaries ranging from \$1,740 to \$2,400.⁸ In the four courts which had special officers assigned to investigations the investigators received as much as or more than the maximum salary paid to assistant probation officers.

⁷ The maximum is now \$4,500 (1924).

⁸ The range is now from \$2,100 to \$2,700 (1924).

In general, the salaries paid the assistant probation officers were far lower than the salaries which competent people who do the actual work of supervising the boys and girls on probation and who make the investigations should receive. In three courts some of these salaries were as low as \$1,000 or \$1,080, and the maximum was not above \$1,500. In the court with the highest salaries for assistant probation officers the range was from \$1,700 to \$2,100. In two courts all the assistant probation officers received \$1,800.⁹

Only two courts had definite plans for increases according to length of service and efficiency. In one appropriations for the probation office were made in three classes, A, B, and C, class A carrying the lowest and class C the highest salaries. Class A salaries were paid the first year of service, promotions to class B coming at the end of that period. Promotions to class C were made on recommendation of the civil-service commission, with the approval of the board of supervisors. For instance, the entrance salary for chief probation officer was \$2,700, the B grade salary was \$3,000, and the C grade, \$3,300. In the other classes, the interval between grades was \$120 a year, except that a flat rate was provided for special investigators.

In another court the entrance salary was \$1,260, and periodic increases of \$60 a year were usually given until the maximum of \$1,500 was reached. At the time of the inquiry a yearly bonus of \$300 was allowed, and all the officers were receiving the maximum, which, with the bonus, amounted to \$1,800.

Hours of work and provision for vacations.

The hours of work were usually from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m., though in one court they were from 9 a. m. to 4.30 p. m., and in a few they were from 8.30 a. m. until 5 p. m. Saturday half holidays were usually allowed, though sometimes the officers had Saturday half holidays only in alternate weeks, so that some were on duty every Saturday afternoon.


In practically all the courts a great deal of overtime work was necessary. In Boston each man probation officer was on duty one month out of every three for night service and was notified and required to go to the precinct stations in case of night arrests of juveniles. In two courts the officers were required to be on duty one evening a week from 7 until 9 to receive reports. Probation officers frequently stated that they made many night visits to their probationers, some also visiting places of commercialized amusement where their charges were likely to be found. A probation officer, like a physician, must be constantly within call to deal with situations as they arise.

The most common annual vacation period was found to be two weeks, though sometimes 20 days or even a month was allowed. In several of the courts it was stated that when necessary, generous periods of sick leave were allowed.

The Minneapolis, Buffalo, and Boston courts reported some provision for the expenses of probation officers while attending State or

⁹ In two of the three courts with the lowest salaries in 1920 or 1921 the maximum is now (1924) \$1,800 and \$2,100, respectively; there are now two courts with a maximum of \$2,100 and one in which all the assistant probation officers receive \$2,100.

JUVENILE COURT - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



STAFF OF THE COURT.

National conferences in line with their work. In Buffalo the expenses of probation officers, and in Boston their railroad fares, were allowed for attendance at conferences called by the State probation commissions. In San Francisco and the District of Columbia expenses were not paid, but additional leave with pay was granted for study or attendance at conferences.

No provision was found, in most cases, for subscriptions to periodicals or dues to associations concerned with subjects pertaining to juvenile-court work, nor were funds provided for the purchase of books. In only two courts was there any collection of books on professional subjects. In one of these the judge's private library was available to the staff of the court. In the other there was a small collection of books in the office of the chief probation officer.

Training and experience.

The low salaries paid in most of the courts studied and the absence of defined requirements for entrance into the probation service naturally resulted in probation staffs whose members, as a rule, had little preparation for their work through education or previous experience. Study of the child and his family and successful reconstructive work not only call for certain indispensable personal qualities but also demand the knowledge and skill which come only from training and experience. To secure such service it is essential that the authorities to whom probation officers are responsible and the general public recognize its character and importance and provide compensation adequate to attract and hold a qualified personnel.

Of the chief probation officers in the courts studied, six had college or professional training, one of the six was also a graduate of a school for social work, and two were lawyers. Seven of the chief probation officers had had previous experience in family case work, boys' work, social work in connection with the public schools, or probation work in another court. In most instances the chief probation officer had been promoted from the ranks of probation officers. A physician had been chief probation officer of the Seattle court for many years; he had resigned just prior to the time of this study but has since returned to the court. His full title was "chief probation officer and diagnostician."

Of the department supervisors, investigators, and assistant probation officers, a small minority were college graduates. Two or three had studied law, and less than half a dozen had attended schools training for social service.

In most of the courts the proportion of probation officers with previous experience in social work was small. In one court all three assistant probation officers had had experience either in child-caring or in boys' club work. Including work as volunteers before their appointment to paid service, 6 of the 12 department supervisors and probation officers in another court had had experience, and 2 of the 4 probation officers in a third court. In seven of the courts studied, however, the majority of the probation officers had had no previous experience in occupations allied with probation. When this lack of

experience was combined, as was very often the case, with relatively little educational equipment, it is clear that the probation work itself must have had to serve for some time as training and practice.

Length of service.

In a majority of the courts studied the members of the probation staff had been connected with the court for a considerable period of time, often for many years. For instance, the chief probation officer of one court had served 14 years, and the length of time the 13 members of his staff had been with the court was as follows: 14 to 16 years, 3; 11 years, 2; 5 to 7 years, 5; 3 years, 1; less than 1 year, 2. In another court the chief probation officer who had just resigned had been with the court nearly 7 years, and 14 of the 25 members of the staff had been with it 5 years or more.

Use of police officers, volunteers, and public and private agencies.


In Buffalo and in Denver a police officer was detailed to give full time to the juvenile court. This officer in Buffalo acted as probation officer in adult cases. In Denver the police officer gave the greater part of his time to preliminary work in adult cases but also served as liaison officer between the police and the court in juvenile cases in which arrests were made, all such cases being referred to him by the police.

Three police officers were assigned to the New Orleans juvenile court, each officer serving 8 hours in every 24. The court was kept open day and night, and the police officers assisted in receiving complaints and in caring for children arrested, taking them, if detention was necessary, to the institution in which they were to be detained. The court thus served in reality as a precinct station for children.

Volunteer probation officers were used by only one court, the New Orleans court, which employed no negro probation officers. All cases of negro children placed on probation were assigned to volunteers, six of whom were more or less active at the time the study was made. A white volunteer officer, a representative of a church, supervised all boys from that church who were on probation. Other courts, notably those in San Francisco and Seattle, used volunteers to some extent, but their service was always under the supervision of paid probation officers and was confined to such tasks as making supplementary home visits or special investigations, or taking children to clinics.

The San Francisco court was cooperating with the University of California by giving students practical experience and by lectures to students by the chief probation officer on the work of the court. Nurses taking the public-health course in the University of California were assigned to the court in groups of four, each group giving four half days a week to the court for periods of one month. University students taking courses in social work gave two and one-half days a week to the court. The students assisted in clerical work and in special investigations, and made supplementary home visits for the girls' department.

In Seattle six students of the University of Washington gave volunteer service under close supervision. Some of them were post-



graduates, and at least five had had field work before coming to the court. They were used chiefly in girls' cases, making home visits and helping with the girls' recreation. Each volunteer was giving one day a week to the court during one college term, and one of the group was staying throughout the year. Reports as to the interest and sympathy, accuracy, judgment, persistence, readiness to grasp ideas, and initiative shown by each student were made by the chief probation officer to the professor supervising their work.

Seven courts utilized in probation work in certain delinquency cases the services of agents of other public departments or of private societies, including the Big Brother or Big Sister organization. The Seattle court was working out a plan whereby cases of delinquency involving school children would be turned over to school-attendance officers for probationary supervision. The supervisor of school attendance was to be responsible to the chief probation officer for these cases and to see that regular probation histories were kept on the forms used by the court. At the time of the study only about 12 cases had been placed on probation to school-attendance officers.

In Boston a representative of the Council of Jewish Women made the investigations and served as probation officer in all cases of Jewish girls. The Boston Children's Aid Society placed in family homes a small number of difficult children who were on probation and did intensive work with them. The secretary of the Louisiana Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children made special investigations for the juvenile court, and school-attendance officers supervised probationers in truancy cases. The judge in St. Louis assigned a few cases for probationary supervision to the Big Brother organization, and any probation officer might ask assistance from the Big Brother or the Big Sister organization, or from representatives of Protestant or Catholic churches. Some of the probation officers made use of such aid to a much greater extent than others. The Buffalo court also utilized to a small extent the services of Big Brothers to supplement probationary supervision.

In Los Angeles County, where the juvenile court served a large territory outside the principal city, agents of societies in the outlying territory were called upon to assist the probation officers in the supervision of cases. These volunteers did not assume full responsibility for cases but kept the probation officers in touch with the situation, reporting to them from time to time by letter or telephone.

The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children did all the work of investigation and follow-up in neglect cases for the Boston juvenile court, and the Children's Protective Society of Minneapolis rendered similar service in cases of dependency and neglect. In the District of Columbia a public organization—the Board of Children's Guardians—made all investigations in dependency and neglect cases and presented the evidence. This juvenile court had the benefit for the year ended July 1, 1921, of the full-time service of a trained investigator detailed to the court by the District of Columbia Chapter of the American Red Cross.

PHYSICIANS AND MENTAL SPECIALISTS.

The importance of the probation staff has been recognized from the time the first juvenile courts were organized, but the need of provision for study of the child's physical and mental condition was not realized for many years. The 1918 survey of children's courts in the United States showed that provision for physical examinations was more common than for mental. About one-third of the courts from which information was obtained in that survey reported provision for physical examinations, but only 7 per cent reported mental examinations in clinics organized for the purpose or by persons having some psychiatric or psychological knowledge.¹⁰

In 2 of the 10 courts included in the present study—those in New Orleans and the District of Columbia—no provision whatever was made for physical and mental examinations. In the District of Columbia a clinic had been operated for 14 months in connection with the court by the United States Public Health Service, but it had been discontinued just prior to the time of this study. In the Denver court no provision for paid service by physicians or psychiatrists had been made, but volunteer medical, psychiatric, and psychological service was given by physicians and psychiatrists and by the department of psychology of the University of Colorado. The St. Louis court utilized the services of a hygiene inspector from the school department, who came to the detention home to give physical examinations. For knowledge of the mental condition of the children the court was dependent upon volunteer psychiatrists.¹¹ In Buffalo a psychophysiological examiner from the school department came to the detention home every morning and made physical examinations and mental tests. The provisions for the study of the physical and mental condition of the children made by the courts of Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Seattle will be described in a later section of this report.¹²

CLERICAL STAFF.

In most of the courts the clerical staff was divided into that under the supervision of the clerk of the court and the clerks and stenographers of the probation office, responsible to the chief probation officer. In Boston the clerk of the court was appointed by the governor for a term of five years. The incumbent was a lawyer; the salary was \$3,000. In four courts which were independent of other court systems the clerk was appointed by the judge. In those juvenile courts which were branches of other court systems the clerk was a deputy of the county clerk (in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle) or


¹⁰ Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases, p. 63.

¹¹ After the time of the study a psychiatric clinic was established in St. Louis, operated for eight months by the division on the prevention of delinquency of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, as part of its activities under the Commonwealth Fund program for the prevention of delinquency. As a result of this demonstration a psychiatric clinic has been established by the city to serve mainly the juvenile court, the public schools, and those agencies that deal with the problem children in the city. For a report of the demonstration clinic see *The Psychiatric Clinic in the Treatment of Conduct Disorders of Children and the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency*, by V. V. Anderson, M. D. (The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, 1923.)

¹² See p. 94 ff.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR



Note
1-3 supplied by the University of California.

— Integral part of the Organization.
- - - Separate agency cooperating with Juv. Clor officer assigned from other Department
- - - - Cooperative relationship; assigned by county clerk who is ex officio clerk of the Superior Court.

a deputy of the clerk of the circuit or the district court. In Minneapolis the judge approved the appointment of the deputy so assigned.

In 9 of the 10 courts the clerk was paid a salary, but in St. Louis, contrary to generally accepted standards of juvenile-court organization, the fee system prevailed in the clerk's office. Fees were charged for issuing warrants and subpoenas and filing papers, as well as for serving papers, which came under the province of the sheriff's office. The costs were usually from \$2 to \$5 per case.

In the clerk's office there were usually assistants who helped with the records, and stenographers. Most of the courts had official court reporters, but where there were no regular court reporters, as in Boston, St. Louis, and Seattle, other members of the staff who were stenographers were called in occasionally to report particularly important cases. When the juvenile court was part of another court system, one court reporter was usually assigned to the judge for both juvenile and adult work. Deputy sheriffs and bailiffs were usually assigned to the juvenile court. The total number employed as court reporters, deputy clerks, and court attendants varied from one to seven, the usual number being from two to four.

The number of stenographers and clerks in the probation office was inadequate in most courts. Usually these employees received complaints, answered inquiries, and kept the records of the probation office. In two courts the clerical staff of the probation office numbered seven or eight, and in two others, three or four; in the remainder not more than one or two persons were available for these duties, and in one the probation staff had no separate clerical or stenographic service.¹³ In several courts considerable saving in the time of the probation staff and more complete and systematic records might have been effected if a larger clerical and stenographic force had been available.

STAFF OF DETENTION HOME.¹⁴

Six of the 10 courts had detention homes managed by or closely connected with the court. In Buffalo all the appointments to the staff of the detention home were made by the judge from civil-service lists. In Denver the superintendent and matron of the detention home were appointed by the mayor on the recommendation of the judge, and the teacher was appointed by the board of education on the recommendation of the judge. The superintendent of the St. Louis detention home was appointed by the judge without examination, and she appointed her subordinates with the approval of the judge. The judge in Seattle appointed the superintendent of the detention home who also served as his assistant and sometimes as probation officer in certain girls' cases; other members of the staff and the house physician were appointed by her.

In Los Angeles and San Francisco the control of the detention home rested with the probation committee, and the judge had nothing to do with its management. The chief probation officer in San

¹³ See charts, showing plans of court organization, pp. 20, 25, 26, 29, 32, and 35. The clerical staff of the San Francisco court has since been increased so that there is now (1924) a full-time stenographer in each department and an office attendant in the girls' department.

¹⁴ For a more complete discussion, see p. 72.

Francisco was the executive officer of the probation committee, and so the administration of the probation office and that of the detention home were closely coordinated. In Los Angeles the position of superintendent was under civil-service regulations. In both cities the superintendent had the power to appoint the other members of the staff; in Los Angeles such appointments were made from civil-service lists, and in both cities they were subject to the approval of the probation committee. In four detention homes the teachers were assigned and paid by the city school department.

OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE COURT.

In Minneapolis four¹⁵ and in Seattle five special members of the staff with the same status as probation officers devoted full time to aid-to-mothers cases. All four in Minneapolis were designated "investigators" and did the work both of investigation and of supervision. In Seattle the mothers' pension department was in charge of a commissioner who had under her supervision an investigator, two field supervisors, and a stenographer.

ADVISORY BOARDS.

In some States the juvenile court law provides for a local board or committee of citizens to advise and cooperate with the court. In connection with only two of the courts studied—those in Los Angeles and San Francisco—had such boards been organized.

The California law provided for the establishment of a probation committee of seven members appointed by the judge for terms of four years. The terms overlapped in such a way that the committee was a continuous body, and the members served without pay. The committee was required under the terms of the law to inquire into the qualifications and management of associations and societies other than State institutions receiving wards of the court and to manage the detention home. The development and functions of the probation committees of the two California courts studied were quite dissimilar.

In San Francisco the committee was appointed by the judge and consisted of five men and two women. The chief probation officer was the executive secretary, and thus a unified control of the probation office and the detention home was made possible. The committee nominated the probation officers, appointed or approved the appointments of members of the staff of the detention home, exercised close control over its management, and was active in securing legislation. The committee was divided into five subcommittees; namely, the house committee, the office committee, the committee on relations, the committee on institutions, and the committee on legislation. Aid was given by the probation committee in securing the approval of the board of supervisors for the budgets of the probation office and the detention home.

¹⁵ In 1924 the number was 6.

The Los Angeles probation committee, though technically appointed by the judge, was in reality appointed by the board of supervisors, and neither the court nor the probation office had any organic relation to it. As a result, the cooperation between the committee and the court had not always been so harmonious as it had been in San Francisco. The work of the Los Angeles committee was confined to the management of the detention home and El Retiro, a school for girls,¹⁶ and appointments of officers of these institutions were made or approved by the committee. Four members of the committee were women and three were men. The committee appointed the following subcommittees: Hours, building, entertainment, amusement, El Retiro, publicity, law and legislation, and emergency.

¹⁶ See pp. 146, 220.

PRELIMINARY STEPS IN COURT PROCEDURE.

The methods of apprehension of the child and of receiving and filing complaints and the care of the child during the interval between apprehension and the disposition of the case are matters the importance of which has not always been fully recognized. Inadequate or careless work in these preliminary processes may result in faulty selection of cases for formal court action and injury to the child through unfortunate contacts with other children or with adult offenders.

The need of detention facilities for children entirely separate from those for adults was recognized from the beginning of the juvenile-court movement. Many States have laws prohibiting the detention in jail of children under specified ages. Yet in 1918 it was found that children were being detained in jails in every State in the Union;¹ and in this study of 10 more or less highly organized courts in large cities, 1 court was found in which jail detention—in separate wards, to be sure—was almost the only method of detention used, and in most of the other courts children were at least occasionally detained in jail.²

Much less consideration has been given to the other aspects of the preliminary processes. The relation between the police and the court has sometimes occasioned considerable difficulty. One of the first problems a juvenile court must solve is winning the cooperation and understanding of the police department. The policeman usually has a sincere desire to "keep the kids out of mischief" and to "give them another chance," coupled with a natural resentment if the result of court proceedings is negative in cases which he believes demand decisive action. In working out plans of cooperation with the police the demarcation between the field of the police and the field of the court must be plainly indicated. The jurisdiction of the court should begin the moment the child is taken into custody. The facilities of the court for social investigation make it the logical agency to determine whether a case demands formal court action or whether it can be settled informally, and whether or not detention is required. This does not mean that the police should not exercise discretion with regard to the children whom they take into custody or report to the court and those whom they merely warn.³

¹ Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases, p. 49.

² For further discussion of jail detention, see p. 62.

³ For a discussion of the place where the responsibility of the police should end and that of the court should begin, see: Proceedings of the Conference on Juvenile-Court Standards, pp. 44-54 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 97, Washington, 1923); Juvenile-Court Standards: Report of the committee appointed by the Children's Bureau, August, 1921, to formulate juvenile-court standards, p. 2 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 121, Washington, 1923). The latter publication is reprinted on pp. 251-256 of this report.

CASES REFERRED BY INDIVIDUALS, SCHOOLS, AND SOCIAL AGENCIES, AND BY POLICE.

The proportion of delinquency cases coming to the juvenile court through parents, relatives, schools, and social agencies, as contrasted with the proportion coming through arrest by police officers, gives some indication of the success of the court in winning the confidence of the community. Although it would be extremely unfortunate for parents or schools to become dependent upon the court for help in minor problems of discipline which should be their own responsibility, nevertheless many cases of developing delinquency might well be referred to it for constructive action before the police have found it necessary to arrest the children or report them to the court.

For four courts information was available showing the number of delinquency cases referred to the court by the police and the number coming to the court's attention from other sources. (Table 5.) In Boston and St. Louis more than four-fifths of the delinquency cases were referred to the court by the police, in Buffalo less than half, and in Minneapolis only slightly over half came from this source. For Seattle and Los Angeles it was possible to secure similar information for delinquency and dependency cases combined but not for cases of delinquency alone. The Seattle figures included cases dealt with informally as well as those heard by the judge. Of 1,787 new cases in the Los Angeles court in 1919, petitions were filed by the police in 1,099, or 61 per cent; and by parents or guardians in 216, by school authorities in 21, and by others in 452.⁴ In Seattle, of the 1,345 cases of dependency and delinquency dealt with formally or informally in 1921, 718 (53 per cent) were referred by the police, 143 by parents, 179 by school authorities, and 305 by others.⁵

TABLE 5.—*Proportion of delinquency cases referred to the court by the police and by others in four juvenile courts.*

Court and period.	Delinquency cases before the courts in specified period.								
	Total.	Referred by police. ^a		Referred by others.				Source not re-ported.	
		Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Par-ents and guard-ians.	School au-thorities.		All others.
Boston juvenile court—year ended Aug. 31, 1920 ^b	952	799	83.9	150	15.7	(c)	(c)	(c)	3
Buffalo children's court—6 months, 1919 ^b	491	226	46.0	247	50.3	51		196	18
Minneapolis juvenile court—1919 ^d	906	477	52.6	429	47.3	82	90	257	
St. Louis juvenile court—1920 ^d	1,708	1,473	86.2	235	13.8	2	22	211	

^a Including in Buffalo special detectives employed by railroads.

^b Data compiled from court records.

^c Information not available.

^d Data secured from annual report of court.

^e New cases filed during year.

^f Figures refer to number of children, not to number of cases.

⁴ Annual Report of the Los Angeles County Probation Department for the Year Ending December 31, 1919, p. 4. In 1922, 952, or 50 per cent, of the 1,922 new cases were filed by the police; 308 by families; 118 by school authorities; and 544 by others.

⁵ The Seattle Juvenile-Court Report for the Year 1922, p. 12. In 1922 the total number of cases was 1,645, of which 927, or 56 per cent, were referred by the police; 142 by parents; 221 by school authorities; and 355 by others.

RECEPTION OF COMPLAINTS.

The receiving of complaints⁶ and the decision with reference to the action which should be taken are of great importance. It is at the complaint desk that the first contacts are made and the first impressions are received. This is true not only of personal interviews but also, to some extent at least, of telephone calls. Even though the complaints are referred to another officer for decision, it is important that the person first receiving them be courteous, intelligent, familiar with the function and methods of the court, and keen in judgment. Juvenile-court organization is frequently weak in this respect, and this deficiency may contribute, in some instances, to the court's failure to win the confidence of the community and its social agencies.

The amount of information obtained at the time the complaint was received was usually limited to names and addresses of those concerned, the child's age, the facts of the offense, and the names of witnesses and interested parties. In two courts information as to school attended, and in one, as to school grade, was also obtained, and in two other courts as much of the history of the case as could be secured from the informant.

Table 6 shows that in one court the judge passed upon complaints, in six courts the chief probation officer or department supervisor, and in three the clerk of the court or some other officer. The discretion exercised in the different courts by the persons passing upon complaints is also shown in Table 6. The terms "petition," "complaint," and "information" are terms used under different laws and forms of procedure to indicate the legal process which brings a case formally to the attention of the court.⁷

TABLE 6.—Persons receiving and passing upon complaints, and discretion exercised.

Court.	Officer receiving complaints.	Officer passing upon complaints.	Discretion exercised by officer passing upon complaints.
Boston juvenile court.	Clerk of court.....	Judge.....	Approval of complaint ^a or refusal to entertain, after preliminary examination of complainant.
Buffalo children's court.do.....	Clerk of court.....	Filing of information or refusal to file.
Denver juvenile court.	Complaint clerk..	Chief probation officer or probation officer for girls.	Decision as to whether case required investigation; decision as to whether case should be dismissed, dealt with informally, or dealt with formally on filing of a petition.
District of Columbia juvenile court.	Clerk or telephone operator in probation office.	Chief probation officer.	Decision as to whether case should be dealt with formally or informally, or whether no action should be taken.
Los Angeles juvenile court.	Complaint clerk..	Boys' or girls' supervisor. In doubtful cases, chief probation officer.	Assignment for investigation; decision as to whether or not petition should be filed.
Minneapolis juvenile court.	Consulting and court officer.	Consulting and court officer.	Decision as to whether petition should be filed or case should be dealt with informally.

^a Used here in its technical sense; approval of complaint means that court assumes jurisdiction.

⁶ The word "complaint" in connection with juvenile-court procedure is here used in the usual sense of a report of some difficulty that has arisen and an informal request for aid. In this sense it is comparable to the term "application" used by other types of agencies. In its technical sense it is a legal process used by some courts to initiate formal action, serving the purpose of the "petition" in a chancery proceeding.

⁷ In New Orleans the term "affidavit" signified the same thing.

TABLE 6.—Persons receiving and passing upon complaints, and discretion exercised—Continued.

Court.	Officer receiving complaints.	Officer passing upon complaints.	Discretion exercised by officer passing upon complaints.
New Orleans juvenile court.	Clerk of court, affidavit clerk, or chief probation officer.	Clerk of court, affidavit clerk, or chief probation officer.	Chief probation officer sometimes adjusted cases without formal court action.
San Francisco juvenile court.	Information clerk.	Boys' supervisor or office manager of girls' department. ^c	Assignment for investigation; in police complaints, ^b decision as to whether petition should be filed or case should be dealt with informally.
Seattle juvenile court.	-----do-----	Chief probation officer or (in girls' cases) superintendent of detention home.	Decision as to whether petition should be filed or case should be dealt with informally.
St. Louis juvenile court.	-----do-----	Chief probation officer and investigators.	Decision as to whether investigation should be made, parties should be called in for conference, or other action should be taken; assignment of cases for investigation. Investigators determined whether or not information should be filed.

^b Stenographer of boys' department made a note of the facts, sometimes taking as much of the history of the case as could be secured from the complainant; the complaint was then referred to the boys' supervisor. The office manager of the girls' department interviewed the complainant.

^c See p. 49.

RELATION BETWEEN POLICE AND JUVENILE COURT.⁸

Special juvenile bureaus had been created in the police departments of two of the cities studied—Los Angeles and Seattle—and in the District of Columbia the women's bureau of the police department was responsible for all work with women and girls and managed the detention home in which both boys and girls and also women, were cared for.

In Los Angeles work which should have been centralized in the juvenile court was performed by other agencies, and the resulting lack of cooperation and duplication of effort was unfortunate. The juvenile bureau of the police department, according to its annual report,⁹ dealt with minor children who had been placed under arrest by any officer of the department or against whom reports were received from parents or other citizens. It also dealt with reports and charges made against adults when children were the victims. The officers of the department inspected dance halls, skating rinks, cafés, penny arcades, picture shows, public parks, and other places frequented by children. The staff comprised 16 persons and was under the direction of a police lieutenant. One man and three women gave the greater part of their time to juvenile work. The offices of the bureau were in the central police station. It was reported for the year 1919-20 that 1,711 juveniles under the age of 16 years and 1,338 over 16 but under 21 years of age were dealt with. Reports of children arrested were made by the arresting officer to the juvenile bureau, and complaints were made direct to the bureau. It was reported that arrests were rendered unnecessary by the work of the bureau in more than half the cases coming to its attention. The regu-

⁸ For a description of the Chicago plan by which police officers are assigned to the juvenile court and work under the general supervision of the chief probation officer, see *The Chicago Juvenile Court* (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 104), pp. 32-33, 40-41.

⁹ Annual Report, Police Department, City of Los Angeles, California, for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1920, p. 31.

lar police officers made most of the investigations in boys' cases, but conferences with parents and children were frequently held at the office of the juvenile bureau by the member of the staff who specialized in work with boys. Investigations in girls' cases were made by women officers. Many cases were adjusted without court action, and children were often released on promise of good behavior.

Another bureau in the Los Angeles police department, known as the city mother bureau, was described in the annual report of the department as a "confidential office," sufficiently removed from police headquarters, to which parents and juveniles might go for advice and assistance without fear of publicity. Cases in which court action was required were turned over to the juvenile bureau. The city mother bureau dealt with delinquent and dependent children, run-aways, children "in danger," and domestic-relations cases.

In Seattle two divisions of the police department—the juvenile bureau and the women's protective bureau—the activities of which were closely coordinated, had charge of children's work, the juvenile bureau dealing with boys and the women's protective bureau with girls and women. All juvenile cases in which arrests had been made were reported to one or the other of these bureaus, which had the power to make investigations or to refer directly to the juvenile court, and to adjust cases informally. The two bureaus occupied adjoining rooms in the central police station.

It has already been noted¹⁰ that in Denver a police officer was assigned to the juvenile court on a full-time basis and that in New Orleans three police officers assigned to the juvenile court served as desk sergeants in cases coming before that court. The Denver officer received reports of children arrested and of children with whom the police had had difficulty, obtained information from the officer making the arrest or complaint, and reported to the police department the disposition of each case referred from that source. He also made arrests in some instances.

In the other five courts studied no special details had been made by the police for children's work,¹¹ but in four of these, special arrangements had been made by the court with the police department. The procedure in each of the cities covered by this study is described below.

Boston.

The best example of early control by the juvenile court over children arrested was found in the central district of Boston. The Massachusetts law required that a probation officer be notified whenever a child was arrested and that children held for examination or trial, or on appeal, if unable to furnish bail, should be committed to the State department of public welfare or to the care of a probation officer. Children arrested were taken on foot or in police automobiles—never in patrol wagons—to the precinct stations, where they were booked. At the station the captain might reprimand them and release them to their parents, no further action being taken; some of the police captains released children in this way, and some did not. If the child was not released a report was made

¹⁰ See p. 31.

¹¹ In Buffalo a police officer was assigned to the adult part of the juvenile court.

by telephone to police headquarters, and from there notice was given immediately to the probation officer on duty and to the parents.

The probation officer receiving the notice went to the precinct station, or if there seemed to be no doubt as to what should be done, gave directions by telephone. Each of the three men probation officers in turn served a month on night duty, being subject to call whenever an arrest was made. If the offense was trivial and the arrest was made during the day the child might be sent home with instructions to bring his parents to the station or with a note directing his parents to take the child to the juvenile court. Children under 14 years of age were not held in police stations except for violation of probation, save for the short time necessary to get in touch with the probation officer and parents. Children held were usually kept in the guardroom or signal room. The probation officer went to the precinct station if the child was under 14 and it was not clear that he could be released safely, or if he was over 14 and it was not plainly evident what the disposition should be. As a matter of fact, even in cases where it had been decided to release the child, the probation officer often went to the station to talk with him and frequently accompanied him to his home to check up the address and make a preliminary investigation. If there was doubt as to whether or not the child should be released a thorough investigation was made. The police officer had the right to make a written request that a child over 14 be held, and this could not be overruled by the probation officer. This right, however, was seldom exercised, as the probation officers had made it a practice to give consideration to the police officer's point of view.¹² Detention in police stations could not continue for more than 24 hours.

Children who could not be released to their parents and who were not held in the precinct station were taken by the probation officer to one of the boarding homes maintained jointly by the court and the Boston Children's Aid Society. The plan was that in the case of a girl arrested in the evening or at night the probation officer should notify one of the women maintaining boarding homes for the court and send a taxicab to take her to the police station to get the girl. During the day a man officer might take a girl to a boarding home, but the woman probation officer usually did this. If a child was arrested before 2.30 p. m. he was usually taken direct from the precinct station to the court, where the complaint was made, and if one of the parents was present and accepted service of summons the case was usually heard forthwith. If the arrest was later in the day the child was brought to the court the following morning. After the complaint had been approved the judge could make an order as to the custody of the child, pending further disposition of the case. Neglected children were cared for in the shelter maintained by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Taking the children to the precinct stations was an unfortunate feature of the plan, even though the probation officers had discretion in the matter of release or detention. If the children could have been brought directly to the court during the day and to a designated boarding home in the center of the city at night they would have been more completely protected.

¹² For number of children held in police stations overnight, see p. 63.

New Orleans.

The New Orleans court furnished an example of the early control of the court over the child through what was in effect a children's precinct station established in the offices of the juvenile court. Children arrested during the day were brought by the police to the juvenile court by street car, police automobile, or on foot. The judge was authorized to use money collected through fines to reimburse the police for car fares paid for children. Official cases were entered in the desk book kept by a police officer assigned to the court. Children were never taken to a police station, and no information concerning them was entered on police books except those at the juvenile court. However, the police officer making the arrest wrote a letter to the chief of police, stating the facts of the arrest and the disposition of the case. A copy of this letter was sent to the juvenile court.

Children brought to the courthouse were released to their parents if the offense was a minor one and the parents appeared to be responsible. An appearance bond of \$100 to \$200 was usually required if the child had previously been before the court. Boys not released to their parents were taken by the police to a city institution for delinquent boys for detention pending hearing. Girls were detained at the House of the Good Shepherd, white girls being taken to this institution by the woman probation officer and negro girls by the police or by men officers of the court. They were transported by street car or automobile.

Boys arrested at night were taken directly to their homes and were ordered to appear at the offices of the court the next morning, or else they were taken to the city institution for delinquent boys. Negro girls arrested at night were taken immediately to the House of the Good Shepherd; but white girls were taken to the juvenile court, the woman probation officer being notified to come and take them to the institution used for detention. Children taken to places of detention during the night were brought to the courthouse the following morning, and the same procedure was followed as if they had just been arrested and brought in.

Minneapolis.

The Minneapolis juvenile court assumed no responsibility for the care of a child arrested until the case was presented to the "consulting and court officer" with a view to filing a petition. At that point the case might be adjusted informally or a petition might be filed, at the discretion of the judge or chief probation officer. Children arrested outside the district in which they lived were usually taken direct to the city jail, which was located in the courthouse. If an arrest was made in the district where a child lived he was taken to the district police station. The captain had no power to release the child at this point but conferred with the officer making the arrest and advised whether or not the child should be held in the city jail. From the police station the child was brought in a patrol wagon to the city jail. Here he was booked in a jailer's book and was then turned over to the police matron, who made every effort to have him released as soon as possible.

Prisoners could be held in the city jail 36 hours before a charge was made and might be held another 36 hours pending investigation. It was in the discretion of the arresting officer whether or not the child should be held. Parents were immediately notified by telephone or through the precinct station and were told whether or not they could come for the child. Pending the arrival of the parents the children waited in the police matron's quarters. It was against the law to detain children under 14 years in police stations or in jail, but occasionally it was deemed necessary to hold such children, especially runaways or lost children. A considerable number of boys 14 years of age and over, and some girls, were held over night or longer.¹³ The police matron kept a separate file of information, not open to the public, concerning children detained and the dispositions in such cases. After the police officer had taken the child to the police matron he reported the case to the consulting and court officer of the juvenile court. Neglected children were turned over immediately to the Children's Protective Society for care. Children in the county outside the city were occasionally detained in the county jail,¹⁴ as were children awaiting transfer to county schools or other institutions after court hearing.

District of Columbia.

In the District of Columbia the detention home was under the management of the women's bureau of the police department. The juvenile court had no control over children arrested until after the complaint had been made. An arrangement with the police had been effected, however, by which arrests were always reported to the probation office on the same day or the morning following, except in cases where the children were held for investigation. In addition, each day a list of the children in the house of detention was telephoned to the probation office. The chief probation officer might request the release of a child from the house of detention after complaint had been made, and the officers making arrests advised the parents to communicate with the juvenile court.

Children arrested were first taken to the precinct station, sometimes on foot and sometimes in a patrol wagon. There they might be reprimanded by the police captain and released, no record of the case being made. If it was decided that further action was required, children were released to their parents on deposit of collateral (from \$1 to \$20) and complaint made to the juvenile court, or they were taken to the house of detention for women and children in a closed car furnished and operated by that institution. There they might be held for investigation for a period and then released, no further action being taken; or they might be released to their parents and complaint made to the juvenile court; or they might be held in the house of detention and complaint made, after which the chief probation officer might request release; or if already on probation, they might be held for the court, no complaint being made. Children arrested were booked at both the precinct station and the house of detention.

¹³ Sometimes the judge held special hearings for children who had to be detained and committed them temporarily to the county school for boys or the county school for girls. The school for boys was 13 or 14 miles from Minneapolis, and the school for girls was in the outskirts of the city.

¹⁴ For number of children held in the city and county jails, see p. 64-65.

Los Angeles.

Children arrested in Los Angeles were taken either to a district police station or to the central station, which served a large part of the city. In the more serious cases outside the central district and in all cases within that district the child was brought to the central station. All arrests were booked at the police stations by the desk sergeants. From the police station children might be released to their parents, taken to the detention home, or detained in the central police station, where there were separate cells for juveniles. Occasionally children were detained in one of the district police stations which had cells where juveniles might be held, and girls were sometimes taken to a home maintained by a private agency. Children under 16 years of age were not supposed to be detained in the police station or in jail. Whatever disposition was made, the case was reported to the juvenile bureau of the police department, but the arresting officer had full discretion in the first instance in matters of detention. Children were not taken to the place of detention in patrol wagons, and girls arrested during the day were accompanied by policewomen.¹⁵ Parents were notified of arrests through the desk sergeant of the police station.

The juvenile bureau of the police department made more or less thorough investigations in juvenile cases and adjusted many cases without court action. The police had the right to detain children in the house of detention for 72 hours without filing petitions, and many children were released by the police without court action having been taken.

Contrary to generally approved practice in juvenile-court work, those cases in which the juvenile bureau deemed court action necessary were reported by that bureau not to the juvenile court but to the office of the district attorney. A deputy district attorney was in charge of juvenile, nonsupport, and contributing-to-delinquency cases. Three investigators, one man and two women, made investigations in children's cases. In boys' cases petitions were usually filed on the report of the police department, but sometimes conferences with parents and children were held and boys were placed on informal probation. In the majority of girls' cases special investigations were made, informal hearings were held, and often girls were placed on informal probation. If court action was necessary, a petition was filed in the juvenile court. A card record of each case reported to the district attorney's office was made out in triplicate, one copy being sent to the probation office, where it was immediately cleared with the index of juvenile cases. If the child had been before the court previously the fact was reported to the district attorney's office, and a petition was filed at once.

After the petition had been filed the juvenile court had complete jurisdiction over the case. If detention was necessary a detaining order signed by the judge was required, and release from detention so ordered could be made only at the direction of the judge or the referee.

¹⁵ Women assigned to the juvenile bureau of the police department are now (1924) on duty at night, and a woman always accompanies a girl under arrest at any hour.

Seattle.

In Seattle, as in Los Angeles, the police through the juvenile division and the women's protective bureau exercised considerable authority over children arrested. They were taken either to the precinct station or direct to the juvenile division (for boys) or the women's protective bureau (for girls), these bureaus being located in the central station. From the precinct station they were released to their parents or sent to the juvenile division or women's protective bureau; if the arrest was between 4 a. m. and 8 a. m.—hours during which the juvenile division and women's protective bureau were not open—they might be taken directly to the detention home of the juvenile court. Every case in which the child was not brought to the appropriate police division was reported to it and either investigated or referred at once to the juvenile court. In serious cases involving boys the latter procedure was usually followed. The police investigation included a visit to the neighborhood and home and frequently a conference at the office with parents, child, and complainant. Following this investigation the case might be adjusted in any one of a number of ways, including restitution or reparation and reference to social agencies. If not thus settled, it was referred to the juvenile court. Children were sometimes detained a few hours, pending investigation, in a separate ward of the central police station. In all cases in which the child was detained in the detention home at the request of the police the superintendent of the detention home was consulted with reference to release. The superintendent had the power of release but always consulted the chief probation officer or notified him.

Denver.

Whenever possible the police in Denver avoided making arrests in children's cases; instead they took the name and address of a child giving trouble and reported him to the special police officer assigned to the juvenile court. That officer then secured information about the case, consulted with the probation officer of the district in which the child lived, perhaps interviewed the child and his parents, and then, if the case warranted further action, referred it to the chief probation officer.

Children arrested might be taken direct to the detention home (which was under the management of the court), to the police matron's quarters in the city jail, or to the precinct station. From the precinct station the children might be released with reprimand by the captain, no further action being taken, or they might be released to the parents and reported to the juvenile court. Children were never booked in the precinct station, but children taken to the police matron's quarters or the detention home were entered as delinquents on the police blotter at the central station. At the police matron's quarters children might be released with warning by the chief of police; sent home and reported to the juvenile court; sent in a patrol wagon to the detention home; or, if over 14 years of age, held in the matron's quarters. The superintendent of the detention home had power to release children to their parents, but this was usually done only after consultation with the captain of the precinct, the special police officer assigned to the court, or some other officer of the court.

San Francisco.

An arrangement between the probation office and the police department in San Francisco, which had been in effect for several years, made it possible for the court to adjust informally many cases initiated by the police. Children arrested were taken to a sub-station, where the captain and arresting officer conferred. They frequently sent the child home with a notice to his parents requesting them to bring the child to the probation office at a certain hour and day—usually three days later—and show cause why a petition should not be filed. A written statement was then prepared, signed by the captain and arresting officer, and forwarded to the central police station and thence to the juvenile court. This statement gave the facts of the offense and the date specified in the notice. The case was then settled informally in the probation office or assigned for investigation, which was followed by informal adjustment or the filing of a petition. In cases not considered sufficiently serious to require reference to the juvenile court, the child was released, with reprimand, by the police captain. If more than notice to the parents seemed to be required the child was taken to the juvenile detention home in a patrol wagon; it was thought that this method of transportation afforded the child greater protection than sending him by street car, accompanied by an officer. Children taken to the detention home were booked by the police and also by the superintendent of the home. Police reports in such cases were made out in the same way as in cases in which the children were sent home with notices to appear at the probation office.

As soon as a child was received in the detention home notice was given to the proper department, and the investigation was begun within 24 hours unless a holiday intervened. The chief probation officer had authority to release children from the detention home and had delegated this power to the department heads, so that in any particular case the decision as to release or detention pending investigation rested with the department of the court which handled the case.

St. Louis.

Children arrested were taken to the district police stations in St. Louis, where they were held in the matron's room or captain's office until the parents had been notified. They might be reprimanded and released, "pledged" to their parents for appearance in court,¹⁶ or taken by street car, automobile, or on foot to the juvenile detention home. The child might be released from the detention home by the superintendent, who usually consulted with the officer making the investigation. One of the special investigators on the probation staff also had the power of release.

Buffalo.

The Buffalo court encouraged the police, except in serious cases, to take children violating laws or ordinances direct to their homes, with instructions to appear in court when notified, and this practice was followed in a great many instances. Often, however, the child was first taken to the precinct station and was then released to his

¹⁶ A pledge was a written promise guaranteeing that the parents would bring the child to court when wanted.

parents, pending hearing, or was sent to the detention home. The latter procedure was followed if the offense was serious or if the child was a runaway or ungovernable, or if he was arrested at night, or if his parents were not at home. In the majority of cases children were not released from the detention home except on bail, though occasionally, especially if they were young children, they were released on the parents' recognizance.

The police officer apprehending a child made a deposition at the precinct station, giving the child's name, age, address, date of arrest, charge, and disposition pending hearing. These reports were all sent to one precinct, designated for the purpose, at which a probation officer called every morning. The reports made it unnecessary for the police to appear in court as witnesses, except in unusual cases.

INVESTIGATION PRIOR TO FILING OF PETITION OR COMPLAINT.

In the San Francisco court an investigation was made in all cases prior to filing a petition, though in dependency cases these investigations were usually made by private agencies. In the Los Angeles and Denver courts investigations, including visits to homes, were made in a considerable proportion of cases, and in St. Louis they were made in all cases brought in by the police—except those involving violations of city ordinances—and in neglect cases. Preliminary investigations were made by the New Orleans court only if there seemed to be some possibility of adjustment without court action. Partial investigations were made in Boston in some cases in connection with the visits of the probation officers to the police stations on receipt of reports concerning children arrested. In Minneapolis and Seattle home visits were not made, but comprehensive interviews with parents, children, and others involved were held in the office. No preliminary investigations were made by the Buffalo or the District of Columbia court.

LEGAL PROCESSES PRIOR TO HEARING.

In courts with chancery procedure the child was usually brought formally to the attention of the court through a petition that might be filed by any person having knowledge of the circumstances. Such a petition alleged that "_____, a child under _____ years of age, is a delinquent (or a dependent or a neglected) child, in that _____ [here follow the circumstances of the case]." The names and addresses of the parents or guardian were then given. In California the petitioner represented that the child named is "a person under the age of 21 years * * * and is a person defined in subdivision _____ of Section I, within the meaning of the * * * juvenile court law." The circumstances which brought the child under the law were then specified.

The procedure in the Seattle court was interesting in that no printed form of petition was used. Each petition was dictated, a typical petition reading in part as follows:

In re the welfare of _____. Petition unto your honor that _____, who was born on or about _____, is a dependent child in this that his parents, _____, with whom he resides at _____, Seattle, fail to provide him with adequate guardianship and social control, and he is in need of care and protection by the court.

Therefore your petitioner prays your honor to inquire into the conditions of _____, and to enter such an order in the premises as shall be for his welfare.

It will be noted that the Seattle petition alleged dependency although it was often used in delinquency cases. The line of demarcation between dependency and delinquency proceedings was not closely drawn in Seattle, and the court preferred to use the term dependency whenever possible. This did not imply, however, that distinction was not made between dependent and delinquent children in the type of treatment given.

In Boston the legal process used to bring the child to the court's attention was termed a "complaint," and in New Orleans an "affidavit." The process used in delinquency cases in Buffalo, in the District of Columbia, and in St. Louis was an "information." In the last two courts "petitions" were used for neglected children, and in the District of Columbia they were also used for incorrigible and dependent children.

The laws usually provided that petitions might be filed by "any reputable person" and often contained specific authorization for probation officers to file them. The policy in one or two courts, however, was not to have petitions filed by probation officers, as it was believed that such action might be confused with prosecution in criminal cases and might therefore hamper the work of the probation officers. In Los Angeles, for instance, it was a general rule that probation officers should not file petitions except for violation of probation. In some of the courts, on the other hand, petitions were usually filed by probation officers. Effort was made in San Francisco to have the parents file the petition whenever possible.

All juvenile court laws provide for some form of notice to the parents or other persons having custody of the child. It is frequently required that this notice must be served a certain number of hours (24 or 48) in advance of the hearing. When, however, parents and child are in court and ready for the hearing before the time has expired an earlier hearing may be desirable. Many courts, therefore, permit parents who come to the court as a result of informal notification by telephone or otherwise to sign a waiver of notice or, as it is sometimes called, an acceptance of service.

DETENTION.

PRINCIPLES GOVERNING DETENTION IN CHILDREN'S CASES.¹

The fundamental principles governing the type and use of detention facilities for children are the same in all communities, though many variations in policy occur, necessitated by differing conditions and needs. These principles may be summarized as follows:

1. Children should not be detained in jails or police stations.
2. The primary purpose of detention is safe-keeping, pending disposition of the case, and both for the child's sake and for the sake of the community which bears the expense of detention it should be limited to those children for whom it is absolutely necessary. Such children include: Runaways and homeless children; those whose home conditions are so bad that immediate removal is necessary; those beyond the control of their parents; those whose parents can not be relied upon to produce them in court; those who have committed offenses so serious that their release pending the disposition of their cases would endanger public safety; those who must be held as witnesses.


Detention for the purpose of observation is thought by some to be justified in cases in which detention for the purpose of safe-keeping would not be warranted. Detention for observation can accomplish no worth-while results, however, unless adequate clinical facilities for physical and mental examination and opportunity for social investigation are available, and unless the attendants are able to make observations of value. Information based upon unskilled observation of a child's reactions to unfamiliar surroundings is not of sufficient value to justify detention. Even when clinics for physical and mental study of the children are maintained in connection with a detention home, it has been found satisfactory to have children not needing detention for the purpose of safe-keeping come from their own homes by appointment. Some of the leading authorities in the study of delinquent children believe that observation is not facilitated but rather is handicapped by detention in a detention home.

3. In order to avoid unnecessary detention and to determine in what cases detention is necessary, means must be provided for ascertaining promptly the home conditions and the possibilities of care by the parents. This does not imply that a complete investigation, such as that required for disposition of the case, can be made when the question of detention is being decided. But the person who is given discretion in the matter of detention should be a person of good judgment and should have sufficient time to give careful consideration to each case, including, if possible, a brief interview with both the child and the parents.²

4. The length of stay in the place of detention should be as short as possible. Frequent court hearings, prompt investigation of cases,


¹ See *Juvenile-Court Standards*, p. 252.

² See preliminary steps in court procedure, p. 39, and particularly the procedure in Boston, p. 43.



First-floor plan, King County [Seattle] juvenile court and detention home.

and care taken by those in charge of the detention facilities to reduce the length of stay to a minimum lessen the duration of detention.



Second-floor plan, King County [Seattle] juvenile court and detention home.

5. While in detention, the physical and moral welfare of the children must be safeguarded and their time occupied with constructive interests.

6. Neglected and dependent children should be separated from delinquent children.

METHODS OF DETENTION IN THE COURTS STUDIED.

The problem of detention of children is usually met in the larger cities by the provision of a detention home under the management of the juvenile court or closely connected with it. The plan of boarding children in private families has been followed by many of the smaller courts and has been worked out successfully in the central district of Boston, but in most communities in which the volume of court work with children is large enough to warrant it the establishment of a detention home is probably the most feasible arrangement.

In 6 of the 10 cities—Buffalo, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, and St. Louis—a special detention home for children was maintained.⁴ The District of Columbia had no separate detention home for children, but a house of detention for women and children was under the management of the women's bureau of the police department. The New Orleans court utilized in boys' cases a city institution for delinquent boys which received children pending court hearing and also for more prolonged care after court commitment. The Minneapolis court was more handicapped in the matter of detention than any of the other courts included in the study. Except for a county institution for delinquent boys, at some distance from the city and a similar institution for delinquent girls located in the outskirts—institutions which it was seldom possible to use for detention pending hearing—no detention facilities aside from the jail were available.⁵

A private sectarian institution was utilized in New Orleans for the care of delinquent girls, and orphanages were occasionally asked to provide temporary care for young dependent children. In Boston the shelter maintained by a protective agency was utilized for the detention of neglected children and sometimes of girls held as witnesses. Family homes supervised by a private child-caring agency rendered detention service to the court in cases of delinquent children. In Los Angeles a small private institution was occasionally used by the police for detention of girls pending investigation and the filing of a petition.^{5a} In Denver, St. Louis, and the District of Columbia dependent children were sometimes cared for temporarily in boarding homes—in the last two cities under the supervision of a public child-caring agency, the Board of Children's Guardians, and in Denver under the child-welfare department of the community chest. In San Francisco private institutions were used for children whom it did not seem wise to continue in the detention home.

Detention of children in police stations or in jails was reported in eight cities—in some as a rare occurrence and in others as a comparatively common practice. In two—Buffalo and the District of Columbia—children were not detained in jail.⁶ However, in the District of Columbia girls of juvenile-court age and women were cared for in the same detention home and were not separated. In Buffalo the age under which the court had jurisdiction was 16 and in the District of Columbia, in delinquency cases, 17.

⁴ For a discussion of equipment and management, see p. 67.

⁵ See pp. 63-65.

^{5a} The use of this institution has since been abandoned except in certain emergencies, such as quarantine.

⁶ For a discussion of the extent of detention in police stations and jails, see p. 62.

EXTENT TO WHICH DETENTION FACILITIES WERE USED.

In the cities studied which had special detention homes for children these institutions varied from that in Buffalo, which was utilized mainly for the detention of children held for the juvenile court on delinquency charges, to that in Los Angeles, which was a complex institution performing services of many kinds. In Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and St. Louis, homeless and lost children, as well as delinquent and neglected children, were cared for in the detention home. The school department in Denver had authority to send troublesome children to the detention-home school as day pupils, and probation officers might send their charges there for short periods for discipline, without a special order from the court. The school authorities in Los Angeles and Seattle had power to place wayward or truant children in the detention home for short periods.


All six detention homes cared for children during continuance of their cases, and the purpose of the continuance was in some instances to provide a short period of discipline. In all the homes care had to be provided for children committed to institutions who were awaiting admission; in Los Angeles such care sometimes extended over a period of many weeks. The Los Angeles and San Francisco detention homes had special sections devoted to the care of venereally diseased girls, who received medical treatment until they could return safely to the community. In these cities, as is usually the case, much less emphasis was given to the venereal-disease problem among boys. In San Francisco boys were not isolated on admission, nor were they examined for gonorrhoea; if an infectious condition was discovered through the general physical examination, they were given treatment in the detention home. In Los Angeles boys as well as girls were isolated on admission, but routine examinations of boys for gonorrhoea were not made; if the disease was suspected the boy was sent to the county hospital for examination.⁷

The detention home for children and women in the District of Columbia was caring for delinquent boys under 17; for delinquent girls and women of any age; for homeless, lost, and runaway children; for children and women held for investigation by the police; and occasionally for delinquent and dependent wards of the District of Columbia Board of Children's Guardians.

The court or the officers of the detention home who were subject to the authority of the court exercised control over children detained (that is, had discretion with reference to release) in five of the cities studied—Boston, Buffalo, Denver, New Orleans, and St. Louis. In Boston this control was vested in the probation officers; in Buffalo and Denver, in the superintendent of the detention home; in St. Louis, in the superintendent of the detention home, the chief probation officer, and the investigators; and in New Orleans, in the chief probation officer and the clerks.

In Minneapolis and Los Angeles the court had no control over detention until a petition was filed, the police officers having full power of release or detention in cases originating with them. The police in San Francisco and Seattle had the power of release prior to the filing of a petition; but in San Francisco the department super-

⁷ See p. 95.



JUVENILE COURT AND DETENTION HOME, SEATTLE, WASH.



CHILDREN'S BUILDING (JUVENILE COURT AND DETENTION HOME),
ST. LOUIS, MO.



JUVENILE HALL (DETENTION HOME), LOS ANGELES, CALIF.



JUVENILE COURT AND DETENTION HOME, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

visors of the probation office also had the power of release and were notified as to all children received, and in Seattle the chief probation officer and the superintendent of the detention home had this power. One of the duties of the Seattle chief probation officer was to go through the detention home each day to see that no children were detained who could be provided for otherwise. The police in the District of Columbia had the power of release prior to the filing of the complaint and the chief probation officer after complaint had been filed.

Experience shows that the larger the place of detention the harder it is to limit its use to children for whom it is really needed. When accommodations permit, it is a temptation to the police and to overworked officers of the court to order the children detained rather than promptly to secure the information and make the adjustments required for care of some other type. Thus one relatively large detention home was constantly overcrowded to such an extent that there was talk of building an addition. The frequency of hearings is also a very important factor in the period of detention. In courts having hearings only once or twice a week it is much more difficult to avoid detaining children than in courts holding more frequent hearings.

For three of the courts studied—those of Boston, Buffalo, and New Orleans—data were secured showing what proportion of the children coming before the court had been detained.

In New Orleans, of 1,205 delinquency cases before the juvenile court in the year 1919, in which disposition pending hearing was known,⁸ 751 (62 per cent) were cases in which the child was cared for in the city institution for delinquent boys, a private institution for delinquent girls, or some other institution; and in 52 cases the child was released on bond. Of the total number of cases before the court (1,289, including cases of improper guardianship but excluding cases heard and disposed of on the day the charge was made and those in which no report as to disposition pending trial was obtained⁹) 811 (63 per cent) were cases in which the child was cared for in an institution pending hearing. A higher percentage of colored children than of white were detained—65 as compared with 42.

The Boston juvenile court dealt with 952 cases of delinquency during the year ended August 31, 1920. In 28 of these cases the children were brought to court for immediate hearing, and no question of detention was involved. In 48 cases the method of care pending hearing or continuance was not reported. Of the remaining 876 cases, 74 (8 per cent) were cared for in a children's aid society boarding home.¹⁰ The child was reported to have been held in a police station in 37 cases (4 per cent),¹¹ and in 9 cases (1 per cent) was committed temporarily to the county jail.¹² In 8 cases the child was committed temporarily to the Massachusetts Department of

⁸ In 132 cases the disposition of the child pending hearing was not reported, and 52 cases not included in the above were heard and disposed of on the day the charge was made.

⁹ Seventy-seven cases were heard and disposed of the day the charge was made, and for 158 disposition was not reported.

¹⁰ Including 2 cases in which the child was later committed temporarily to the department of public welfare in default of bail.

¹¹ Excluding 2 cases in which the child was later sent to jail.

¹² Excluding 1 case in which the child was in jail two days and was later sent to a children's aid society home and 2 cases in which the child defaulted during probation and was committed temporarily to jail.

Public Welfare.¹³ Temporary care was given in 2 cases by a small private institution for girls, and 2 girls were cared for, pending hearing, by the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. The child was released in 63 cases to a probation officer who was responsible for his appearance in court but who allowed him to remain at home, and in 29 cases the child was released on bail. In the remaining 652 cases it was reported that the child either had never been arrested or committed for temporary care or had been released promptly after arrest to his parents or to some other individual.

The total number of delinquency cases in Boston in which detention care was deemed necessary was 132 (15 per cent). Of the 85 girls whose care pending hearing was reported and whose cases were not disposed of immediately, 30 girls (35 per cent) were detained as compared with 102 (13 per cent) of the 791 boys. None of the girls was reported to have been held in a police station or in jail. The neglected children requiring detention care were provided for in the shelter maintained by the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

In Buffalo the only available figures were those in the published report of the court, which showed the number of children detained in the detention home during the year 1920 and the charges on which they were detained. The Buffalo detention home cared for so few children who were not brought before the court that a comparison of the population with the total number of children's cases gives an approximately correct proportion of cases in which detention was deemed to be necessary. There were 1,143 cases of delinquency in 1920, and 417 delinquent children were held in the detention home, indicating that the children were detained in about 36 per cent of the cases. About three-fourths of the girls, as compared with one-third of the boys, were held in the detention home.¹⁴

In the absence of information as to the other courts similar to that obtained for the courts of Boston, Buffalo, and New Orleans, it is of interest to compare (Table 7) the total number of children before each court in a given period with the average daily population of the detention home, and the total number of cases of all types cared for.¹⁵ In Minneapolis there was no detention home, and the information given relates to the city and county jails. The figures for Boston relate to the boarding homes, police stations, and jail.

¹³ Not including children committed to the department after adjudication or during continuance in default of bail but including 3 cases in which the child was first released to the parents or the probation officer and later committed temporarily to the department of public welfare.

¹⁴ Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1920, pp. 19, 26. The number of cases of delinquent boys was 1,041 and of delinquent girls, 102. Of the 461 children cared for in the detention home 417—340 boys and 77 girls—were held on delinquency charges. Since 1920 the detention home has been moved into new quarters, and the policy has been adopted of detaining all children presenting special problems for several days, in order that thorough study may be made.

¹⁵ The figures for cases cared for do not represent the number of children detained, since the same child might have been received in the detention home several times during the year.

TABLE 7.—Number of children's cases, average daily population of detention homes, and number of detention cases during year, and other places of detention used.

Court and period.	Number of children's cases during year. ¹		Detention home.		Other place of detention.	
	Delinquency.	Depend-ency and neglect.	Average daily popula-tion.	Num-ber of chil-dren detained during year. ²	Type.	Number of detention cases during year.
Boston juvenile court—year ended Aug. 31, 1920. ³	952	63	(*)	-----	Children's aid society boarding homes. Police stations----- County jail----- Department of public welfare. S. P. C. C. shelter----- Other-----	121, including children detained for short periods while on probation. 39, including 2 also held in county jail. 12. 8 (delinquent children). 2 (neglected children). 2.
Buffalo children's court—1920. ⁴	1,143	33	⁵ 5	⁵ 461	None.	
Denver juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920. ⁶	2,057	301	⁷ 10	⁷ 700	Matron's quarters, city jail. Boarding homes---	2 or 3 children a week. Occasionally used for dependent children.
District of Columbia juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920. ⁶	1,641	359	⁸ 25	⁹ 1,800	Board of Children's Guardians.	Dependent and delinquent children occasionally committed temporarily, pending disposition of their cases.
Los Angeles juvenile court—1919. ¹⁰	1,314	¹¹ 473	¹² 129	¹² 2,179	Private institution. Police station; jail.	Occasionally used for girls. Older boys frequently detained in jail.
Minneapolis juvenile court—1919. ⁶	1,000	549	(*)	-----	Matron's quarters, city jail. County jail----- County home schools.	795 children. ¹³ 149 children 12 to 16 years of age; many of them did not remain over night. ¹³ Occasionally used for detention care.
New Orleans juvenile court—1919. ³	1,549	154	(*)	-----	City school for boys. House of the Good Shepherd. Other institutions.	655. 100. 35.
San Francisco juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920. ¹⁴	¹⁵ 795	1,030	46	1,942	Jail----- Children's institu-tions.	Older boys occasionally detained in jail. Used when it does not seem wise to continue children in detention home.
Seattle juvenile court—1920. ¹⁶	986	445	¹⁷ 27	1,482	Jail-----	Older boys occasionally detained in jail.
St. Louis juvenile court—1920. ⁶	1,708	356	¹⁸ 61	¹⁹ 2,386	Board of Children's Guardians. Jail-----	Dependent children occasionally committed temporarily. ²⁰ Older boys occasionally detained in jail.

¹ Including only cases dealt with formally through court hearing, except that in Denver and Seattle both formal and informal cases are included.

² One child may have been cared for several times during the year; hence the figures do not represent the number of different children detained.

³ Data compiled from court records.

⁴ Ninth Annual Report, Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1920.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 26. Average based on total number of days children were detained—i. e., 2,537. Of the 461 children detained, 417 were held on delinquency charges. In 1923, 601 children were detained, and the average daily population was somewhat higher.

(Footnotes continued on p. 60.)

The extent to which some of the detention homes cared for children not coming to the attention of the court is indicated by the fact that in three cities—Los Angeles, San Francisco, and St. Louis—the number of detention cases was greater than the number of official children's cases,¹⁶ and in a fourth, Seattle, the number detained was nearly as great as the number of official children's cases. In Minneapolis the number of children held in the city jail was more than half as large as the number of children's cases in the juvenile court. A considerable proportion of those held in Minneapolis, as in other cities, were released by the police without being reported to the court, and many of those held in the city jail were detained for a few hours only. In New Orleans over half the delinquent children before the court were detained.

In Buffalo, where the detention home was used almost exclusively for court children, the ratio between children detained and court cases of delinquency was about 2 to 5, and in Boston the ratio for delinquent children was less than 1 to 5. All of the 184 children detained in Boston had come to the attention of the court, but 47 of them were cared for during continuances or while on probation.

That the proportion of children before the Boston juvenile court who were detained is small is due partly to the plan of notifying a probation officer whenever a child was arrested and inquiry by the officer into the circumstances of the case.¹⁷ The natural tendency of the boarding-home plan, moreover, is to keep detention at a minimum, and the frequency of hearings in Boston (six days a week) led to a more prompt disposition of the case and hence reduced the number of cases in which detention was required.

Because of the different purposes for which the detention homes were used, they varied greatly with respect to the length of time the children were detained. For four of the seven detention homes included in the study information was obtained with reference to the number of days each child cared for during a given period remained in the home, and for two others the average length of detention was ascertained. The length of time the children were cared for in boarding homes in Boston was also learned.

The average duration of detention care in each of six detention homes and in the Boston boarding homes is shown in Table 8.

¹⁶ See p. 59.

¹⁷ See pp. 43-44.

(Continued from p. 59.)

⁶ Data obtained from reports published or unpublished.

⁷ Approximate.

⁸ Approximate average for April, 1921.

⁹ Year ended June 30, 1923. Frequently a child was entered more than once—for example, a child held for court and returned to the detention home by the court during continuance of his case was counted twice. Hence the figure includes many duplicates.

¹⁰ From annual report.

¹¹ Dependency cases include 21 insane or feeble-minded children.

¹² The Los Angeles detention home was used by the police in a large number of cases which were not brought to the attention of the court.

¹³ Figures furnished by police matron and sheriff. A total of 172 children detained in the city jail (124 boys and 48 girls) were reported as prisoners charged with offenses. See p. 64.

¹⁴ Data derived from manuscript report or compiled from monthly reports of detention home.

¹⁵ In addition to the 795 formal cases, 610 were adjusted informally, and in 7 of these cases the child was held temporarily in the detention home.

¹⁶ The Seattle Juvenile-Court Report for the Years 1920-1921.

¹⁷ Derived from monthly reports; average for 11 months, 1920.

¹⁸ Derived from monthly reports from September, 1919, to May, 1920, inclusive. The average daily population is now higher.

¹⁹ Represents number of children received during the year.

²⁰ In 1924 the Board of Children's Guardians was providing temporary boarding care for dependent children.

* No detention home.

TABLE 8.—Average number of days of detention in six detention homes and in Boston boarding homes.

Detention home and period.	Total number of children detained.	Average number of days of detention.		
		Both sexes.	Boys.	Girls.
Boston boarding homes—year ended Aug. 31, 1920.....	1 74	2 2.6		
Buffalo—1920 ¹	461	5		
District of Columbia—September, 1920 ²	4 144	2.4	2.3	2.9
Los Angeles—1919.....	5 2,027		6 16.29	6 30.94
San Francisco—year ended June 30, 1920.....	7 1,802		6 6.18	6 16.15
Seattle—1921 ³	1,264	6.2		
St. Louis—October, 1919 ⁴	9 172	11.6		

¹ Number cared for during the year, excluding 47 cared for during short periods while on probation, whose length of stay was not ascertainable. Data compiled from records.

² Data compiled from records.

³ Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1920, p. 26.

⁴ Number received during the month.

⁵ Number released during the year. From manuscript report.

⁶ From manuscript report.

⁷ Number received during the year. From manuscript report.

⁸ The Seattle Juvenile-Court Report for the Years 1920-1921, p. 13. The Seattle figures for 1922 were as follows: Total number of children cared for, 1,451; average period of detention, 6.1 days. For 1923: Total number of children cared for, 1,476; average period of detention, 5.5 days.

⁹ Number received during the month, excluding 14 for whom length of time in detention was not reported.

The high average for girls in Los Angeles and San Francisco is due largely to the fact that the homes in these cities cared for girls receiving treatment for venereal disease, whose protracted stay brought up the average.

Table 9 shows for four detention homes and for the Boston boarding homes the distribution of the children according to the number of days they were detained.

TABLE 9.—Number of days of detention of children in four detention homes and in Boston boarding homes.

Number of days of detention.	Children detained.									
	Boston boarding homes, year ended Aug. 31, 1920.		District of Columbia, September, 1920.		San Francisco, year ended June 30, 1920.		Seattle, Sept. 1-Oct. 15, 1920.		St. Louis, October, 1919.	
	Number. ¹	Per cent distribution.	Number. ²	Per cent distribution.	Number. ³	Per cent distribution.	Number. ⁴	Per cent distribution.	Number. ²	Per cent distribution.
Total.....	74	100.0	144	100.0	1,796	100.0	158	100.0	172	100.0
Less than 1.....	1	1.4	33	22.9	291	16.2	22	13.9	24	14.0
1.....	35	47.3	41	28.5	273	15.2	37	23.4	30	17.4
2-3.....	23	31.1	37	25.7	278	15.5	26	16.4	17	10.0
4-5.....	8	10.8	16	11.1	177	9.9	18	11.4	11	6.4
6-7.....	3	4.1	12	8.3	177	9.9	17	10.8	14	8.1
8-9.....	2	2.7	2	1.4	112	6.2	4	2.5	19	11.0
10-13.....	1	1.4	1	.7	139	7.7	6	3.8	11	6.4
14-19.....			2	1.4	120	6.7	8	5.1	9	5.2
20-29.....	1	1.4			116	6.4	8	5.1	18	10.5
30 and over.....					113	6.3	12	7.6	19	11.0

¹ Children cared for in children's aid society homes during the year, excluding those cared for while on probation.

² Data compiled from records.

³ The figures were derived from monthly reports of detention home and represent children released during the year, excluding 3 for whom length of detention was not reported. The figures given in Table 8 were from the annual report and represent the number received during the year.

⁴ Children received in the detention home from Sept. 1 to Oct. 15, 1920, excluding 1 for whom length of detention was not reported.

In the District of Columbia 51.4 per cent of the children remained in detention less than two days;¹⁸ in Boston the corresponding percentage for the boarding homes was 48.7. In Seattle 37.3 per cent, and in San Francisco and St. Louis, 31.4 per cent of the children were detained less than two days. The percentages of children detained longer than seven days ranged from 3.5 in the District of Columbia and 5.5 in Boston to 33.3 in San Francisco and 44.1 in St. Louis, with a percentage for Seattle of 24.1. In Boston and San Francisco the number detained for the longer periods was affected by the fact that girls with venereal disease were detained while they were receiving treatment.

DETENTION IN POLICE STATIONS AND JAILS.

For the purpose of this discussion detention in police stations refers only to detention for as long a period as overnight. In several of the cities children were held in police stations for periods varying from a few minutes to several hours, while their parents were being sent for or until decision was made with reference to the action that should be taken. During these periods they were cared for in the matron's room, the guard room, or the signal room. Except for these short periods, girls were said never to be held in police stations or jails in eight of the courts studied.

The practice with reference to the detention of boys varied considerably. The age jurisdiction of the court and the detention facilities available would be expected to influence jail detention to some extent. In one of the two cities in which it was said that boys were never detained in police stations or jails, the juvenile court had jurisdiction only up to the age of 16 years and in the other, only up to the age of 17. In one city where the court had jurisdiction up to the age of 17 years jail detention was so rare as to be negligible; occasionally, it was reported, a boy who could not be controlled in the usual place of detention was sent to jail. Of the juvenile courts in the seven cities in which boys were sometimes detained in jail or police stations, one had jurisdiction in boys' cases only up to the age of 16 years; two, to 17 years; two more, to 18 years; and two others, to 18 with concurrent jurisdiction to 21 years. The laws under which three of these courts operated forbade the detention of children under the age of 14 years in jails or police stations; and such detention was forbidden in a fourth city, with a proviso which permitted the detention of a boy 12 years of age or over under certain circumstances. In three cities it was illegal to detain a child under the age of 16 years in police stations or jails. The information obtained indicated that these laws were observed in all but one city.

Cities in which children under 16 were detained in police station or jail.

In six of the cities studied, so far as could be ascertained in the course of the inquiry, children under the age of 16 years were not detained in police stations or jails. The situation with reference to jail detention in the remaining four cities was as follows:

¹⁸ Change of policy in the District of Columbia juvenile court since the time of the study has undoubtedly resulted in an even larger proportion detained less than two days.

St. Louis (juvenile-court jurisdiction to 17 years).—It was reported that a few 16-year-old boys and some boys as young as 14 whose presence in the detention home was a menace to the other children were detained in the city jail.

Denver (juvenile-court jurisdiction to 16 years in boys' cases^{18a} and to 18 years in girls' cases).—Because the detention home was overcrowded it was sometimes necessary to detain children in the matron's quarters in the city jail. In these quarters separation of boys from men, but not girls from older women, was provided for. There was one room for boys and one for women and girls. Each room had four beds and a toilet. One bathroom, opening out of the hall, served all those detained. A dining room also opened out of the hall.

Boys under grand-jury indictment were detained in the county jail, and boys also were remanded to jail for a week or two weeks pending continuance of their cases. They were usually employed as "trusties."

Boston (juvenile-court jurisdiction to 17 years).—Boys over the age of 14 years were sometimes detained in police stations overnight, and occasionally boys were ordered detained in jail if the court deemed it necessary to prevent their running away. Girls were said never to be held in police stations or in jail. Children detained in police stations were reported not to be held longer than 24 hours and were kept in the signal room or guardroom. Those detained in jail were cared for in a separate row of cells. In 39 out of a total of 851 cases of delinquent boys before the juvenile court during the year ended August 31, 1920, the records, as checked by a member of the probation staff, showed that the child had been held in the police station overnight. One of the 39 children had been held in the police station twice during the year. Four of the children held in police station had been detained for the municipal court and were afterwards transferred to the juvenile court; 9 were arrested during a police strike when conditions were abnormal, in some cases the probation officers not being notified of the arrest; 15 were boys on parole from industrial schools; and 4 were run-aways. In 2 of the 39 cases the child was 12 years of age and in 3, 13 years; 12 children were 14 or 15 years old, and 22 had passed their sixteenth birthday.

Two of the boys held in police stations and eight others were committed to jail, pending the dispositions of their cases, and two boys who had been on probation and failed to report in court on the day specified were committed temporarily to jail. Four of the boys held in jail were 14 or 15 years of age and 8 had reached the age of 16 years.

Minneapolis (juvenile-court jurisdiction to 18 years).—This court depended chiefly upon the city and county jails—both located in the courthouse—for detention service and, until petitions were filed, exercised no control over children detained. Children whom the police desired "held," lost children, and runaways were detained in the matron's quarters of the city jail. Boys were cared for in a row of five cells within these quarters. These cells were dark and unpleasant and were no better than the usual cells for adult prisoners; but they were entirely separate from the cells containing men prisoners, and the boys were under the supervision of the police matron. When

^{18a} Now 18 years (by a 1923 law).

more than five boys had to be provided for—as was often the case—separate cells in the rear of the city jail proper were used. These cells accommodated three or four boys.

The provision for girls was somewhat better than that for boys. They were cared for in one room containing three single beds, a toilet, and a shower bath. The juvenile ward was entirely separate from the adult ward in which was a tier of cells where as many as 40 women could be detained. It was impossible to separate the younger children from the older, or those diseased from those free from disease.

The matron had one assistant. These two did all the purchasing for the city jail and prepared and served the meals for both the juvenile and the women's ward, and the matron received all children and women arrested and made arrangements for the release of the former to their parents when possible.

The number of children under 18 years of age who were received in the city jail in 1919 is shown in Table 10. A considerable proportion of these children were held for a shorter period than overnight. Many of them never came to the attention of the juvenile court but were released to their parents without further action.

TABLE 10.—*Children under 18 years of age held in city jail in one city, by reason of detention, 1919.*¹

Reason for detention.	Total.	Boys.	Girls.
Total.....	2 795	601	194
Lost.....	146	93	53
Given lodging.....	17	13	4
Held for parents.....	142	130	12
Held for investigation.....	333	300	33
Held for policewomen.....	93	13	80
Held for institutions.....	50	47	3
Held for probation officer.....	7	5	2
Held for sheriffs of other towns.....	7	-----	7

¹ This table shows conditions in a city (Minneapolis) in which no arrangements were made for short-time detention, aside from the jail. The length of detention could not be secured, but it is probable that a considerable proportion of the children were held for periods shorter than overnight.

² Of this number, 172 children (124 boys and 48 girls) were reported as prisoners charged with offenses.

Children could not be detained in the county jail without an order from the court or from the sheriff, and such orders were rarely issued by the sheriff. Children awaiting admission to institutions or placed on probation and later brought before the court for subsequent offenses were sometimes detained in the county jail. A suite of rooms intended originally for the private use of the jailer had been set aside for children. There were two rooms for girls, one containing two beds and the other one bed; more beds could be put into these rooms if needed. Two rooms were set aside for boys, and these were reached by a hall separated from the main corridor by a doorway over which was the sign "Juvenile detention ward." Sometimes as many as 15 boys were detained in these two rooms. When not needed for boys one of the rooms was sometimes used for the detention of insane women. Each room had a toilet, and each ward a bathroom. In addition to these wards there was a cell block reserved for boys 15 to 20 years of age.

It was impossible to secure figures as to the numbers of children actually detained in the county jail, because the figures available included those who came only to eat lunch. Boys committed to the county school for delinquents often had to wait several hours before they could be taken to the school, and there was no way of feeding them except in the jail, where they ate in the kitchen. The jailer stated that in 1919 approximately 98 children under 12 years of age were detained, but most of them remained for a very short time. These children were not "booked." In the same year 36 children between 12 and 14 years of age and 113 children 14 to 16 years, inclusive, were "booked" in the county jail. Although some of the children were reported to have stayed as long as three or four days or even a week, it is probable that the number who remained even overnight was small.¹⁹

Cities in which only children 16 and over were detained in police station or jail.


In cities where the juvenile court has jurisdiction only up to the age of 16 or 17 years all children over that age who are arrested and held are usually detained in police stations or jails. In the three cities included in the present study in which the juvenile court had jurisdiction over children under the age of 18 or 21 years, children under the age of 16 years were not, so far as could be ascertained, held in jails or police stations.

Seattle (juvenile-court jurisdiction to 18 years).—Girls under the age of 18 years were not detained in jail. Boys 16 years of age or above who were arrested in the county but outside the city were sometimes brought to the county jail but were transferred within 24 hours to the detention home. It was stated that the police of the city never took a boy under 18 to the county jail without first taking him to the detention home or consulting the superintendent; if possible, he was cared for in the detention home. Boys under 18 detained in jail were held in a separate ward. Detention in police stations was limited to cases in which the children were held for a few hours in a separate ward at the central station, pending investigation by the juvenile division or the women's protective bureau of the police department.

San Francisco (juvenile-court jurisdiction exclusive to 18 years and concurrent between the ages of 18 and 21 years).—Girls under 18 were never detained in jail, and girls between the ages of 18 and 21 years who came to the attention of the juvenile court by other means than through the police department were not so detained. The court was always notified by the police department of the jail detention of girls under the age of 21 years. Boys between the ages of 16 and 18 years were very seldom detained in jail—only when they were a menace to the other children in the detention home. Boys over 18 were usually detained in jail.

Los Angeles (juvenile-court jurisdiction exclusive to 18 years and concurrent between the ages of 18 and 21 years).—Pending the filing of petitions boys 16 years of age and over were frequently detained by the police in the central police station and sometimes in one of the precinct stations which was equipped for detention purposes.

¹⁹ A study made by the National Probation Association showed that 300 children under 18 were held in the county jail in 1923. Some were under 14. The majority were held only a few hours.



CITY OF ST. LOUIS
CHILDREN'S BUILDING.

In the central police station was a row of four cells reserved for juveniles. In the precinct station, also, boys detained were separated from adults. Girls and women were detained in the matron's quarters. Every morning one of the women probation officers of the court visited the central police station to see if any children were detained there. If girls under 18 were found special effort was made to get them out immediately; boys under 18 were reported to the men probation officers, who tried to secure their release or transfer to the detention home.

Girls under the age of 18 years were never detained in the county jail, but boys 16 years of age and over were frequently detained there by order of the court, pending hearing or continuance and after petition had been filed. Boys under 19 years of age held in the county jail were confined in the juvenile ward, unless the ward was too crowded. This ward was in a dark, poorly kept basement and consisted of eight cells within a small inclosure. One toilet in the inclosure served all the boys. No washing facilities were visible. Often there were 15 or 16 boys from 16 to 18 years of age, inclusive, within this small space—2 boys to a cell. Some of these boys were held for the juvenile court and some of the older ones for the criminal courts. The boys had absolutely nothing to do, and the only place for exercise was within the inclosure. When questioned, some of the boys said they had been taken first to the detention home, but as that was too crowded to receive them they had been brought to the jail. Juvenile-court officials stated that the maximum length of jail detention prior to hearing was six days, but cases were sometimes continued and the children remanded to jail. This was very likely to happen if the boy was a vagrant, and information concerning him was difficult to obtain. Boys held for the criminal court sometimes remained several weeks. The juvenile ward was often so overcrowded that some of the 18-year-old boys were put in the cell blocks with older prisoners.^{19a}

EQUIPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF DETENTION HOMES.

Physical equipment.

If the number of children to be provided for is relatively small it is often possible to purchase and remodel a private residence at less than the cost of a new building. Such a plan usually does not permit the combination of court room, probation offices, and detention home in the same building—an arrangement that has proved desirable from many points of view. Moreover, it is likely to be much more difficult in a remodeled building than in one specially constructed, to make arrangements for segregation of various types of children and to provide proper sanitation and facilities necessary for convenient and efficient administration.

The physical essentials of an adequate detention home include:

1. Sufficient space to accommodate without crowding the number of children likely to be detained at any one time.
2. Arrangement of rooms so as to permit segregation according to sex, character, and physical condition. Neglected and dependent

^{19a} It is planned during 1924-25 to erect a large dormitory for boys from 16 to 18 years of age of the type now detained in jail.

children, if cared for in a detention home, should be entirely separated from delinquent children. For older children single rooms are usually conceded to be better than dormitories, and less supervision at night is necessary when single rooms are provided.

3. Separate bathing and toilet facilities for boys and girls, and for children suffering from infectious diseases.

4. Proper lighting and ventilation.

5. Dining rooms, recreation rooms, and schoolrooms.

6. Security against escape—windows may be protected by iron screening or may be constructed of iron frames with small panes of glass.

7. Adequate protection against fire.

8. Outdoor play space.

In only one of the seven cities studied which had detention homes—Denver—was the building a former private residence. Two other cities, however—Buffalo and Washington—utilized old buildings for detention homes.^{19b} The detention homes of Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Seattle had been built for the purpose, and in the last three cities the buildings were comparatively new.

Some of the detention homes were seriously overcrowded. In one home, for instance, most of the rooms were intended for single rooms, but it was often necessary to put two children in a room. Relief from this overcrowding was expected, to some extent at least, as soon as two new buildings were completed.

Single rooms were used exclusively in but one of the homes—that in San Francisco.²⁰ In one of the others single rooms were used as far as possible, but overcrowding often made it necessary to place two children in a room. Dormitories were used exclusively in three homes, and in the other two some of the children slept in dormitories and some in single rooms.

The amount of space and the arrangement of the rooms in two of the detention homes made it impossible to classify the children except upon the basis of sex. In a third home classification was very difficult, and in a fourth the space available for dining rooms and recreation rooms made it impossible to segregate different groups during the day, except that separation of boys and girls was maintained. The arrangement of the detention homes of Los Angeles and San Francisco, and to a lesser degree that of the District of Columbia, permitted better classification than was possible in the other homes.

Bathing and toilet facilities in one of the detention homes were totally inadequate, even for the relatively small capacity of the home, as one bath and one toilet served staff and children, boys and girls.

In most of the homes the windows were guarded by iron screens, and in one the windows were barred. Neither screens nor bars were used in one of the homes, but all the windows except those at the front of the building were divided into small panes separated by heavy iron framework.

^{19b} The Buffalo court now occupies a well-equipped building of brick and stone, attached by a passageway to a brick cottage in which the superintendent and some of the women attendants live. The buildings were formerly hospital buildings.

²⁰ Very young dependent children were cared for in dormitories.

Dining rooms, recreation rooms, and schoolrooms were frequently inadequate. For instance, in one detention home were three schoolrooms, one for negro boys and girls of all ages, the second for white girls and younger boys, and the third for older white boys. The second served also as a dining and recreation room for all the girls, both white and negro.

Out-of-door play space was at the time of the study practically unavailable in three of the detention homes.²¹ In one home a cement-floored area divided into three sections separated by board fences was used for play purposes, and in the rear of one of the other detention homes were two yards, one for boys and one for girls, where the children spent a considerable amount of time. More ample out-of-door play space was provided by two detention homes, in one of which considerable attention was paid to gardening and poultry raising.

Descriptions of two of the newer detention homes, those of Seattle and San Francisco, follow:

The Seattle juvenile-court building and detention home.—This was completed in 1915. It occupied a tract of land 120 feet wide and 196 feet deep. An adjoining lot had been purchased just prior to the time of the study, making the total depth 256 feet, and plans for an addition to the home had been completed.²² A wall covered with shrubbery surrounded the grounds on three sides. In the rear of the home were two yards, one for boys and one for girls.

The Seattle building was of steel and brick construction. It accommodated comfortably 17 boys and 17 girls, and 6 more boys could, if necessary, be cared for in the attic. Sometimes as many as 29 boys and 29 girls had to be accommodated. The proposed addition would make it possible to care for the children much more adequately.

The 1921 budget for the Seattle detention home was \$16,974.80, including salaries and all expenses; in 1920 the cost of maintenance was \$13,629.90. The increase was partly due to the provision of a salary for a house physician. Each floor of the detention home was divided into two sections—one for boys and one for girls. The court room, judge's chambers, and probation offices occupied the front part of the first floor, which also included a small office for the superintendent, in front of the girls' section; a living room and a dining room for girls; a living room and a dining room for boys; and a kitchen in the rear, which served both sections. On the girls' side of the second floor were five single rooms, two dormitories containing four beds each, an open-air room accommodating two girls and used as an "honor" room, an attendant's room, a schoolroom, a clinic room, a locker room, a linen closet, and a bathroom. The arrangement on the boys' side was similar, except that the superintendent's room, connecting with both sides of the building took the place of the clinic room, and one less single room was available on that side because of the extra space added to the superintendent's quarters. The open-air room on the boys' side was not used. In the attic were six beds for use by boys when the second floor was overcrowded, and a playroom for boys.

²¹ Since the study was made playgrounds have been developed in connection with two of these homes.

²² See floor plans, pp. 53, 540.

With the proposed addition a total of 13 single rooms on each side would be available. In the center was to be a nursery, opening onto a porch. When not required for small children, the plan was to use the nursery as a general-utility room. Each side was to have two hospital rooms, with one bed in each, and the accommodations for attendants were to be enlarged.

The San Francisco juvenile court and detention home.—This was completed in October, 1916, at a total cost for land and building of approximately \$250,000. A nine-story building, it was planned with a view to making possible the segregation of children according to sex, age, and character, each floor being given over to a certain type of child. Single rooms predominated except on the nursery floor. The windows were protected by iron screens. At the rear of the building was a playground.

The first floor of the building and part of the second floor were given up to the court room and probation offices, and the office of the detention-home superintendent. On the second floor were the offices of the girls' department and the living quarters of the women officers on the detention-home staff. The men officers did not live in the detention home.

On the third floor was the room used by the referee hearing girls' cases; this floor also contained two dormitories and individual receiving rooms for dependent boys under the age of 8 or 9 years and dependent girls under the age of 12. The fourth floor was devoted to older boys; the fifth, to younger delinquent boys; the sixth, to venereally diseased girls; the seventh, to "well girls"; and the eighth, to receiving rooms for girls, an operating room, a clinic room, a dental laboratory, an examining room, and two or three small consulting rooms. On the fifth floor was a dining room used by all the boys, which sometimes served also as a schoolroom.²³ The sixth and seventh floors each had a dining room used as a schoolroom, and one or two small sewing rooms. On the top floor were a lunch room for the probation staff, a dining room for the staff of the detention home, a laundry, a general kitchen, a recreation room, and store-rooms. Each sleeping room contained a bed, a dresser, and a chair. The dining rooms were furnished with tables, chairs, and desks.

The classification of the children.

One of the most important aspects of detention service is the extent to which various classes of children are separated—boys and girls, sick children and well children, delinquent children and dependent children or children who have not been seriously delinquent. The discussion of the physical equipment of the detention homes included in the study has indicated some of the difficulties which were involved in properly segregating the children.

In two homes practically no segregation except that by sex was maintained, and even the separation of the sexes was not complete.^{23a} In a third home proper segregation was difficult because of overcrowding. Boys were entirely separated from girls except while attending school, and the older white boys had a schoolroom of their own.

²³ A room in the basement also was available as a schoolroom for boys.

^{23a} One of these homes now occupies a new building in which there is ample provision for segregation, and for isolation when necessary.

Some attempt was made to separate neglected children from delinquent children, but such classification was not complete.

At the time of the study, in a fourth home there was practically no classification except upon the basis of sex and color, but plans were being developed for the segregation on one floor of children with little or no delinquent experience—they were to sleep, eat, play, and attend school on this floor. In another home the separation of boys and girls was complete, and so far as possible dependent children and younger delinquent children were cared for in dormitories and older delinquent children in single rooms. No attempt was made to segregate the children during the day, except for the separation of the sexes.

In the largest detention homes included in the study—those of San Francisco and Los Angeles—provision for classifying the children was more nearly complete. Single rooms were used for all delinquent children in San Francisco. Dependent children were cared for on a floor reserved for them. One floor was devoted to younger delinquent boys, one to older delinquent boys, one to well girls, and one to sick girls. Younger and older boys shared the same dining room and the same schoolroom.

The Los Angeles detention home was divided into units (those for boys being called "companies"), and each unit had its own sleeping quarters, dining room, schoolroom, and recreation period. The classification as given in the regulations of Juvenile Hall was as follows:

Nursery.—So-called dependent young children (girls and boys up to the age of 8); older girls who are of the type which would be injured by contact with girls of more experience; so-called older dependent girls.

Nursery for young children (juvenile hospital nursery).—For those infected with venereal disease in a contagious form; majority of noncontact origin.

Hospital for older girls, venereal.—Those infected with venereal disease by actual contact.

Senior girls' department.—The older girls are known as the senior department.^{23b}

Girls' dormitory.—The younger girls are those in the girls' junior dormitory from the age of 11 to 14.^{23b}

Boys.—Those 14 and over are in Company A. The smaller boys are detailed to Company B, those 8 to 13 years of age.^{23c}

The assignments to various groups were determined by medical examinations, reports of the probation officers, and observation by the superintendent.

The only way to insure the detention-home population against the spread of infectious disease is to isolate the children on reception until a physical examination and laboratory tests are made and to provide for the separation of those found to have infectious disease from those found to be well. The problem is especially difficult because of the short time the children stay in detention and the loneliness of those who are isolated pending examination. In many detention homes no attempt is made to segregate children pending examination unless symptoms of disease are evident.

^{23b} Girls who stay longer than a few days (for example, those detained as witnesses) are now (1924) housed in a new two-story brick building with 24 single rooms for the girls and with adequate matron's quarters.

^{23c} A third company, "C," has since been formed, housed in a separate dormitory with capacity for 15. A matron has charge of this group, which consists of the younger boys. They eat at the "B" boys' table, have a playground to themselves and a special school-teacher, using the school rooms when the older boys are at work.

In the Los Angeles detention home children were kept in isolation in their rooms for three days pending physical examination and laboratory tests. In San Francisco girls were cared for in a special receiving ward until physical examinations and laboratory analyses had been made. Dependent children were isolated until they had received physical examinations. In contrast to the situation in these homes was that in one in which no provision was made for the isolation of sick children or children pending examination, or for physical examinations.

A physician called each morning at two of the detention homes included in the study and examined the children; they were not segregated pending examination. In two other detention homes in which the children were not isolated upon reception, the plan was to have each girl examined the day she entered the home, but this was not always practicable.

The staff.

In considering the administration of detention homes the question of personnel is all-important. A home with inadequate equipment but under the management of a person of broad experience and understanding is preferable to a better-equipped home under the management of those who do not understand the needs of children. The number of employees must be adequate for the management of the home and the supervision of the children, and salaries must be large enough to secure the services of persons adapted to the work. Sufficient help should be employed to make it unnecessary for the children to do work of the heaviest kind.

The functions which must be performed by the staff of a detention home include:

1. The general management of the home, the reception of children, and the keeping of records. These duties are usually performed by the superintendent with or without the aid of an assistant superintendent or of clerical assistants.
2. The supervision of the details of household management, the purchase of food and supplies, and the planning of meals (usually done by an assistant superintendent or a matron or housekeeper, but in a small home often included in the superintendent's duties).
3. Day supervision of the children.
4. Night supervision of the children.
5. Preparation of the meals.
6. Care of the building and the heating plant.

The services numbered 3 and 4 are usually performed by attendants; but the housekeeper or matron often has charge of the supervision of the girls, and in a small home the janitor may assist in the supervision of the boys. As a matter of course, all the employees who will be required to perform any service in connection with the supervision of children should be selected on a basis of their qualifications for that work.

Teachers are often assigned from the school department for service in the detention home, and supervisors of recreation are sometimes secured from the same department for part-time assistance. Physicians and mental specialists are sometimes part of the detention-home organization; but since their service should not be confined

TABLE 11.—Average daily population and staff¹ of detention homes.

City.	Average daily population of detention home. ²	Staff of detention home. ¹						
		Executives.	Attendants.		Nurses.	Teachers.	Janitors, clerks, charwomen, maids.	Office help.
			Men.	Women.				
Buffalo ³	7	Superintendent (woman).	1 ⁴	1.....			Cook; maids.....	
Denver.....	10	Superintendent (man); matron.				1 (man).....	Cook.....	
District of Columbia.....	5 25	Lieutenant in charge of women's bureau of police department; ⁵ superintendent (woman); house-keeper.	2.....	1.....		(7).....	Cook; janitress; 2 drivers who take children from court and police stations.	2 clerks.
Los Angeles.....	129	Superintendent (woman); office matron.	4.....	12.....	1 receiving; 3 hospital.	7 assigned by board of education (1 man, 6 women).	Cook.....	1 stenographer and clerk.
San Francisco.....	46	Chief probation officer; ⁶ superintendent (man); assistant superintendent (man); matron.	Janitor; night superintendent.	4 attendants; 1 night matron.	Clinic nurse.....	1 assigned by board of education (woman).	Cook.....	
Seattle.....	27	Superintendent (woman).	1.....	1 full time; 1 part time.		1.....	Kitchen attendant.....	
St. Louis.....	61	Superintendent (woman); matron.	2.....	2.....		3 women assigned from school department and a recreation supervisor, part time (man).	Cook; janitor.....	(9)

¹ Not including physicians and mental specialists.

² See Table 7, p. 59, footnotes.

³ The Buffalo detention home now occupies new quarters and has a somewhat higher average daily population, though the number of children detained is still relatively small. The staff in 1924 consists of a superintendent, an assistant superintendent, two women attendants, two men attendants, a night watchman, a cook, and an assistant cook. An engineer, two firemen, building custodian and ground keeper, all attached to the Buffalo Bureau of Buildings, serve the detention home. A teacher is assigned by the department of public instruction.

⁴ The janitor served as attendant for the boys.

⁵ Approximate number of children; women also were cared for.

⁶ General supervision.

⁷ Since the time of the study a teacher has been assigned by the school department.

⁸ As executive secretary of the probation committee the chief probation officer exercised general control over the detention home. The superintendent now (1924) is a woman, and the attendants are as follows: Seven women, one night superintendent, two orderlies.

⁹ There are now (1924) in addition to the staff shown above, a third man attendant and a stenographer and clerk.

to the detention-home population, it is more logical to consider them as belonging to a separate branch of the court.

The personnel of the staff of each of the detention homes studied is summarized in Table 11.

Supervision of the children.

In dealing with a group of children in a detention home supervision is of very great importance, but it should not be conceived of as a negative duty, undertaken merely for the purpose of preventing undesired happenings. Children in detention are especially in need of sympathetic interest and intelligent understanding, for they are passing through a period of humiliation and apprehension as to the future. Supervision of the right sort, by the right persons, will prepare the way for subsequent constructive work with the child.

In some of the detention homes included in the study the staff was so small that adequate supervision was very difficult. For instance, in one of the smaller homes the superintendent was aided by only one woman assistant, the janitor (or custodian), the cook, and the maids.^{23d} The girls' dormitory adjoined the superintendent's sitting room, and the janitor slept in a room adjoining the boys' dormitory. In another small home the superintendent and the matron, who were husband and wife, had the assistance of only a man teacher, employed on part time, and a cook. Practically no supervision was maintained at night, though the dormitory system was used. Supervision in a somewhat larger detention home was limited, although a matron, two men attendants, and two women attendants were provided. During the time between the close of school and dinner or supper the children were locked into playrooms or, in the case of the older girls, sat in their dormitories.

The plan of supervision in one detention home in which most of the children slept in small dormitories provided for close supervision during the day and for supervision of the boys at night by an attendant who was on night duty. Responsibility for the care of the girls rested with the housekeeper, who had a woman assistant, a man attendant and his assistant caring for the boys. In addition to the attendant on night duty, two men slept on the boys' floor. On the girls' floor no one was on night duty, but one attendant slept near the dormitory for negro girls and another slept in the hall. Panels had been removed from the doors of the rooms in order to make supervision easier.


Supervision was less difficult when the children slept in single rooms. In one large home in which all delinquent children were thus provided for, a woman night attendant made the rounds of the girls' floors each half hour during the night, and a man night superintendent was responsible for the boys. In another large home the children were under constant supervision during the day, but at night it was difficult to give adequate supervision because the overcrowded condition of the home made it necessary to place more than one child in some of the rooms intended for single rooms.^{23e}

^{23d} The staff has since been increased.

^{23e} Two night matrons are now (1924) constantly on night duty, and the overcrowded condition has been relieved by the construction of new buildings.

Daily program.

Supervision alone, no matter how constant or how skillful, can not prevent the development of undesirable mental states, nor even keep the children from harmful intimacies. One of the fundamental features of adequate detention service is the arrangement of the daily



Juvenile court and detention home, city of San Francisco.

program so that the children's time will be fully and wholesomely occupied. It is for this reason that the provision of school facilities in detention homes is so important. Recreation both indoors and outdoors and wholesome occupation for part of each day should also be provided.

In two of the detention homes no schooling and no out-of-door recreation were provided; but in both of these a teacher has since been assigned by the school department and in one a playground has been established, while in the other there is ample space for outdoor recreation. With no place for outdoor play and no school the activities of the children in the first of these homes were limited to reading (about 60 books each month were obtained from the public library), playing the few indoor games that were available, and helping with the housework, laundry work, and scrubbing.^{23f} In the second home the time of the girls was more fully occupied. The girls' recreation room was attractively furnished and contained a piano; and here the girls read, sewed, crocheted, and sang together. Plenty of material for sewing and fancy work was furnished. The boys did not fare so well. Their recreation room was scantily furnished; and as they were not allowed to take books from the general recreation room on another floor, they had very little to do during their free hours.

In three of the detention homes in which schooling was provided, the children attended school half a day or less; in two they attended during both morning and afternoon sessions. In three homes but one teacher was employed; and as one of these homes was among the largest included in the study, the teacher had to divide her time among the different groups of children and to give some of the groups only short periods of instruction. She taught the boys for three hours in the morning, girls not suffering from venereal disease for one and one-half hours in the afternoon, and other girls the same amount of time, giving some of them and the girls in the receiving ward individual instruction in their rooms. Children above school age received no instruction.

Three teachers were assigned by the school department to one of the two detention homes in which the children attended school both morning and afternoon, and two principals and five teachers were assigned to "Juvenile Hall" in Los Angeles, which had the status of a parental school under the department of education. One of the principals and four teachers served in the main school, and a principal and her assistant taught the school attended by girls under treatment in Juvenile Hall hospital. The principal of the main school had the same rank as a principal of a 12 to 18 room school. Each child attended school four hours a day. One of the teachers gave full time to instructing the boys in shopwork, and one of the matrons taught the girls sewing.^{23g}

The success of the Los Angeles detention home in securing the assignment of so many teachers was due to the assurance given by the superintendent to the board of education that the teachers would be given an opportunity in the detention home to observe all the problems with which special-school teachers come in contact, the school thus serving as a laboratory and training school for teachers of special classes. Usually each teacher stayed a year in the Juvenile Hall School, and many of them had subsequently secured good positions as special-school teachers. The detention-home staff tried very definitely to give the teachers information that would assist

^{23f} Each sex is now provided with a recreation room and a glassed-in veranda. A piano is provided in one of the recreation rooms, and the children are given the opportunity for daily singing.

^{23g} Hospital girls are now (1924) given handcraft instruction every afternoon from 2 to 4 o'clock, in a special workroom built for the purpose.

them in understanding the problems met with. Each week a report of the intelligence quotient of every child in the home was sent to the principal. The principal of the main school gave group intelligence tests and graded the children accordingly.

In all of the detention homes the girls helped with the housework and the boys with the scrubbing, and in the Los Angeles home some of the children were assigned to garden work and some to the care of poultry. One of the other homes had gardens in which the children worked. Special emphasis was given by one superintendent to the fact that sufficient help was employed so that the children did not have to do the heaviest household work.

The lack of out-of-door recreation in three of the detention homes has already been mentioned. In the other four the children were usually out of doors each day for longer or shorter periods. Most of the detention homes had victrolas, and some had pianos; and the children were usually supplied with quiet, indoor games. In some of the homes volunteers came on certain days to read to the children, teach them to sew, take them to church, or give them religious instruction. In one of the detention homes a recreation supervisor came every evening to conduct a recreation period for the boys. A recreation period every other evening was provided for the girls in another detention home.

The Los Angeles detention home had the most comprehensive plans for occupying the time of the children in various constructive ways, but as children who were in detention less than three days were kept in isolation they did not take part in these activities. The school maintained in the home by the board of education has already been described. Special emphasis was placed on recreation, including the organization of special entertainments. The children also were assigned tasks in the home or in the garden.

The daily program in the Los Angeles detention home for the children outside the hospital and hospital nursery, and not in segregation, was as follows:

Morning.

- 6.30 to 8.15—Dressing, breakfast, cleaning rooms, and similar activities; setting-up exercises for boys; tooth-brush drill in open air.
- 8.15 to 10.15—School for half the children and work for the other half. The girls did housework and the boys worked in the yard and garden.
- 10.15 to 10.45—Recess for all children attending school; supervised recreation was given, and children whose physical condition needed building up were given eggnog, milk, and crackers.
- 10.45 to noon—The groups that worked the first part of the morning attended school and the others worked.

Afternoon.

The boys and girls who worked the last part of the morning attended school during the first half of the afternoon, and vice versa, the shifts changing in the middle of the afternoon. School was in session until 4.25. After that the children did any cleaning about the rooms which was necessary.

At 5 p. m. there was roll call, followed by setting-up exercises. Supper was at 5.30. From 6 to 7.15 or 7.30 the children had recreation, then tooth-brush drill in open air, after which they went to their rooms for the night.

Company A, composed of the older boys, had a lobby of its own, where group meetings were held and matters of interest decided. All the children came into the main lobby for entertainments and

community singing, and special parties were given there. Company A and Company B sometimes had ball games or played teams from other special schools in the city. On Sundays the children received visitors.

A "boys' court" was held weekly, a staff officer being present. Two boys were chosen each time to act as judges. The staff officer and the boys reported misdemeanors, and the judges decided what penalties should be enforced.

A typical recreation program for a week was as follows, the daily out-of-door recess not being included:

Monday, 6 p. m., Companies A and B, current events.

Tuesday, 7 p. m., girls, hospital and nursery, singing, and current events.

Wednesday, 6 to 6.45 p. m., boys; general assembly with outside speaker.

— 6.45 to 7 p. m., girls; same.

Thursday, open for entertainment.

Friday, boys' court in Company A lobby; girls in sitting room; hospital group in sewing room.

Saturday, ball game for boys, 2 to 4 p. m.

Sunday, services, general assembly.

— 6.15, Company B, story hour.

THE BOSTON PLAN OF DETENTION.

The Boston plan of detention in private-family homes should be of special interest to courts in small cities and rural communities, where the volume of work is too small to warrant the establishment of a house of detention. It is also worthy of consideration in larger cities, at least as a possible means of supplementing the facilities of a house of detention by providing more individual care in special cases. Therefore a somewhat detailed description of the plan is here presented.

History and extent of the service.

Massachusetts was the first State to adopt as general policies care of dependent children in family homes and probation as a method of dealing with delinquents. High standards of child placing had been developed prior to the establishment of the juvenile court, and the Boston Children's Aid Society²⁴ had for some time been furnishing probation service to the municipal court in children's cases. When the Boston juvenile court was organized in 1906, this agency offered its assistance to the court in the development of a detention service through the use of family boarding homes. The plan has been followed to the present day under the cooperative arrangement then effected.

During the first five years a private institution was utilized for the detention of boys, especially those over the age of 14 years, whose detention in private families was considered unsafe. In his report of the first five years of the juvenile court Judge Baker stated that the use of this congregate institution for temporary detention was not fair to the boys who were regular inmates and not wholly desirable for the boys sent to be temporarily detained.²⁵ At about that time the Boston Children's Aid Society enlarged its facilities for detention care and adopted the plan of granting small monthly subsidies

²⁴ Now the Children's Aid Association.

²⁵ Harvey Humphrey Baker—Upbuilder of the Juvenile Court, p. 53. Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, 1920.

to the boarding homes; an experienced worker was placed in charge of the service and devoted the major part of her time to it. The use of the institution for detention purposes was discontinued, and at the time of this study the society, in cooperation with the court, had been for some years providing detention care for nearly all delinquent boys and girls who could not remain at home pending the hearing and disposition of their cases by the juvenile court.

The only other methods of detention available to the juvenile court, aside from the jail and the police station,²⁶ were the shelter maintained by the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children and the detention service offered by the division of child guardianship of the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare. The shelter was used for neglected children and occasionally for the care of delinquent girls during the continuance of their cases, when the complaints originated with the society. Delinquent, wayward, and neglected children might be committed temporarily to the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, and the division of child guardianship of that department had a home accommodating 21 boys between the ages of 12 and 21 years; but the juvenile court rarely found it necessary to utilize this method of detention except in cases in which the judge intended to make a permanent commitment to the department.^{26a}

The boarding-home service was utilized only by the Boston juvenile court, which served about one-fifth of the population of Boston. The other Boston courts were dependent upon the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, police stations, and the county jail for the detention of children who could not remain in their own homes pending hearing.

The court children for whom the boarding-home service was utilized included practically all delinquent boys under the age of 14 years who could not remain in their own homes, many delinquent boys over that age, and practically all delinquent girls for whom detention was required. The special boarding homes also gave temporary care to certain of the wards of the Boston Children's Aid Society and to girls with venereal disease who were referred to the juvenile court by the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. One or two of the homes were set aside for the care of venereally diseased girls whenever provision of this kind was required. The court had the first claim upon the homes, and no other agencies could use them without permission of the supervisor of the detention service. It was believed that the use of the homes for other agencies was a distinct advantage in that it permitted the maintenance of a larger number of homes than would have been needed for the court work alone and thus made possible greater variation in the types of homes.

Number of homes and financial arrangements.

The plan for the central district of Boston contemplated 9 or 10 family homes—from 2 to 4 in the down-town district or easily accessible thereto, which could be used in case of night arrest, and about 5 in outlying districts, for children who would probably need care for several days. A home in the country for older boys requir-

²⁶ The extent to which the jail and the police station were used has been indicated on p. 63.

^{26a} See pp. 143, 155.

ing detention for more than one or two days was regarded as desirable. At the time of the study (a period when the volume of work was light) only 7 homes were in use. In May, 1922, 1 of these homes had been dropped and 2 new ones had been added.

Essential features of the plan were that not more than one or two children were cared for in the same home at the same time and that the care of boys and the care of girls was entirely separate. Occasionally as many as three children were cared for in one home for a night but never for a longer period.

In order to have the homes always available, the children's aid society paid each home a monthly subsidy of from \$5 to \$35. In two homes in which \$5 was the amount paid this sum covered only the increased rent which was necessitated by the service rendered. The highest amount (\$35) was paid to the home which cared for diseased girls. The boarding women were supposed to be at home practically all the time, even when no children were present, in order that they might answer the telephone and be on hand to receive children.

In addition to the subsidy, \$2.50 a day was paid by the court²⁷ for each child cared for not more than three days, and a weekly rate of \$12 for each child cared for during a longer period. In the case of diseased girls the daily rate of \$2.50 was paid regardless of the length of stay. If an unusual amount of work was required in caring for a child an extra sum of \$2 was paid. Sometimes additional payments for telephone service were made by the court. The children's aid society supplied underclothing for the women, night clothes, slippers, and cotton dresses for the girls, overalls for the boys, jumpers, and whatever disinfectants and cleansing facilities were necessary. The court paid for outfits of clothing which it was necessary to give the children but not for clothing used during detention only. The children's aid society supervisor checked all bills with her records monthly and sent the court the bills for such service as the court paid for.

Number and types of children cared for, and length of stay.

The children's aid society boarding homes cared for 121 children referred to them by the juvenile court and for 63 other children during the year ended August 31, 1920. Seventy-four of the court children, as already noted, were cared for pending hearing or disposition of their cases, and 47 while on probation. Of the total number of court children cared for, 75 were boys and 46 girls. The number of boys and girls cared for by each home during the year was as follows:

	Boys.	Girls.
Total.....	75	46
Home A.....	58	4
Home B.....	--	27
Home C.....	--	13
Home D.....	6	--
Home E.....	2	--
Home F.....	3	1
Home G.....	1	1
Home H.....	1	--
Home I.....	3	--
Home J.....	1	--

²⁷ Until June, 1920, the rate per day was \$2, and in one home \$1.50.




DETENTION HOME, DENVER, COLO.



PRIVATE HOMES USED FOR DETENTION, BOSTON JUVENILE COURT



HEARING, JUVENILE COURT OF DENVER COUNTY, COLO.



HEARING, JUVENILE COURT OF KING COUNTY (SEATTLE), WASH.

Information with reference to the ages of the children cared for in the boarding homes was available only for the 74 court children provided for pending the hearing or disposition of their cases by the court. The ages of these children were as follows:

	Boys.	Girls.
Total.....	51	23
Under 10 years.....	2	--
10-13 years.....	15	--
14-15 years.....	19	12
16 years.....	15	11

The duration of the care given these 74 children in boarding homes is shown below.

	Boys.	Girls.
Total.....	51	23
Less than 1 day.....	1	--
1 day.....	31	4
2 days.....	10	6
3 days.....	3	4
4 days.....	3	2
5 days.....	1	2
6 days.....	--	1
1 week, less than 2 weeks.....	2	3
3 weeks.....	--	1

The 63 children not under the jurisdiction of the court who were cared for in boarding homes during the year were received from the following sources: Boston Children's Aid Society, 52; Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 7; other private agencies, 3; courts other than the juvenile court (central district), 1.

Selection of homes.

The responsibility for the selection and supervision of the homes rested entirely with the Boston Children's Aid Society, which had detailed a member of the staff to devote as much time to this work as was needed.²⁸ The selection of the homes proved to be a highly specialized task, which required of the person undertaking it experience, persistence, imagination, and wide acquaintance in the community.

Visits to many homes were usually required before the right home could be found. The most important consideration in the selection of a home was the personality of its mistress. The composition of the family, the living and sleeping arrangements that could be made for the children, and the accessibility of the home to the court were also taken into consideration. The possibility of specialization was one of the greatest advantages of the plan. A woman admirably fitted to deal with delinquent girls might not be so successful in the care of boys; a family which had no male member was well adapted to the care of girls but unsuited for the care of boys, since in the care of difficult boys the aid of a man was sometimes required. It had been found advantageous, however, to have some homes in which, at different times, either boys or girls might be cared for, as the service could then be utilized fully in meeting varying needs. The

²⁸ The resignation of the supervisor of juvenile-court detention work has since made it necessary to re-adjust the work, and the assistant secretary in charge of the department of placing out now supervises the detention service, with the assistance of members of her staff.

presence of young people in a family made impossible the use of the home for certain types of cases but was found to be an asset in dealing with other types—little boys, for instance, who might otherwise become lonely.

Supervision of homes.

Constant supervision by the Boston Children's Aid Society was necessary. In the first place, the supervisor had to control the intake, to be kept constantly informed of the numbers and types of children in each home, and to see that the requisite number of homes were kept free for emergency service. Frequent conferences with the officials of the court were necessary.

The supervisor visited each boarding home every four to six weeks and consulted with the boarding woman at that time about the work and any special problems that might have developed. She was on call at any time. In an emergency she went to the home and assisted the woman in the care of a difficult child or relieved her so that she might have rest. She had to be able and willing to render any service that might be required of a woman who undertook to board children. The supervisor was responsible also for making arrangements with hospitals and dispensaries for physical examination and medical treatment.

In an article in the *Survey* for November 13, 1920, Miss Elizabeth P. Durham, for many years the supervisor of the detention service, describes the supervision required as follows:

The retaining of women of unusual ability and character for this special detention service * * * calls for careful oversight and direction. Too many children of one type or children making unusual demands should not be sent in rapid succession to the same court home. The types of children sent to these homes must be varied, or else the service becomes too wearing, too monotonous, and too destructive of the very qualities in the foster mothers which are essential to the success of the plan.

Description of homes in use.

At the time of the study seven homes were used for detention service. Two of them cared for children arrested at night. The first, within 5 minutes' walk from the courthouse and police headquarters, was used for boys; the second, in the South End, about 15 minutes by trolley from the courthouse, was used for girls—those arrested at night and others as well. Girls with venereal disease were sometimes cared for in this home when it was not otherwise in use. From the first home boys were usually transferred the morning after arrest to one of the homes farther from the downtown section.

Four homes were located in Roxbury, about 25 minutes by trolley from the courthouse. Three of these were used for either boys or girls, as occasion required, but never for both at the same time.²⁹ The fourth, which was later discontinued as a boarding home, received boys only. A home in Dorchester, about 20 minutes from the courthouse by trolley, was devoted entirely to the care of girls, especially girls with venereal disease, who often had to be provided for during extended periods while they were taking treatment.

The home in which boys arrested at night were received was especially adapted for this service but not for the care of children

²⁹ One was not being used for boys at the time of the study.

during the day. As it was necessary to keep it free for night arrests, the boys were transferred promptly to other homes. The home was managed by a young man who had taken lodgers while he was obtaining his professional training and who had had considerable experience in boys' work. His mother assisted him in the care of the children. The home used for girls arrested at night was managed by a thoroughly reliable and intelligent woman, who was very much interested in the girls and kept them with her always during the day. One room was permanently reserved for court girls, and if more than one girl had to be cared for a second room was assigned for detention service.

Five of the families giving detention service lived in apartments, usually of five or seven rooms, pleasant and comfortably furnished. Three of the boarding women were widows with grown children. The sons of two of these women were living either at home or in an apartment in the same building, and their help was available for the care of boys. The two sons of the third boarding woman had recently left home, and for this reason boys were not being placed there, as it was felt that the presence of a man was essential in detention service for boys. A fourth family giving detention service consisted of a husband and wife, two grown daughters, and one grown son. This home was used chiefly for young boys. Two elderly maiden ladies were caring for girls, including those with venereal disease.

Sleeping arrangements varied with the individual homes. In one of the homes in which girls were cared for each of the two women in charge had a cot in her room on which a girl might sleep. In this way the girls were given constant oversight. In the home used for night arrests of boys the man in charge had two cots in his own room where the boys were under his constant supervision. In some of the homes the children had separate rooms. The arrangements in most of the homes permitted close supervision and made it unnecessary, save in exceptional cases, to lock the children in their rooms. In the home in which girls arrested at night were cared for the doors were locked. Escapes were very rare; several of the women who had been in the service a number of years stated that no child had ever escaped.

In each home the children were under the constant supervision of the boarding woman throughout the day. They stayed with her in the kitchen when she was at work there and helped her with the housework; crocheted, knitted, read, or played games in the living room; and ate at the family table. Books of interest to the children and games were supplied. There was, of course, no attempt at school instruction. Occasionally the children were taken to a motion-picture theater by some member of the family or to church or entertainments. Parents were allowed to visit the children. Unless the probation officer gave the children's aid society definite instructions to the contrary the children were never allowed out of doors unaccompanied by the boarding woman or her representative.

Physical care of the children.

As soon as the children were received they were bathed and given clean clothes. Their own clothes, if they could be saved, were disinfected and washed. The boys cared for in boarding homes were not given physical examinations as a matter of routine, but it had been

agreed by the court and the supervisor of the detention service that except in cases of night arrests all girls should be given physical examination by the woman physician employed by the court for such work before they were taken to the boarding homes. Girls arrested at night were to be examined the following day. This plan had not been fully carried out, as the doctor was not always available on a moment's notice, and it was difficult for the woman probation officer to see that the procedure was followed in all cases. The supervisor felt, however, that all children detained in boarding homes should be given physical examinations.³⁰ Diseased girls were examined at a dispensary and were given treatments three times a week. Two of the boarding homes were supplied with equipment for special baths and certain treatments. One or two conferences had been held at which the supervisor, the boarding women, and the staff physician of the Boston Children's Aid Society discussed the physical problems met with.

Records.

Whenever a child was discharged from a home a notice was sent by the boarding woman to the supervisor the following morning on a post-card form supplied by the Boston Children's Aid Society. This form called for the name of the child, the date received, the source from which received, the date removed, and the person to whom released. A special blank had been prepared for the investigation of the homes and the records of the children cared for. Brief descriptions of all homes visited in the search for boarding homes and of the recommendations thereon had been kept by the society.

Expense of the plan.

The expense of this plan of detention includes the monthly bills paid by the court, the subsidies paid by the society, cost of clothing and extra telephone service, the taxicab service allowed the boarding-home women when taking to their homes girls arrested at night, the salary of the supervisor, medical service, and a small amount for stationery and printing. From September 1, 1919, to August 31, 1920, the total cost of board for 121 court children cared for was \$508.80, and the cost of extras was \$32.35, making the total amount paid by the court \$541.15.

The approximate cost of the service to the Boston Children's Aid Society for the same period, for court children, was \$1,681, making the total approximate cost of detention service \$2,222. This means an average cost per child of about \$18.³¹ The cost includes a considerable item for medical service but does not include the cost of physical examinations of girls by a physician paid directly by the court.

The estimate for the cost of the service to the Boston Children's Aid Society is only approximate for the reason that 63 children were received for care from sources other than the juvenile court, board being paid usually by the agency referring the case. It was difficult to apportion the overhead expense among court children and the

³⁰ As far as possible girls given detention care in 1923 were examined and treated by the preventive clinic operated by the society in cooperation with another agency.

³¹ In June, 1920, the court increased the amount paid for board in five of the homes from \$2 to \$2.50 a day, the weekly rate remaining the same as before; hence, figures for the following year would show a somewhat higher per capita than those for the year ended Aug. 31, 1920.

other children, but since the court children represented 65.8 per cent of the total number of children cared for this percentage was applied to the total cost incurred by the society³² and the result added to the \$541.15 expended by the court.

It is probable that the estimate for the cost to the Boston Children's Aid Society for the care of court children is unduly high, for the reason that other children usually remained in the homes longer than court children and the number of days of care for these other children was not given.³³

The expenses incurred by the Boston Children's Aid Society for the 184 children cared for (including court children and others) were as follows:

Subsidies to homes-----	\$969. 08
Clothing-----	86. 80
Medicine and sundries-----	13. 97
Medical service and supplies (approximate)-----	400. 00
Stationery-----	10. 00
Telephone-----	119. 89
Stenographic service-----	5. 00
Salary of supervisor (part time)-----	950. 00
Total-----	2, 554. 74

The per capita cost of approximately \$18 for children cared for in the Boston boarding homes compares favorably with such figures as are available for well-equipped detention homes, while the total cost of detention for a year (approximately \$2,200) was very much less than would have been required if a detention home of the usual type had been maintained. The boarding-home plan involves no initial investment in land or buildings—a considerable item in the cost of institutional detention service. For instance, the San Francisco detention home cost approximately \$168,000 and \$17,000 for furnishings, a total of \$185,000, exclusive of the cost of the land. At 6 per cent the interest on this investment would be \$11,100 a year, or \$5.70 for each child cared for during the year ended June 30, 1920. The original cost of the St. Louis building was \$180,000, an investment which would yield interest to the amount of \$10,800 annually, or \$4.50 per capita in the year 1920. In San Francisco for the year ended June 30, 1921, the amount appropriated for the maintenance of the detention home was \$13,000 and that for salaries of the staff, \$14,220.^{33a} Including the estimated interest on the investment in the building but excluding the investment in the land, the total cost in that year was \$38,320. The per capita cost, based on the number of children cared for during the previous year, would be \$19.70, as compared with the Boston figure of \$18.

Information as to the investment in buildings and furnishings and the cost of maintenance was not secured for the Los Angeles detention home, but the approximate amount expended for salaries of the staff (including the part time of a psychologist and two physicians)

³² Exclusive of board.

³³ The 1921 annual report of the Boston Children's Aid Society gives the following figures for detention service: Number of homes in use, 8; number of court children, 118; number of Boston Children's Aid Society children, 83; number of children from the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 3; number of other children, 12; customary period of detention for court children, 1 day to 10 days; customary period of detention for S. P. C. C. children, 2 days to 1 month; customary period of detention for Boston Children's Aid Society Children, 1 day to 3 months.

^{33a} For the year ending June 30, 1925, \$30,220 has been appropriated for the detention home—\$17,220 for salaries and \$13,000 for maintenance.

was \$33,780 for the year ended June 30, 1921, or a per capita amount, based on the children cared for in 1919, of \$15.50 for salaries alone. In Seattle the budget for the detention home for 1921 was \$16,975 (including an item for physicians' services), which would make the per capita expenditure, exclusive of the investment in building and land, \$13.50.

Advantages and disadvantages of the plan.

In his report of the first five years of the Boston juvenile court (1906-1911), Judge Baker stated that the use of private-family homes for the detention of girls was entirely satisfactory and that the system gave a better opportunity for observation than a detention home because the girls followed a normal mode of living and the woman with whom they were boarded gained information which the busy matron of a detention home would not have time to acquire. He further stated that the use of private-family homes for the detention of boys for brief periods had been satisfactory and that the possibility of developing the plan should be thoroughly tried out "before any money is locked up in costly buildings and an expensive staff of officials is installed."³⁴ Since Judge Baker made his report this service for boys has been improved by increasing the amount of supervision. The present judge of the juvenile court has stated that he favors the plan. Dr. William Healy, director of the Judge Baker Foundation, at a joint session held under the auspices of the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor and the National Probation Association, on June 21, 1922, said in the course of a discussion of detention:

We have come to be unequivocally against detention homes in all but very exceptional cases. Is the juvenile court established for the good of the children or for the convenience of police officers? As was pointed out years ago by an English penologist, when we place children in institutions they learn worse things than they ever knew before and cultivate habits worse than they ever had before, and that is certainly not going to reform them. It is perfectly true that the detention home, unless you exercise the utmost care, is bound to have this result * * *. We know of many habits formed for life which have been first acquired through acquaintances in the detention home * * *. Without a detention home we are making very much better studies of the children than we ever did before, because the spirit of the community developed in another direction. I grant, of course, that there are young hold-up men put in an institution who ought to be jailed, but I am talking now for the majority of cases that we have become familiar with, not by theory but by actual observation and by statistical information.

On the other hand, some of those familiar with the Boston situation believe that the court needs a small detention home under its direct control.

The arguments for and against this method of detention have been summed up by the supervisor as follows:³⁵

Arguments for the plan of individual care.

The rare opportunities it affords for understanding children, because the reports from the court foster homes after having days of observation of the child are unusually good.

The ability to isolate special problem cases so that the girls or boys presenting sex complexes are not mixed with each other.

³⁴ Harvey Humphrey Baker—Upbuilder of the Juvenile Court, p. 52 ff. Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, 1920.

³⁵ Durham, Elizabeth P.: "Boston's child-court system." The Survey, Nov. 13, 1920, p. 250.

Economy in the expenditure of funds and the attainment of increasingly better social work for the children involved.

The limited detention facilities provided under this family plan tend to make each party interested exert the utmost care to keep a child in his own home, unless his home is wholly unfit.

Where a large house of detention with ample bed facilities is available, there is a very great temptation to admit the child before it is ascertained whether he really should be admitted.

The introduction of the child to a group of other children presenting serious conduct problems, no matter how carefully supervised, results in the interchanging and exchanging of experiences, with very grave effects upon many of the children [as in the usual type of detention home].

Arguments against the plan.

Not all children can be provided for in family detention homes.

There will be many runaways.

It will be hard to get enough families that will care to receive children coming in neglected condition.

The strain to the probation officers.

In most cities having conditions very different from those that hold in Boston, there is such concentration of work in the juvenile court as to make individual care on the Boston plan quite impossible.

Under the Boston plan a certain number of Boston juvenile-court children receive detention care in the city jail.

With reference to the argument that all children can not be provided for in family detention homes, the supervisor stated that there had never been a time when the service could not meet the demands made upon it by the court. No serious difficulty had been experienced in finding families of the right type to care for the children, though as already indicated it was necessary to devote a considerable amount of time to investigating prospective homes. No more escapes occurred and perhaps fewer than are likely to take place at detention homes of the ordinary type. The plan should be further developed to eliminate holding the children in police stations even for very short periods save in exceptional cases. This would involve a change in the procedure of the police department and the designation of one or more boarding homes to which children could be brought by the police immediately upon arrest and at which decision could be made as to release or detention.

Concerning the statement that the plan would not be applicable to cities having conditions very different from those found in Boston, it is undoubtedly true that the application of the plan under present circumstances is limited. Only persons with long experience in the difficult problems of placing out could develop and supervise the service. Moreover, because of the long experience of Massachusetts with the boarding-home system and the extensive work that has been done in finding and developing suitable homes, a type of boarding woman is available which it might be difficult to find elsewhere. The boarding women all had a professional attitude toward the work and subordinated their other interests and activities to it. Nevertheless, the fact that the experiment has worked successfully in Boston is significant of possibilities which may be developed in other places.³⁶

³⁶ The city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., has recently substituted the "Boston plan" for its detention home. "Under this plan the children will be boarded in carefully selected and supervised private homes. This progressive step was made possible through the cooperation of the United Charities of Wilkes-Barre, who have added an extra visitor to the staff of their child-welfare department to have charge of this new work." News Letter, Pennsylvania Department of Welfare, Bureau of Children, June, 1923.

STUDY OF THE CASE.

IMPORTANCE OF ADEQUATE STUDY.

The purpose of the juvenile court is not to inflict a penalty on a child but to save him from further delinquency and from neglect. Its success, therefore, depends upon a comprehensive understanding of all the significant aspects of each case.

In few courts has provision been made for such thorough study of children's cases. Social investigations are generally recognized as an essential part of the procedure, but they are by no means uniformly complete. Practically all the juvenile courts in large cities have facilities of some kind for physical examinations, and many of them make provision for mental examinations, which are, however, frequently confined to intelligence tests. But many courts make these examinations only in cases where some defect or disability is obvious or suspected.

Only one of the courts studied had provision at the time of the inquiry for well-rounded study of all important cases, including the social, physical, and mental factors. As a rule, the facilities for social investigation, that is, the study of the child's surroundings, were more complete than were those for the study of the child himself. Social investigations were usually made by probation officers who were also engaged in supervising children and families, but in four of the courts—those in Los Angeles, Seattle, St. Louis, and the District of Columbia—special investigators devoted full time to this work.

SOCIAL INVESTIGATION.

Types of cases investigated.

In seven of the courts studied it was the general rule that all cases formally handled should be investigated prior to hearing, but certain exceptions were made—in one court, of traffic cases; in another, of cases involving violations of city ordinances; and in several courts, of children's cases referred by other agencies which had already made social investigations.³⁷ In the District of Columbia investigations were never made prior to the first hearing, but the majority of cases, including all those of serious nature, were continued for investigation and disposition. In Boston, hearings frequently were held on the day the complaint was made, thus making impossible a thorough investigation prior to the hearing. Many minor cases were formally handled, since comparatively few cases were dealt with unofficially. The Boston court continued for investigation all serious cases in which complete information was not available at the time of the hearing. In the New Orleans court

³⁷ The report of the committee on juvenile-court standards emphasized the importance of prompt hearings and also of social investigation set in motion at the moment of the court's earliest knowledge of the case (pp. 253-254). To apply the former principle, it would often be necessary for the court to hold a preliminary hearing, as in Boston and the District of Columbia, and then continue the case for investigation and disposition.

investigations were made only when there appeared to be a possibility of informal adjustment or when disputed facts or indications of special needs became evident during the hearing.

Scope of investigation in delinquency cases.

Essentials of investigation and sources of information.—Juvenile-court investigations call for the exercise of special care in eliminating untrustworthy evidence regarding both the child himself and his home conditions. The investigations in some of the courts studied conformed in general to the standards developed by family-relief and child-caring agencies. In other courts they were not carefully planned or supervised, and the information was obtained in a more or less haphazard fashion.

The essential points to be covered by the social investigation in a delinquency case include at least the following:

1. The cause of the complaint.
2. The child's developmental history, habits, and conduct, including previous delinquencies.
3. Home conditions:
 - (a) Composition of the family; occupations, earnings, and characteristics of its members; and assistance from social agencies.
 - (b) Type of dwelling, and living and sleeping arrangements.
 - (c) Conditions in the home which may have a special relation to the child's conduct.
 - (d) Constructive possibilities in the home.
4. The child and his school:
 - (a) Present standing with reference to academic progress and conduct.
 - (b) School history.
5. The child's working history (if he has been employed).
6. The child's recreational activities and connection with churches, clubs, and other organizations.

The sources of information with reference to these points may include:

1. An interview with the child.
2. A visit to the home and an interview with one or both parents (preferably both).
3. Interviews with relatives, neighbors, and companions.
4. Interviews with principals, teachers, and officials of the school-attendance department; school records.
5. Interviews with employers, past and present.
6. Inquiry of social-service exchange and social agencies that have known the child or family.

Information obtained from the child.—In delinquency cases it was the almost invariable practice in eight of the courts to include an interview with the child as part of the investigation; in two courts the child was not always interviewed. In most instances the child was questioned about the circumstances of the offense, though in one court emphasis was placed on the point that the child was not to be cross-questioned; but a child unwilling to admit that he was involved in the delinquency complained of was admonished to tell

the truth in court. Considerable importance was attached in some courts to the child's interpretation of the reasons for his coming to the attention of the court. In Los Angeles, for instance, the first step in the investigation when the child was detained was an interview with him at the place of detention. He was questioned particularly with reference to the cause of the complaint, and his statement of the reasons for his apprehension was taken down verbatim. Information concerning the child's history and the motive for the offense was secured at this interview and was later checked with information obtained from other sources. In San Francisco, too, all children detained were interviewed at the detention home as the first step in the investigation. Information was secured concerning the circumstances connected with the offense for which he was brought to court, the child's school and work record, and his special interests. Children detained in Seattle were interviewed at the beginning of the investigation and a second time after the investigation was completed. In the District of Columbia investigations were subsequent to the initial hearing; the children were always interviewed privately, either at home or at the probation office.

Information obtained from the parents and from home visits.—A visit to the home and an interview with one or both parents were almost always considered essential parts of the investigation. Sometimes office interviews with the parents took the place of home visits. In two or three courts special efforts were made to interview both the mother and the father, and private interviews with the father at the probation office were sometimes arranged. In four courts information obtained from the parents was frequently supplemented by visits to other relatives, friends, or neighbors, and in two other courts they were consulted when it was necessary to check conflicting statements or supply missing data. Investigators often stated that they were very careful about making inquiries which might be prejudicial to the child or his family.

Through interviews with child and parents, supplemented by data obtained from neighbors, relatives, and other sources, more or less complete information was secured with reference to the child's personal history, school and work records, habits, and associates. In the District of Columbia at the time of the study the social investigation, which had been under the direction of the head of the juvenile-court clinic, included a considerable amount of information concerning the child's developmental history; in two other courts the parents were questioned with reference to the child's physical and mental condition, and the form used for recording the investigations had space for the information obtained as a result of this questioning and the investigator's observation of the child. One court included a specific question with reference to the child's vocational preference. The probation officers of the Boston court obtained general information with regard to the child's history, and much more intensive information was secured by the Judge Baker Foundation in cases studied by that agency. In all the courts new cases were cleared with court records to determine whether the children had been in court previously. In addition, in Boston all cases were registered with the State probation commission, which kept an index of all the cases known to the Boston courts or to the courts in a number of adjoining cities.

All the courts except one attempted to secure information regarding family circumstances and home conditions, the investigation forms usually specifying such items as the composition of the family, the ages of the members, their occupations and earnings, their religious affiliations, their habits, and their police records. With reference to the type of dwelling, the following items were often included: Type of dwelling; floor; owned; rent; number of rooms; number of persons in household; number of boarders and roomers. The form used by only one court included a question on sleeping accommodations, and one other included an inquiry with reference to the persons occupying the child's sleeping room. The importance of these facts does not seem to have been generally recognized. In some of the courts specific information was obtained with reference to the sanitary conditions in the home, its upkeep, and the moral conditions of the home and neighborhood. In one court two visits were made to the home, if possible, to determine its physical condition and the standards maintained.

Some of the investigation blanks called for information with reference to the "atmosphere in the home," the "parents' attitude toward the child," or the "parents' suggestions" with reference to the child.

The District of Columbia juvenile court has recently prepared a very complete outline for summarizing investigations of cases of delinquency. The investigation form in use calls for the usual "face-card" information regarding the child and the home, and the third and fourth pages of the form are left blank for a summary to be prepared under the following headings: Charge; family history; health; education; church; character; employment and family income; budget; child's story; sources of information. The family budget in each case is to be considered in relation to the standards of living maintained by the family and in relation to the child's employment.

The preceding discussion has been based mainly on the standards for investigation found in the different courts and the information called for on the investigation forms. Reading of records disclosed the frequent failure on the part of the investigator to obtain all, or even the major part, of the information called for on the investigation forms. Overburdened officers often found it impossible to secure, or at least to record, all the facts which the investigation was supposed to cover, and in most of the courts there was no systematic review of investigations by the chief probation officer or the department supervisor to determine the adequacy of the information obtained. In most of the courts studied the records of investigation showed a lack of appreciation of the importance of such factors as the attitude of the child and the parents and other members of the household toward each other, the causes of irritation or unhappiness that might exist in the family circle, the extent to which the parents attempted to hold the interest of the child in his home, and the cooperation or lack of cooperation between the parents and the school. Such an analysis of home conditions, if made at all, usually came after the child had been placed on probation, the officials of the court failing to realize its significance in connection with the disposition of the case.

School history.—The schools are an important source of information in all cases involving school children, but in only six of the courts was

that source utilized in practically all cases. In two other courts such inquiry was frequently made. In one court information was never obtained from the schools, and in another it was not secured as a rule. Objection to consulting the teachers was sometimes made on the ground that they might discriminate against children known to have been before the juvenile court, or that the other children might become aware of the situation. To avoid this possible difficulty an interesting method of cooperation had been worked out in Los Angeles between the court and the school department. The court made application for school records direct to the school-attendance department instead of to individual schools. This department was in the habit of asking for special reports from teachers in a large number of cases in which it alone was concerned; requests for data on court cases were made in the same manner, and the school-teachers and principals were not aware that the requests were made for the court.³⁸ A number of judges and probation officers, however, felt that cooperation with teachers was very important and that their discretion could be relied upon.

Working history.—Information from the employers of working children was rarely secured as part of the investigation, unless the employer was especially involved in the case. In one court, however, it was stated that both former and present employers were often consulted; and in another, that employers were usually consulted. Past employers were seen in one court when it seemed desirable, though the policy was not to interview present employers. Some of the investigating officers brought out the point that although it was, as a rule, undesirable to see the employers, for fear they would be prejudiced against the children, welfare workers in large industrial establishments were an important source of information and could usually be trusted with the facts.

Information from the social-service exchange and social agencies.—The existence of a social-service exchange in each of the cities studied made it possible for the courts to secure information in all cases as to whether or not the families had been known to other agencies. One court, however, never utilized this source, and in only three courts were all cases cleared through the exchange. Some of the judges questioned whether the court ought to clear delinquency cases through the exchange; in one court this agency was not utilized at all in the investigations, but inquiry was made after children had been placed on probation or under supervision. In another court inquiry was not made in cases of delinquent children but was made in adult cases, and in still another court the exchange was consulted more often in dependency and neglect cases than in delinquency cases. Most of the courts reported that information was secured from social agencies if it was known that they had dealt with the child or his family. When requested, information was given to social agencies that had a legitimate interest in a case.

For 524 of the 869 children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court during the period September 1, 1919, to August 31, 1920, representatives of the Children's Bureau secured from the records of the proba-

³⁸ A plan has been worked out in the District of Columbia since the time of the study, whereby requests for information concerning the attendance and conduct of children coming before the court are sent to the supervising principal of the division in which the school is located, and the individual teachers are not consulted by the court.

tion office information reported by the Boston Confidential Exchange. In 286 cases, or 55 per cent, the family had been known to some agency; many families had been known to a number of different agencies. The total number of children whose families had been known to family-care agencies, public and private, was 157; to child-caring agencies, public and private, 93; to child-protective agencies, 65; and to correctional institutions, 17. Other agencies included health agencies, day nurseries, school visitors, and agencies engaged in vocational or in recreational work.

Investigations in cases of neglect and dependency.

In several of the courts the investigations in neglect and dependency cases were left to private or public agencies which initiated court action.³⁹ In others the court itself made these investigations, which often did not differ materially from investigations in delinquency cases so far as the facts regarding the family and the home and the information gained from social agencies were concerned.

In the "county-aid" cases in the San Francisco court and in the mothers' allowance and mothers' pension cases in Minneapolis and Seattle detailed information was obtained with reference to family income and expenditures and the estimated family need, as well as facts which were essential in establishing the right to aid, such as length of residence, date of marriage, date of death and cause of death of the father, and amount of property and insurance. In Denver such information was obtained by another public agency which cooperated with the court in the administration of the mothers' pension law.

Investigations in adoption cases.

The principal reason for placing adoptions under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court is that a thorough investigation may then be made of the circumstances surrounding the adoption and the prospective foster home. Yet in the two courts which had jurisdiction over adoption cases investigations were not invariably made. In one of these courts it was stated that adoption cases usually came through a State or a private institution which had already made investigations. This court always required three letters of recommendation regarding the future home and frequently made inquiry in regard to conditions. In the other court it was the practice to appoint the investigator guardian ad litem in each adoption case. She investigated the situation if it seemed necessary, in some cases making extensive inquiries and in others relying mainly upon letters from persons given as references. No record was kept in this court of the investigations in adoption cases.

Investigations in adult cases.

A situation similar to that respecting adoption cases was found with reference to investigations of adult cases, including nonsupport and contributing to delinquency or dependency. The object of placing these cases in the juvenile court is to secure socialized treatment, and this is not possible without adequate investigation. Seven of the courts exercised some type of adult jurisdiction. In only two of them was regular provision made for investigation of such cases.

³⁹ See pp. 31, 33.

STUDY OF THE CHILD.

Need of scientific study.

When all the facts that a social investigator can gain about the child, his family, his home, his school, his recreation, and his companionships have been ascertained, the court is still far from knowing the kind of child with which it has to deal and often has little knowledge of the causes of the delinquency. If treatment is to be directed to causes and adapted to the needs of the individual, the child himself must be studied—his physical condition, his mental capacities, his personality, and the driving forces of his conduct.

Such study involves, first, a thorough physical examination by a competent physician; second, the measurement of the intelligence of the child through mental tests; and third, skillful and sympathetic study by a person trained in the analysis of mental life and the motivation of behavior. Such study should link together, check up, and evaluate the results of the social investigation, physical examination, and psychological and psychiatric study. In large cities the facilities for study of the child may be provided by the court itself, or may be secured through cooperation with other agencies or institutions. In small communities a county-wide service or a traveling clinic working out from some center in the State may afford the means for such study.

Not only is scientific study indispensable to adequate understanding of individual children who come before the court, but unless the court knows the material with which it deals and the results of the treatment prescribed it can not measure its successes or its failures.

Physical examinations.

In three cities no provision was made for paid service in giving physical examinations to children before the court. In one of them the city physician or one of his assistants examined children referred by the court; some children were examined by private physicians who volunteered their services. Only those children were examined whom the judge or the superintendent of the institution which gave detention service deemed to be obviously in need of attention. In the second city having no paid service of this kind physical examinations were sometimes made prior to the hearing by volunteer physicians, of whom two men and two women were on call. Perhaps as many as four or five boys were given examinations each month. The third court, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, had had for 14 months prior to the time of the study the services of a clinic maintained by the United States Public Health Service; a man physician and psychiatrist had been employed on full time, and a woman physician on part time.⁴⁰

Provision for physical examination was frequently made in connection with the detention home, for the purpose both of protecting the detention-home population from the spread of communicable disease and of studying the child as a preliminary to deciding upon treatment. It is unfortunate when the services of the examining physician are confined mainly to the detention-home population, as was the case in several of the courts studied. In Buffalo and St.

⁴⁰ This service has since been discontinued, and the court now depends upon a hospital social-service department, a hospital out-patient department, and other volunteer service.

Louis⁴¹ a physician from the school department came to the detention home every morning and examined children detained. Children not detained were not examined unless their appearance or conduct indicated special need. In neither city was a woman physician available for examining girls, but in St. Louis the superintendent of the detention home (a woman) was always present when girls were examined, and in Buffalo the superintendent (a woman) or other female attendant, was always present during such examinations.

In Seattle each boy brought before the court formally or informally was weighed and measured and given a brief examination by the "chief probation officer and diagnostician," who was a physician of long experience. It was planned to have a woman physician, employed on a part-time basis, make examinations in certain girls' cases.

The University of California maintained a clinic for the San Francisco juvenile court. The head of the clinic was in charge of both the medical and the psychological work. A woman physician was assigned to the detention home and gave the major part of her time to physical examinations and medical care of the children detained. A man physician came to the detention home three times a week and examined all the boys. A nurse, paid by the court, gave full time to the clinic and the care of the children in the home.

One entire floor of the San Francisco detention home was devoted to the clinic and the receiving ward for girls. All children in the detention home were examined, except those who remained a very short time, and children not detained were often brought to the clinic. One room was equipped with the necessary apparatus for a dental clinic. Formerly a dentist examined the children's teeth but he had not had time to do any corrective work; at the time of the study the physician giving the general examination reported on the condition of the teeth, and arrangements for corrective work were made with outside dentists. The detention home had an operating room where tonsillectomy and other minor operations were performed.

The Los Angeles court employed a man physician on part time to examine the older boys. A woman physician employed on a part-time basis spent every day except Tuesday and Sunday at the detention home and examined the girls and younger boys. A nurse was employed on a full-time basis. All children detained in Juvenile Hall or in the county jail who were not released prior to their hearings were given physical examinations, and other children were examined at the request of the judge or the probation officers. Examination was made as a matter of routine, and few parents objected. The nurse weighed and measured the children and made preliminary physical examinations. Throat cultures were made in all cases within three days after admission to Juvenile Hall, and laboratory tests were made in girls' cases. Boys suspected of having venereal disease were sent to the county hospital for examination.

The Minneapolis court placed more emphasis than did many of the courts studied on physical examinations and corrective work. The staff of the court clinic was composed of a man physician in charge, a woman physician, and a dentist, all employed on a part-

⁴¹ A clinic has since been established in St. Louis, which is making physical examinations as well as psychological and psychiatric studies for the juvenile court. See *The Psychiatric Clinic in the Treatment of Conduct Disorders of Children and the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency*, by V. V. Anderson, M. D. (The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, New York, 1923).

time basis; an oculist, who volunteered his services; and a full-time nurse, appointed as a probation officer. The nurse made arrangements for examinations, visited the homes of the children, assisted in operations, and did follow-up work. The plan was to have the nurse make a home visit prior to the examination, but lack of time prevented this in the majority of cases. Children were examined before adjudication of their cases only at the request of the judge, after the first hearing. The aim of the court was to have all children on probation and all those at the county schools (institutions for delinquent children) given physical examination. Children not committed to institutions were not examined without the consent of their parents, written or oral. Dependent and neglected children were examined at the request of the judge or the agency initiating the case.

Girls were examined in Minneapolis by the woman physician, either at her office or at the county school for girls. Many girls were sent to the school before examinations had been made. The court was hoping to be able to install more complete equipment in the nurse's office, so that specimens could be taken for the health department and a diagnosis made within 24 hours. This would avoid the necessity of sending girls to an institution before the examination had been completed.

In Boston a woman physician on the staff of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was employed by the juvenile court to make physical examinations in girls' cases; she received a certain amount for each examination. The outpatient departments of several hospitals and dispensaries were used by the court, and laboratory tests were made at those hospitals. The Judge Baker Foundation made physical examinations of all children's cases referred to it for study. In girls' cases, when it was felt necessary to have a local examination, as in the cases of all sex offenders, it was made by the woman physician employed by the court. The Boston court frequently secured information from the school department with reference to the physical condition of children. Every school child was supposed to have a physical examination in school. Most of the schools had school nurses, and the probation officers frequently consulted with them. The dispensaries were in touch with a great many children who were on probation.

In the District of Columbia while the court clinic was in operation, the children were given physical examinations in practically all cases in which social investigations were made—a majority of the formal cases. Boys were examined by the man physician in charge of the clinic, and girls by a woman physician. Every child was given a Wassermann test, and every girl was examined for gonorrhoea. This was the only court studied in which such tests were made in so large a proportion of cases.⁴²

Information as to the number of children given physical examinations was available for only five courts. In the District of Columbia during the period between February 9, 1920, and March 31, 1921, when the United States Public Health Service clinic was in operation, 1,050 children were given physical examinations.⁴³ The total num-

⁴² These tests are no longer given as a matter of routine.

⁴³ Hearings before the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Sixty-Seventh Congress, First Session, H. R. 4118, June 9, 1921, p. 23.

ber of delinquent children formally before the District of Columbia court in the year 1919-20 was 1,125. In Boston 869 delinquent children were dealt with by the juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, and 364 (12 of them after the close of the year) were referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.⁴⁴ These 364 children and some others were given physical examinations.

During 1919, 469 children were examined by the Minneapolis court, of whom only 10 were found to have no defects. The total number of delinquent children before the Minneapolis court in the same period was 1,000 and the total number of dependent and neglected children was 549.⁴⁵ In St. Louis the number of complete physical examinations made in 1920 was 965, and the number of cases of children entering the detention home in the same year was 2,386; a child was given a complete physical examination only on his first entrance into the detention home.⁴⁶ The total number of delinquent children dealt with by the St. Louis court in 1920 was 1,708, and the total number of neglected children was 356. In Buffalo 232 children were given physical examinations in 1920; the number of children detained was 461; and the number of children before the court was 1,003.⁴⁷

Study of the child's mental capacities and mental life.

Facilities provided and basis of selecting cases.—The courts in Boston, Buffalo, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and San Francisco were making some provision for the employment of expert service in mental examinations, though in some of these cities the study of the child's mental condition was made only in a small proportion of cases and was limited to the giving of routine intelligence tests. In five of the courts at the time of this inquiry there was no provision for paid service for the study of the child's mental condition.^{47a} The Seattle and District of Columbia courts, however, had recently had fairly complete facilities for such study, which will be described. The courts of St. Louis and New Orleans were dependent on volunteer assistance. Since the time of the study a psychiatric clinic has been established in St. Louis, at first by the Commonwealth Fund of New York, through the division on prevention of delinquency of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, and now as a municipal undertaking. This clinic has placed its facilities at the disposal of the juvenile court.⁴⁸ Similar clinics have been established in Minneapolis (the clinic will also serve St. Paul) and Los Angeles.

Provision for psychological study in the Minneapolis court was limited. A school psychologist who gave half a day each week to court work was employed by the court during the months when school was in session. Only about two children could be examined each week. Selection of children for psychological study was made by the judge, the probation officers, the physician, and the superin-

⁴⁴ Data compiled from court records and records of the Judge Baker Foundation.

⁴⁵ The Juvenile Court of Hennepin County, Minn., 1918-19, pp. 13, 15, 24, 48.

⁴⁶ Report of the Juvenile Court and Probation Office for the Years 1916 to 1920, inclusive, St. Louis, Mo., p. 18.

⁴⁷ Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1920, pp. 17, 26, 29. In 1923 the number examined was 249 (Twelfth Annual Report, p. 31).

^{47a} The school department of Denver, since the time of the study, has arranged to make mental examinations for the juvenile court.

⁴⁸ See p. 95, footnote 41.

tendents of the county schools for boys and girls, and was based mainly on the presence of characteristics indicating possible mental defect. In Buffalo, as in Minneapolis, a member of the staff of the school department called a "psychophysiological examiner" gave part time to court work, but in Buffalo he came to the detention home every morning. All children detained were examined and others, in the discretion of the judge.

The clinic maintained in the San Francisco court by the University of California furnished psychological as well as medical service, and the head of the clinic, who was also a medical and mental examiner for the health department, was both a physician and a psychologist. Her assistant, a graduate nurse, was paid a salary by the health department, and five graduate students, two of whom were working for doctors' degrees in psychology, volunteered their services. At times as many as 15 graduate students were doing this work. The routine testing was done by the students, but the head of the clinic wrote all reports except those prepared by the most advanced students, reviewed all reports that she had not written, and examined difficult cases. Each student was assigned some special problem; for instance, the follow-up of individual feeble-minded girls. All children in the detention home a sufficient length of time and others who appeared to be in need of study were given psychological examinations. It was the general rule that no recommendation for commitment should be made until the child had undergone both a medical and a psychological examination. Children of border-line mentality were reexamined at least once a year during the time they were under the control of the court. Many mothers and fathers involved in neglect cases were examined.

A psychologist was employed by the Los Angeles court on a part-time basis and spent four days a week in the detention home. Practically every child detained in Juvenile Hall until the time of hearing was examined, as were children recommended for examination by the judge or the probation officer. One day a week was devoted to examinations in cases referred by outside agencies. Difficult psychopathic cases were referred to the psychopathic department of the county hospital. It is of interest to note that both the judge and the referee had had psychological training. The judge presided over the psychopathic department of the superior court, as well as over the juvenile department, and in juvenile hearings laid considerable stress on the psychological aspects of the cases.⁴⁹

In Seattle the chief probation officer, a physician, who was also diagnostician, studied more or less intensively each boy who came before the court.⁵⁰ A considerable amount of time was spent in separate interviews with the child and his parents and in interpreting the child to his parents and enlisting their cooperation in dealing with the maladjustments which were revealed. Routine tests were not given as a rule. In addition, the court utilized for psychological study of the children the Gatzert Foundation, connected with the University of Washington, and the child-study department of the Seattle public schools. A member of the staff of the mothers*

⁴⁹ This judge is no longer assigned to juvenile-court work.

⁵⁰ At the time of the study the "chief probation officer and diagnostician" had just resigned and the court had to depend primarily upon outside agencies for psychological study of the children. This officer later returned to the court.

pension department of the court who had had psychological training gave mental tests in certain cases—but not more than three a week. The chief probation officer selected the cases in which examinations were to be made. All girls committed to the county parental school were thus tested. No final diagnoses were made by this investigator, but cases in which abnormality was suspected were referred for further study to the department above mentioned.

During the time when the United States Public Health Service clinic was in operation in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia mental examinations were given in practically all cases in which social investigations were made. All mental examinations were made by the director of the clinic—a physician who was equipped for psychological and psychiatric study. From one and one-half to two hours was spent with each child. The basis of the mental study was the Stanford revision of the Binet-Simon scale, but the director also tried to obtain some information concerning the child's mental reactions and mental life. Occasionally children were referred for further study to private clinics or to hospitals.

The Judge Baker Foundation studied all children referred to it by the Boston juvenile court, the judge selecting the cases for examination. All cases presenting serious problems and practically all in which commitment to an institution or agency was contemplated were given intensive study by the foundation. The staff comprised, at the time of this inquiry, two directors, of whom one was a psychiatrist and the other a psychologist; one paid social worker and one full-time volunteer social worker; three volunteer assistant psychologists giving part time; the holder of a scholarship in applied psychology; and two stenographers, one of whom gave part time to social investigation.

The offices of the foundation were in a down-town office building. When a child was to be examined, an appointment was made by the court, and one of the parents was required to go with the child. If this was not possible, the child went by himself, or if he had been detained in a boarding home he was taken by a probation officer. One of the two directors dealt personally with each difficult case. Mental tests and analyses of the mental life and attitudes and reactions to experiences were made by the directors or by assistant psychologists on the staff. Several hours were spent in each examination, and sometimes several visits to the foundation were required. Each case was discussed at a staff meeting led by the directors, and recommendations for treatment were made as a result of these conferences. The directors passed on each case studied. All cases were followed up by a system later described.⁵¹

Number of children studied.

For only five courts could figures be secured showing number of children given mental examinations. In Boston the children referred to the Judge Baker Foundation (364 of the 869 delinquent and wayward children before the court in the year ended August 31, 1920) were referred primarily for study of their mentality and personality. In the District of Columbia during the period from February 9, 1920, to March 31, 1921, when the clinic conducted by

⁵¹ See p. 102.

the United States Public Health Service was in operation, a total of 1,061 children were given mental examinations.⁵² This constituted a large majority of the delinquent children dealt with formally by the juvenile court during the same period. (The number of delinquent children dealt with in the year ended June 30, 1920, was 1,125.)

The number of delinquent children dealt with by the Buffalo children's court in 1920 was 979, and 209 children were given mental examinations.⁵³ In Minneapolis in 1919 mental examinations were given 117 children, and the total number of delinquent children before the court was 1,000.⁵⁴ Statistics were available in San Francisco only for the girls' department, which dealt with 225 girls in the year ended June 30, 1920; 151 girls were given psychological examinations.⁵⁵

CORRELATION OF PHYSICAL, MENTAL, AND SOCIAL FINDINGS.

Study of the child which will contribute to the understanding of his delinquency and furnish a basis for treatment necessarily involves the correlation of physical, mental, and social findings. Yet in one court no attempt was made to furnish the person who made the physical and mental examinations with information gained from the social investigation, and records of physical and mental examinations were filed in a different place from that where social records were kept. The social-investigation blank did, however, call for the physical and mental findings. In another court the psychologist had, in most cases, no physical or social findings to aid in interpreting the results of the mental examination.

The psychologist in a third court had the medical report and such history as had been obtained from the child on his admission to the detention home. In special cases a report of the social investigation was obtained from the probation officer, but as a rule the social findings were not available to the psychologist, and the physical and mental findings were usually not available to the person making the investigation until after the hearing. The summary made by the superintendent of the detention home for every child detained and presented to the judge or referee at the time of the hearing included information in regard to the results of medical and mental examinations, record during detention, and school record.

In five courts the social, physical, and mental findings were considered together. Although the psychological service in the Minneapolis court was very inadequate, in those cases which were studied full information concerning physical condition and social history was furnished the psychologist. Before a mental examination was made the nurse filled out a physical record containing facts with reference to: The family history and the child's developmental history during infancy and childhood, anatomical measurements, defects, mental balance, reflexes, heredity, treatment furnished by the physical department, and results. A sociological history was also prepared, containing information about the parents, the use of spare time, friends, recreation, home conditions, and school history. A home visit

⁵² Hearings before the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Sixty-seventh Congress, First Session, H. R. 4118, June 9, 1921, p. 23.

⁵³ Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, N. Y., 1920, pp. 22-29. In 1923 the number examined was 249 (Twelfth Annual Report, p. 31).

⁵⁴ The Juvenile Court of Hennepin County, Minnesota, 1918-1919, pp. 13, 15, 49.

⁵⁵ San Francisco Juvenile Court, Annual report for the year ending June 30, 1920 (in manuscript).

always preceded psychological study. Separate reports of the physical and mental examinations and the social investigation were filed. The social information gained by the probation officers was not used in connection with the psychological study, all social information for that purpose being obtained by the nurse. The fact that a physical or mental examination had been given was entered on the probation officer's history sheet.

In San Francisco the results of the physical examination and the social history obtained by the probation officer were reviewed in connection with the mental examination. In special cases one of the assistants in the clinic visited the home to secure supplemental information. Separate reports of the social investigation and the physical and mental study were made, but before the hearing a summary of the important facts revealed in any of the fields was made by the probation officer making the social investigation.

The diagnostician in Seattle made brief physical examinations and studied the children from both the social and the psychological approach. In the District of Columbia court the director of the clinic had made both the physical and the mental examinations in boys' cases. Data concerning the family history, the child's developmental and social history, and his physical condition were considered important factors in diagnosis. The results of the physical and mental examinations were included in the report of the social investigation and were also filed separately.

The physical examination and social history were considered by the Judge Baker Foundation of Boston as indispensable to interpretation of the mental examination and any decision as to the causes of delinquent conduct; therefore the findings in all three fields were closely correlated. Social history was secured from probation officers' reports, reports of social agencies, interviews with parents at the office, and if these sources were insufficient, home visits. One of the parents was always required to come to the office to give the facts of the child's biological, educational, and environmental background. The summary prepared for presentation to the case conference included, in addition to the physical and mental findings, items concerning the family, home conditions, developmental history, habits, school, work, interests, and companions and the special facts which might be regarded as probable causative factors of the delinquency.

RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO TREATMENT AND FOLLOW-UP WORK.

In most of the courts studied a recommendation for disposition was made either by the person making the social investigation, the chief probation officer, or the person making the mental examination. In Buffalo and Denver the person making the social investigation usually recommended the treatment that should be given, and in the former city the investigation and the recommendation were reviewed by the chief probation officer prior to hearing. The probation officers in Minneapolis, or the agents of societies bringing cases to court, sometimes included in their reports recommendations as to disposition; at the weekly or semiweekly case conferences of the probation staff, interesting cases were discussed. In the District of Columbia court recommendations were made by the director of the clinic.

In the San Francisco court the main facts were summarized, and recommendation was made by the probation officer responsible for the social investigation. All recommendations for probation or commitment were subject to the approval of the chief probation officer. For first hearings reports without recommendations were submitted, but in continued cases recommendations were always made. Case conferences for each department were held weekly, and in the girls' department and the family-relations department all cases were discussed at these conferences prior to hearing. Representatives of children's agencies joined in the conferences of the family-relations department, which dealt mainly with county-aid cases, and recommendations for disposition were made.

The superintendent of the Los Angeles detention home summarized cases in which the child was detained, but did not include in the summary the report of the probation officer. The probation officer's report included a recommendation for disposition, and in the girls' department these recommendations were reviewed by the head of the department. In the boys' department recommendations were not usually reviewed.

The investigator of the Seattle court prepared in each case as brief a report as possible and did not include any recommendations. The diagnostician reviewed all investigations prior to hearing but made no written recommendations, though he frequently made oral recommendations at the time of the hearing.

In Boston the probation officers' reports of investigations did not include recommendations, but in all cases studied by the Judge Baker Foundation a summary of the study and a prognosis, including recommendations, were made by that agency. The recommendations were the result of the case conferences held by the staff of the foundation. The judge conferred with a director of the foundation almost every day regarding court cases and frequently conferred also with members of the staff.

Except for remedial physical work that was carried on by some of the other courts—notably the Minneapolis court—the Boston court was the only one of the 10 that had the advantage of follow-up work by the persons making the study of the child. All cases studied by the Judge Baker Foundation were followed up as a routine procedure within six months, if possible, and in many special cases at much more frequent intervals. The probation officers and the social agencies having charge of the children were expected to report progress, and the social investigators on the foundation staff made visits in cases not under the care of the court or of social agencies. Case conferences were held with representatives of the agencies from time to time, each conference being concerned with the cases under the care of a single agency. A follow-up card system was maintained, providing for each new adjustment. Different colors were used for different types of cases. The recommendations were entered on the top of the card and the adjustments below.⁵⁶ Restudies of special cases were also made.

⁵⁶ See form, p. 288.

CHILDREN STUDIED BY THE JUDGE BAKER FOUNDATION OF BOSTON.

The Judge Baker Foundation was established in 1917 and is equipped to study about 600 new cases each year. At first the work of the foundation was concerned almost entirely with children before the Boston juvenile court, but cases have been referred from other agencies in increasing numbers. Of the first 600 children studied, 538 were referred by the court; of the second 600, 441; of the third 600, 292. In 1920 the foundation studied children referred by 39 different agencies.

During the year ended August 31, 1920, 352 children were referred by the Boston juvenile court to the Judge Baker Foundation. This number constituted 40.5 per cent of the total number of delinquent children⁵⁷ dealt with by the court. A larger proportion of girls than of boys were referred—69.5 per cent as compared with 38.4 per cent. Information concerning the children was secured from records of the Judge Baker Foundation.

Table 12 shows that more than half of the children charged with theft and allied offenses were referred to the clinic. The foundation was asked to study over three-fourths of the stubborn or wayward children or sex offenders dealt with by the court during the year. Only a small percentage of violators of ordinances and license regulations were referred.

TABLE 12.—Number and percentage of children referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation, by offense and sex; delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920.

First offense committed during the year.	Delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court.								
	Both sexes.			Boys.			Girls.		
	Total.	Referred to Judge Baker Foundation.		Total.	Referred to Judge Baker Foundation.		Total.	Referred to Judge Baker Foundation.	
		Num-ber.	Per-cent. ¹		Num-ber.	Per-cent. ¹		Num-ber.	Per-cent. ¹
Total.....	869	² 352	40.5	774	286	37.0	95	66	69.5
Stubbornness, waywardness, and immorality.....	62	48	77.4	34	27	-----	28	21	-----
Runaway.....	42	28	-----	20	15	-----	22	13	-----
Violation of city ordinances or license regulations.....	145	13	9.0	145	³ 13	9.0	-----	-----	-----
Theft and allied offenses ⁴	419	226	53.9	375	⁵ 194	51.7	44	32	-----
Assault and battery.....	21	4	-----	21	4	-----	-----	-----	-----
Miscellaneous statutory misdemeanors.....	180	33	18.3	179	³ 33	18.4	⁶ 1	-----	-----

¹ Per cent not shown where base is less than 50.

² Including 74 children not referred to the Judge Baker Foundation in connection with the offense shown but referred by the court and studied by the foundation at an earlier date. Twelve others not included were subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

³ Three others were subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

⁴ Including breaking and entering.

⁵ Five others were subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

⁶ Subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

⁵⁷ Including wayward children.

The percentages of children of various age groups referred for study increased with the age of the child. (Table 13.) Only 28.1 per cent of those under 10 years were sent to the foundation, as compared with 48.4 per cent of those 16 years of age.

TABLE 13.—*Number and percentage of children referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation, by age and sex; delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920.*

Age of child.	Delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court.								
	Both sexes.			Boys.			Girls.		
	Total.	Referred to Judge Baker Foundation.		Total.	Referred to Judge Baker Foundation.		Total.	Referred to Judge Baker Foundation.	
		Num-ber.	Per-cent. ¹		Num-ber.	Per-cent. ¹		Num-ber.	Per-cent. ¹
Total.....	869	² 352	40.5	774	286	37.0	95	66	69.5
Under 10 years.....	57	16	28.1	55	³ 15	27.3	2	1	-----
10-11 years.....	114	40	35.1	107	⁴ 36	33.6	7	4	-----
12-13 years.....	188	70	37.2	182	⁴ 66	36.3	6	4	-----
14-15 years.....	301	137	45.5	257	⁴ 106	41.2	44	⁵ 31	-----
16 years.....	182	88	48.4	148	62	41.9	34	26	-----
Not reported.....	27	1	-----	25	1	-----	2	-----	-----

¹ Per cent not shown where base is less than 50.

² Twelve others were subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

³ Two others were subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

⁴ Three others were subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

⁵ One other was subsequently referred to the Judge Baker Foundation.

In addition to the 352 referred to the foundation at the time they were before the court on the first offense charged during the year, or previously referred, 12 children were referred for study on account of a subsequent offense. The mental condition of the 364 children examined by the foundation at any time is shown in Table 14. Two-thirds of the children (67.9 per cent) were mentally normal or supernormal; 28.3 per cent were defective, and 2.7 per cent were psychopathic or psychotic or feeble-minded. The percentage of supernormal mentality was higher among girls than among boys—14.9 as compared with 7.1 per cent.

TABLE 14.—*Mental condition of delinquent boys and girls dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, and referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation.*

Mental condition.	Children dealt with by Boston juvenile court and referred to Judge Baker Foundation.					
	Both sexes.		Boys.		Girls.	
	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.
Total.....	1 364	100.0	297	100.0	67	100.0
Supernormal.....	31	8.5	² 21	7.1	10	14.9
Normal.....	216	59.3	³ 176	59.3	⁴ 40	59.7
Defective.....	⁵ 103	28.3	87	29.3	16	23.9
Psychopathic or psychotic.....	10	2.7	⁶ 10	3.4	—	—
Not reported.....	4	1.1	⁷ 3	1.0	⁸ 1	1.5

¹ Including 12 not referred to the Judge Baker Foundation when first before the court during the year but referred subsequently.

² Including 1 unstable and immature.

³ Including 1 case in which the diagnosis was tentative; the child may be subnormal.

⁴ Including 1 with psychoneurosis, irresponsible; 1 tentatively classed as normal.

⁵ Including 80 definitely feeble-minded.

⁶ Including 4 cases in which the diagnosis was tentative.

⁷ Including 2 cases in which the diagnosis was uncertain and 1 in which the tentative classification was not reported.

⁸ Diagnosis uncertain.

The recommendations made by the Judge Baker Foundation pertained to physical conditions, home conditions, school or vocational training, work, recreation, companions, the development of better interests, and other items. In a number of cases care for a time outside the child's own home was recommended—placing on a farm or with relatives, for instance. Recommendations with reference to commitment to institutions were also made. It was very difficult to classify the recommendations, since a number of suggestions were often recorded in a single case. In Table 15, however, an attempt has been made to show the recommendations for children of different ages, selecting in each case the one thought to be most fundamental or to involve the most radical change in the child's manner of living. Table 16 gives the same information according to the child's mental condition.

80306°—25†—8

TABLE 15.—*Recommendations made by the Judge Baker Foundation, by age of child; delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, and referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation.*

Recommendation as to disposition. ¹	Children dealt with by Boston juvenile court and referred to Judge Baker Foundation.					Not reported.
	Total.	Under 10 years.	10-13 years.	14-15 years.	16 years.	
Total.....	364	18	116	141	88	1
Commitment to institution for the feeble-minded.....	16		8	5	3	
Commitment to correctional institution.....	32	1	4	7	20	
Probation.....	301	16	102	119	63	1
Advice given on specified subject.....	249	13	87	100	48	1
Care in private institution.....	6		1	3	2	
Care in foster homes ²	93	10	33	31	18	1
Home.....	16	1	7	6	2	
School or vocational training.....	27	1	8	14	4	
Work.....	26		4	13	9	
Interests, companions, recreation.....	54	1	28	17	8	
Other.....	27		6	16	5	
Specific advice not recorded.....	52	3	15	19	15	
No recommendation and pending.....	15	1	2	10	2	

¹ The recommendations in a single case often covered four or five subjects; for the purpose of this table, only one is counted in each case, preference being given in the order presented in this table. Under the heading "Other" are included recommendations as to health in 23 cases, marriage in 1 case, and advice to join the Navy in 3 cases.

² In a number of cases, in the country or with relatives.

TABLE 16.—*Recommendations made by the Judge Baker Foundation, by mental condition of child; delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, and referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation.*

Recommendation as to disposition. ¹	Children dealt with by Boston juvenile court and referred to Judge Baker Foundation.					Not reported.
	Total.	Super-normal.	Normal.	Defective.	Psycho-pathic or psychotic.	
Total.....	364	31	216	² 103	10	4
Commitment to institution for the feeble-minded.....	16			15	1	
Commitment to correctional institution.....	32		20	9	2	1
Probation.....	301	27	191	73	7	3
Advice given on specified subject.....	249	25	155	62	4	3
Care in private institution.....	6	1	5			
Care in foster home.....	93	12	56	25		
Home.....	16	1	12	3		
School or vocational training.....	27	4	17	6		
Work.....	26	1	14	8	3	
Interests, companions, recreation.....	54	4	38	9		3
Other.....	27	2	13	11	1	
Specific advice not recorded.....	52	2	36	11	3	
No recommendation and pending.....	15	4	5	6		

¹ See Table 15, footnote 1.

² Including 80 definitely feeble-minded.

As is shown in Tables 15 and 16, recommendations with reference to home care, informal supervision, school work, and other phases of the child's life, or with reference to placing in family homes or care in institutions, were made for 349 of the 364 children studied. In the remaining 15 cases no recommendation was made or the study had not been completed.

Commitment to an institution for the feeble-minded was recommended for 16 children, or 5 per cent of those in whose behalf suggestions were made, and commitment to a correctional institution for 32 children, or 9.2 per cent; probation was recommended for 301 children, or 86 per cent. For 249 children, specific suggestions with reference to various ways in which the child might be helped to make better adjustments and form better interests and associations were made. Placing for a time in the country, with relatives, or in some home other than the child's own, was recommended for 93 children, or 27 per cent.

The number of children in whose behalf each suggestion was made is shown in Table 17. It is interesting to note that the physical condition of 179 children (51.3 per cent of the 349 for whose treatment suggestions were made) was found to require attention and that for 128 children (36.7 per cent) specific advice was given with reference to companions, recreation, or the development of better interests.

TABLE 17.—Total number of children in whose behalf specified suggestions as to treatment were made by the Judge Baker Foundation; delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, and referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation.

Suggestions as to treatment. ¹	Children dealt with by Boston juvenile court and studied by Judge Baker Foundation.				
	Total.	No recommendation and pending.	Recommendation made by Judge Baker Foundation.		
			Probation.	Correctional institution.	Institution for the feeble-minded.
Children referred for study.....	¹ 364	15	301	32	16
Physical condition.....	179		² 163	12	4
Home.....	16		16		
School.....	49		44	5	
Work.....	42		42		
Interests, companions, or recreation.....	128		128		
Care in private institutions.....	6		6		
Care in foster homes.....	94		94		
Other.....	5		4	1	

¹ For some children more than one suggestion was made as to treatment.

² Including 4, physical and mental; 1, return to home recommended.

It was impossible in the time allowed for the study to secure information concerning the extent to which the recommendations of the Judge Baker Foundation were carried out. Table 18 compares, however, the dispositions made by the court with the recommendations of the foundation in the 278 cases in which the study made by the foundation was in connection with the first offense committed during the year to which the data refer.

TABLE 18.—*Court disposition of cases of delinquent children dealt with by the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, and referred for study to the Judge Baker Foundation, by nature of recommendation.*¹

Disposition of cases.	Children dealt with by Boston juvenile court and studied by Judge Baker Foundation.				
	Total.	No recommendation and pending.	Recommendation made by Judge Baker Foundation.		
			Probation.	Correctional institution.	Institution for the feeble-minded. ²
Total.....	278	13	226	26	13
Filed or dismissed.....	30	1	23	1	5
Costs, restitution, reparation, atonement, or forfeiture.....	6		6		
Committed to correctional institution.....	24		9	14	1
Committed to Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare.....	2		2		
Probation.....	207	12	179	9	7
Suspended sentence.....	3		2	1	
Agency supervision.....	1		1		
Appealed.....	1			1	
Returned to his home.....	1		1		
Not reported.....	3		3		

¹ Including only cases referred in connection with the first offense charged during the year of the study.

² The juvenile court did not have the power to commit to an institution for the feeble-minded.

CASES ADJUSTED WITHOUT FORMAL COURT ACTION.

POLICY OF INFORMAL TREATMENT OF DELINQUENCY PROBLEMS.

Juvenile courts receive many complaints which are regarded by some judges as not requiring formal judicial treatment or official determination of the status of the child. For instance, complaints of trivial offenses can often be settled with a warning to the child, and it would involve needless expense for the court and trouble for all concerned to insist on service of notice and formal hearing. As the juvenile court becomes well established in the community parents and others bring to the attention of its officers problems of conduct or of environment which call merely for advice or for direction to the social agency best equipped to handle the difficulty. In addition to giving advice which does not involve assuming responsibility for the child many courts make a practice of supervising children whose parents desire them to have the benefit of such oversight and guidance without the formality of hearing and of determination of delinquency.¹

In this study the term "informal adjustment of cases" includes all cases adjusted by the judge or by a probation officer without the filing of a petition or complaint. The word "adjusted" is, however, greatly in need of a definition that will be commonly accepted and will make comparative statistics possible. When is a complaint "adjusted" and when is it merely "refused" or "dropped," no action being taken? Wide difference in usage exists. Some courts consider all cases not made official as "cases handled informally"; others include in this group all cases in which the attempt has been made to handle the matter informally, whether or not the cases have later been made official. Some courts divide the nonofficial cases into those dealt with unofficially and those in which no action is taken. In this report the usage of each court was accepted, so that the statistics given are only roughly comparable.

METHODS OF INFORMAL ADJUSTMENT IN THE COURTS STUDIED.

In six of the courts studied a considerable proportion of cases were adjusted without the filing of a petition or complaint. These were the courts of Denver, the District of Columbia, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, and St. Louis. Some cases were adjusted informally in the courts of Boston, Minneapolis, and New Orleans, but records were not kept in these cases and their number could not be determined.² Great variation from court to court was found in the types of cases handled informally and the methods used.

¹ For a discussion of the development and extent of informal work and a statement of its advantages and disadvantages, see "The unofficial treatment of children quasi-delinquent—report of the committee on juvenile courts," by Thomas D. Eliot, in *The Social Service of the Courts, Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the National Probation Association, held in Providence, R. I., June 20-26, 1922*, p. 68. This same material is given by Mr. Eliot in "The back-to-the-school movement—the unofficial treatment of pre-delinquent children," published in *The Journal of Delinquency, Whittier, Calif., for November, 1922*.

² Since the time of the study informal adjustment of cases has been greatly extended in the Minneapolis court. However, in these informal cases petitions are filed, but the hearing is conducted informally by the chief probation officer. Thorough investigations are made. A total of 302 minor delinquency cases were handled in this way in 1923; 271 were adjusted without court appearance, and 34 children were placed on "informal probation."

Denver.—In Denver one of the main purposes of the investigation of a delinquency complaint was to determine whether or not a petition should be filed. The police could not insist upon the filing of a petition, though a private individual had the right to do so. Investigations, more or less complete, were made in practically all cases except those in which petitions were filed by agencies. If the investigation showed that more than a warning or an immediate adjustment of the difficulty by the probation officer was needed but that, according to the practice of the court, formal action was not required, the child, the parents, and the complainant were asked to come to the court, and either the judge or the chief probation officer held an informal hearing. If damages were involved they were often paid voluntarily. Frequently children agreed to come under probationary supervision and were then subject to the same rules and regulations as children officially placed on probation. Children over juvenile-court age were often dealt with informally and with their own consent placed on probation, and adult as well as children's cases were adjusted without formal action. Many girls came to the court on their own initiative for advice and help, and others were brought by girl companions who had been assisted by the court.

Since the informal work of the Denver juvenile court differs in method and extent from that carried on by most juvenile courts a statement by Judge Lindsey concerning it is given in full:

It has been more than 20 years since we started what is known as the informal-conference method of hearing cases. By this method we do not betray the confidence of any boy or girl who has confided to us any facts; that is to say, I take a child alone in chambers and agree that anything he tells me shall not be told to any one without his consent and I take my chances on getting his consent as I increase the confidential relationships between us. I had a case yesterday illustrating this point. A boy 17 years of age belongs to a club which is evidently indulging in automobile joy rides, booze parties, and so forth. I enlisted the confidence of that boy in my purpose "to help everybody and hurt nobody." The unwritten law among boys against "snitching," for example, is a very wise and proper law. It promotes loyalty, but it is based on the theory that by "telling" the boy is hurt or ostracized or the girl in some degree loses her self-respect. In a measure we reverse the purpose of such laws by falling in line absolutely with them; i. e., we too "help everybody and hurt nobody." I refused to let this boy tell me the name of a single boy or girl involved, but I got his confidence to the point of telling me how many girls and how many boys were "in it," how many automobiles had been stolen, how many illicit joy rides had been taken, and so forth. I then explained to the boy the dangers involved for both boys and girls and sent him as a sort of confidant back to his club or gang with my views about this matter; in other words I appeal to the interest of this group. The result is that before I get through with that case by this confidential method, I will have not 1 boy caught by the police after a long chase but perhaps 20 boys and girls who have come to me for help. This has happened time and again.


I am frank to say that we have not reached, in this city, anything like the point of perfection that we are striving for, but this sort of thing in Denver has gotten us nearer the truth about conditions as they are than could be accomplished by any other method. This is not due to the officers, but to the methods and what I call the psychology—and indirectly the biology—involved. It is from this standpoint of psychology and biology that most of our work has to be done if we are going to get anywhere except to move around in a circle, alleviating, it is true, the distress in individual cases here and there, but doing very little in the end to point out, much less to stamp out, the causes of what are called sin and crime. I might say, in conclusion, that because of this "confidential-conference method" the ethical relations of the court to many of the children who come here voluntarily, as most of them do in such cases, is such that no formal petitions could or should be filed against them. Neither are they necessary except for chronic repeaters, as to whom a reservation in such confidence is always made with the consent of the "confessee."

Seattle.—The juvenile court law of the State of Washington provided that in counties having paid probation officers such officers should as far as possible determine before a petition was filed whether such petition was reasonably justified.³ The chief probation officer who had directed the work of the probation staff for a number of years but who resigned just prior to the time this study was made,⁴ had placed special emphasis on the informal adjustment of cases, and in this chapter the procedure described is that which was carried

COMPARISON OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL CASES OF DELINQUENCY

IN FOUR COURTS, 1920.

BOYS' CASES ONLY INCLUDED.



out under his direction. Whether or not a case became official depended largely upon the attitude of the child at the first interview. The chief probation officer interviewed all the boys, and the superintendent of the detention home interviewed the girls and usually consulted the chief probation officer with regard to them. Few girls' cases were adjusted informally, partly because a large amount of unofficial work was done by the woman's protective division of the police department without reference to the court.

³ Washington, Remington's Comp. Stat., 1922, sec. 1987-6.

⁴ This officer resumed work for the court early in 1923.

Every child was first interviewed alone; later the parents were called in. Sometimes, in an effort to ascertain all the factors in the case, four or five interviews were held with one child, and considerable time was spent with the parents in trying to develop a right attitude on their part. Confidential information revealed by the child was not given to the parents except with the child's consent. Usually information with regard to school progress and home conditions was obtained from the school by telephone, but further social investigation was rarely made in informal cases. When all the desired information had been secured a conference was called by the chief probation officer, at which the parents, the child, and the police or the complainant were present. Whenever a satisfactory adjustment could be made the case was not filed. Cases were often carried for several weeks, the children being asked to come in to see the chief probation officer frequently, but he believed that authority should accompany supervision and did not place on probation children who had not been formally before the court. When the chief probation officer was too busy to undertake the work described in informal cases he allowed petitions to be filed after brief interviews with the children and their parents.

San Francisco.—Informal adjustment of cases in San Francisco was confined chiefly to boys' cases originating with the police. Whenever in a police case the boy was not arrested and brought to the detention home the parties were notified to be present at the probation office on a given day and hour, and a written report was forwarded to the court. At the time specified the head of the boys' department held an informal hearing at which were present the child, his parents, and frequently the complainant. Controversial questions were settled, if possible, and payment of money damages was arranged for. Sometimes the boy was sent to the detention home for a few days as a means of discipline, and occasionally a boy was placed on informal probation and required to report regularly to the probation office. If need for further study was indicated the cases were continued for investigation or for physical or mental examination. Very few cases in the girls' department were handled informally.

District of Columbia.—The juvenile court of the District of Columbia was a court of criminal and not of chancery jurisdiction, and informal adjustment of cases of certain types had for some years been utilized as a method of avoiding the entry of a criminal record against the child. In July, 1919, the judge ordered that in preliminary informal hearings in cases of "children of tender years" who were alleged to have committed trivial offenses, only the parents or guardian or custodian of the child involved, and the complaining witnesses, should be present. If satisfactory adjustment was not made, the matter might be continued for the purpose of bringing in the child himself for further hearing or for court trial. Under this order, the report of the court for 1919-20 stated that parents had appeared instead of young children in 131 cases.

In December, 1919, it was ordered that the following complaints be heard unofficially by the chief probation officer:

1. All first complaints, not involving sex offenses, against children under 12 years of age.

2. All first complaints, not involving sex offenses, against children under 17 years of age, which in his opinion are not serious enough to be brought into court.

3. All complaints involving trivial violations of police regulations.

The 1920 report of the court stated that since 1914, when unofficial hearings were begun, the cases of 6,663 children had been heard unofficially. The number of cases so dealt with in 1919-20 was 1,243.⁵

At informal hearings the child, parents, and witnesses were present and were questioned by the chief probation officer.^{5a} No investigation was made prior to the hearing, but if the child had been in court before the information obtained at that time was in the hands of the chief probation officer. If during the hearing some problem requiring attention was found to exist, the case was referred to some private organization cooperating with the court. If damages were in question and the parents were willing to make restitution or reparation they were advised to do so, but care was taken not to exercise pressure in this matter. The dispositions that might be made in informal cases included dismissal with warning, reference to other agencies, and continuance for formal action. Unofficial probation was not among the methods used in this court.

Los Angeles.—In Los Angeles two special investigators, a man and a woman, were employed primarily to determine in what cases formal court action was necessary, and to adjust cases informally. A complete inquiry into the social conditions surrounding the child was not made prior to the filing of a petition; but interviews were held, usually in the child's home, with the child and the parents, and the complainant was also interviewed. Informal hearings were not held, but the children were sometimes with their own consent placed under supervision. The term "probation" was not used in these cases, as the court believed that it would weaken the effect of official probation to have the children placed on probation under an informal arrangement. Complaints of damage to property were frequently adjusted by the investigators. Cases were referred to other agencies when such reference seemed advisable. In the girls' department the Parent-Teacher Association, churches, and other social agencies were used for follow-up of informal cases. Part of the work of the special investigators was concerned with requests for information made by out-of-town correspondents.

St. Louis.—The probation office in St. Louis frequently called in parents and children for consultation and warning. Neighborhood disputes, complaints of coal stealing and jumping on street cars, and complaints of petty theft (involving not more than \$5 or \$10) were among the cases settled by the investigating officer or as a result of an informal hearing by the chief probation officer. Children arrested for violations of city ordinances were never dealt with informally. As in Los Angeles, a man and a woman investigator were employed to make investigations prior to the filing of complaints. The inquiry into the home conditions and the circumstances of the offense was

⁵ Recently cases dealt with informally by the District of Columbia juvenile court have been divided for statistical purposes into the following groups: Unofficial cases (arrests); adjusted cases (complaint); cases in which no action is taken (arrests and complaints).

^{5a} Informal hearings in boys' cases are now (1924) held by the clerk of the court and in girls' cases by the chief probation officer (a woman).

fairly complete. In cases in which the complainant did not wish to file he was asked to write a letter to the court stating that fact, and the matter was submitted informally to the judge for decision as to whether or not the case should be made official. If the investigators were uncertain as to whether court action should be taken the same procedure was followed. Cases dealt with informally were sometimes referred to a private agency for follow-up, and occasionally the child was placed under the informal supervision of the probation office.^{5b}

Summary.—To summarize the methods used in the six courts, more or less complete investigations in cases dealt with informally were made in Denver, Los Angeles, and St. Louis, and in Seattle the office interviews with the children's parents and complainants amounted to investigations. Informal hearings were held by the judge or the chief probation officer in Denver and by the chief probation officer in the District of Columbia, San Francisco, and St. Louis, while the conferences with the chief probation officer in Seattle were practically hearings of this kind. Informal probation was used frequently in Denver and occasionally in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and St. Louis, though in Los Angeles it was termed "supervision" and not "probation."

EXTENT TO WHICH CASES WERE ADJUSTED WITHOUT FORMAL COURT ACTION.

The proportion of delinquency cases adjusted without formal court action varied from 43 per cent to 86 per cent in the four courts which utilized this method to any considerable extent and for which statistics were available. Differences in jurisdiction, in policy, and in statistical method make it difficult to compare the statistics of one court with those of another, but the data nevertheless indicate general tendencies. Table 19 shows that in Denver 86 per cent of the delinquency cases were adjusted informally; in Seattle, 68.9 per cent; in the District of Columbia, 43.1 per cent; and in San Francisco, 43.3 per cent.

In St. Louis during 1920 a total of 1,708 delinquent children were dealt with formally, and the number of cases settled out of court was reported as 351.⁶ It is not known whether or not this number includes cases in which no action was taken as well as cases in which some adjustment was made.^{6a} The total number of new cases of delinquency filed in the Los Angeles juvenile court in 1919 was 1,314, and the number of cases adjudicated without filing was 1,192. It was reported that 75 children were on voluntary probation during the year.⁷

^{5b} In 1924 two men officers and one woman were employed in this work. Informal hearings were held by the investigators each morning. In a majority of the informal cases visits were made in the home or neighborhood. Only occasionally were difficult cases referred to the chief probation officer.

⁶ Report of the Juvenile Court and Probation Office for the Years 1916 to 1920, inclusive, St. Louis, Mo., pp. 38, 44.

^{6a} In February, 1924, the two men investigators dealt with 257 children arrested by the police; 90 were brought before the court on petition; the other cases were settled out of court. In 1923, 1,215 cases were adjusted, as compared with 2,332 delinquent and neglected children brought before the court.

⁷ Annual Report, Los Angeles County Probation Department, for the Year Ending December 31, 1919, pp. 9, 14. In 1922 the total number of new cases of delinquency filed was 1,461, and the number of cases adjudicated without filing was 477; 120 children were on voluntary probation during the year. (Annual Report, Los Angeles County Probation Department, for the Year Ending December 31, 1922; in manuscript.)

TABLE 19.—Cases in which petitions or complaints were filed and cases adjusted informally; delinquency cases coming to the attention of four courts.

Court and period.	Delinquency cases coming to the courts' attention.			
	Total.	Cases adjusted informally.		Cases in which a petition or complaint was filed.
		Number.	Per cent.	
Denver juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920 ¹ -----	2,057	² 1,770	86.0	287
District of Columbia juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920 ¹ -----	2,884	³ 1,242	43.1	³ 1,641
San Francisco juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920 ¹ -----	1,402	⁴ 607	43.3	⁵ 795
Seattle juvenile court—1920 ⁶ -----	986	679	68.9	307

¹ Data obtained from report of the court.

² Including 1,658 "settled out of court" and 112 "dropped." These included some children who were not delinquent but who came to the court for advice or for help in securing work.

³ In the year ended June 30, 1924, the District of Columbia juvenile court dealt with 1,904 delinquency cases officially, handled in unofficial hearings 541 delinquency cases referred by the police, adjusted 210 complaints, and in 65 cases referred, took no action. Excluding these 65 cases, 28.3 per cent of the delinquency cases were dealt with informally.

⁴ Cases handled in boys' department only, excluding 3 cases in which the basis of complaint was "improper home." No report was made of informal cases in the girls' department, but it was known that few cases were so dealt with.

⁵ Cases handled in the boys' department and the girls' department, excluding 50 cases in the former department in which the basis of the complaint was "no proper guardian" or "improper home" and 36 girls' cases in which the basis was "need of protection."

⁶ Data obtained from monthly reports of the court.

COMPARISON OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL CASES.

In two of the three courts in which both boys' and girls' cases were handled informally and for which information as to sex was available, the percentage of boys' cases so adjusted was higher than the percentage of girls' cases. In the District of Columbia the percentage of girls' cases adjusted informally was slightly higher than the percentage of boys' cases. The greatest difference was found in Seattle, where 75.9 per cent of the boys' cases as compared with only 27.7 per cent of the girls' cases were adjusted without formal court action. (Table 20.) In some of the courts several factors tended to make the proportion of informal cases smaller among girls than among boys. These included greater attention to preventive work among girls by police departments and adjustment of girls' cases by the judge or probation officers without making any records other than confidential records in personal notebooks.

TABLE 20.—Boys' and girls' cases in which petitions or complaints were filed and cases adjusted informally; delinquency cases coming to the attention of four courts.¹

Court and period.	Delinquency cases coming to the courts' attention.							
	Boys.				Girls.			
	Total.	Cases adjusted informally.		Cases in which a petition or complaint was filed.	Total.	Cases adjusted informally.		Cases in which a petition or complaint was filed.
		Number.	Per cent.			Number.	Per cent.	
Denver, juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.....	1,609	1,403	87.1	206	448	367	81.9	81
District of Columbia juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.....	2,449	1,050	42.9	1,399	435	193	44.4	242
San Francisco juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.....	1,213	607	50.0	606	189	-----	-----	189
Seattle juvenile court—1920.....	842	639	75.9	203	144	40	27.7	104

¹ For sources of information and inclusions, see Table 19, footnotes.

In all four courts in which it was possible to secure information concerning the ages of the boys whose cases were handled formally and of those whose cases were adjusted without court action, the largest percentages of cases in which no formal court action was taken were among boys under 14 years of age. In three of the courts the smallest percentages of informal cases were found in the 14 and 15 year age group; the larger percentages in the group 16 years of age and over were probably due to the fact that some cases in which the boy was somewhat over the age limit of the court's jurisdiction were dealt with informally. In the San Francisco court, which had jurisdiction up to the age of 21 years, the lowest percentage of informal cases was in the highest age group. (Table 21.)

In the District of Columbia juvenile court all the cases of girls under 10 years of age were adjusted informally, 61.7 per cent of these between the ages of 10 and 14 years, 40 per cent of those 14 and 15 years of age, and 36.8 per cent of those 16 years of age and over.⁸ In the other three courts, because of the small number of cases or the absence of age data, no comparison was possible of the percentages of girls' cases in the various age groups in which adjustment was made without formal court action.

⁸ Statistics based on number of children, counting each child only once during the year.

TABLE 21.—Percentage of cases adjusted informally, by age of child; boys' delinquency cases coming to the attention of four courts.

Age of child.	Boys' delinquency cases, formal and informal, coming to the courts' attention.							
	Denver, 1919. ¹		District of Columbia, 1919-20. ²		San Francisco, 1919-20. ³		Seattle, 1920. ⁴	
	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.
Total.....	670	71.6	1,938	51.6	1,266	48.2	842	75.9
Under 10.....	63	85.7	174	75.9	453	66.6	46	78.3
10-13.....	301	73.7	733	56.7			266	76.3
14-15.....	249	64.3	652	42.9	348	51.4	265	74.7
16 and over.....	53	81.1	379	45.4	465	27.7	264	76.1
Not reported.....	4						1	

¹ Data compiled from court records.

² Data obtained from report of the court. Figures represent children and not cases; that is, each child was counted only once, no matter how many times he had been before the court during the year.

³ Data obtained from the annual report of the court. Total includes 53 cases of "no proper home" or "improper guardian" which it was impossible to eliminate because age distribution was not given.

⁴ Data obtained from monthly reports of the court.

Comparing the percentages of boys' cases adjusted informally on the basis of the offense which brought the boy to the attention of the court, Table 22 shows for all four courts for which information was available high percentages of cases so adjusted in that group which included cases of malicious mischief, disorderly conduct, gambling, and violations of city ordinances, and relatively low percentages in the group of theft cases. In three courts the percentages in the group which included cases of incorrigibility, waywardness, and truancy were lower than the average. More than 90 per cent of the cases involving vagrancy and running away were adjusted informally in the courts of San Francisco and Seattle. Informal action in cases of theft was taken in 65.1 per cent of the Denver cases and in 74.6 per cent of the Seattle cases, as compared with percentages of 14.3 for the District of Columbia and 38.2 for San Francisco.

TABLE 22.—Percentage of cases adjusted informally, by offense; boys' delinquency cases coming to the attention of four courts.

Offense.	Boys' delinquency cases, formal and informal, coming to the courts' attention.							
	Denver, 1919. ¹		District of Columbia, 1919-20. ²		San Francisco, 1919-20. ²		Seattle, 1920. ³	
	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.	Total.	Per cent adjusted informally.
Total.....	670	71.6	2,449	42.9	1,213	50.0	842	75.9
Incorrigibility, immorality, waywardness, truancy.....	109	69.7	315	57.1	296	29.7	160	46.9
Vagrancy, running away.....	85	72.9	2	-----	81	96.3	136	91.9
Malicious mischief, disorderly conduct, gambling, violation of city ordinances.....	140	90.0	1,041	63.8	321	78.2	203	90.6
Theft and attempted theft ⁴	301	65.1	711	14.3	479	38.2	342	74.6
Other.....	⁵ 35	57.1	380	27.4	36	19.4	0 ⁶	-----

¹ Data compiled from court records.

² Data obtained from report of the court.

³ Data obtained from monthly reports of the court.

⁴ Including such offenses as theft, breaking and entering, breaking and entering and taking things, forgery, stolen property in possession.

⁵ Including 4 cases in which the offense was not reported.

⁶ Offense not reported.

DISPOSITIONS IN CASES ADJUSTED INFORMALLY.

Differences in terminology and methods of tabulation make it difficult to compare dispositions made in informal cases. In all the courts for which information was secured the great majority of cases adjusted informally were reported as "dismissed," "warned," "parents or children advised," or "settled out of court." The percentages thus disposed of ranged from 57.6 in Denver to 90.4 in Seattle. In three courts payment of damages was arranged for in 2.5 to 7.6 per cent of the cases. Only the Denver court used "voluntary probation" to any extent; in 35 per cent of the informal cases this method of treatment was employed.⁹ In San Francisco 11.8 per cent and in Seattle 8.9 per cent of the informal cases were adjusted by returning the children to their homes or by sending them to other jurisdictions. (Table 23.)

⁹ Complete figures were not secured for Los Angeles, but the annual report of that court for 1919 showed that voluntary probation was used in 6 per cent of the cases adjusted without filing a petition. In 1922 the percentage was much higher; i. e., 25 per cent.

TABLE 23.—Dispositions in delinquency cases adjusted informally in four courts.

Disposition of case.	Delinquency cases adjusted informally.							
	Denver, 1919. ¹		District of Columbia, 1919-20. ²		San Francisco, 1919-20. ²		Seattle, 1920. ³	
	Num-ber.	Per cent distri-bution.	Num-ber.	Per cent distri-bution.	Num-ber.	Per cent distri-bution.	Num-ber.	Per cent distri-bution.
Total.....	488	100.0	1,243	100.0	4,610	100.0	5,724	100.0
Dismissed.....	14	2.7	697	7.8	403	66.1	1	0.1
Warned or advised, or otherwise ad-justed.....	268	54.9	908	73.0	768	11.1	654	90.3
Payment of damages arranged for.....	12	2.5	95	7.6	27	4.4	-----	-----
Voluntary probation.....	⁸ 171	35.0	-----	-----	11	1.8	2	0.3
Referred or returned to agencies or in-stitutions.....	8	1.6	14	1.1	12	2.0	-----	-----
Returned home or sent to other juris-dictions.....	5	1.0	-----	-----	72	11.8	64	8.9
Continued for formal hearing ⁹	1	0.2	126	10.1	2	0.3	-----	-----
Other.....	5	1.0	3	0.2	15	2.5	3	0.4
Not reported.....	4	0.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

¹ Data compiled from court records.

² Data obtained from report of the court.

³ Data obtained from the monthly reports of the court.

⁴ Boys only; including 3 cases of "no proper home."

⁵ Including 45 cases of neglect; separate data regarding dispositions of delinquency and neglect cases could not be secured.

⁶ Including 20 "not guilty," 5 "no action," 72 "not found," "failed to appear," "complainant not found," or "complainant refused to prosecute."

⁷ Including 61 "returned to school" and 7 "held temporarily"; these dispositions are probably similar to those included in other courts in the group "warned, advised, or otherwise adjusted," and hence have been included here in that group.

⁸ Including 3 cases in which payment of damages was also arranged for.

⁹ These cases were brought before the court formally after they had been handled informally. The large figure for the District of Columbia court as compared with other courts is partly accounted for by different methods of statistical treatment. Doubtless in some of the courts many cases handled at first informally and later formally were counted only in the formal cases.

SUCCESS OF INFORMAL ADJUSTMENT AS A METHOD OF TREATMENT.

The success of informal adjustment as a method of treatment in delinquency cases could be measured only if it were possible to follow up the subsequent history of each child. However, the percentage of cases in which the child did not again come to the attention of the court indicates to some extent the value of this method. Information was obtained in 1920 with reference to cases adjusted informally in the San Francisco and Seattle courts in 1917 and in the Denver court in 1917-18. The data secured show the number of times the children had come to the attention of the court previous to and subsequent to the appearance in 1917 or 1917-18.

In Denver 78.8 per cent of the boys' cases in 1917-18 were adjusted informally and in Seattle in 1917, 61.2 per cent.¹⁰ In San Francisco only 51.4 per cent of the cases were so adjusted in 1917.¹¹ In Denver there was no subsequent appearance in 81.1 per cent of the informal cases; in Seattle in 71.2 per cent; and in San Francisco in 68.5 per cent. (Table 24.) The fact that the delinquency jurisdiction of the Denver court at the time of the study extended in boys' cases only until the age of 16 years, while in Seattle jurisdiction extended until 18 and in San Francisco until 21 (concurrent jurisdiction from 18

¹⁰ Data obtained from court records.

¹¹ Derived from 1917 annual report of the court.

to 21) undoubtedly accounts in part for the smaller proportion of reappearances in the Denver juvenile court. However, boys above 16 years of age were dealt with by the Denver court informally and on criminal charges. The six-month difference in time period would also tend to make the Denver percentage of reappearances somewhat smaller than the percentages for the other cities.

The proportion of informal cases in which the boy subsequently came to the attention of the court more than once was in Denver 5.8 per cent, in Seattle 10 per cent, and in San Francisco 11.8 per cent.

TABLE 24.—*Previous and subsequent appearances in formal and informal cases; delinquent boys whose cases were adjusted informally in the courts of Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle.*¹

Previous and subsequent appearances in formal and informal cases. ²	Delinquent boys whose cases were adjusted informally.					
	Denver. ³		San Francisco. ⁴		Seattle. ⁴	
	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.
Total.....	1,202	100.0	629	100.0	292	100.0
No subsequent appearance.....	975	81.1	431	68.5	208	71.2
One subsequent appearance.....	157	13.1	124	19.7	55	18.8
More than one subsequent appearance.....	70	5.8	74	11.8	29	10.0
No previous appearance.....	1,015	100.0	523	100.0	239	100.0
No subsequent appearance.....	844	83.2	383	73.2	181	75.7
One or more subsequent appearances.....	171	16.8	140	26.8	58	24.3
One or more previous appearances.....	187	100.0	106	100.0	53	100.0
No subsequent appearance.....	131	70.1	48	45.3	27	50.9
One or more subsequent appearances.....	56	29.9	58	54.7	26	49.1

¹ Data compiled from court records.

² In Denver, prior to September, 1920; in San Francisco, prior to October, 1920; in Seattle, prior to December, 1920.

³ Year ended June 30, 1918.

⁴ Calendar year 1917.

The percentage of boys involved in informal cases in Denver who had not previously been known to the court either formally or informally was 84.4; in Seattle the percentage was 81.8 and in San Francisco 83.1. Table 24 shows that among the boys who had not been previously before the court the percentages that appeared subsequently were much smaller than among boys who had previously been known to the court.

For Denver and Seattle it was possible to compare the percentages of reappearances in boys' cases adjusted informally with those in cases formally dealt with. In Denver the percentage among the latter was slightly smaller than among the former—16.1 as compared with 18.9. For Seattle the percentage of reappearances among formal cases was slightly larger than among informal—31.4 as compared with 28.8.

Table 25 shows the total number of appearances in new cases, formal or informal, of boys whose cases were adjusted informally in 1917 in the three courts for which information was available. The figures include appearances prior to, including, and subsequent to

1917. The fact that the percentage of cases in which the boy had come to the attention of the court only once was higher in Denver than in San Francisco or Seattle may be partly due to the lower age limit in the Denver court.

TABLE 25.—Number of appearances, formal and informal; delinquent boys whose cases were adjusted informally in the courts of Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle.¹

Number of appearances in formal and informal cases. ²	Delinquent boys whose cases were adjusted informally.					
	Denver. ³		San Francisco. ⁴		Seattle. ⁴	
	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.	Number.	Per cent distribution.
Total.....	1,202	100.0	629	100.0	292	100.0
One.....	844	70.2	383	60.9	181	62.0
Two.....	204	17.0	131	20.8	57	19.5
Three.....	88	7.3	56	8.9	23	7.9
Four.....	35	2.9	32	5.1	15	5.1
Five.....	17	1.4	13	2.1	6	2.1
Six or more.....	⁵ 14	1.2	⁶ 14	2.2	⁷ 10	3.4

¹ Data compiled from court records.

² In Denver, prior to September, 1920; in San Francisco, prior to October, 1920; in Seattle, prior to December, 1920.

³ Year ended June 30, 1918.

⁴ Calendar year 1917.

⁵ Including 8, six times before the court; 3, seven times; 2, eight times; 1, ten times.

⁶ Including 6, six times before the court; 5, seven times; 2, eight times; 1, eleven times.

⁷ Including 6, six times before the court; 3, seven times; 1, nine times.

For the San Francisco court the total number of times boys dealt with informally in 1917 had come to the attention of the court in informal cases before or after 1917 was ascertained. In 491 cases, or 78 per cent of the total number, the boy was dealt with informally only once; in 108 cases, or 17 per cent, twice; and in 30 cases, or 5 per cent, more than twice. Nine boys appeared four different times in informal cases; 3 boys, five times; and 1 boy, six times.

The annual report of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for 1919-20 showed the total number of unofficial hearings in each year since 1914 (when unofficial hearings were inaugurated) and the number of reappearances in each year of children previously heard unofficially. Prior to 1919-20 a total of 5,481 cases had been heard unofficially. Of these, only 265, or 4.8 per cent, were officially before the court in the year 1919-20. How many of the total number had been officially before the court in previous years, and how many were still of juvenile-court age in 1919-20 are not known.

Concerning the extent to which the juvenile court should undertake to give advice and assistance in cases not made official, there is difference of opinion and of practice. Some authorities believe that difficulties should be adjusted without formal action whenever possible, and in some courts more than half the cases are dealt with in this way. Others experienced in juvenile-court work or interested in the problems involved believe that the court should not undertake to adjust cases without official action. They hold that such work will interfere with the other activities of the court or weaken its authority in formal cases, or that it will be done in a haphazard and unscientific

fashion and so fail to reach underlying problems that may be serious, or that it will discourage the development of resources for prevention of delinquency by schools and private agencies.

Properly to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of informal treatment of juvenile delinquents by juvenile-court officers would require much more study and research than was possible in the course of this inquiry. Moreover, in many courts such treatment is in an experimental stage, and in all courts it is affected and modified by local conditions and community resources. Much of the work being done in informal cases by juvenile courts is made necessary because the schools are not meeting their obligations to children presenting conduct problems. Undoubtedly the next few years will witness marked progress in the introduction of social work into the schools, and this should result in a better understanding of pupils by their teachers, a more perfect adjustment of the school program to individual needs, closer cooperation between schools and parents, and a reduction in the number of school children referred to the courts.¹²

Whether the future will witness a greater development of informal work by the courts themselves or an assumption of responsibility for the less serious delinquency problems by schools or private agencies, the juvenile court, so long as this judicial agency exists, will have to exercise the following functions in addition to its official work: (1) Elimination of cases not requiring official consideration or prolonged court treatment; (2) reference to the proper agency of problems demanding attention but not considered to be within the scope of the court. Work of this kind will continue to be necessary because the court will never be able completely to limit complaints and applications for advice to cases in which formal action is really required. If the court is to make a wise selection of cases for formal action and to refer cases intelligently to other agencies, it ought to be sure of the facts upon which decision as to reference is based. The juvenile court rests upon the principle that treatment is to be determined by the child's needs and not by the nature of the offense. A trivial offense may bring to the court a child seriously in need of help. Whether the needed advice or extralegal supervision in informal cases is a function of the court itself or of other agencies, it must be based upon knowledge of the child's needs and must be given by persons skilled in social service.

¹² For a discussion of the relation between the school and the court, see p. 226.

HEARINGS.

SOCIALIZATION OF PROCEDURE.

Prior to the formal hearing the contact of the judge with individual cases has been, in most courts, only through the medium of the staff. At the hearing it is the function of the judge to weigh the results of the social investigation and the study of the child, to afford each of those concerned full opportunity to state the facts in his own way, to determine whether the conditions alleged in the petition exist, and to endeavor to enlist the cooperation of the parents in whatever treatment he may determine to be necessary in view of the needs discovered. The extent to which court procedure in children's cases can be socialized and legal formalities eliminated without impairing individual rights has been discussed by Judge Edward F. Waite,¹³ formerly of the juvenile court of Hennepin County, Minn. (the Minneapolis court), in a paper presented before a conference on juvenile-court standards. His general conclusions are as follows:

1. In criminal proceedings¹⁴ the child has before conviction all the legal rights of the adult. Here the field of socialization is practically limited to treatment of the child after conviction.

2. In noncriminal proceedings there may be either with or without express legislative authorization, according to the nature of the court, the broad latitude customarily exercised by courts of chancery jurisdiction, this being appropriate and necessary to the full use of parental functions. Here no constitutional provisions relating to criminal prosecutions apply, and socialization of procedure may have wide scope. There are limits, however, of which the judge should never be unmindful.

3. In adopting this broader practice courts should have regard to the popular sense of justice, even when it is not supported by established principles of constitutional law.

At the same conference Dr. Miriam Van Waters,¹⁵ referee of the Los Angeles juvenile court, summed up a discussion of the socialization of court procedure in the following words:

Socialization of the juvenile-court procedure depends on the clear, firm grasp of the principles of equity. The court is one of guardianship, not a penal court. Nothing that the child says can incriminate him in this court, because the object of the court is his welfare. Socialization involves getting at the whole truth; nothing that is true and relevant should be excluded. Socialization involves cooperation, constructive discipline, and the dynamic concept as expressed in the principle that an order in this court may be modified as life conditions are modified.

FREQUENCY OF HEARINGS.

The more frequent the hearings, the shorter the detention periods required. The number of regular hearings of delinquency cases varied in the courts studied from one to five a week. In two of the

¹³ Proceedings of the Conference on Juvenile-Court Standards, pp. 55-64. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 97.

¹⁴ Such as are authorized by some juvenile court laws; for instance, the law in the District of Columbia.

¹⁵ Proceedings of the Conference on Juvenile-Court Standards, p. 69.

courts having full-time judges—those of Boston and Denver—delinquency cases might be heard, as a matter of fact, at any time.¹⁶ In some of the other courts, also, special hearings were held on other than the regular days. The situation in the courts having only one hearing for delinquency cases a week was unfortunate, since if a petition was filed too close to a regular hearing for an investigation to be made, it went over until the following week, and the child might be detained as long as 9 or 10 days before the first hearing. Four courts had special days for hearing delinquency cases and cases of neglect and dependency; in six courts all children's cases were heard as they happened to come up, without separation according to type. In the courts making special arrangements for dependency and neglect cases such hearings were usually held once a week. It seemed to be the prevailing opinion that it was not necessary to arrange special times for cases of neglect and dependency if only those involved in a case were present at the hearing and if proper provision were made for those awaiting hearing. It was not, however, considered desirable to hear adult cases and mothers' pension cases at the same time as children's cases.

The plans for hearings in three of the courts studied are given below:

COURT A.—

Monday—Cases of dependency and neglect, and sometimes special delinquency cases.

Friday—Delinquency cases.

Saturday—Mothers' pension cases.

COURT B.—

First hearings in new cases held every day in the week, with no division as to type. Cases set for hearing or continued were set for the appropriate day.

Monday—New delinquency cases in the morning; girls' cases in the afternoon.

Tuesday—Delinquent boys' cases from one section of city.

Wednesday—Delinquent boys' cases from a second section.

Thursday—Delinquent boys' cases from a third section.

Friday—Neglect cases.

Saturday—Continued cases involving schoolboys, and special reports.

COURT C.—

Monday—Adult cases.

Tuesday—Delinquency cases.

Wednesday—"Destitute" cases.

Thursday—Adult cases; in the evening, special hearings, children or adults.

Friday—Delinquency cases.

Saturday—Sometimes special hearings.

PRIVACY OF HEARINGS.

The exclusion of the public from hearings of children's cases is generally recognized as a fundamental feature of juvenile-court procedure. It is not sufficient, however, that the general public be excluded; the best practice admits only those concerned in each case as it is reached. Questions often arise in regard to admission of representatives of social agencies not concerned in the case, students, and others having a general interest in the problems of the court. It is to the advantage of the court to permit acquaintance with its work that

¹⁶ The District of Columbia juvenile court in 1922 adopted the plan of preliminary hearings five mornings a week for children who had been brought to the detention home on the previous day.

will win the understanding and cooperation of the community. On the other hand, the interests of the children and their parents must be safeguarded. As one judge stated in discussing this question, "The smaller the court room, the simpler the problem."

The practice in the courts varied from strictly private hearings in the judge's chambers, much of the time with not even the officers of the court present, to the situation in two courts where the room was crowded at each hearing with children and their parents, witnesses, and others. In these two courts the hearings were in effect public, except that merely curious onlookers usually were not present. In one of these courts, however, the judge's bench was at some distance from the audience, and the hearing was conducted in such low tones that the proceedings could not be overheard, except in the front of the room.¹⁷

In some of the courts which endeavored to observe the plan of having only those in the room who were concerned in each case, the desire on the part of those responsible for calling cases to expedite proceedings often resulted in persons concerned in a case being brought in before the completion of the preceding case. Moreover, children were often allowed to remain in the room during the cases following their own, until it was convenient for one of the officers of the court or of the detention home to come for them. In some courts the practice was followed of having all the boys from the detention home remain in the court room throughout the entire session.

In a few of the courts, including even some in which all the hearings were practically limited to those directly concerned in each case, the judge sometimes conducted certain types of hearings in his office, with the idea that even greater privacy could thus be secured. In one of these courts all cases involving children born out of wedlock who were brought in as dependents and most of the cases involving sex offenses were heard in this way. In contrast to the practice in this court was the method in one court which held public hearings in all cases of destitute children.^{17a} In the two courts in which girls' cases were heard by women referees such hearings were much more private than were the boys' hearings.

PROVISION FOR CHILDREN AWAITING HEARING.

Except in the courts in which the children were in the court room while awaiting their turns, the general plan was to have the children, their parents, and witnesses in a general waiting room until their cases were called. When the court and the detention home were in the same building exceptions were sometimes made in the cases of children who had been in detention; it was then possible to have such children wait in the detention home, and this plan was followed in several courts. For the referee's hearings in Los Angeles one room of the detention home was used as a waiting room for boys, another as a waiting room for girls, and children who had not been detained awaited hearing in the lobby with their parents and the witnesses. The District of Columbia court was the only one which had attempted to provide means for occupying the children's time while they were

¹⁷ Private hearings in the judge's chambers have since been adopted in one of these courts.

^{17a} Such hearings are now held (1924) in the judge's chambers, and the children are present only for a moment.

awaiting hearing. A room in the basement of the court building was provided with tables, books, and quiet games, and here the boys from the detention home remained under the supervision of an officer until their cases were heard.

DELINQUENCY HEARINGS.

Juvenile-court laws have been generally upheld by the courts against objections that they deprive children of due process of law; they are not unconstitutional because of the informality of the procedure followed under them.¹⁸ Juvenile-court procedure can not, however, entirely eliminate the necessity for determining what the child has done, for except in cases involving a charge that the child is "ungovernable" or "beyond the control of his parents," petitions in delinquency allege as evidence that the child comes within the definition of the juvenile court law, specific acts which are in violation of State laws or city ordinances. The court must satisfy itself that the allegations in the petition are true. The proof under chancery jurisdiction need not be proof beyond reasonable doubt, as criminal procedure requires, but may be preponderance of evidence. Nevertheless, juvenile-court judges are usually very careful in children's cases to have the facts well substantiated.¹⁹ If the child is found not to have committed the act alleged in the petition the petition must be dismissed, even though the investigation shows the child's habitual conduct to be such that the court's protection is required. A new petition can, of course, be brought in such a case, stating the grounds upon which the child may be considered to come within the provision of the juvenile-court laws.

The determination of the facts of the offense constitutes in most cases the least difficult part of the hearing. In a number of the courts studied it was said that at least nine-tenths of the children readily admitted having committed the offense. The more important function of the judge is to determine whether the child is in need of protection or care and to decide what treatment is best adapted to his needs. It is therefore apparent that strict adherence to legal forms and technicalities of procedure has no place in juvenile-court hearings. Great diversity in methods of conducting hearings was encountered in the courts studied. Although it is desirable that exchange of experience should affect practice in the interest of better adaptation of procedure to the end sought, it would be extremely detrimental if an attempt were made to impose an inflexible plan upon all courts. In the juvenile court there should always be room for experimentation and variation of procedure.

Instead of summaries of the practice of the courts studied with reference to specific points of procedure, descriptions of delinquency hearings in several of the courts representing various types of procedure are here presented.

Chancery procedure.

In the Denver court formal hearings in delinquency cases were held in the judge's chambers. The judge and the clerk (a woman) sat at a small table, and across the table, facing the judge, the child

¹⁸ The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court, p. 9. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 99.

¹⁹ For discussion of the weight of evidence required, see Proceedings of the Conference on Juvenile-Court Standards, p. 59.

was seated. All witnesses in the case were usually present throughout the hearing. As a rule the probation officer who made the investigation attended the hearing and often was called upon to state the facts of the case. In cases brought by the police the officer assigned by the police department to the juvenile court testified, and usually the officer who had made the arrest was not present. A court reporter was present only in serious cases that were likely to be contested. No charge was read to the child, and no plea of guilty or not guilty was received. Witnesses were not sworn except in serious, contested cases. If the child was inclined to deny having committed the offense, the judge spent a great deal of time trying to free him from fear and win his confidence. The outstanding feature of this court was the work of the judge with the child at the time of the hearing. Occasionally in cases of serious delinquency in which lawyers were employed, witnesses were sworn and a stenographic record was made; the judge in such a case dictated his decision, explaining at length his reasons for it. In girls' cases only the judge, the woman probation officer, the parents, and the girl were present.^{19a}

The Denver hearing just described represents procedure under chancery jurisdiction, when the court need not be hampered by technicalities. Considerable variation was found, however, even among courts operating under chancery practice. In the Minneapolis court the hearing was conducted with greater formality than in Denver; in San Francisco the court had less privacy. In some courts—those in San Francisco and St. Louis, for instance—the children and their parents were not seated during the hearing.

In the judge's hearings (in cases of older boys) in Los Angeles all concerned in the case were seated around a table. Besides the judge and the parties interested, the clerk, the bailiff, the court reporter, and the chief probation officer were present. In Seattle the judge was seated in front of a flat-topped desk, and the child was seated facing him at his left. The clerk of the court (a woman) and the chief probation officer and other members of the probation staff were present, and usually also representatives of the school-attendance department. Parents and witnesses were seated a little distance back of the child and facing the judge. The principal emphasis in the hearing was placed on the social investigation, a summary of which was read aloud by the judge. In girls' cases, except for the judge and the parties concerned, only women were present—i. e., the woman clerk and the superintendent of the detention home.

Quasi-criminal procedure.

In Buffalo, Boston, and the District of Columbia the procedure was quasi criminal. Nevertheless, delinquency cases were heard privately and in two of the three courts, very informally. In the Buffalo hearings, which were held in the dining room of the detention home, the judge was seated at a table with the stenographer at his left and the chief probation officer near by. As the case was called the child and parents were summoned from the adjoining room by the court attendant. The child stood at the judge's right hand and the parents and witnesses were seated in front of the judge. The judge

^{19a} The judge of the Denver court states that the great majority of girls' cases and of serious cases involving boys are heard in "confidence" with the judge alone, the officers being called in for consultation from time to time. "All confidences are sacredly observed. I consider this the most effective work we do."

had before him the report of the investigation but did not refer to it until after he had questioned the child and was satisfied as to whether or not the child had committed the offense. He first asked the child his name, age, the school attended, grade, and teacher. Part of this questioning was for the purpose of bringing out essential facts, but the main object was to establish a friendly relation with the child. The child was then asked, in an informal way, whether or not he had committed the offense. After he had given his story the parents were questioned about conditions in the home and their ability to control the child. If several children were involved they were sometimes heard in a group, but usually the group hearing followed individual hearings. In each case the judge tried to impress upon the child and the parents what was expected of them.

Delinquency cases in Boston were heard in the judge's office. The judge was seated at a desk. The probation officer was the only officer of the court who was present, and often he did not remain in the room during the entire hearing. If the child had been arrested, the police officer was present. The child stood at the judge's right, and the judge questioned him with reference to his age, grade in school, and so forth. He then asked the child to tell him what happened—why he was brought to court. The child usually told part or all of the story, and the judge questioned him closely, often taking notes on what was said. The judge then asked the parents questions and gave them an opportunity to make any statement they might desire. The police officer was given a chance to relate the circumstances, and if there were any other witnesses they were called in from the waiting room and questioned. The child and parents were then given an opportunity to question the police officer or other witnesses. Under the Massachusetts law the child and the parents had separate rights of appeal in delinquency cases, and it was necessary to inform them of this right at the time of adjudication.²⁰ The judge, in making a finding of delinquency, used approximately the following language:

I am going to find that what you did was wrong and was against the law and that you are a delinquent child. You have a right to go to another court and have another judge decide whether what I have found is right and what ought to be done with you, or you may leave it to me to decide.

The child after some hesitation usually decided to leave the matter in the hands of the judge, who thereupon informed the parents of their right of appeal. If appeal was not taken the judge asked the probation officer what he had learned about the child, and if the information was incomplete—cases were often heard on the same day the complaint was made—the case was continued for investigation and often for study by the Judge Baker Foundation. If the judge was fairly certain that he would place the child on probation he often made this order at once, specifying a short probation period during which the study of the case could be made. This procedure made it unnecessary for the parents to be present at a subsequent hearing, while a simple continuance necessitated their coming a second time. The majority of cases, however, were continued pending investigation.


²⁰ See p. 134.



HEARING, JUVENILE COURT, ST. LOUIS, MO.



HEARING, JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



HEARING, CHILDREN'S COURT OF BUFFALO, N. Y.



REFEREE'S HEARING, JUVENILE COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY,
CALIF.

Delinquency hearings in the District of Columbia were held in the judge's chambers. The judge was seated at a desk, with either the clerk of the court or the chief probation officer at her left. The child was seated opposite the judge, and the parents and witnesses were seated behind the child. The hearings were conducted more formally than in any of the other courts studied. Children were sworn and were required to answer "guilty" or "not guilty" to the complaint. In cases of very young children a simple yes or no answer to the question of whether the child committed the offense was accepted.

HEARINGS IN GIRLS' CASES.

In only three of the courts were girls' cases heard by women, the District of Columbia court having a woman judge and the Los Angeles and San Francisco courts having women referees. Some of the other courts had made special arrangements for hearing girls' cases. In Buffalo the woman superintendent of the detention home, and in Minneapolis one of the woman probation officers, was called upon by the judge for assistance when it was necessary to secure from the girls details which they would be reluctant to state to a man.^{20a} Hearings in girls' cases in the Seattle court were usually set for a time when other cases had been disposed of, and only women officers were present; the woman superintendent of the detention home acted as special adviser to the judge in girls' cases. In hearings of girls' cases in the District of Columbia all the court officers present were women, and the police department was usually represented by officers of the women's bureau of that department.

The referee of the Los Angeles court heard all girls' cases and cases of boys under 13 years of age. The chairman of the probation committee of the San Francisco court served as referee in all girls' cases. The judge was never present at girls' hearings in Los Angeles but passed upon all decisions. In San Francisco the judge sometimes sat with the referee in difficult cases.

The referee's hearings in Los Angeles were held in a small room in the detention home. The referee was seated at a table, with the supervisor of the girls' department of the probation staff at her right and the probation officer concerned in the case at her left. A woman court reporter was always present, seated at one end of the table; frequently a representative of the compulsory-education and child-welfare department of the public schools attended the hearing. The woman superintendent of the detention home acted as bailiff and called the cases. Often the girl was brought in first, and the referee talked with her before the parents and witnesses came into the room. Parents and witnesses were sworn, but the hearing was conducted very informally. The referee went into each case very thoroughly, sometimes spending as much as two hours on a single case.

The referee's hearings in the San Francisco court were conducted in a small room of the detention home. The referee and the probation officer in charge of the girls' department were the only officers of the court present. The girl was first called in. After the referee had

^{20a} In 1924 the Buffalo court was using in the disposition of girls' cases a committee of five mature women, composed of professional and lay social workers. The committee inquired into the facts of the case, interviewed the girl, and made recommendations to the judge.

talked with her the parents were called in, and often the girl was sent out of the room so that the referee might talk with the parents alone. The girl and others interested were seated at the table during the hearing.

DEPENDENCY HEARINGS.

In Denver, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Seattle hearings in dependency cases (including cases of destitute and neglected children) did not differ materially from delinquency hearings. The children involved were present at the hearing but were sent from the room if the nature of the evidence made their presence undesirable. During neglect proceedings in St. Louis the children were always in the building, but often they were not required to be in the court room. At hearings of cases of adoption and change of custody the St. Louis court did not always require the presence of the children.

In Boston and Minneapolis a private agency, and in the District of Columbia a public child-caring agency, made the investigations in neglect cases and presented the cases to the court. The Massachusetts law required that the State department of public welfare be notified in such cases, and a representative of that department was present at the hearings. In the Boston court a representative of a Catholic agency which cared for a large number of neglected children was also present. An agent of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children presented the cases. The children were not present except for a few moments at the time of arraignment, unless their physical condition was to be introduced as evidence. Witnesses were sworn and were examined by the judge; they were often cross-examined by the representative of the department of public welfare. Many cases of neglect were continued for several months or for a year, the children being placed in the custody of a private agency and the child-protective agency being required to report on the date to which the case had been continued. The parents were not required to be present at the hearings of continued cases when no change of custody was to be made.

Neglect hearings in the Minneapolis court were similar to delinquency hearings, except that agents of the Minneapolis Children's Protective Society who had made the investigations and had usually filed the petitions took the place of probation officers. The children were always present during the original hearing though they were often taken out of the room while testimony was being presented. The proceedings were conducted with some formality, even when the facts were admitted, and a stenographic record of all sworn testimony was made. If the parents retained counsel, an assistant county attorney was called in to act for the State. In hearings of continued cases the agency which had been given charge of the child reported to the judge, through its agent, on the work that had been done, the status of the case, and recommendations as to further action. The children and parents were not required to be present at such hearings.

The procedure in Minneapolis in dependency cases was practically the same as for cases of neglect, except that dependency cases involving children born out of wedlock were handled in a special manner. Under the Minnesota laws many of these children were brought

before the juvenile court in dependency proceedings, adjudication of dependency giving the court authority to place the child under the general guardianship of an agency or institution which had power to consent to adoption. The procedure was usually for the purpose of preparing the way for adoption. The county board of child welfare, acting as the representative of the State, made investigations in all such cases, saw that action was taken to determine paternity whenever such proceedings were desirable and feasible, and assisted in making arrangements whereby the mother and child could remain together for at least part of the nursing period.

Dependency proceedings in Minneapolis were not initiated, in the case of a child born out of wedlock, until the child was 3 months of age—usually not until he was older. The hearings were in chambers, and the testimony was taken by the court reporter. All witnesses were sworn. A representative of the city health department was present with the child's birth certificate and introduced the statement on the certificate as evidence. A representative of the county child-welfare board was present, usually the person who had signed the petition. She was questioned with reference to the steps that had been taken to establish paternity. If paternity had not been established and the reasons for failure to take action were not satisfactory to the judge, the case was continued. If the child had been in a maternity home or under the care of a social agency a representative of the agency accompanied the mother and child to court and was present at the hearing. The "consulting and court officer" questioned the witnesses, and the probation officer in charge of dependency and neglect cases was also present. The mother was questioned with reference to the child's paternity, her ability to support the child, and her plans for him. If it appeared that the child's interests would be served best by having him placed for adoption he was placed under the general guardianship of an agency, which might be the State board of control, the State school for dependent children, a private child-protective agency, a maternity home, or some other private agency.

Dependency hearings in the District of Columbia were public and were conducted formally, the corporation counsel representing the District.^{20b} Agents of the Board of Children's Guardians, who made the investigations in these cases, testified as to the conditions found. The children were brought in for a moment only, to be identified.

Procedure in neglect cases in the San Francisco court was very much the same as that in delinquency cases involving boys. County aid was granted through the San Francisco court both to children in their own homes and to children under the care of agencies and institutions. On days when these cases were heard the court room was usually crowded with mothers, babies, and older children. The hearings were brief, as the judge nearly always followed the recommendations made by the head of the family-relations department in conference with representatives of the three private child-caring agencies to which the children granted aid were committed for supervision or for placement if they could not remain in their own homes. The representatives of these agencies were present

^{20b} Such hearings are now held in the judge's chambers.

at the hearing. The judge questioned the children and the mothers briefly and explained what would be required of the mothers in the care of their children.

The Denver, Minneapolis, and Seattle courts had jurisdiction over mothers' pensions or county allowances to mothers with dependent children.²¹ In Denver, where the judge had designated the Bureau of Charities of the City and County of Denver as the agent of the court in the investigation and supervision of these cases, the hearings were very informal, only the mother and the representative of the county bureau appearing before the judge. The presence of the children was not required. The representative of the bureau presented the results of her investigation and her recommendation. The judge explained to the mother the purpose of the law and of the supervision which would be given. In cases of application for increase of pension the mother's presence was not required, but in cases of decrease or discontinuance the mother was almost always present.

In hearings of county-allowance cases in Minneapolis the mothers and other witnesses were usually examined by the chief probation officer and the judge, testimony being given under oath. Sometimes, however, if there was no point in controversy, the mother was not examined by the judge, and action was based entirely upon the report of the chief probation officer and the recommendations of the advisory county-allowance board. The law provided that all findings and orders might be made upon the written reports of official investigators with like effect as if based upon competent testimony given in open court.²² In order to grant an allowance it was necessary to adjudge the children dependent. If there was a difficult legal point to be settled, involving the mother's residence, for instance, a preliminary hearing was held prior to the investigation and that point determined. Children were never required to be present in court in county-allowance cases.

The mothers' pension hearings in Seattle were private, and usually neither the mother nor the children were required to be present. Five members of the mothers' pension department met with the judge in his chambers, and he read the history and questioned the investigator. The stenographer of the department took notes and gave them later to the clerk of the court. When a decision was made a letter was written the mother telling her of the action taken. If a difficult problem came up or the mother was unresponsive she was called before the judge.

JURY TRIALS.

In five of the courts jury trials were not permitted under the law in children's cases, and in four of these courts no cases of any kind were tried by jury. In the adult part of the Buffalo court, at the request of the defendant, the trial might be by a jury of six. Jury trials were not permitted under the California juvenile court law unless the judge held the child not to be a fit subject for juvenile-court procedure; in such a case the child might be proceeded against in the criminal court. In San Francisco it was reported that there

²¹ County aid in San Francisco was divided between the court, as described above, and the widows' pension bureau.

²² Minnesota, Laws of 1917, ch. 233, sec. 5, as amended by Laws of 1919, chs. 328 and 333.

had been only three cases of this kind since the establishment of the court.

Jury trials in the District of Columbia court were in practice confined to nonsupport and bastardy cases. During the year ended June 30, 1920, seven cases—six bastardy and one nonsupport—were tried by jury. The law provides as follows:

In all prosecutions * * * in which, according to the constitution of the United States, the accused would be entitled to a jury trial, the trial shall be by jury unless the accused shall in open court expressly waive such trial by jury. In all cases where the accused would not under the Constitution of the United States be entitled to trial by jury, the trial shall be by the court without a jury, unless in such of said last-named cases wherein the fine or penalty may be \$50 or more, or imprisonment as punishment for the offense may be 30 days or more, the accused shall demand a trial by jury, in which case the trial shall be by jury.²³

The law of the State of Washington provided as follows:

In all trials under this act, any person interested therein may demand a jury trial, or the judge of his own motion, may order a jury to try the case.²⁴

Jury trials were seldom demanded in Seattle. They were held in the courthouse, since the juvenile-court room was too small to accommodate a jury.

Serious cases in the St. Louis juvenile court were occasionally tried by jury, though the number of jury trials was said not to average more than one a year. The law provided that when a child stood charged with violation of the criminal statutes of the State, trial by jury might be demanded by the child, his parents, or any person standing in loco parentis.²⁵ Cases tried by jury were heard in the courthouse, where the facilities were adequate for such trials.

In the Denver juvenile court a jury trial might be demanded in any case,²⁶ but it was reported that there had been only one or two juvenile-delinquency jury cases in a period of seven years. Most of the jury trials in the Denver court were in contested nonsupport cases. Because the juvenile court was independent of any other court system it was necessary to impanel a special jury.

In the Minneapolis court jury trials might be had upon demand²⁷ but were seldom requested—not more than five or six times a year. The jury trial was a civil proceeding and was conducted as such, except that the judge thought it best to apply some of the rules of evidence governing criminal cases. Rules of competency of evidence were rigidly adhered to. The attendance of the public was restricted in the same way as in other cases. Trial was by a jury of 12. In his charge to the jury the judge explained briefly the nature of the juvenile-court proceeding, stating that its purpose was the protection and not the punishment of the child. After the verdict was returned the judge called before him the persons interested; if the child was found delinquent, the further procedure was exactly the same as the procedure following adjudication of cases heard without jury.

²³ 34 Stat. 75. By a 1922 decision in the case of *United States v. Moreland* (258 U. S. 433) the United States Supreme Court held unconstitutional a provision permitting the District of Columbia juvenile court to proceed by information against a person neglecting or refusing to provide for the support and maintenance of his minor children.

²⁴ Washington, Remington's Comp. Stat., 1922, sec. 1987-2.

²⁵ Missouri, Rev. Stat., 1919, sec. 2592 (Laws of 1911, p. 177, sec. 2).

²⁶ Colorado, Comp. Stat., 1921, secs. 607, 5506.

²⁷ Minnesota, Laws of 1917, ch. 397, sec. 2.

APPEALS.

In all the courts studied appeals might be taken, in some on matters of law only, and in others on matters of law and fact. The Louisiana Constitution provided that appeals should be allowed on matters of law only and should be direct to the supreme court.²⁸ The Missouri law provided as follows:

An appeal shall be allowed to the child from any final judgment of delinquency or dependency or final order of commitment made under the provisions of this article and from any modification of such order, and may be demanded on the part of the child by its guardian, by either parent, or by its previous custodian, or by any person within the fourth degree of kindred of such child. * * * *Provided, however,* That such appeal shall be taken at the same term of the court at which the order is made * * *²⁹

In none of the courts were appeals frequent. For instance, in St. Louis it was stated that there had been only four or five appealed cases in the last four or five years. Annual statistics secured from court reports or court records showed for only two courts the number of appealed cases—1 pending on appeal at the end of the year in Denver and 16 delinquency cases appealed in Boston. It is possible that some of the reports listed appealed cases under the heading of "other" or "pending," or grouped them with other cases according to the disposition made by the appellate court.

The Massachusetts law provided that a child adjudged a wayward child or a delinquent child or a juvenile offender might appeal to the superior court and that such child should, at the time of adjudication, be informed as to his right of appeal.³⁰ Appeal lay both from a finding of delinquency and from commitment to an institution or to the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare. Appeal could not be taken after a suspended commitment had been accepted. In neglect cases appeal lay only from the finding of neglect³¹ and was taken to the superior court sitting for civil business. The law prescribed the procedure in appealed cases as follows:

The appeal, if taken, shall be entered, tried and determined in like manner as appeals in criminal cases, except that the trial of the said appeals in the superior court shall not be in conjunction with the other business of that court, but shall be held in a session set apart and devoted for the time being exclusively to the trial of juvenile cases. This shall be known as the juvenile sessions of the superior court and shall have a separate trial list and docket. All juvenile appeal cases in the superior court shall be transferred to this list and shall be tried, unless otherwise disposed of by direct order of the court.

The Massachusetts law specified also that the superior court before passing sentence or ordering other disposition should be supplied with a report of any investigation made by the probation officer of the court from which the appeal was taken.

The Massachusetts practice of notifying the child and his parents of the right of appeal in each case³² has resulted in appeals in a larger number of cases than in courts in other States. In the Boston juvenile court in the year ended August 31, 1920, 16 delinquency cases were appealed, or 1.7 per cent of the 952 cases of delinquency and waywardness dealt with by the court during the year. Thirteen

²⁸ Louisiana, Constitution of 1913, art. 118, sec. 1. The constitution of 1921 (Art. VII, sec. 96) provides that appeals shall be on questions of law and of fact to the criminal district court.

²⁹ Missouri, Rev. Stat., 1919, sec. 2610 (Laws of 1911, p. 177).

³⁰ Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, secs. 56, 81.

³¹ Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, sec. 47.

³² See p. 128.

cases were appealed from an adjudication of delinquency, 1 from commitment to the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, and 2 from commitment to an industrial school. All the cases were set for hearing by the superior court within the same month as that in which the appeal was taken, or the month following. In 3 cases the child failed to appear and was not found; 5 cases were placed on file on recommendation of the district attorney; 1 case was placed on file because the boy was serving the sentence from which the appeal had been taken; 2 cases were placed on file by order of the court; in 1 case the appeal was withdrawn; and in only 4 cases was the child placed on probation.³³

Juvenile sessions of the superior court of Suffolk County, the county in which Boston is located, were held about twice a month at no fixed time but whenever it was convenient. The list of cases was publicly posted in the clerk's office. Sessions were held in the main court room in the afternoon, and sometimes 12 or 15 cases were heard at a single session. The court room was cleared, and only those interested in the particular case were present. Cases were usually heard within a month, unless continuance was requested by counsel, but it was stated that it was usually two or three months before cases were finally disposed of. Children under 14 unable to furnish bail were usually cared for, pending hearing or continuance, by the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare. Jail detention was rarely resorted to, it was stated, the probation officers giving nominal surety if bail could not be furnished.

Records obtained from the lower courts gave the charge, plea, finding, birthplace, residence, employer's name, previous court record, and other pertinent information. This information was sometimes supplemented by visits to home and school by a woman probation officer attached to the superior court.

Cases of girls and school boys placed on probation by the superior court of Suffolk County, Mass., were assigned to a woman probation officer, and those of other boys were assigned to a man probation officer. Each case assigned to the woman officer was reviewed in advance of the hearing by the assistant district attorney and the probation officer. These reviews were in reality informal hearings, the parents, child, and interested parties being present. If the evidence was insufficient, the offense trivial, or the child already on probation, the district attorney recommended to the judge that the case be filed without appearance. Such an order had to be signed by the judge, but the effect was practically the same as though the case were *nolle prosequi*—a practice forbidden by a law passed in 1916. Prior to 1916 district attorneys, it was stated, had been inclined to *nolle prosequi* cases too readily, thus leaving the children without the protection and special care needed.

In the great majority of cases heard by the judge the child pleaded guilty, and jury trials were rare. There was usually, but not always, a plea of guilty before a case was filed. Fines were seldom imposed in juvenile cases, and costs were never assessed, but restitution was said to be ordered frequently. Children were not committed to institutions without a period of trial on probation. The probation period was two years, but cases were often continued from four to

³³ Information compiled from court records.

six months, the child being supervised by a probation officer. Occasionally girls' cases were continued on condition that the girl be placed in an institution.

In 1919 a total of 124 juvenile cases were appealed to the superior court of Suffolk County, Mass. The dispositions in these cases were as follows: Placed on file, 86; placed on probation, 31; fined, 4; committed to State school, 3.³⁴

The number of children on probation to the superior court was usually between 30 and 40, though sometimes as high as 60. From 50 to 75 boys and only 2 or 3 girls were under the care of probation officers during a year. The total number of probationers—adults and children—under the supervision of the officer to whom girls and school boys were assigned was 150. She stated that the children were visited either at home or at school, two or three times a month. Probation histories were kept in loose-leaf notebooks.

The practice of allowing appeal in all cases, without limiting it to appeal on matters of law, was felt to be undesirable by some of those most familiar with juvenile-court work in Massachusetts. The children whose cases were appealed were less likely than children dealt with wholly in the juvenile court to secure prompt treatment adapted to their needs.³⁵

³⁴ Fourth Annual Report of the Bureau of Prisons of Massachusetts for the Year 1919, p. 150. Boston, 1920.

³⁵ On May 9, 1922, "The News About the Department," issued by the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, contained the following item: "In Suffolk County, District Attorney Thomas C. O'Brien has taken up the consideration of cases appealed from the juvenile courts and by probation or otherwise is disposing of many cases which were formerly dropped. The district attorney will give these cases his personal attention."

THE COURT ORDER.

ORDERS IN DELINQUENCY CASES.

Variations between courts.

The orders made by the court in the various classes of cases are affected by the law, the facilities available to the court, and the proportion of cases adjusted without formal court action. Because of variations in these factors, differences in terminology, and lack of uniformity in the compilation of statistics, it is impossible to compare one court with another except in general terms and with many qualifications.

The usual dispositions in delinquency cases are as follows:

1. Dismissal (upon hearing or after continuance unaccompanied by probation order).
2. Order for restitution or reparation, and dismissal of case.
3. Probation, with or without an order for restitution or reparation.
4. Commitment to an agency, public or private.
5. Commitment to an institution.
 - a. State.
 - b. County or city.
 - c. Private.

In addition, costs are sometimes assessed, and courts of criminal or quasi-criminal jurisdiction may impose fines.

In California and Washington the law provided for making the children over whom the court desired to exercise control "wards of the court," this wardship continuing during minority unless the case was sooner dismissed or the control passed from the court to a State institution to which the child had been committed. The Seattle court sometimes adjudged children wards without placing them under supervision—an order similar to the "placing on file" in other courts but perhaps conveying to the child and his family a somewhat stronger sense of the court's authority.

In six of the courts—those in Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, St. Louis, and the District of Columbia—a large proportion of cases were adjusted informally; that is, without the filing of a petition or complaint.³⁶ Cases not requiring prolonged attention by the court or the sanction of a formal order to secure the ends desired were eliminated, and hence the proportion of dismissals was smaller and the proportion of commitments in cases in which formal action was taken was increased.

Dismissal.

The Denver court dealt with a large proportion of cases informally, and only about 9 per cent of the formal cases were dismissed upon

³⁶ See Cases adjusted without formal court action, p. 109.

hearing or were continued indefinitely. In the Buffalo court, on the other hand, a court which did practically no informal work, half of the cases were discharged or dismissed. In Minneapolis 9 per cent were dismissed at hearing and 16 per cent after continuance. In St. Louis 39 per cent of the formal cases were dismissed or "continued generally,"³⁷ while in San Francisco the percentage so disposed of was 58. In the District of Columbia 39 per cent, in New Orleans 32 per cent, and in Boston 27 per cent of the cases were dismissed, discharged, placed on file, or continued.³⁸ The relatively high proportion of dismissals in San Francisco, where a large number of cases were handled informally, was probably due to the practice of placing cases on file after short continuances if successful adjustments appeared to have been made. The proportion of delinquency cases dismissed or placed on file was not obtained for the Los Angeles or Seattle court, but for these courts and for the others also statements of policy were obtained in the course of interviews with the judge and members of the probation staff.

The officers of the Los Angeles court stated that very few cases were dismissed upon hearing but that many cases coming before the judge were placed "off calendar" and later dismissed if no report of further trouble was received. This procedure was particularly common in traffic cases, in which bail was usually required and was often ordered refunded at the time of dismissal. The referee sometimes continued a case and ordered the child to report in court at a specified time. If conditions were then found to be satisfactory the case was dismissed. The judge sometimes continued a case for a specified period—usually six months—and released the child in the custody of the parents during good behavior. If no adverse report was made the case was dismissed at the end of the period. The same order with a direction that the child be under the supervision of a probation officer was sometimes used and constituted in effect an order for short-time probation.

Seattle court statistics made no distinction between formal and informal cases. About two-fifths of the cases before the court in 1919 were dismissed or were entered as disposed of under the heading "Parents and child advised." Very few formal cases were dismissed or continued indefinitely. Most of the cases in which parents and children were "advised" were cases handled without formal court action.

The Minneapolis court dismissed cases upon hearing if the evidence was not sufficient or if it was established that the child was not delinquent. If the child was found to have committed an offense, but if it was trivial or if supervision was not believed to be needed, the case was continued without probation to a given date, six months or a year from the time of hearing. The judge in such a case told the child that he was making a memorandum to the effect that the facts warranted adjudication but that if the child got into no further

³⁷ The phrases "continued generally," used in St. Louis, "placed off calendar," used in San Francisco, and "placed on file" or "continued subject to call," used in some of the other courts, all mean that the child was allowed to go without any supervision from the court but that the case could be reopened at any time that report of misconduct by the child was brought to the attention of the court.

³⁸ The figure for the District of Columbia includes the following cases: Dismissed with warning; dismissed for want of prosecution; dismissed for want of jurisdiction; adjudged not guilty; continued subject to call; nolle prosequit; proceedings discontinued; sentence suspended.

trouble the case would be dismissed without adjudication on the date specified.

Many trivial cases before the Buffalo court were dismissed or discharged upon hearing, frequently with reprimand. A great many cases of trespass on railroad property or theft from railroads were disposed of in this way. In New Orleans at the time of the study cases were discharged if they were trivial or if the judge thought the promise of good behavior would be effective. The St. Louis court discharged or dismissed very few cases of violation of State laws, but the great majority of cases of violation of city ordinances were reported as being disposed of in this way. In Boston cases of children committing trivial offenses—stone throwing, window breaking, peddling, "gaming," etc.—were often placed on file, with or without a finding of delinquency, and might be taken from the file at any time.

Fines and costs.

A fine is a penalty and as such is usually considered to have no place in juvenile-court procedure.³⁹ Juvenile courts operating under quasi-criminal procedure, however, have a right to impose fines, and some of the courts of chancery jurisdiction included in this study had made use of expedients comparable to fines in certain cases, believing that the imposition of a small money penalty was the best means of awakening the child and his parents to the seriousness of the offense. Since the juvenile court has been established to render service to children and there are no parties defendant the cost of proceedings should, it is generally agreed, be borne by the State or the community. In some of the courts, however, it was found that costs were sometimes assessed, though usually for the purpose of discipline, as it was believed that a fine would impress both the children and the parents.

In the Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Seattle courts fines or costs were never imposed in children's cases. The District of Columbia court had power to impose fines but seldom exercised it, only three cases being thus disposed of in the year 1919-20.

In Denver costs were never assessed in children's cases and very rarely in cases of adults. Technically fines were not imposed, but the court had a plan, sometimes used in cases adjusted without court hearing, whereby in certain types of cases, such as catching rides on cars, the boy paid from \$1 to \$5, which was refunded if he did not repeat the offense and forfeited if he did. When forfeited, the money, with the boy's consent, was given to a welfare organization. Sometimes as much as \$10 was assessed in this way. The plan had been found to be very successful in reducing the number of cases of jumping on moving railroad cars. The boy was expected to earn the money, but the parents might pay if the boy did not have it.

The Los Angeles court never imposed fines or assessed costs, but in all traffic cases the police required bail of \$3 to \$25. The bail was sent by the police to the bookkeeper of the probation office, who deposited it with the county treasurer. Frequently at the hearing the judge placed the case "off calendar" (i. e., continued the

³⁹ See The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 99), p. 9, footnote 7.

case indefinitely) and determined whether the bail should be returned to the child or forfeited. If the child could not furnish bail the parents were permitted to do so, and the amount was usually returned if the judge thought it would be a hardship on the parents to forfeit it. For a second offense the permit to operate a motor vehicle was taken away. It must be borne in mind in this connection that the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles court was exclusive to 18 years and concurrent to the age of 21, so that many older boys were brought in for traffic violations.

In St. Louis in 1920 fines or costs were imposed in 17 out of 1,708 cases—approximately 1 per cent. Fines were imposed only in cases of violation of city ordinance and even in such cases very rarely.⁴⁰ Costs were determined in each case, the court operating under the fee system for the issuance and service of papers, but the costs were usually borne by the city. Sometimes the children were ordered to pay one-half or one-third of the costs, which varied from \$2 to \$5. Parents were expected to pay the costs when assessed if the children could not.

Fines were never imposed by the Boston juvenile court, but "costs" were often assessed. Unlike the practice in St. Louis, they were not estimated on the basis of actual cost to the court but were imposed for the purpose of making the child and his parents recognize their responsibility to society. They were in the amount of \$1, \$2, \$3, \$5, \$10, or sometimes even more, and they might be paid in installments. If the child was working, the judge insisted that the amounts come from his earnings. They were not assessed if the judge thought the family was so poor that to pay them would be a hardship. Often the case was continued for two weeks for the purpose of determining whether the family was able to pay. Costs might be assessed either with or without an order for probation. In 1919-20 costs were assessed in a total of 275 cases, or 29 per cent of the 936 delinquency cases in which information as to disposition was obtained by representatives of the Children's Bureau. An order for probation accompanied the order for the payment of costs in 117 cases. In almost half the cases in which payment of costs was ordered the amount was under \$3, and in less than one-tenth of the cases was the amount \$10 or over. In the calendar year 1920 a total of \$963.40 was collected as "costs."⁴¹

Fines were imposed in the Buffalo court in amounts of \$1 or \$2 for such offenses as burglary, petit larceny, theft from railroads, and train riding. In 1920 fines were imposed in 92 of 1,176 delinquency cases, or 8 per cent.⁴² The main object of the fine, the judge stated, was to impress the parents with the gravity of the offense. Stealing coal from railroad cars was a great problem in Buffalo, and the imposition of a fine of \$2 or \$3 for \$1 worth of coal taken was found to impress the parents and the neighbors. Fines might be paid in installments, and the children were frequently placed on probation until the fines were paid. If the financial condition of a family was such that a fine would be a hardship, it was not imposed. •

⁴⁰ No commitments could be made in city ordinance cases except for failure to pay fine.

⁴¹ Statistics of County Finances for the Year Ending December 31, 1920, Division of Accounts, Department of Corporations and Taxation, Boston, pp. 22-23.

⁴² In 1923 fines were imposed in only 34 (3 per cent) of the 973 delinquency cases.

Restitution and reparation.

Restitution for property taken or reparation for damage done was ordered occasionally by two courts and somewhat more frequently by eight. A restitution order was often accompanied by placing the child on probation, but in some cases it was felt that the payment of money as restitution or reparation was a sufficient lesson to the child and that prolonged supervision by the court was unnecessary. In such cases an order for restitution or reparation accompanied a suspended sentence or a continuance. If the child was working he was expected to make restitution or reparation out of his own earnings and might pay in installments. The following are statements of policy with reference to restitution or reparation in two of the courts studied:

In Minneapolis the judge laid great stress on restitution or reparation if the child was of sufficient age to earn the money; the child was expected to pay out of his earnings, and the amount might be paid in installments. In cases of younger children such payments were not usually required, though the judge sometimes advised the parents to make good the damage. The court discouraged the making of complaints simply for the purpose of obtaining restitution.

Restitution or reparation was frequently required by the Boston court when property had been stolen or injury done, and might be paid in installments. A provision of the Massachusetts law reads as follows:

If, in adjudging a person a delinquent child, the court finds, as an element of such delinquency, that he has committed an act involving liability in a civil action, and such delinquent child is placed on probation, the court may require as a condition thereof, that he shall make restitution or reparation to the injured person to such an extent and in such sum as the court determines.⁴²

The judge sometimes required the payment of money as "atonement" for the wrong done, when restitution or reparation was not involved; money so collected was paid to charitable agencies, the children being allowed to select the agency to which it should be given.

Orders for restitution or reparation were made by most of the courts in relatively few cases. For instance, in Buffalo in 1920 such orders were made in 4 per cent of the cases and in the District of Columbia in 1919-20, in less than 3 per cent. The Seattle court reported \$400 collected as restitution in 1920. In Boston in 1919-20, restitution, reparation, atonement, or forfeiture was ordered in 94 cases in which costs were not assessed and in 33 cases in which payment of costs was ordered. For the year 1920 the chief probation officer of the Boston court reported \$1,960.57 collected as restitution, \$46 for reparation, and \$205.92 for atonement.⁴³

Continuances.

Reference has already been made to the use of continuances during good behavior or pending the payment of fines or costs, restitution, or reparation. Many cases are of course continued for short periods in order to secure more information about the child, to give opportunity for physical and mental examinations, or to get in touch with relatives, make arrangements for the return of runaway children to

⁴² Massachusetts, General Laws, 1921, ch. 119, sec. 62.

⁴³ See p. 140, footnote 41.

their parents, or perform other services of like nature. Further discussion of the policies of the courts with reference to continuances will be limited to the San Francisco court, which had developed the use of short-term continuances with a certain amount of supervision as a method of utilizing probation for those children only who gave promise of benefiting by it.

The development in San Francisco of the plan of using continuances for short periods of supervision pending decision as to final disposition was based upon the theory (1) that the officers could be held more successfully to prompt, decisive action at the beginning of the case if they had to report to the court after a short period than if they were given an indefinite time to show results through an order placing the child on probation; and (2) that constructive probation work could be stimulated and the officers made to feel that they were securing results if probation were limited to cases in which, after careful study and, if it seemed necessary, after a trial period, the decision was reached that a fair chance of success under probation seemed to be indicated. Continuances with supervision were not used, of course, where probation seemed from the beginning to be the logical order for the court to make. In the boys' department at the time of the study about 5 per cent of the cases were carried on the "continued calendar." The girls' department not only carried cases on a "continued calendar" but had also a "reserve calendar" of cases. These were cases in which reports to the court were required every three months, supervision being given by the probation officers. The plan was developed in order to provide for feeble-minded girls who could not be placed immediately in the State institution for the feeble-minded and who could not be received in other institutions. While such cases were in effect probation cases the plan had the merit of keeping constantly before the court and the staff the problem of the mentally defective and at the same time of confining the group of children on probation to those with whom the probation officers might achieve a large percentage of success.

Probation.⁴⁴

The proportion of formal cases in which the child was placed on probation was naturally affected by the number of cases adjusted informally or continued without a probation order. Some judges endeavored to select for probation only promising cases, and others used probation for all cases in which no other disposition was immediately indicated. The smallest percentage of formal cases in which probation was ordered was found in New Orleans⁴⁵ (8 per cent), while the largest percentages were in Boston⁴⁵ (45 per cent) and Minneapolis⁴⁶ (44 per cent). In the District of Columbia the percentage of probation cases was 38, in Denver 34, in St. Louis 32, and in San Francisco 15.⁴⁶ For Buffalo and Seattle it was impossible to obtain separate percentages for dependent and delinquent children; the percentage for all cases in 1920 was 22 in the former

⁴⁴ For a discussion of methods of probation see p. 161.

⁴⁵ Data obtained by representatives of the Children's Bureau.

⁴⁶ Reports of the courts (in manuscript). In the District of Columbia the percentage of probation cases in the year ended June 30, 1924, was 30.3.

and 16 in the latter.⁴⁷ In the District of Columbia, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle a large proportion of cases were adjusted informally, so that only the more serious cases came formally before the court.

Statistics for the Los Angeles court can not be compared with those for the other courts for the reason that in Los Angeles the policy was to adjudge as wards of the court nearly all children whose cases were not dismissed or who were not committed to State institutions. In some cases children were placed on probation on a continuance order for six months or a year, without the court's having declared them wards. The majority of the wards were on probation, but a considerable number were cared for in private institutions of various types. The statistics published by the court made no distinction between children who were under the care of the court by reason of dependency and those who had been delinquent. Of 1,787 new cases filed in the Los Angeles court in 1919, 1,294, or 72 per cent, were under the supervision of the court in their own homes or in other family homes or institutions at the end of the year.⁴⁸

Interesting differences in the comparative frequency with which probation was used in boys' and in girls' cases were found. In four courts a larger proportion of girls than of boys were placed on probation, and in two a larger proportion of boys than of girls. The proportions of boys and of girls were about the same in one court; in one court separate statistics regarding boys and girls were not available; and in two courts the statistics for dependency and delinquency cases were combined.

Commitment to child-placing agencies.

Public agencies which placed delinquent children in family homes or in institutions were available to four of the courts. The Minneapolis court sometimes committed children to the Minnesota State Board of Control, which placed them in institutions or otherwise provided for them. This order was, however, infrequent. The court in the District of Columbia often committed delinquent children to the Board of Children's Guardians, either for definite, relatively short periods, or during minority. Only children under 16 could be committed to the board. In 1919-20, of 1,641 delinquency cases, 154 (9 per cent) were committed to the board as compared with 146 (9 per cent) committed to the national training schools.^{48a} The court had no power to commit to other institutions. The children were placed by the board in free or boarding homes or in institutions.

The Boston court had authority to commit children to the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, to be placed in boarding, free, or wage homes by the division of child guardianship of that department, which had the right to transfer delinquent children to the State training schools. Children having settlement in Boston might be committed to the Boston Institutions Department, to be placed in family homes. In 1919-20, in only 4 of the 952 cases of

⁴⁷ Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, p. 17, and the Seattle Juvenile-Court Report for the Years 1920-1921, p. 13. The Seattle figures included cases dealt with formally and cases adjusted without court action. In 1922 the percentage was 17 and in 1923, 11. In Buffalo in 1923 the percentage placed or continued on probation was 19.

⁴⁸ Annual Report Los Angeles County Probation Department for the Year Ending December 31, 1919, p. 3. Los Angeles, 1920.

^{48a} In the year ended June 30, 1924, of 1,904 official delinquency cases in the District of Columbia, 133 (7 per cent) were committed or returned to the Board of Children's Guardians (93 of the commitments being temporary), as compared with 129 (6.8 per cent) committed or returned to the national training schools.

delinquency before the court were the children committed to the State department, and no commitments were made to the city.⁴⁹ "Wayward children"—a class between the delinquent and the neglected provided by the Massachusetts law—could not be committed to institutions but might be committed to the State or the city child-placing department.

The Buffalo court might commit children to the city commissioner of charities for home placement. This order, however, was made usually only in cases of destitution or improper guardianship. Working boys or school boys 14 or 15 years of age were sometimes committed by the Buffalo court to the children's aid society. They remained in the receiving home of this agency for a time and were then placed in family homes. The Seattle court in 1921 committed children to a home-finding society in 44 cases—3 per cent of all the dependency and delinquency cases that came to the attention of the court. The Los Angeles court in 1919 placed 20 children in care of a home-finding society, 3 of them under temporary commitments. It is probable that most, if not all, of these children were dependent.

Some of the courts utilized child-placing agencies for the care of children on probation who needed to be provided for away from their own homes. Such a disposition was not an official court order but was an informal arrangement, made usually by the probation staff. For instance, the Boston Children's Aid Society had developed a highly specialized placing-out service for a limited number of delinquent boys on probation recommended for such care by the Judge Baker Foundation. Other agencies also performed somewhat similar service for delinquent boys or girls on probation. In Los Angeles, and to a lesser extent in seven other courts, the probation officers sometimes placed in family homes children needing such care.⁵⁰

Commitment to public institutions.

State institutions available.—State training schools for boys (or in the District of Columbia, a national training school) were available to eight of the courts, and State (or national) training schools for girls were available to nine courts. In three of the States there was but one State training school to which the court might commit a delinquent boy. Two of these courts, however, had available a county school to which the younger and less seriously delinquent boys in need of institutional care were usually sent. Massachusetts had two State schools for boys, one for those under 15 years of age and the other for those 15 to 17 years of age, inclusive. Boys might be transferred from the former to the latter, and one parole department served both institutions. A somewhat similar situation existed in California, where one State school received boys under 16, and another received boys between the ages of 16 and 21 years. Here, also, children might be transferred from the former to the latter. The Buffalo court could commit delinquent or ungovernable boys 12 years of age or above to a State institution in the western part of the State, and for violation of probation it could send boys 16 to 18 years of age to an institution in the eastern part of the State which received boys of all ages from the eastern district. Missouri had

⁴⁹ Information obtained from court records.

⁵⁰ See *The administrative work of the court*, p. 216.

no State training school for boys, but delinquent boys of any age might be committed to a reformatory which received men under the age of 31 years. A city institution for delinquent boys was available to the St. Louis court.

In Louisiana the State training institute, a reformatory, received a few of the older white boys committed by the New Orleans court for felonies or repeated misdemeanors. A city institution was available for other children in whose cases commitments were made.

To each court but one (that in New Orleans) a State training school for girls was available, and the St. Louis court made commitments to two such institutions—one for white girls and one for colored. The Seattle court sometimes committed older girls suffering from venereal disease to the "Women's Industrial Home and Clinic," an institution for girls and older women with venereal disease, to which commitments were indeterminate, with a maximum of three years.⁵¹ The courts in California were conditioned in their commitments by the fact that the State school was unwilling to receive tuberculous, syphilitic, or feeble-minded girls. Moreover, the capacity was limited, and each county was assigned a quota which could not be exceeded. In the State of Washington, also, admission to the State school was limited to girls of sound health and mind. This institution occasionally received dependent as well as delinquent girls, and the dependent children were not separated from the delinquent.

County or city institutions available.—In one of the communities studied a county school for delinquent boys, and in three a city school, was maintained. The county school to which the Minneapolis court committed boys was under the joint management of the judge and the county commissioners and was in reality part of the probation system. This school, located about 14 miles from Minneapolis, received delinquent boys of juvenile-court age; occasionally neglected boys were boarded there, with the consent of the judge, by the children's protective society. The capacity of the institution was 54, and the children were housed in three cottages. The school had considerable acreage of wooded and farm land.

Like the Hennepin County (Minnesota) school in purpose but under the management of the school department, was the Boys' Parental School of Seattle, situated on an island in Lake Washington and accommodating 115 boys, all of whom were committed by the juvenile court. Boys living in the county outside the city were cared for at the expense of the county. School boys under 16 (and under the part-time school law, those under 18 who were habitual truants or incorrigible) were received. Boys could not be committed to this institution for offenses punishable by confinement in a penal institution. Occasionally dependent boys were committed to the school, but in such cases, in addition to dependency, some element of delinquency was usually present. The school, consisting of three dormitories, a school building, shops, and farm buildings, occupied 180 acres, practically all of the land being under cultivation. Military drill every day and band practice twice a week, schooling, farm and industrial work, and recreation, made up the program of training.

Located on the banks of the Missouri River some distance from St. Louis, Bellefontaine Farms had recently been built by that city to

⁵¹ This institution has since been closed because of the failure of the legislature to make appropriations.

take the place of an old industrial school of the congregate type. Eight cottages, accommodating 30 boys each, a combined receiving cottage and hospital, an administration building, and a chapel and recreation building were in use at the time the study was made, and other cottages were planned. Delinquent boys of juvenile-court age were committed to this institution by the court, which had available no other institution for delinquent boys except the State reform school for boys and men. School and farm work and recreation comprised the program of the school. No industrial work had as yet been provided.^{51a}

The city school for boys in New Orleans was a congregate institution, one building being used for white and one for colored boys, and served the court both as a detention home and as the only public institution, aside from the State reformatory, to which delinquent boys could be committed. Sixty white and 80 colored boys were cared for at this institution, which was under the management of the commissioner of public works. Aside from the school work, for which public-school teachers were assigned, nothing constructive was done for the children in this institution.

Except for the occasional use of the detention home for short-term commitments and of municipal hospitals for the care of sick children, the other six courts included in the study had access to no local public institution for the care of delinquent boys. To all these six, however, State schools were available. Boston had formerly had both a city parental school for the institutional care of truants and a county school to which delinquent children might be committed. It had been found desirable to close the former in 1914 and the latter in December, 1920.

County or city schools for delinquent girls were available to three of the courts. The county school for girls in Minneapolis and the girls' parental school in Seattle were under the same management as the corresponding schools for boys and occupied similar places in the community's program for the care of delinquent children.

In Seattle a new building was nearly ready for the occupancy of the girls' parental school, which had been using an old frame house and several portable cottages. The new institution occupied 10 acres on the lake shore. The building, two stories, with full basement and attic, included 22 single rooms for the girls in addition to the hospital wing, which had operating rooms and seven single rooms. The population of the school at the time of the study was 34. Commitments to it have increased somewhat since the completion of the new building. School work, housework, gardening, and recreation comprised the daily program. Like the Seattle boys' school, the institution was under the supervision of the attendance department of the public schools, and girls were received only on commitment from the juvenile court.

A unique experiment in the reeducation of delinquent girls was being made by the Los Angeles juvenile court. "El Retiro" was established in 1919 by the county board of supervisors and was considered a branch of the detention home (Juvenile Hall) so far as finances and administration were concerned. Built originally as a sanitarium for convalescing tuberculous patients, it is described by

^{51a} A similar institution for delinquent girls was to be opened about Oct. 1, 1924. It occupies approximately 140 acres and is on the cottage plan. It will be called the Meramec Hills School for Girls.

the first superintendent as hidden in an olive grove near the mountains and as giving physical expression to the idea of adjustment and of the restoration of the girl to confidence in normal life.⁵² At the time of the study it accommodated 30 girls and in 1923 cared for about 50. These girls were selected after careful study at the detention home and were not committed as wards of the court but were "permitted to go to El Retiro until further order." After a period of trial they were either accepted by the El Retiro Association—the student body of the institution—or were rejected and had to be provided for by the court in some other way. Under the guidance of those in charge, the spirit of loyalty to the group and the sense of individual responsibility for carrying out the project which was assigned each girl, after careful study and conference, formed the basis for later readjustment to community life. A club was maintained in Los Angeles for graduates of the school who worked in the city and could not live at home. The club housed 20 girls and served as a clubhouse for all El Retiro graduates. A field secretary was employed and lived at the clubhouse.

The six courts having detention homes under their management used these homes for the care of children during continuances, and in some cases the purpose of the continuance was to provide a short period of discipline for children who were to be placed on probation.⁵³ Children awaiting admission to other institutions were cared for in the detention homes, and in Los Angeles and San Francisco girls with venereal disease were thus cared for during long periods, their cases being continued until it was safe for them to be returned to the community.

None of the courts studied used commitment to jail as a method of disposition, but one of the courts occasionally suspended sentence to an institution on condition that the boy serve from 10 to 30 days in jail. This method was used only in cases of boys 14 years of age and over and chiefly in cases of automobile theft or joy riding. The boys were usually kept with the "trusties."

Policy governing commitments.—Commitments to State institutions were seldom made without a period of trial on probation. In fact, in Los Angeles, the order of commitment to State institutions usually read "John Doe, having failed on probation * * *." The judge of the Boston juvenile court stated that since the establishment of the Judge Baker Foundation for the study of the children dispositions had become more certain, and that commitments to State institutions without a preliminary trial period were made in serious cases upon the recommendation of the foundation. Particularly in cases in which home conditions are such that the child must be provided for elsewhere a period of probation is often impossible. Many courts utilize for such cases intermediate institutions—county, city, or private—or placement in private homes by child-caring agencies. The school for girls under the court's management and several private institutions for boys met this need in Los Angeles County, and children were seldom committed to State institutions without trial on probation or in one of these intermediate institutions. In San Francisco the first step in the treatment of a delinquency case was usually a continuance

⁵² Van Waters, Miriam: "Where girls go right." Survey Graphic, June, 1922, p. 363. See also El Retiro: The New School for Girls, by the same author. California State Board of Health, Sacramento, 1920.

⁵³ See p. 56.

or several continuances; the second, probation at home; the third, foster-home care or commitment to private institutions, of which there were a number suited to cases of various types; and the fourth, commitment to a State institution. In several of the courts it was stated that commitment to institutions without a period of trial on probation was more frequent in the cases of girls than in those of boys, since institutional care was often necessary for girl sex offenders whose home conditions were unfavorable.

The commitments to State schools were usually minority commitments, the schools retaining custody until the child reached the age of 21 years. In Minnesota children committed to the State schools were subject to the guardianship of the State board of control. The St. Louis court often committed girls to the State schools for a period ending with the eighteenth birthday (though it might commit them to stay until they were 21) and sometimes made commitments for two or three years. Practice varied with reference to the term of commitment to city and county schools. The Minneapolis court usually made such commitments indeterminate, though in boys' cases the understanding was usually that the boy would be released in three months if his conduct was satisfactory; boys sent to the county school for stealing automobiles were committed for definite terms, usually 10 days. Girls usually remained in the county school in Minneapolis for three to six months. The Seattle commitments to the parental schools were indeterminate. In St. Louis commitments to the city school for delinquent boys were of three types: Division I, 1 to 2 years; Division II, 6 months to 1 year; and Division III, 1 day to 180 days. The last division was used for runaway and homeless boys and for boys 16 years of age or over.^{53a} The school could not retain control over the boys after they had reached the age of 17 years. The usual length of stay in the New Orleans institution was six months.

Commitment to private institutions.

Four of the courts utilized to some extent private institutions for the care of delinquent boys, and all the courts but one utilized such institutions for the care of delinquent girls. The juvenile courts of the District of Columbia and of Boston had no power to commit delinquent children to private institutions, but certain institutions in Boston were receiving without commitment girls who were on probation, the probation officer retaining responsibility for them. In the District of Columbia a policy recently adopted by the juvenile court has been to defer commitment in certain cases of delinquent children who would otherwise be committed to the Board of Children's Guardians, on condition that the parents place the children in suitable private institutions and pay board for them.

The courts of Boston, Denver, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Seattle did not send delinquent boys to private institutions, but all these courts sometimes sent delinquent girls to the House of the Good Shepherd, which usually received them free of charge on court commitments. In St. Louis a junior department of the House of the Good Shepherd was maintained for the younger girls. Protestant girls were not committed to these institutions unless their parents so requested. In two of these five cities a Florence Crittenton Home

^{53a} In 1924 the court was committing boys only for two-year periods.

and in one a home maintained by a church young people's society received delinquent girls from the court. In Boston a private society received from the court girls who were on probation and cared for them for periods of about a year in a small home accommodating 13. Here they received school instruction and training in domestic science and gardening and were taught to be self-reliant and to assume responsibility. After they left the home they remained under the supervision of the society. Another small institution in Boston specialized in the care of delinquent girls between the ages of 12 and 16 years, giving them training in academic subjects, sewing, and household service. Still another society which maintained a temporary home and a second home where girls remained six months or more cared for girls and women between the ages of 15 and 23 years, giving them instruction in housework, basketry, and sewing.

The New Orleans court depended entirely upon private institutions for the care of delinquent girls. The House of the Good Shepherd received white and colored girls of all ages and of any religious faith. An industrial school for colored children which received a yearly appropriation from the city cared for young colored girls and boys who had not been seriously delinquent.

The Buffalo, Los Angeles, and San Francisco courts had access to more private institutions than the others included in the study. Protestant boys in Buffalo might be sent with the consent of their parents to an industrial farm in another city, where they often remained for several years, the parents in most cases paying board. The institution had a capacity of 100 and preferred to take boys between the ages of 10 and 12 years who had not been seriously delinquent. A large congregate institution caring for 1,600 Catholic boys from all over the United States was located in Buffalo and received children from the Buffalo court. This institution admitted boys under the age of 14 years only; truants were received from the school department without court commitment. Private institutions for delinquent girls in Buffalo were the House of the Good Shepherd and a training school under the same management which received girls under the age of 16 years who had not been immoral.

Three private institutions for delinquent boys were available to the Los Angeles court: One accommodating 50 boys between the ages of 8 and 14 years who were described as "mildly delinquent"; a second institution some distance from Los Angeles, which received children of the same age; and a third—the California George Junior Republic—which cared for boys between the ages of 14 and 18 years and gave them industrial and farm training. Girls might be sent to the second of these institutions, to the House of the Good Shepherd, or to two institutions giving care to unmarried mothers.

The San Francisco court utilized five private institutions, one caring for "mildly delinquent" boys between the ages of 7 and 15 years; a second receiving boys between the ages of 10 and 17; a third receiving boys and girls between the ages of 8 and 14 years; and two private training schools for girls, of which one specialized in the care of girls from 14 to 16 years, though it received some girls older and younger, and the other cared for more experienced girls between the ages of 14 and 20, some of whom had venereal disease. Both the Los Angeles and the San Francisco court used the private institu-

AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL
COLLEGE OF TEXAS LIBRARY

tions as intermediate institutions providing treatment between probation and State institutional care.

The care of children committed to private institutions was usually paid for by the parents, who in some communities—Seattle, for instance—could be compelled to pay. In Seattle one institution received from the county a lump-sum annual appropriation of from \$800 to \$900. In California, county aid to the amount of \$20 a month for each child was paid institutions caring for juvenile-court wards, and State aid was available for orphan, half orphan, and abandoned children.⁵⁴ In Buffalo, county aid was given on a somewhat similar basis.

Relation between the court and the institution.

Public institutions.—In all the courts studied, when a child was committed to a State institution the control of the court over him was practically at an end. In California the courts had the power of "vacating the order of commitment" and occasionally exercised this power; in Minnesota it was provided by law that a State institution could not discharge a child within one year of the date of commitment without the consent of the court. The Seattle court had power to vacate an order of commitment to a State institution, but it was never exercised. None of the courts was kept informed of the child's progress while in the institution, and only one—the Seattle court—was notified when a child was paroled or discharged from a State institution. The Seattle judge visited the institutions frequently and to some extent kept in touch with the children in that way. None of the courts did parole work for State institutions.

The records sent to State institutions when the child was committed varied from the order of commitment accompanied by no statement whatever of the child's history and home conditions to a complete copy of the court investigation and a summary of the child's history during the period when he had been known to the court. Some courts sent brief letters summarizing the main facts. Others sent a chronological summary. The interesting practice in San Francisco was to have a review of the summary by the chief probation officer, followed by a conference with the child, during which the points made in the summary were discussed with the child; emphasis was placed on the importance of the child's understanding why he was being sent to the institution. The probation officer of one court stated that he had tried very hard to interest the institutions in securing complete information with reference to the children sent to them but that they had not seemed to care to receive such information; hence only a brief letter summarizing the main facts of the case was sent.

In the main the institutions were furnished with insufficient information about the children whose lives they were expected to reshape, and the courts had little opportunity to measure the extent to which commitments to State institutions were successful solutions of the problems which occasioned them.

The five courts which utilized county or city schools for delinquent boys or girls retained jurisdiction over the children sent to these institutions and authorized their release, and the Los Angeles and Minne-

⁵⁴ In 1921 this aid was extended to children of fathers incapacitated for gainful work by permanent physical disability or by tuberculosis.

apolis courts were directly concerned in the management of the schools. Each girl sent to the Los Angeles County school was assigned to a probation officer who kept in close touch with her during and after her stay in the school. In Seattle children committed to the parental schools remained wards of the court until 21 years of age, though the authority of the school department terminated at 16. Usually if supervision was needed after release from parole, the child was brought before the court on a new petition, but this procedure was not essential.

Records sent the county and city institutions were usually similar to those sent the State institutions. In one court the commitment paper furnished the only information about the child which the institution received. In contrast, the Los Angeles County school for girls had the advantage of a full report of the social investigation and physical and mental findings. After a period of observation at the school a conference was held in which the referee of the court, the probation officer, the physician, the psychologist, the superintendent of El Retiro, the principal of El Retiro school, the recreation director, and one of the girls chosen from the student body participated. The purpose of the conference was the formation of a project or activity-goal for the girl, a task suited to her strength and personality.⁵⁵ In Los Angeles a very close relation existed between the court and the institution.

In Minneapolis, too, the court was in close touch with the children's progress in the county schools. Monthly reports concerning the children were furnished the judge and the chief probation officer, who frequently visited the institutions. In Seattle the probation officers kept in close contact with the children in the parental schools and were notified when they were paroled or discharged.

After leaving the Los Angeles school, the girls remained under the supervision of probation officers, and in Minneapolis the children were nearly always on probation for six months following release. Boys released from the St. Louis institution were on parole to probation officers of the court. In Seattle parole work for the boys' parental school was under the school-attendance department, and the superintendent of the girls' school served as parole officer for that institution. Children on parole might be returned to the parental schools by the school department or by the court.

Private institutions.—The commitments to private institutions were usually indeterminate, and the court retained control of the children and consented to their release. Most courts sent to the institutions records similar to those sent to public institutions. The judge of one court sent one of the private institutions for delinquent boys a letter giving his idea of the characteristics of each boy and the treatment needed for him.

The probation officers of three courts—those of St. Louis, Los Angeles, and San Francisco—kept in touch with the children while they were in private institutions; and in Boston, where children cared for in private institutions had been placed there as part of the probationary treatment, reports were made to the court on the date of continuance or the last date of probation. In Los Angeles at least once a month each child in a private institution was visited by a

⁵⁵ See "Juvenile-court procedure as a factor in diagnosis," by Miriam Van Waters, in *Papers and Proceedings of the American Sociological Society*, Vol. XVI, p. 209.

probation officer, or the child wrote to the probation officer, or a report was received from the head of the institution. One member of the probation staff in San Francisco specialized in work with private institutions. Each institution receiving children from the court was visited at least once a year by this officer; if the county was paying for the care of the child the commitment had to be renewed every six months, the officer assigned to institution work passing upon the renewals. Efforts were made to return the children to their homes as soon as possible.

In Los Angeles all children released from private institutions were under the supervision of probation officers, and in San Francisco such children were frequently placed under probationary supervision. Several of the courts did parole work with children whom they had committed to certain private institutions.

Proportion of commitments.

For eight courts information was obtained with reference to the proportion of delinquency cases in which commitments to institutions were made. Table 26 shows that the proportion varied from 5.1 per cent in Boston and 8.9 per cent in the District of Columbia to 41.1 per cent in New Orleans, 41.6 per cent in Minneapolis,⁵⁶ and 44.6 per cent in Denver. Two factors must be borne in mind in considering these figures: First, the large proportion of cases adjusted without court hearing, in some courts, of which Denver was a notable example; and, second, the fact that the courts of Boston and the District of Columbia had no power to commit to private institutions, though children might be placed in care of institutions during continuance, or while on probation, or, in the District of Columbia, while under care of the Board of Children's Guardians. The fact that the Boston court had the smallest proportion of institution commitments is doubtless due in part to the fact that it had no power to commit to private institutions and that it did little informal work.

* ⁵⁶ This percentage, however, is probably an overstatement, for the reason given in Table 26, footnote 4.

TABLE 26.—Number and percentage of children committed to institutions, by sex; delinquency cases in eight courts.

Court and period.	Delinquency cases. ¹								
	Both sexes.			Boys.			Girls.		
	Total.	Institution commitments.		Total.	Institution commitments.		Total.	Institution commitments.	
		Num-ber.	Per-cent.		Num-ber.	Per-cent.		Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Boston juvenile court—year ended Aug. 31, 1920.....	952	49	5.1	850	35	4.1	102	14	13.7
Buffalo children's court—6 months, 1919.....	491	52	10.6	465	43	9.2	26	9	34.6
Denver juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.....	287	128	² 44.6	206	77	37.3	81	51	63.0
District of Columbia juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.....	1,641	³ 146	8.9	1,399	102	7.3	242	44	18.2
Minneapolis juvenile court—1919.....	1,000	⁴ 416	41.6	(⁵) 312			(⁶) 104		
New Orleans juvenile court—Jan. 1—Oct. 1, 1919.....	1,385	569	41.1	1,231	476	38.7	154	93	60.4
San Francisco juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.....	881	203	23.0	656	153	23.3	225	50	22.2
St. Louis juvenile court—1920.....	1,708	444	25.8	1,484	352	22.2	224	92	41.1

¹ In St. Louis the figures relate to children; in the other courts, to cases.

² The high percentage of institution commitments in Denver is due to the large number of informal cases—1,658 as compared with 287 dealt with formally. The same element affects to a lesser degree the figures for the District of Columbia, San Francisco, and St. Louis.

³ Including only commitments to the national training schools. Some of the children committed to the Board of Children's Guardians were placed in institutions by that organization. In the year ended June 30, 1924, 129 children (6.8 per cent) were committed or returned to the national training schools.

⁴ This may be slightly above the true figure; it was obtained by adding together the commitments to State schools, county schools, and private institutions. Some children were committed to the State school, their commitments were stayed, and they were sent to a county school; if they failed to do well the stay was revoked, and the children were sent to a State school without the filing of a new petition.

⁵ Total for boys and for girls not available.

In all but one (San Francisco) of the courts in which separate information was available for boys and girls the proportion of commitments was much higher in girls' cases than in boys' cases. For instance, in New Orleans 60.4 per cent of the girls' cases as compared with 38.7 per cent of the boys' cases resulted in commitment to institutions. The high percentage of commitments in girls' cases in Denver may be due largely to the amount of informal work done; those involving girls, particularly, were not likely to be made formal unless the desirability of commitment was indicated.

The proportions of commitments to State, local public, and private institutions are given for seven courts in Table 27. Differences in institutional facilities available, in the power of the court to commit to private institutions, and in practice with reference to informal adjustment of cases must be kept in mind in studying this table.

TABLE 27.—*Number and percentage of children committed to State, local public, and private institutions; delinquency cases in seven courts.*

Court and period.	Delinquency cases. ¹						
	Total.	Commitments to State institutions.		Commitments to local public institutions.		Commitments to private institutions.	
		Num-ber.	Per cent.	Num-ber.	Per cent.	Num-ber.	Per cent.
Buffalo children's court—6 months, 1919.	491	36	7.3	4	0.8	12	2.4
Denver juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.	287	83	28.9	² 21	7.3	24	8.3
District of Columbia juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.	1,641	³ 146	8.9	-----	-----	-----	-----
Minneapolis juvenile court—1919.	1,000	143	14.3	273	27.3	-----	-----
New Orleans juvenile court—Jan. 1—Oct. 1, 1919.	1,384	7	0.5	457	33.0	104	7.5
San Francisco juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920.	881	24	2.7	-----	-----	179	20.3
St. Louis juvenile court—1920.	1,708	⁴ 194	11.3	⁵ 221	12.9	29	1.7

¹ In St. Louis the figures relate to children; in the other courts, to cases.

² Including 19 boys committed to county jail and 1 boy and 1 girl committed to detention school.

³ Commitments to national training schools.

⁴ Including 129 boys committed to a reformatory, 64 girls committed to State training schools, and 1 girl committed to a penitentiary.

⁵ Not including 9 committed to a city hospital.

The Los Angeles court made no distinction between dependency and delinquency cases in its statistics, except in tables showing offenses. Of 1,787 cases filed in 1919, 1,314 involved delinquency; 452, dependency or neglect; and 21, feeble-mindedness or insanity.⁵⁷ It is impossible to make an exact comparison between the number of institution commitments and the number of cases filed, since many of the commitments might have related to cases filed the year before. The number of commitments to State institutions during the year was 186—22 commitments of girls and 164 commitments of boys. A total of 298 children were placed in private institutions, 20 in El Retiro, 2 in a school for the deaf and blind, and one each in a hospital, sanatorium, or fresh-air camp.

Los Angeles County not only paid \$20 a month toward the care of children placed in private institutions or in private families but also met part of the expense of the care of children committed from the county to the State institutions. On November 1, 1920, 126 institutions and private families were receiving county aid through the court for the care of dependent, delinquent, or mentally defective children. The number of children in private institutions for whom county aid was paid was 191, and 49 children in boarding homes for defectives were receiving aid. About 30 children were in the county school for girls. On the same date 77 Los Angeles County children were at the State school for younger delinquent boys, 73 at the school for older boys, and 35 at the State school for girls, making a total of 185 in State schools for delinquent children.

The Seattle juvenile court did not distinguish in its annual report between formal and informal cases; neither did it give separate statistics for dispositions in delinquency and dependency cases. In

⁵⁷ The figures for 1922 were as follows: Total cases filed, 1,922; delinquency, 1,461; dependency or neglect, 439; feeble-mindedness and insanity, 22.

1921 the total number of children's cases was 1,345; 19, or 1 per cent of the total number, were committed to a State school for delinquent children, and 114 children, or 8 per cent, to a parental school. Commitments to the State school for the feeble-minded were made in 28 cases, or 2 per cent; to the State institution for diseased women, in 1 case; and to the detention home, in 1 case. In 79 cases, or 6 per cent, the children were placed in the care of private institutions.⁵⁸

ORDERS IN CASES OF DEPENDENCY AND NEGLECT.

In addition to the order of dismissal, the orders the court might make in cases of dependency and neglect included in the majority of courts the following: Placing the family under the supervision of the court, by declaring the children wards (as in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle) or by placing them or their parents on probation, or by continuing the cases with or without an adjudication as to dependency; placing the children under the supervision of a private agency, the court retaining control through continuances; committing to private institutions; committing to a public agency; committing to public institutions.

Supervision of children in their own homes.

Seven of the courts supervised dependent or neglected children in about the same manner that they supervised delinquent children on probation, placing emphasis, of course, on the home conditions and on reconstructive work with the family. In Buffalo the children might be placed on probation on a charge of improper guardianship, or the parents themselves might be placed on probation in the adult part of the court. Three courts—those in Boston, the District of Columbia, and Minneapolis—rarely placed neglected and dependent families under the direct supervision of the court. In Boston, destitute children did not come under juvenile-court jurisdiction, and neglected children, if allowed to remain in their own homes, were usually placed under the general supervision of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, their cases being continued for definite periods. The situation was similar in Minneapolis, where neglected and dependent children were usually placed under the supervision of the children's protective society. In the District of Columbia no agency was responsible for the supervision of neglected children who were allowed to remain with their own families. The juvenile court had no power to order probation or supervision in these cases, and the only alternative to removal from home and commitment to the Board of Children's Guardians was to allow the children to remain in their own homes over which the court exercised no control.

Commitment to public or private agencies.

The Boston court could commit neglected children for home placement to the Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare or to the Boston Institutions Department, and the Minneapolis court sometimes committed such children to the Minnesota State Board of Control to be placed in institutions or in family homes, as the board

⁵⁸ The figures for 1922 were as follows: Total cases, 1,645; commitments to State schools for delinquent children, 29 (2 per cent); commitments to parental schools, 146 (9 per cent). For 1923: Total cases, 1,609; commitments to State schools for delinquent children, 39 (2 per cent); commitments to parental schools, 121 (8 per cent).

deemed best. The St. Louis and the District of Columbia court committed dependent and neglected children to a public board of children's guardians for placement in family homes; the St. Louis board also gave aid to children in their own homes, and the District of Columbia board placed some of the children in institutions. The Buffalo court occasionally committed children to the city commissioner of charities for home placement. Private child-placing agencies were utilized to a greater or less extent by the courts of Boston, Buffalo, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and San Francisco. The Boston court did not commit to private agencies, but children were placed in their custody on continuances for three months, six months, or one year, surety being given. One child-placing agency, in particular, was utilized for the care of children 3 years of age and over in free homes, the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children keeping in touch with the children's own homes. Children under 3 years of age were placed by this agency in an infant asylum. In Buffalo a private agency which served mainly as a clinic for the study of the physical and mental condition of children sometimes provided boarding homes for working or school boys committed to it by the court. The Minneapolis Children's Protective Society received children for placement, and in San Francisco a nonsectarian, a Catholic, and a Jewish agency supervised dependent and neglected children who were granted county aid through the court and were cared for in their own or in foster homes. The St. Louis court occasionally committed neglected children to a private child-placing society.

Commitment to public institutions.

Public institutions for dependent children were utilized by only two of the courts studied, but two others occasionally committed dependent children to institutions intended primarily for the care of delinquents. These were the District of Columbia court, which sometimes sent destitute children 16 years of age but under 17 to the national training schools, and the Seattle court, which sometimes committed dependent girls to the girls' parental school. Colorado and Minnesota each had a State school for dependent children which received dependent and neglected children on court commitments. Both these schools placed children in free homes or on indenture, but some of the children remained in the institution for considerable periods. The Colorado institution received children under the age of 16 years and the Minnesota institution, children under the age of 15.

Commitment to private institutions.

All the courts except two—those of Boston and the District of Columbia—committed neglected and dependent children to private institutions. The District of Columbia court occasionally continued cases without adjudication, allowing the children to be placed in institutions. The private institutions available to the court usually included orphanages for boys and girls of various ages, conducted under denominational or, less frequently, under nonsectarian auspices.

Relation between the court and the agency or institution.

Courts committing children to the care of public agencies or institutions for dependent children did not retain control of the children. All the courts which utilized private agencies and institutions, except the courts of Denver and Minneapolis, retained control of children placed in the care of these organizations and usually kept in close touch with the children. The Minneapolis court retained control over children placed in care of agencies and institutions on continuances; when temporary guardianship was given, the court had no control during the time the order was in effect, and when general guardianship had been given to an agency or institution the court had no further control over the child.

In Los Angeles the contact of the court with children under the care of private institutions was maintained through the probation officers, who received reports or visited the children at least once a month. The probation officers of the Seattle court also kept in close touch with children in institutions. In San Francisco a special officer of the court visited institutions.

Support of children in institutions.

In Los Angeles and San Francisco county aid was given private institutions caring for children.⁵⁹ In Seattle several private institutions received lump-sum subsidies from the county, and a child-placing society received \$50 for each ward of the court who was placed. In Buffalo children whose parents could not pay for their support in institutions became wards of the county and were cared for at county expense.

Parents might be compelled to pay for the support of their children who had been committed to private institutions as dependent or neglected, in Seattle, Buffalo, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. In San Francisco a special officer of the court was employed to collect payments from parents.

Summary of dispositions made in cases of dependency and neglect.

Table 28 shows for the eight courts for which information was available the dispositions made in the cases of neglected and dependent children. Variations in terminology make comparisons difficult. In Denver and San Francisco in a considerable number of cases the children were left with parents or relatives under the supervision of the probation staff. Commitment to a public agency was made in more than four-fifths of the cases in the District of Columbia and in about one-third of the cases in St. Louis. To the courts of Denver and Minneapolis State schools for dependent children were available, but they were utilized in relatively small proportions of cases. Private institutions were used to a considerable extent in Denver, New Orleans, San Francisco, and St. Louis.

⁵⁹ See p. 150, footnote 54.

TABLE 28.—Dispositions of cases of dependent and neglected children dealt with by eight courts.

Court and period.	Dependent and neglected children dealt with.									
	Total.	Left with parents or relatives, with or without supervision.	Placed in care of other individuals.	Placed in care of agencies.		Committed to institutions.			Case dismissed and case pending.	Other and not reported.
				Public.	Private.	State.	Other public.	Private.		
Boston juvenile court—year ended Aug. 31, 1920 ¹	63	26	-----	16	12	² 1	-----	-----	8	-----
Buffalo children's court—6 months, 1919 ¹	34	3	-----	24	2	2	-----	3	-----	-----
Denver juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920 ³	301	⁴ 169	⁵ 6	-----	-----	32	⁶ 1	⁶ 40	53	-----
District of Columbia juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920 ³	477	-----	-----	407	-----	2	-----	-----	68	-----
Minneapolis juvenile court—1919 ¹	549	⁷ 215	-----	-----	⁸ 105	21	22	-----	186	-----
New Orleans juvenile court—Jan. 1—Oct 1, 1919 ¹	123	48	8	-----	1	-----	12	43	6	5
San Francisco juvenile court—year ended June 30, 1920 ³	⁹ 944	¹⁰ 117	6	-----	364	-----	-----	119	¹¹ 323	¹² 25
St. Louis juvenile court—1920 ³	356	116	32	116	-----	-----	7	52	33	-----

¹ Data compiled from court records.

² Institution for the feeble-minded; arrangement for commitment made.

³ Data obtained from reports, published or unpublished. In the District of Columbia in the year ended June 30, 1924, 279 dependent and neglected children were dealt with by the juvenile court, of whom 204 were committed to a public child-caring agency temporarily or during minority, 9 were committed to institutions, and 11 were placed on probation; the remaining cases were dismissed or withdrawn, or continued subject to call.

⁴ Including 72 cases in which custody was given to parents, relatives, or friends; 97 cases continued indefinitely under supervision, and in custody of parents, relatives, or friends.

⁵ Guardian appointed.

⁶ Including 1 committed to a hospital.

⁷ Including cases continued for further investigation and other cases pending at the end of the year.

⁸ Care of private homes or committed to individual guardianship.

⁹ Care of private homes or committed to individual guardianship.

¹⁰ Including only children dealt with by the family-relations department of the court.

¹¹ Under supervision of probation officer.

¹² Including cases placed "off calendar."

¹³ Children declared abandoned and eligible for adoption.

PROVISION FOR MENTALLY DEFECTIVE CHILDREN.

The courts of Buffalo, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle had power to commit feeble-minded children who were before the court for delinquency, neglect, or dependency, to State institutions for the feeble-minded, and the California courts had jurisdiction over feeble-minded children who were not delinquent or dependent. In Louisiana no public provision for the care of the feeble-minded had been made, but a small private school occasionally received defective girls from the New Orleans court. In most of the courts the care of the feeble-minded was a serious problem because of the inadequacy of institutional provision for them. The reserve calendar in the San Francisco court on which were placed long-continuance cases of feeble-minded girls has already been described.⁶⁰

The Los Angeles court was utilizing six private homes for feeble-minded children. Many of the children were wards of the juvenile court, and county aid to the amount of \$20 per month was paid for their care. Each home was adapted to the care of children of a certain type, and all were under the supervision of the lunacy commission of the county. The number of children in each ranged from 9

⁶⁰ See p. 142.

to 40. The probation officers kept in touch with the wards of the court who were cared for in these homes. On November 1, 1920, 49 wards of the court were being cared for in five of these homes. Of these children, 5 were in a home providing for a total of 10 children who had been graded very low in the intelligence tests, 12 in a home providing for about 20 young children, 16 in a home caring for 40 girls who had received high gradings in the intelligence tests, and 15 in a home caring for 31 boys.

ADEQUACY OF THE COURT'S RESOURCES.

In each court studied the judge and the chief probation officer were asked to state in what respects they considered the resources of the court and the community and State resources at the disposal of the court adequate, and in what respects they were hampered by insufficient means of securing desired treatment. These statements were supplemented by the observation of the representatives of the Children's Bureau.

The number of probation officers in most courts was recognized as inadequate.⁶¹ In one court, for instance, it was stated by the chief probation officer that three to five more probation officers were needed for work with children and three more for work with adults. In two courts, in each of which there was only one woman probation officer, the need for another woman was urgent. An additional man to relieve the chief probation officer and an additional woman probation officer were stated as the needs of a third court. In one court, which had a large number of probation officers, who were nevertheless carrying too many cases, a better organization of the staff and more intensive case work seemed to offer a remedy.

In all but two of the courts emphasis was placed on the need of more adequate provision for delinquent children who did not require commitment to the State institutions available. Even where public intermediate institutions were provided it was felt that the need was not fully met. Two courts, for instance, each of which had available a school for the training of the more promising delinquent girls, felt the need for a senior county institution which would take girls more seriously delinquent or mentally subnormal, whom the court did not wish to commit to a State institution.⁶² Another court, which depended upon expert placing in family homes for care of an intermediate grade, felt that enlarged facilities for the placing of delinquent boys were needed. A fourth court had available no intermediate institutions and no means for expert placing of difficult children. The judge of a fifth court which utilized private institutions for care of an intermediate grade felt that such provision should be under public auspices. Inadequate provision for the unmarried mother and for girls with venereal disease was felt in one court to present a serious problem.

In all but one court State institutional provision for delinquent children seemed to be inadequate in one or more respects, such as overcrowding, which made proper segregation impossible, inadequate parole work, refusal of institutions to accept certain types of children, location of a State institution too far from the city in which the court was located, and in one court entire absence of any State insti-

⁶¹ For a discussion of the number and qualifications of probation officers, see p. 22.

⁶² Through one of these courts (that in Los Angeles) a permanent "vacation camp" has since been established for neurotic or psychopathic girls. It is supported by private funds.

tution devoted entirely to delinquent children and in another absence of any such institution for delinquent boys.

Inadequate provision for the care of mental defectives created difficult problems in nearly all the courts. Louisiana had made no public provision for the feeble-minded, and the one private institution in the State received girls only and had a capacity of 30. In another State the waiting list of the school for the feeble-minded was so long that the court which was included in the study sometimes was forced to utilize for children a city sanitarium for the insane. In Los Angeles the system of boarding homes for the feeble-minded seemed to be meeting the needs fairly well, but the psychologist of the court felt that the establishment of a small institution for psychopathic children was desirable. No institution for the feeble-minded had been established in the District of Columbia,⁶³ and such children as were provided for, were boarded in institutions outside the District or were placed in boarding homes by the Board of Children's Guardians.

For the care of dependent children many of the courts had available a considerable number of agencies and institutions of various types. In the District of Columbia some method of supervision of dependent and neglected children in their own homes and of public aid for such children was greatly needed. In New Orleans no provision for mothers' pensions had been made at the time of the study, but later the Louisiana Legislature passed such a law. Some of the courts studied were committing to institutions practically all dependent and neglected children who had to be provided for outside their own homes. In these communities placing out had been little developed, except placing in free homes with a view to adoption, and for children who required care temporarily or even for a period of years and who might ultimately be restored to their parents care in institutions was the only type of provision available.

In general the resources at the disposal of the court seemed to have been developed in a haphazard manner and did not fit together to form a complete community program for the care of delinquent and dependent children. The court, therefore, was limited in the treatment it could prescribe. In the development of the juvenile court great emphasis has recently been placed on careful and scientific study and diagnosis. Such study is fundamental, but emphasis should also be placed upon scientific treatment in accordance with diagnostic findings. The psychological factor in delinquency has been largely neglected on the treatment side, and in many cases effort has been directed principally toward the child's environment. Moreover, classification of the types of cases received by the various institutions has been based largely on the child's experiences and only to a slight extent on mental habits and attitudes and mental and emotional needs. The work of El Retiro in Los Angeles and of certain private agencies in Boston has taken into account the psychological factor and has endeavored to fit the treatment to the diagnosis. The analysis of the resources of the community in terms of the needs of delinquent children before the juvenile court and the cooperation of the various agencies and institutions in a well-rounded community plan would undoubtedly achieve marked results

⁶³ Provision for the establishment of such an institution has since been made by Congress.

PROBATION.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROBATION STAFF.

It is generally agreed that effective probation service means regular, paid service, either full time or in connection with other social work requiring similar qualifications and approach. Volunteer service is effective only when supplemental to paid service. The work of a probation officer requires the application of the principles of social case work and training and compensation at least equal to that demanded for case work with families or other specialized work in the social-service field.⁶⁴ To be effective probation must enlist all the available resources of the community.

Although these principles have received fairly general recognition the means for their application are in many courts insufficient. Often the first essential—a sufficient number of well-trained workers—is difficult to secure. The methods of selecting probation officers in the courts studied, their training, and the salaries they received have been previously discussed.⁶⁵

The functions of the probation staff include general administrative work; reception of complaints; investigation of cases, both before and after the filing of petitions; supervision of children on probation and of families; clerical and stenographic service; miscellaneous functions, such as, in some courts, serving legal papers and taking children to and from the detention home and to and from institutions. The same officer may perform several of the functions outlined above. The primary classification of the organization of a court may be based not upon function but upon the type of case handled—for example, delinquency cases, neglect cases, and cases involving family relations. Secondary classifications may be according to sex, race, or language, religion, age, or district of residence. The degree of specialization depends primarily upon the volume of work and the size of the staff. The number of paid officers engaged in probation work in the courts studied ranged from 4 to 26.⁶⁶ Even where the size of the staff permits specialization opinions differ with regard to the extent to which it is desirable.

Considering only the cases of delinquent and neglected (or dependent) children included in the jurisdiction of all the courts, the 10 courts may be grouped roughly into three classes, according to the degree to which the work of the probation staff was specialized.

Simple plan of organization.

In all the courts included in this report the work had been differentiated at least to the extent that general administrative duties were lodged in a chief probation officer, aided in some instances by an assistant chief probation officer or by department supervisors,

⁶⁴ See Juvenile-Court Standards, p. 255.

⁶⁵ See p. 23.

⁶⁶ See p. 22.

and that girls' cases were assigned to women and cases of older boys to men. Furthermore, in all these courts some help was given the probation officers in writing records and in other necessary clerical work which did not belong to the clerk's office. One other step in the direction of specialization had also been taken in all the courts studied. Cases had been divided among the officers according to geographical districts or some other plan of assignment. Except that girls' cases were always handled by women, these classifications were not hard and fast. In some courts the chief probation officer added to his administrative duties the supervision of some of the children on probation. As a rule the probation officers were not assigned sufficient stenographic or clerical help, with the result that time which should have been spent in the field had to be devoted to office work. In the assignment of cases by district or by some other plan it has usually been found wise to keep the scheme flexible so that assignments in special cases may be made on the basis of the skill of certain officers in particular types of work.

In 4 of the 10 courts—those in Buffalo, New Orleans, Boston, and Minneapolis—the work of the probation staff was not further specialized, except that 2 of the 4 had differentiated their delinquency cases from cases of neglect and dependency, investigation and supervision of the latter group being carried by an outside cooperating agency.

Buffalo.—The staff of the probation office in Buffalo assigned to the children's part of the court, which dealt with cases of delinquency and dependency or neglect, included the chief probation officer, two men probation officers, and a woman probation officer. The chief probation officer devoted all his time to administrative work. The city was divided into three districts, each of the men officers and the woman having a district. Investigations were made strictly according to the district plan, but the supervision of all girls' cases⁶⁷ was assigned to the woman officer, and the men officers supervised the older boys (above 12 or 14 years of age) in her district. All the adult probation work was done by the special police officer detailed to the juvenile court.

New Orleans.—The majority of the white boys were formally on probation to the judge and reported to him, but the chief probation officer made all home visits to white boys with the exception of boys on probation for school offenses and those on probation to volunteers. The woman probation officer visited all white girls on probation. Some investigations were made by the chief probation officer and the woman officer, but the majority of cases were not investigated. The two men assistants divided the city between them and served court papers, took children to and from institutions, served as attendants at court hearings, and occasionally made investigations or visited probationers. All negro children were placed on probation to volunteer officers of their own race, and their cases were rarely investigated.

Boston.—The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children made the investigations in neglect cases and supervised neglected children who were allowed to remain in their own homes. The judge exercised closer supervision over the probation work than

⁶⁷ Except for a few girls on probation to the superintendent of the detention home.

was the case in most of the courts studied, and accordingly the chief probation officer had somewhat less executive responsibility. He supervised the statistical work and had oversight over the finances of the court, and in addition did the work of investigation and supervision of boys on probation in one district of the city. Each of the other two men officers had a district, but one of them was responsible for Jewish boys from two districts. The woman officer was responsible for the investigation and supervision of all delinquent girls except the Jewish girls, who were cared for by a private agency, and unlike the woman officers in the courts described above, she was free to devote all her time to girls' cases.

Minneapolis.—The situation in Minneapolis was somewhat similar to that in Boston; a private society investigated and supervised cases of neglected and dependent children. A member of the probation staff, however, was assigned to dependency and neglect cases. She attended court hearings, summarized the evidence presented, and did other office work.^{67a} The chief probation officer in Minneapolis was the only man officer and carried the cases of the older boys on probation in addition to his administrative work, which included the supervision of the mothers' pension department.^{67b} The city was divided into four districts, and each district was assigned to a woman probation officer who made investigations and supervised delinquent girls and boys who were under the age of 15 years. A "consulting and court officer" received all complaints and had charge of the records and the statistical work.⁶⁸

Separation of investigation and supervision.

In three courts investigations were assigned to a special staff, and the probation officers were left free to devote all their time to the supervision of cases. These were the courts in St. Louis, Seattle, and the District of Columbia.^{68a} The Los Angeles court also had adopted this plan, but its work had been further specialized and is discussed under the third type of organization.

St. Louis.—The court in St. Louis had two investigators—a man who made the investigations in cases of delinquent boys and a woman who investigated cases of delinquent girls and of neglected children. Occasionally special investigations were assigned to other officers. Seven men and seven women were engaged in the supervision of delinquent and neglected children.⁶⁹ The men handled cases of delinquent boys and the women supervised all neglect cases, cases of delinquent girls, and some cases of delinquent boys, mainly younger boys. The city was not districted, except that two of the men officers worked principally in the south, two in the north, and two in the west and northwest districts of the city. The chief probation officer assigned cases partly on the basis of race, nationality, and religion but mainly according to the special qualifications of the

^{67a} She now (1924) makes investigations in informal cases.

^{67b} The chief probation officer now (1924) serves as referee in the hearing of minor delinquency cases. An additional man officer has been employed.

⁶⁸ See court-organization chart, p. 25.

^{68a} In the District of Columbia the investigator now (1924) makes only about half the investigations, the others being made by the probation officer. The following investigations are made by the investigator: (1) Investigations in cases in which mental and physical examinations are ordered; (2) reinvestigations in cases of wards of the Board of Children's Guardians brought into court on new charges or incorrigibility petitions; (3) investigations in out-of-town cases; (4) special investigations or reports ordered by the court or made at the request of other courts; (5) investigations during the absence of the probation officer, of probationers charged with new offenses.

⁶⁹ In 1924 there were two men investigators and six men engaged in the supervision of cases.

officers. The staff included a negro man, who supervised all the older negro boys; and a negro woman, who supervised the negro girls and younger negro boys. A Jewish woman supervised the majority of Jewish children on probation, and to an officer who spoke German were assigned mainly German cases. One woman specially fitted for work with older delinquent girls was given the majority of such cases. Another woman specialized in neglect cases.

The chief probation officer carried on the administrative work of the probation office, passed on all complaints, was present at court hearings, and assigned all cases for supervision.⁷⁰

Seattle.—The staff of the Seattle court was considerably smaller than that of either of the other two courts in this group. The chief probation officer served also as "diagnostician" and made the physical and mental examinations of many of the children coming before the court. He was present at all hearings and advised the judge in regard to dispositions. He also heard a large number of cases informally. Much of the administrative work was delegated to a "senior supervisor" who combined probationary supervision of cases assigned to her with general oversight of all the probation work. All investigations were made by a woman investigator, unless the child was already a ward, when the investigation was made by the probation officer having charge of the case. The senior supervisor was responsible for most of the delinquent girls on probation, though a considerable number were assigned to the superintendent of the detention home. Another woman officer supervised most of the dependency and neglect cases. All boys over 12 years of age except those assigned to the school-attendance department were under the supervision of a man probation officer. Cases were assigned for supervision by the judge at the time of the hearing. Mothers' pension cases were dealt with in a separate department in charge of a commissioner, who had under her supervision an investigator, two field visitors, and a secretary.⁷¹

District of Columbia.—The chief probation officer in the District of Columbia, who was responsible for the general administration of the office and also heard a large number of unofficial cases, had the aid of an assistant chief probation officer, who was the case supervisor. This officer was in close touch with all probation cases and held regular periodic consultations with the probation officers, reviewing the plans formulated and the progress made in each case.

In 1924 a new plan of organization was worked out whereby the clerk of the court (formerly the chief probation officer) has been designated director of administrative work and has general responsibility for the administration of both the clerk's office and the probation department. He reviews all complaints; decides which cases are to be heard officially by the court and which are to be disposed of unofficially or by adjustment; hears and adjusts all charges and complaints in boys' cases not disposed of officially by the court; is present in court at all hearings except those of girls' cases; makes recommendations as to dispositions; reads and approves or disapproves probation officers' reports recommending dismissal from probation, transfer to another officer or to the inactive list, or charge of violation of probation; and is responsible for the entire administrative work of

⁷⁰ See court-organization chart, p. 20.

⁷¹ See court-organization chart, p. 26.

the court. The chief probation officer (a woman), under the general supervision of the director of administrative work, is responsible for the organization and work of the probation staff, hears and adjusts charges and complaints in girls' cases not disposed of officially by the court, is present in court during the hearing of all girls' cases, maintains cooperative relationships with public and private organizations and contacts with out-of-town organizations, and is responsible for the educational program for probation officers and the general educational work of the court. The assistant chief probation officer acts as case supervisor.

At the time of the study about half the initial investigations were made by a special investigator whose salary was paid by the local chapter of the Red Cross and the balance by an investigator employed by the court. Special investigations were assigned in some instances to other officers. Neglect cases were investigated by the Board of Children's Guardians. Eight probation officers—three men and five women—supervised delinquent children on probation. Each officer also had under supervision a small number of non-support cases.

The staff now (1924) consists of four white men—one of whom is responsible for adult cases—three white women, two colored men, and one colored woman. Investigations in about half the cases are made by the investigating officer and in half by the regular probation officers. The adult work of the court is confined principally to illegitimacy cases.

Many of the negro children were supervised by officers of their own race—a man and a woman. Each officer was assigned a certain geographical district, and it was the aim to follow the district plan as closely as possible. The men, however, supervised the majority of the boys 14 years of age and over, and white children living in a district assigned to a negro worker were under the care of a white officer from another district, and vice versa. The case supervisor assigned cases to probation officers immediately after the hearing.⁷²

Departmental plan of organization.

The third type of organization was the more specialized departmental plan, in which definite authority and responsibility were lodged in department supervisors working under the general direction of the chief probation officer.

In San Francisco this plan was most highly developed, though the Los Angeles court also was organized in a similar way. Certain features of the plan had been developed in the Denver court, the work being divided into several distinct branches.

San Francisco.—The chief probation officer of the San Francisco court exercised general supervision over the probation staff, the detention home, and the clinic. He was the executive secretary of the probation committee. He was present at all court hearings, held regular case conferences with the staff, had charge of the training of volunteers—a special feature of the work of this court—and had immediate supervision of about 30 boys on probation.

The staff in San Francisco was organized into three departments with a supervisor in charge of each. The boys' supervisor was also the assistant chief probation officer. He conducted informal hearings

⁷² See court-organization chart, p. 29.

in boys' cases, supervised the work of the other officers in the boys' department, and had some boys on probation. Three men assistant probation officers and one woman constituted the staff of this department. The district system was not used, but work was assigned according to type of case. So far as possible, the policy was followed of having the officer who made the initial investigation undertake the supervision of the case. Assignments of cases for investigation were made by the boys' supervisor, and the chief probation officer assigned probation cases for supervision. The woman probation officer made most of the investigations in cases involving school boys and supervised all grammar-school boys on probation, except those presenting unusual problems which could be handled better by men. Even in such cases she cooperated with the men probation officers by making all the contacts with the schools. She was the only probation officer on the staff who regularly visited schools, and she cooperated with the girls' department and the family-relations department with reference to school problems.

One of the men in the boys' department dealt with Chinese boys and with all cases involving the theft of automobiles. He did not understand the Chinese language but had made a special study of Chinese customs. One man, who was an Italian, was assigned all Italian, Spanish, and other Latin cases, including schoolboys whose parents could not speak English. A third man worked with Roman Catholic boys of other nationalities over school age, especially those needing employment. The supervisor of the department had charge of Protestant boys over school age and of special cases. The chief probation officer gave direct supervision only in especially difficult cases. The work of the boys' department was concerned almost entirely with delinquent boys, but a few dependent boys over the age of 10 or 12 years were supervised by the department.

The girls' department in San Francisco cared for delinquent girls and for dependent girls 14 years of age and over. The organization of this department differed from that of the other departments in that it included in addition to the supervisor an office manager, who spent all her time in the office and who took all first interviews and wrote all case histories. Since most of the girls were brought to the detention home this arrangement was effective. The supervisor of the department assigned cases, supervised the probation work, and also had girls on probation. Two assistant probation officers made investigations and did probation work. Assignments were not usually made according to a district system, but frequently an officer visiting a district made visits also to girls in the district under the care of other officers. One of the probation officers and the supervisor had charge of all Roman Catholic girls; one woman had all the Jewish and Protestant girls. In addition to her regular work, one of the officers had charge of all employment problems, and another investigated applications for release from institutions.

In the family-relations department were three women probation officers, one of whom was in charge. Many of the cases coming to this department had been investigated by the San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and cases in which a definite order had been made for county aid or for removing children from their homes were supervised by private child-caring agencies. The department, however, frequently made investigations after cases

had been continued and supervised families in continued cases and in cases in which probation was ordered. The supervisor of the department received all complaints coming to the department, and once a week met in conference representatives of the children's agencies. She did no field work. One of the officers who spoke Spanish handled all Latin cases and sometimes assisted the boys' or girls' department in such cases. The third officer in the department specialized in cases in which the home had been disrupted by intemperance. The secretary of the department visited every six months each home to which county aid was given and visited at least once a year institutions receiving such aid. When children were recommitted she went over the reports and if there was anything questionable, made investigations. The collection of payments from parents or others was the duty of a collector, who devoted full time to this work.⁷³

Los Angeles.—The staff of the Los Angeles court was organized into two departments, whereas that in San Francisco had three. It also differed from the San Francisco staff in that the work of investigation and supervision had been differentiated. Two special investigators—a man and a woman—made investigations in cases in which petitions had not been filed by outside agencies. The majority of cases were reported to the probation office and were investigated prior to filing petitions. Whenever possible, the investigators acted as adjusters. In cases in which a petition had been filed without inquiry the regular probation officers made the investigations later.

The boys' supervisor, who was also the assistant chief probation officer, had 11 men probation officers under his direction. The girls' supervisor had in her department 10 women probation officers. To all the women officers except the supervisor cases of boys as well as of girls were assigned, and dependency cases were usually assigned to the girls' department. Practically all boys under 13 years of age were cared for by that department with the exceptions noted below.

In the boys' department the entire county was districted. Except one officer who handled all the traffic cases and those involving vagrancy or rape, and a Spanish-speaking officer who supervised Spanish boys over 8 years of age, each officer was assigned to a district.

In the girls' department in Los Angeles the assignments were usually based on the type of case rather than on geographical location, though the size of the county made it necessary to divide the work outside the city, assigning certain districts to each of four officers. Two of these officers also had cases in the city, and one of them kept in touch with girls in El Retiro, the school under the jurisdiction of the court. One of the women spoke Spanish, and to her were assigned all Mexican and Spanish girls, and boys of these nationalities under 8 years of age. Another officer, who spoke Russian, was assigned Russian children, and girls over 14 years of age of other nationalities. One of the women specialized in family cases and those of girls under 14. Two officers dealt mainly with girls over 12 or 13 years of age; one supervised younger boys and feeble-minded children. The division of work was for the most part provisional, and cases were assigned by the supervisor as circumstances required.⁷⁴

⁷³ See court-organization chart, p. 35.

⁷⁴ See court-organization chart, p. 32.

Denver.—The chief probation officer in the Denver court was responsible mainly for boys' cases. The officer for girls and the probation officer for dependent children worked directly under the supervision of the judge and had no subordinates. The chief probation officer did a considerable amount of legal-aid work, made investigations, supervised boys on probation, and was in general charge of the work for delinquent boys. Two men probation officers and a negro woman who was employed on a half-time basis assisted the chief probation officer. One of the men was also in charge of domestic-relations and adult cases.

For work with delinquent boys the city was divided into three districts, the chief probation officer and the two men assistants each having charge of one. A Jewish officer supervised one of the districts, which had a large Jewish population, and the negro probation officer assisted the chief probation officer in work with negro boys, 90 per cent of the negro population of the city living in his district. The negro officer also made initial investigations in some of the cases involving negro girls.

Relative advantages of various types of organization.

The descriptions of the organization of the probation staffs in the courts studied have shown in what different ways the same problems may be approached. In juvenile-court work perhaps more than in other forms of social case work it is impossible to develop set formulas which will apply under all circumstances. The extent of the court's jurisdiction, the other social agencies upon which the court may rely for various kinds of service, and many other factors must determine the particular type of organization best suited to local needs.

Even in courts with relatively large probation staffs opinions differ as to the wisdom of assigning all investigations to one set of officers and the supervision of cases to another set. The arguments in favor of having one officer carry through a case from the first investigation to final discharge or commitment are chiefly that the child and the family are thus saved the necessity of making two adjustments to two different officers and that the probation officer making the investigation is familiar with all the circumstances and needs, has already formulated at least the general outlines of a plan, and upon the order of the court can proceed immediately with the treatment indicated. Those favoring this plan of combining investigation and supervision have as precedents the experience of family case-work agencies and of some child-caring agencies.

The reasons given for preferring an organization with specialization of service in investigation and in supervision may be summarized as follows: First, the qualities required of an investigator are not always those which make the most successful probation officer, and vice versa. Specialization permits assignment of workers to the task for which they are best fitted. Second, the assignment of special workers to investigations insures more prompt attention to cases as they arise and thus tends to shorten the period necessary for the preparation of cases. Third, relieving probation officers of investigation work permits the use of their full time and energy for the work involved in supervision. The overburdened officer who is assigned both investigation and supervision must often put the investigations ahead of other work because they have to be completed by a fixed

date—the day of the hearing—and the work of supervision, though equally important, is likely to be put aside. The probation officer who is not called upon for investigations is able to plan his time logically and efficiently and to concentrate upon constructive case treatment. Fourth, families are more likely to resent the searching inquiries involved in investigation than the constructive planning which supervision involves. The probation officer has a better chance if he enters a case after the decision of the court has been made.

It is evident that difference of opinion exists with reference to whether or not the cooperation of the family is best enlisted by having the investigation and supervision by the same or by different officers. Whatever plan is adopted must meet the following tests if it is to bring results:

Is the organization successful in general in winning the cooperation of the child and the family?

Does the probation officer who takes up the case become thoroughly familiar with the results of the social investigation and preliminary study of the child?

Is the work of investigation thorough, prompt, and complete? Does it eliminate worthless details and gossip and secure all essential facts?

Is enough time allowed for the supervision of cases, and is this time sufficiently regular and uninterrupted by emergency work?

These conditions may conceivably be met by either plan of organization. In general if it is impossible to secure a sufficiently large staff, if the officers must carry more cases than they can handle successfully, the division of the work of investigation and supervision seems to promise a more even and efficient distribution of effort. The statement of an investigator in one court where the plan of dividing the work had been put into effect is significant. She believed it to be the best method under existing conditions in that court, but she believed that if the staff were sufficiently large better work could be obtained under the other form of organization.

With reference to the assignment of cases for supervision one principle is generally agreed upon—girls must be under the care of women officers, and older boys should, if possible, be under the care of men. Concerning the age under which a boy may well be supervised by a woman officer considerable difference of opinion exists. In only two of the courts studied were all the boys under the supervision of men. In some courts the dividing line was 12 years, in some 13 years, and in some as high as 14 or 15 years, exceptions being made in cases of boys under these ages who presented difficult moral problems.

The secretary of the civil-service commission of Los Angeles County in November, 1919, wrote the judges and chief probation officers of a number of courts, asking their policies with reference to the assignment of boys and girls for supervision to probation officers of their own sex. Replies were received from 17 representative courts in different parts of the country. All the courts agreed that girls should be supervised by women officers and stated that this policy was followed. In five courts the supervision of all delinquent boys was assigned to men, and in two others this was the general rule, but exceptions were made. In three courts women probation

officers supervised boys of all ages, but in two of these many boys were assigned to men. Women supervised the younger boys and men the older in seven courts, 12 or 13 years being the dividing line in four of these courts, and a higher or an indefinite age in three. The general opinion was that men officers were better qualified than women for the supervision of older boys, though in 2 of the 17 courts it was believed that women could handle boys of all ages as successfully as men. In four instances it was stated that competent women could be obtained more easily than competent men for the salaries available. Replies from five courts indicated the belief that women should not supervise boys above the age of 12 years; from three, above the age of 13 years; and from two, above the age of 14 years. The arguments in favor of placing younger boys on probation to women included the possibility of closer cooperation with mothers and teachers and the statement that women possess more of a "personal touch" than men. The reasons for desiring men officers for boys entering the adolescent period included the stronger masculine appeal in the age of "hero worship," the greater ease and deeper understanding with which a man can explain matters of health and sex pertaining to boys, and the greater freedom with which a boy will bring his problems to a man.

It is probable that many small boys on probation do as well or better under a woman probation officer than they would under a man. The problems encountered are often mainly with reference to the family situation; nevertheless, the probation officer and the chief probation officer or the supervisor of case work must be constantly on the alert for signs that the boy is in need of a man's counsel and guidance. If the child has no father the supervision of a man probation officer is likely to be particularly desirable.

It is often advisable, when the size of the staff permits, to specialize somewhat further in the assignment of cases on the basis of age. Especially where the court has jurisdiction to the age of 17 or 18 years or above, is it sometimes helpful to allow one officer to specialize in older girls' cases, another to work with younger delinquent children and dependent children, and so forth. Or it may be found best to center in one officer or department all the work with families of dependent and neglected children.

With reference to race, nationality, religion, and geographical district local considerations must govern. Districting of the area served certainly results in economy of effort and gives the probation officer an opportunity to become thoroughly familiar with his district and to take part in community activities. On the other hand, the newer immigrant groups that are especially handicapped from the language standpoint form a community which cuts across geographical lines, and participation in the activities of such a community is even more important in preventing delinquency. It is impossible for a probation officer to understand the conflicts which result in delinquency without a knowledge of the racial background of the families which he serves. Ability to talk with the parents in their own language is essential if their cooperation is to be secured. If it is impossible for a court to have probation officers of each large racial or language group, the difficulty may be met in part through the assistance of persons employed by other agencies or of other qualified individuals who belong to races and nationalities not represented

on the probation staff. A district system so rigid that it prevents assignment of special cases to the officers best fitted to deal with them is unfortunate.

NUMBER OF CASES UNDER SUPERVISION OF ONE OFFICER.

It is agreed that from 50 to 75 cases are all that one probation officer can handle effectively,⁷⁵ but in only four of the courts studied was this standard generally observed. The average number of probation cases under the care of a probation officer, including in some courts cases of dependency and neglect as well as cases of delinquency, ranged from 36 to 156. In three courts it was more than 100. The majority of probation officers had other duties, such as the investigation of cases and attendance at court hearings, in addition to their work of supervision. Table 29 shows for the cities studied the smallest number and the largest number of probation cases under the care of one probation officer and the average for the staff, on a given date.

TABLE 29.—*Smallest number of cases under care of one probation officer on a given date, largest number, and average for the staff.*

Court and month in which date fell.	Special investigators.	Probation cases under care of one probation officer.		
		Smallest number.	Largest number.	Average for staff.
Boston juvenile court—September, 1920 ¹	No.....	79	89	84
Buffalo children's court—March, 1920.....	No.....	² 29	58	44
Denver juvenile court—September, 1920.....	No.....			³ 50 to 60
District of Columbia juvenile court—May, 1921.....	Yes.....	⁴ 79	⁵ 104	91
Los Angeles juvenile court—October, 1920.....	Yes.....	⁶ 53	⁷ 194	⁸ 114
Minneapolis juvenile court—March, 1920.....	No.....	40	72	⁹ 56
New Orleans juvenile court—January, 1920 ¹⁰	No.....	6	41	-----
San Francisco juvenile court—June, 1920.....	No.....	20	50	11 36
Seattle juvenile court—December, 1920.....	Yes.....	12 50	13 188	14 125
St. Louis juvenile court—December, 1919.....	Yes.....	15 99	195	15 156

¹ A number of cases had been dismissed just prior to the date to which the information relates, Sept. 30, 1920. On Sept. 30, 1919, the minimum was 75, the maximum 103, and the average 92. Some of the children were under the care of agencies and did not require active supervision.

² Larger territory covered by officer with minimum number than by others. In 1918 each officer had 60 or more probationers under supervision.

³ Information relates to boys' cases only, including those on formal and those on informal probation.

⁴ Including 70 children and 9 adults.

⁵ Including 85 children and 19 adults.

⁶ The girls' supervisor carried 18 cases on probation but was trying to be relieved of them as fast as possible.

⁷ Not including one officer who was responsible for boys placed on probation for violation of traffic rules; these were not under active supervision.

⁸ Including both delinquent and dependent children and a considerable number of children in institutions who were not under active supervision.

⁹ Leaving out of consideration 42 cases under the supervision of the chief probation officer. In January, 1924, the smallest number was 39 and the largest 68.

¹⁰ In many cases no investigations were made. The figures given refer only to white children on probation, some of whom were probably on probation to volunteers. The smallest number represents white girls on probation. The woman probation officer spent a large share of her time in special investigations and other work aside from the supervision of cases.

¹¹ Leaving out of consideration cases on probation to the chief probation officer or boys' supervisor.

¹² Including 47 families of dependent or neglected children.

¹³ Including 58 families of dependent or neglected children.

¹⁴ Including an average of 66 families of dependent or neglected children.

¹⁵ Leaving out of consideration 26 children on probation to the chief probation officer. In February, 1924, the average number of cases under the supervision of each officer was 128.

⁷⁵ The report of the committee on juvenile-court standards gave 50 cases as the maximum that should be under the supervision of one officer at any one time. *Juvenile-Court Standards*, p. 255.

CONDITIONS OF PROBATION.

"Please give my boy a chance, Judge. Give him probation. He'll be a good boy." This plea is frequently made by mothers or fathers, many of them speaking English with difficulty and bewildered by their children's experience in the complexities of American city life. They look upon the juvenile court as an agency which may either impose punishment or "give the child a chance." The judge of one of the courts studied was especially careful to explain to the mothers that the whole purpose of the juvenile court is to "give the child a chance" but that his best chance may come through some other disposition than probation. "Can you give the child a chance if I allow him to remain at home?" is a question that might well be asked of the parent more often. The child, and especially the child's parents, must be active agents in the reconstructive process. No amount of intensive supervision by the most highly trained probation officer can accomplish results unless the interest and cooperation of the child and his parents are enlisted. Perhaps this is a reason for hesitation in following the precedent set by the laws of certain States in emphasizing the wardship of the court over the child rather than the individual responsibility for making good which the term "probation" implies.

Too often, in placing children on probation, judges fail to make the parents and the children see the opportunities and the responsibilities involved, or they emphasize compliance with formal rules—such as reporting at specified intervals—at the expense of more important elements of cooperation. "Now I'm going to let you go, but you must go to see this lady every Saturday afternoon—she'll help you to be a good girl," can hardly by itself convey to the child or her parents much of an idea of the meaning of probation. Only in a surprisingly few instances was this understanding of the meaning and spirit of probation given the child. Yet the first and most important element in the successful working out of probation is that the child realize what it means—a chance to do things which are not only right but interesting. The definite terms or conditions of probation were also too frequently negative and prohibitory, rather than constructive. The succession of "must nots" contained in the instructions of some of the courts could scarcely fail to have an influence on the child exactly opposite to that essential to probation work. It is true that the judge at the time of the hearing can not go into details with reference to the processes involved, but there is lost many an opportunity to take advantage of an attitude of mind on the part of child and parents that in many instances is very favorable. The probation officer in well-conducted courts interviews the members of the family immediately after the hearing or within two or three days, and it should be his task to explain the details of supervision and cooperation and to assure the family of his desire to be of service in carrying out the reconstructive work contemplated.

In four of the courts studied the judge in making the order usually explained the conditions of probation. In two of these courts such items as regular attendance at school, coming home early at night, and obedience to parents were specified; and in one, particular emphasis was laid on regular performance of church duties. The dispersion of gangs was sometimes stressed. In the other two courts particular conditions applicable to the circumstances of the individual

case were specified. In three of the four courts the judge's instructions were supplemented by an interview of the probation officer with the family immediately after the hearing.

The judge in six of the courts did not usually specify the conditions of probation, exception being made in cases in which it was deemed desirable to give certain specific instructions. In one of these courts, however, the judge explained in detail the meaning and purpose of probation, and in three courts the probation officer immediately after the hearing saw the child and the parents and explained the conditions with which they would be expected to comply. In a fourth court the probation officer interviewed the child and the parents immediately after the hearing or sometimes, in continued cases, at a later time. The practice in two courts was for the probation officer to interview child and parents just after the court hearing if possible, but this arrangement could not always be made. In one of these courts if the probation officer was not in the office at the time of the hearing an appointment was made with the family for an interview in the home within two or three days, and in the other court the child was told to report for instructions the following Saturday.

Printed conditions of probation were used in five courts, though in one of these their use was in the discretion of the probation officer and the form consisted merely of a blank giving the name of the probation officer, the term of probation, the time and place when the child would be expected to report, and space in which the conditions applicable to the individual case could be filled in. The form, when used, was addressed to the parents or guardian. In girls' cases in this court the printed conditions included a statement that the court might retain jurisdiction over the girl until she reached the age of 21 years, unless she was sooner discharged for good conduct, and the following special conditions were specified:

1. Must not visit public dance halls, cafés, or places of questionable character.
2. Must not be out late at night.
3. Must not use liquor or tobacco.
4. Must obey all the instructions of the court and the probation officer.
5. Must report as often and in such manner as the probation officer shall indicate.
6. Must not leave home without first communicating with the probation officer.
7. Must not marry without the consent of the court.
8. Must not leave the court's jurisdiction without an order of the court.

In another court the children were given cards containing the rules of probation, and the smaller children were required to memorize them. The cards began with the following statements: "You are put on probation by the court to give you a chance to do better. You are put on your honor. Be frank and truthful with the probation officer." They directed the child to report at a stated time, and specified the following: "Keep away from bad company; do not loiter around billiard halls, street corners, etc.; do not use tobacco; do not be out evenings after 9 o'clock, unless accompanied by a parent or with the special permission of the probation officer; go to school regularly or work regularly; obey all laws, obey parents, and be of good behavior; do not leave the city without the consent of the court."

The form used in one court referred particularly to reporting and to change of address, school, or employment. In another court a slip

was given the child immediately after the hearing, stating the period of probation, the probation officer's name, and the terms of probation. The terms of probation included: Proper behavior at all times and obedience to laws, ordinances, and regulations of the school committee; reporting to the probation officer at times required and obedience to instructions; notice to the probation officer of change of address; and any supplementary conditions the probation officers might impose. Sometimes the child was asked to bring when he first reported a statement of what probation means.

In the District of Columbia the following form was given the child at the time he was placed on probation:

Date.....

(Name of child.)

You are placed on probation in order that the court may help you in your efforts to do better and will be under the supervision of-----
If you do well, you will later be dismissed from probation; if not, you will again be brought before the court.

You must follow these instructions:

- (1) Go to school regularly; keep steadily at work and hold present job till a better one is secured and probation officer consulted.
- (2) Report, as directed by the probation officer, and if unable to report, write or telephone your excuse promptly.
- (3) Secure probation officer's permission before leaving the District of Columbia.
- (4) Notify probation officer at once if you change your address.
- (5) The probation officer represents the court, and you are expected to obey all directions of the probation officer.

In one of the five courts in which written conditions of probation were not used little actual probation work was done; in the others the probation officer might impose any conditions he deemed appropriate to the individual case. One chief probation officer was strongly of the opinion that written conditions were undesirable, on the ground that if certain things were specified the child might think anything not forbidden was allowable.

It is evident from the foregoing that in all the courts studied the individual probation officer had a considerable amount of discretion with reference to the conditions of probation; in all, moreover, this discretion covered, necessarily, the decision as to whether the child and his parents were living up to the conditions imposed. The probation officer might also modify the conditions of probation, but in some courts certain kinds of modification—such as the elimination of the requirement for reporting—had to be taken up with the chief probation officer. In difficult cases the probation officers consulted with the chief probation officer, and sometimes the judge was consulted informally. The judge in the District of Columbia gave personal consideration to serious cases and held informal hearings one evening a week for cases that were not progressing satisfactorily. Likewise, in Boston, the judge talked informally with all boys who were not doing well and decided whether or not they were to be surrendered from probation.

PLANNING INDIVIDUAL TREATMENT.

One of the aspects of probation work that is of vital importance and yet is relatively undeveloped in many courts is that of planning individual treatment at the beginning of probationary supervision. In all but four of the courts such planning was haphazard, depending upon the capacity and inclination of the probation officer and the pressure of work.

The courts of San Francisco and the District of Columbia, through their probation departments, and the Boston court in cooperation with the Judge Baker Foundation, placed special emphasis upon the prompt formulation of plans of treatment. In San Francisco, as was pointed out in the discussion of the court order,⁷⁶ many cases were put on the "continued calendar" for a brief period of supervision, during which plans could be made and tested to some extent. The weekly conferences conducted by the chief probation officer and the department supervisors were of great help in bringing out possibilities and determining in each case what measures were best adapted to meet the particular problems presented. In Los Angeles in cases of girls and smaller boys a system somewhat similar to that employed in San Francisco was followed. The probation officers in the District of Columbia court were required to make plans promptly after children were placed on probation. These plans were reviewed by the case supervisor in weekly conferences, and the extent to which they were followed was checked up at intervals.

The study of the child made in Boston by the Judge Baker Foundation usually resulted in definite recommendations for treatment. Frequent conferences between the judge and members of the staff of the foundation were held. The judge reviewed probation cases about once a month and talked over with the probation officers plans for the children.

REPORTS BY PROBATIONERS.

Most juvenile courts require at least certain classes of children on probation—older boys, for instance—to report regularly to the probation officer at a specified time and place. Reporting insures frequent interviews between the probation officer and the child, trains the child in habits of regularity and promptness, and makes it possible for the probation officer to establish a confidential and friendly relationship, a thing difficult to accomplish through home visits, when other members of the family are usually present. Reporting to probation officers must be carefully planned and safeguarded and must not be made a substitute for frequent visits to the home.⁷⁷

In most of the courts studied boys on probation were usually required to report regularly, exceptions being made in certain cases. In all but one court reporting by girls was rare and was usually confined to cases in which it was difficult to see the girl in her home or to special appointments made for definite purposes and not a part of the ordinary routine. One of the reasons why reporting by girls was discouraged was a desire to avoid the necessity of bringing the

⁷⁶ See p. 142.

⁷⁷ For a discussion of the value and limitations of the "reporting" system, see Probation in Children's Courts, U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 80, pp. 19-21.

girls frequently to the probation office. However, in one of the two courts which utilized for reporting settlement houses, libraries, and similar places in the vicinity of the homes of the children, it was not the general practice to require girls to report. The fact that many girls on probation are sex delinquents makes a special problem in reporting, particularly in evening reporting. Frequently very young boys were not required to report; in San Francisco only high-school boys and working boys were asked to do so. It was the aim of the District of Columbia court to limit reporting as much as possible, and except in special cases reports were required only of working boys. In Seattle, also, except for girls on probation to the superintendent of the detention home, reporting was very rarely required of either boys or girls. The St. Louis court, however, required all boys to report and the New Orleans court, all boys who could afford the necessary carfare. In Los Angeles practically all boys 13 years of age and over reported, and in Minneapolis, Boston, Buffalo, and Denver, all or practically all delinquent boys. In Minneapolis girls were required to report unless special arrangements were made for visiting them in their homes more frequently than was usually possible.

The frequency of reporting varied from once a week to once a month, more frequent reports often being required at the beginning than at the end of the probation period. Six courts planned to have the children who were asked to report come, as a rule, once a week—at least for a time; and one of these courts sometimes required reports twice a week. If conduct was satisfactory the interval between reports was often increased. In one court the frequency of reporting varied from once a week to once a month, and boys seeking employment were sometimes asked to come to the probation office every day. Two courts planned to have the children report every other week, though one of them had weekly reporting in difficult cases. Monthly reporting was the rule in one court. Some of the courts required boys placed on farms during the summer and other children living outside the city to report by letter at regular intervals.

In two courts—those in Denver and New Orleans—the boys reported direct to the judge. During the school year in the former city the judge received reports every other week for all boys on probation formally and informally, except working boys and others who could not come at the time specified. About 100 boys assembled every other Saturday morning at the courthouse, and the judge spent about an hour and a half with them. He first gave them an introductory talk lasting from 5 to 15 minutes. The boys then lined up and filed past the judge, showing him their school report cards and each receiving a word of praise or admonition. Boys whose reports showed serious failure to live up to the conditions of probation were detained a few moments for consultation with their probation officers. Occasionally the judge called the attention of the group to a particularly good report. The judge felt that this group reporting made it possible for boys to be publicly praised for good work and furnished an effective means of cooperation with the schools. Only two rules were insisted on in connection with group reporting: The boys were to go home singly, and they were never to talk about their misconduct. They conversed freely while waiting to report. Boys who did not come Saturday mornings reported individually

to their probation officers on Friday afternoons between the hours of 4 and 7. During the summer or in the absence of the judge group reporting was suspended, and the probation officers received individual reports in the probation office. On alternate Saturdays when group reports were not being received boys who were required to report weekly were interviewed by the probation officers.

In New Orleans, also, the boys assembled on Saturday morning to report to the judge, though their reports were received individually and the judge did not talk to the group as a whole. Fifteen or 20 children reported each week after the court hearing. If the judge was very busy reports were received by the chief probation officer. Children on probation to volunteers—including all negro children—reported at the homes of the volunteers at appointed times.

In contrast with the policy regarding reporting in Denver and New Orleans it was the belief in the other courts studied that the chief value in reporting lay in the opportunity it gave the probation officer to talk privately with the child and that the chief danger to be avoided was the formation of group contacts among children on probation. In six courts reports were received at the probation office—which, in one court, was in the county courthouse and, in five, in special children's court buildings. One of these six courts—that in Buffalo—made arrangements for some of the children to report at the public library. In Boston each probation officer had arranged to receive reports at a settlement or branch station of the public library within his district, and only special reports were received at the probation office. In Minneapolis boys over 14 years of age reported at the courthouse, but those under 14 and most of the girls reported at settlement houses, except during the summer, when because of vacations the probation staff was small and it was necessary for the members to spend more time in the probation office. Each probation officer of the Minneapolis court spent one hour, on alternate Saturdays, at a settlement house receiving reports. Boys who found it inconvenient to report at the usual time because of their work were allowed to report at the homes of the probation officers or by telephone.

In one court 30 or 40 boys reported to one probation officer in a single evening between the hours of 5 and 7.30. The schoolboys came first and the working boys later. Another officer in the same court had from 80 to 100 boys reporting in a single afternoon between the hours of 3 and 7, the schoolboys coming immediately after school. The probation officer felt that there was no danger involved in the boys' becoming acquainted with one another while waiting to report; some of the boys knew one another in school. From 3 to 5 minutes were spent with each of the boys presenting the less serious problems and about 10 minutes with other boys. One of the officers stated that he was likely to be hurried with the schoolboys and that if the school report was satisfactory and everything seemed to be all right, he spent only a few minutes with each. If the report was not satisfactory the boy was required to wait.

In contrast with the situation just described, reporting in a second court was so arranged—by the appointment system—that very few children came to report at the same time. This court utilized settlement houses in some cases, and these houses provided separate rooms for boys and girls waiting to report. If children under the age of

10 years were required to report, they were accompanied by their mothers or fathers. About 10 minutes, on the average, was spent with each child, but if special problems arose the interview was much longer.

The probation office in a third court was open three nights a week until 9 o'clock, and reports were also made on Saturday mornings. From six to eight children at a time were waiting to report and from 15 to 20 minutes were spent with each boy. In another court half an hour or an hour was sometimes devoted to an interview.

Only two courts required the child, in reporting, to bring from home a report of his conduct. In one of these courts it was recognized that the parents' report was of little value, but to ask for it was thought to be beneficial as a reminder to the parents that the child was on probation. In five courts the children were required to bring reports from school, and in three others such reports were asked for in some cases. Contact with the schools was maintained in two courts by other means than by requiring the children to bring school reports to the probation officer.⁷⁸

In each court some or all of the probation officers were asked to state their opinion with reference to the value of reporting, and these statements may be summarized as follows:

Court A (reports required of most of the boys on probation).—Reporting is important as a means of discipline and of keeping in touch with the child. There is little danger of undesirable associations being formed. In the reporting the chief probation officer tries to have emphasis placed on the constructive aspects of probation such as personal hygiene, savings, reading, and club activities and other forms of recreation.

Court B (reports required of practically all boys on probation).—The officers felt that the disciplinary value of reporting was important.

Court C (reports required of practically all boys on probation).—The probation officers regarded reporting as an invaluable feature of probation.

Court D (reports required of working boys and in special cases).—The probation officers felt that reporting was of little value. If it were possible for the officers to make evening visits reporting could be still further reduced. Special conferences of the child and the supervising officer and the judge were considered of value when satisfactory progress was not being made.

Court E (reports required of the majority of boys over 13 years of age).—Some of the probation officers preferred home visits as a complete substitute for reporting, as a general rule, and believed that there was considerable danger of undesirable mingling of children when general reporting was required. Reporting, however, was thought to have value in some cases as a disciplinary measure or as making possible private interviews or enabling the officer to see the child very often.

Court F (reports required in practically all cases of delinquent boys and in many cases of delinquent girls).—The probation officers said that reporting was valuable for girls as well as for boys; that it impressed the child with the court's dignity and his own responsibility and gave the probation officer a chance to see the child alone.

Court G (reports to judge or probation officers required of boys on probation).—Reporting was thought to be of value and was, as a matter of fact, in this court the principal method of keeping in touch with the child.

Court H (reports required of high-school boys and of working boys).—Reporting was thought to be of value for the older boys, as a means of keeping in touch with them and as a disciplinary measure.

Court I (reports rarely required).—The probation officers felt that reporting resulted in the child's becoming too familiar with the court; occasionally it was valuable as a means of discipline, but only in special cases.

Court J (reports required of all delinquent boys but rarely required of girls).—Reporting was believed to impress the boy with his obligation to the court and to enable the probation officer to see the boy alone under conditions which he

⁷⁸ See pp. 184-185.

could control. It was said to enable the probation officer to keep in touch with the boy with less expenditure of time than would otherwise be required. It would, however, in the opinion of the probation officers, be better if fewer boys reported at the same time, and they felt that reporting should always be accompanied by home visits of sufficient frequency.

HOME VISITS.

The home visit and constructive work with the child's family is, in the majority of cases, the most essential part of effective probation work. The probation officer must know the child's environment and the persons with whom he comes most intimately in contact, and if unfavorable conditions exist he must attempt to modify them. He deals not only with problems of poverty, such as insufficiency of income and absence of mothers who are wage earners as well as home makers, but also with the more intangible and often more important phases of home life which involve the parents' understanding of and control over the child, the provisions made in the home for the child's leisure time, and the maladjustments that may exist in the relationships of the different members of the family. To aid him in performing these services he must call to his assistance all the available resources of the community. The probation standards recommended at the 1919 annual meeting of the National Probation Association include the following:

True probation work consists of definite constructive effort to help probationers by means of kindly guidance, home visiting, and practical service. Perfunctory supervision consisting principally of reports to the probation office is not real probation work.

Complete cooperation with the social agencies of the community with the endeavor to surround probationers with every helpful influence is necessary to effective probation work and to the progressive development of the system. In general, probation officers should not undertake service for probationers which other agencies are better equipped to furnish.⁷⁹

The frequency with which home visits were made varied in the courts studied, chiefly because of differences in the number of cases carried by the individual officers, the amount of other work required, and the compactness of the districts. In home visiting, as in making investigations, automobiles effect great economy of time and permit more intensive work, and this means of transportation was available to the officers in some of the courts.

Home visits in three courts were said to be made, as a rule, oftener than once a month; in two of these courts reporting was seldom required. Frequently different officers in the same court followed different practices with reference to home visits. For instance, in one court the officer who specialized on work with dependent families stated that she visited each home two or three times a week; another officer said she visited every family at least once a month except toward the close of the probation period, when the visits were sometimes less frequent; the officer who had charge of most of the boys attempted to see his charges either at home or at school once a week. In a second court the chief probation officer, who had a number of boys on probation, stated that he would have liked to visit the homes every week, but that on the average he made home visits about once in two and one-half weeks; visits were more frequent in the beginning

⁷⁹ Standards for Effective Probation Work, Topics for Discussion, p. 65. National Probation Association, 1919.

of a case than toward the end, and families not under the supervision of other agencies were visited more often than families being visited frequently by representatives of agencies. In the same court another officer who had an exceedingly compact district averaged more than one home visit a week and often called for a few moments informally every day; an officer who had a more scattered district visited some of the homes every three or four weeks and others much oftener, and one officer was usually unable to visit the families under supervision oftener than once a month.

In the third court in which the plan was to make visits more often than monthly the probation officers tried to visit the homes every week, but some of them were unable to cover their districts more often than every other week. Visits were made in some of the more difficult cases, however, several times a week. Supplementing the home visits, the parents were often required to call at the probation office for special conferences, and partly for this purpose the probation office was open one night a week until 9 o'clock. One of the probation officers who had on probation at the time of the study 65 boys, 8 girls, and 12 adults said that she tried to visit the home, unless it was an unusually good one, every week. Children who had been diagnosed as "psychopathic" she tried to see at home or at school two or three times a week. Boys who were merely troublesome were seen once a week or once in two weeks. The parents were seen every two or three weeks, the officer frequently making night visits. Sometimes the father was requested to come to the probation office for a private interview. Another officer of the same court, who had almost as many cases under supervision, said that she visited the homes once a week or once in two weeks, and less often toward the end of the probation period. The parents were seen in the homes, and the children were usually seen at school.

The probation officers in two courts tried to make home visits about once a month. In one of these courts, where boys but not girls were required to report, the homes of girls were visited more often than those of boys. In some cases weekly visits were the rule. In the other court pressure of work often made it impossible to visit the homes every month, and in some of the boys' cases very few home visits were made. Because girls were not usually required to report they were visited more often than boys. In some cases weekly visits were the rule. Visits were more frequent at the beginning than at the end of the probation period.

Home visits in five courts were usually made less often than monthly, though in two of these courts a monthly visit was the standard aimed at. Probably the average interval between visits in these two courts was, for most of the officers, two months; some of the probation officers, especially those supervising girls, succeeded in visiting their charges monthly or even oftener. In a third court in this group, home visits were made every four to six weeks, and oftener—even weekly—if needed. In the less serious cases, however, as much as three months might elapse between visits. The average interval between visits in a fourth court was from one and one-half to two months; in some cases visits were made much more frequently. In a fifth court, visits were seldom made by the paid probation officers in cases of school children on probation or in cases of children on probation to volunteers—a considerable proportion of the total num-

ber under care. Visits were reported to be made to some children on probation as often as every three or four weeks.

The time when the home visit was made and the persons who were interviewed depended partly upon whether the child was reporting or whether the home visit furnished the principal opportunity for the probation officer to talk with the child. For instance, in a court where girls and younger boys were not, as a rule, required to report, the probation officers frequently visited the homes in the evening, when they could see the children and their parents. For this purpose they were allowed leave for overtime to the extent of two days each month. In other courts most of the home visits were made during the day, often during school hours. It is frequently necessary to talk with the parents alone about the child's needs and the progress he is making. A probation officer in one court made day and evening visits on alternate weeks, one week going at noon when the mother was likely to be at home, and the next in the evening, when he could see the father. In this court contacts with the child were usually made by other means than through home visits, except that in girls' cases the visit to the home was relied upon for interviews with both child and parents.

In one court some of the probation officers frequently made evening visits to see if the children were obeying the rules about coming in early; day visits were made principally for the purpose of seeing the parents. In a court in which home visits in the cases of girls and younger boys usually took the place of reporting visits were made, as a rule, during the day, but evening visits were sometimes made in cases of girls who were employed and who did not report at the probation office. Evening visits were frequent in one court, since home visits were relied upon to a large extent to furnish the opportunity for contact with the child.

Through the home visit information was obtained from the parents with reference to the child's personal habits, conduct at home, companionships, use of leisure time, savings, and observance of church duties. Some of the probation officers made special efforts to gain the cooperation of the parents and to keep in touch with both mother and father. In Buffalo efforts were made in foreign-language speaking families to persuade the parents to learn English. The courts were greatly hampered, during the period of the study, by the housing shortage, which made it almost impossible to find homes for the families of children on probation when conditions made it desirable that they move to another house or another neighborhood. Occasionally, the judge included in his order of probation the requirement that the family move.

Efforts to improve housekeeping standards, to encourage the proper feeding of the children, to find employment for various members of the family, to induce the father to support his family—if necessary, to initiate court action for nonsupport—and to secure financial assistance from relatives, were among the services reported by probation officers. Family-welfare and child-protective agencies were called in when necessary, as were Big Brother and Big Sister organizations, settlements, and visiting nurses. In the Denver court delinquency cases involving difficult family problems were referred to the probation officer who specialized in cases of dependency and neglect; if nonsupport was involved, the officer who specialized in adult cases rendered assistance. In the District of Columbia and

in San Francisco special emphasis was placed on seeing that proper caretakers were provided for the children when the mother was a wage earner. The District of Columbia had no "mothers' pension" law, and the problem of working mothers in the families dealt with by the court was a serious one; in half the cases under the care of one probation officer the mothers were working. The probation officers helped the mothers to make arrangements for the proper care of the children.

No difference of opinion existed among the probation officers in the courts studied with reference to the value of the home visit and its primary importance in the plan for probationary supervision. Opinion was not unanimous with reference to the frequency with which the homes should be visited. In five courts more frequent visiting than once a month was considered desirable, and in four courts⁸⁰ monthly visits were held to be a reasonable standard. One judge believed that home visits should be twice as frequent as reports from the children, which were required monthly. In one of the courts in which it was considered desirable that home visits should be more frequent than monthly the chief probation officer believed that visits should be made about once a week in girls' cases and once in two weeks in the cases of boys. In another court in the same group the chief probation officer believed that the homes should be visited every week for six or seven weeks and thereafter about twice a month. The officers of a third court thought visits should be weekly until near the end of the probation period. "Every two or three weeks," and "once a week to once a month" were opinions expressed in two courts. Of course those who believed monthly visits should be the standard would make more frequent visits in special cases. Individual needs, it was recognized, must govern the frequency with which the homes are visited, as well as the other aspects of probation work.

SAFEGUARDING HEALTH OF CHILDREN ON PROBATION.

The emphasis placed upon health work with children on probation and the agencies called upon by the court to cooperate in safeguarding health varied considerably in the different courts studied. For instance the courts in Boston, the District of Columbia, and Minneapolis paid special attention to the correction of physical defects. Of these the Boston and District of Columbia courts depended entirely upon the cooperation of outside agencies, while the Minneapolis court maintained its own medical department. This department, however, had the close cooperation of two hospitals.

In Boston children needing dental attention were cared for at a dental infirmary which specialized in children's work; the Boston Dispensary and other clinics and hospital out-patient departments furnished medical treatment. In the District of Columbia various hospitals gave free care, and the board of charities bore the cost of operations. Children were not released from probation by the District of Columbia court unless physical defects had been corrected or a certificate had been obtained from the family physician

⁸⁰ One of the 10 courts is not included in this discussion because of the small amount of home visiting that was done.

stating that he did not believe the corrective work contemplated was necessary. The parents and other members of the families were given physical examinations and medical treatment, if need for such examinations or treatment was indicated.

The staff of the medical department of the Minneapolis court has already been described.⁸¹ The physician employed by the court performed necessary operations, the consent of the parents first having been obtained by the nurse who made a home visit in each surgical case. Two hospitals in the city placed at the court's disposal a total of 8 to 10 beds each week. A dental clinic was maintained jointly by the court and one of the hospitals, and every child on probation had his teeth cleaned, at least, if his parents consented.

The Seattle court utilized for minor operations on children of school age the clinic maintained by the school department, and for surgical work for older children the county hospital. After the operations the children were brought to the detention home for convalescence. The school dental clinic did the dental work for children on probation. A dispensary in St. Louis gave general medical and surgical service to wards of probation officers. In New Orleans operations found to be necessary were performed by private physicians free of charge.

Medical care and hospital service were furnished in connection with the detention homes of Los Angeles and San Francisco. In Los Angeles dental work was done in the detention home, but for other corrective work, aside from the treatment of venereal disease, the court depended upon outside clinics. In San Francisco tonsillectomy and other minor operations were performed in the detention home, but dental work was done by outside dentists.

The problem of the care of girls suffering from venereal disease was met in Los Angeles and San Francisco by the provision of special wards in the detention home and medical treatment furnished by the court. The girls sometimes remained in the detention home for several months. The San Francisco court cooperated closely with a local representative of the State bureau of social hygiene, who made investigations of the homes of the girls to determine whether it was safe for them to return home after a period of treatment and who sometimes placed in boarding homes girls having venereal disease in a noninfectious stage. In such cases the girls were given treatment in outside clinics or by private physicians. A small club accommodating 8 to 10 girls was privately maintained in San Francisco for the care of girls with venereal disease and for other delinquent girls in need of special supervision.

In Boston girls with venereal disease received treatment at the Boston Dispensary, and if care outside their homes was necessary it was provided through the boarding-home service furnished by the children's aid society in cooperation with the court. One of the hospitals in the city had a ward for venereal cases, but it was rarely used for court children. In the District of Columbia children (both boys and girls) who were on probation and who had venereal disease were required to report regularly for treatment at the clinic maintained by the United States Public Health Service. If they

⁸¹ See p. 95-96.

failed to do so, they were committed to the Board of Children's Guardians or to one of the training schools.⁸²

A private institution in Denver gave care to girls of juvenile-court age suffering from venereal disease. In Seattle such girls were cared for in the county or the city hospital and in St. Louis, in the detention hospital for venereally diseased women or in the city hospital, no provision being made for segregating them from the older women. No hospital provision for the care of children suffering from venereal disease was available in Minneapolis, except the venereal ward of the contagious hospital, in which juveniles and adults were not segregated; few children were sent there. White girls in New Orleans suffering from venereal disease and requiring hospital care were sent by the court to a hospital. Negro girls were sent to an isolation hospital where they were in close association with older women under treatment.

Except in the District of Columbia court little emphasis was given to the problem of venereal disease among boys. The experience of the clinic maintained at that court for 14 months by the United States Public Health Service shows that the problem of syphilitic infection among boys appearing in the juvenile court is by no means nonexistent. Among the children examined during the period from February 9, 1920, to March 31, 1921, the following percentages were found to have syphilitic infection: White males, 1.52; colored males, 5.58; white females, 7.14; colored females, 22.6. Few gonorrhoeal infections were found among either boys or girls.⁸³

RELATION OF PROBATION OFFICER TO SCHOOL.

Since in most courts a large proportion of the children on probation are attending school, the relation of the probation officers to the schools the children attend and the special divisions of the school department dealing with problems of nonattendance is surpassed in importance only by their relation to the homes of the children. Having accepted the responsibility for a child through placing him on probation, the court must take the initiative in winning the school's cooperation in the task of supervision.

All but one of the courts required, in some cases at least, school reports to be brought by the children, mailed to the probation office from the school, or transmitted through the department of compulsory attendance and child welfare. In the Denver court the report was signed by both teacher and principal and contained information in regard to the child's attendance, conduct, and progress. Reports were required every two weeks and in difficult cases, weekly. In Minneapolis also reports were required every other week and were signed by the principal. They were not required of children attending junior or senior high schools, but such children brought their regular monthly reports to the probation officer. Delinquent boys in St. Louis were required to bring school reports signed by the teacher, and the monthly school reports of the girls were seen by the probation officers when they visited the homes. In Buffalo special reports were

⁸² The practice now (1924) is to send these children to the hospitals until they are reported to be non-infectious. Children approaching 17 years of age are in some instances committed to the national training schools, if the Wassermann results are positive beyond doubt.

⁸³ Prevention of Venereal Diseases in the District of Columbia: Hearings before the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Sixty-seventh Congress, First Session—Hearings on Bill H. R. 4118, June 9, 1921, p. 23. Washington, 1921.

brought from the teachers, or the regular monthly report was shown to the probation officer. The latter practice was followed if it was thought best not to inform the school that the child was on probation. Weekly school reports were required in New Orleans in all school cases.

Special methods of keeping in touch with the schools through a modified system of school reports were followed in Boston, Los Angeles, Seattle, and the District of Columbia. In San Francisco visits to the schools were depended upon wholly, and reports from the schools were not required.^{83a}

In Boston a blank and a return envelope were sent each week from the probation office to the teacher of each boy or girl on probation, with the request that a report of the child's attendance, conduct, and scholarship be furnished. Such reports were not required for children attending continuation school; but a list of children on probation was sent the continuation school, and the teachers informed the probation officers if any difficulty arose. In Los Angeles school reports were not always required, but some of the probation officers arranged with the department of compulsory attendance and child welfare to be given monthly reports on attendance and conduct, signed by the school principals and forwarded through the office of the department. The same forms were used as in other cases in which information was requested by the school department, and thus the teachers did not know from the request that the children were on probation. The Seattle court notified the school principals when children were brought before the court, and the principals notified the probation officers whenever any difficulty arose. If the probation officer failed to visit the school during the month the principal sent him the child's monthly report card. The officer who supervised the majority of boys on probation required monthly reports from teachers and principals.

Visits to the schools by the probation officers were made invariably or frequently in six courts, and seldom or in special cases only, in four. School visits were sometimes relied upon as the principal means of keeping in touch with the child, and in such cases an interview with the child as well as with the teacher and principal formed part of the visit.

Visits to each school attended by children on probation were usually made once a month in Seattle. The probation officer went over the children's school records with the principal, interviewed the teachers if necessary, and sometimes saw the children. In Denver some of the officers visited the schools every month, and others made visits only when called upon or when making investigations or when a child brought a poor report. Whenever a school visit was made the probation officer saw every child in the school who was on probation. At the beginning of the school year each principal was furnished a list of school children on probation, and this list was kept up to date throughout the year. Absence was supposed to be reported at once to the probation officer, whose duty it was to see that the child was in school before the day was over.

^{83a} In the District of Columbia at the present time (1924) probation officers do not visit any schools, public or private. Reports are requested in writing on a form sent periodically to the supervising principal of the district in which the school is located. The supervising principal secures information from the teachers. This makes it unnecessary to let the teachers know that the children are on probation.

RELATION OF PROBATION TO RECREATION.

The use the child makes of his leisure time and the constructive recreational programs developed by such organizations as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, settlements, and various kinds of clubs for boys and girls are generally recognized as of special importance in work with delinquent children. Nine of the courts studied devoted more or less attention to recreation as a part of probation work. The emphasis placed on recreation varied from that in one court in which the statement was made that the probation officers tried to keep in touch with the playgrounds, clubs, and other agencies and in some cases tried to direct the reading of the children but did not have time to do a great deal along this line, to that in the Boston court, the probation officers of which stated that the recreational aspects of practically every case were given careful consideration. One of the officers tried to get boys between the ages of 12 and 15 years into scout troops, settlement clubs, the Young Men's Christian Association, or church activities. Another officer cooperated closely with a settlement that did considerable recreational work. Other local agencies also had highly developed recreational programs that were utilized by the court. Special attention was paid to recreation in the cases of girls as well as of boys, especially when the girls were not living at home but were placed in private families. In Seattle the Boy Scouts, the Young Men's Christian Association, and other recreational agencies were utilized, and women volunteers from the university were of great assistance in providing recreation for girls on probation. The Minneapolis probation officers tried to encourage the children to take the initiative in affiliating with recreational agencies.

ADVISING IN CHOICE OF OCCUPATION AND SUPERVISING EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ON PROBATION.

Successful probation work with children who are soon to enter employment and those who are already gainfully employed requires on the part of the probation officer knowledge of the vocational opportunities in the community, the kind of preparation required for various occupations, the legal regulations governing the employment of children, working conditions, and opportunities for advancement. Keeping children out of "blind-alley" occupations is one of the most important vocational problems which the probation officer should be able to meet. It involves determining as far as possible the child's capacities, stimulating his ambition, and arranging opportunities for more adequate preparation for industrial or commercial life.

The maintenance of a separate employment or vocational-guidance bureau under the auspices of the court is not desirable. The work should be done through cooperation between the court and the agencies specializing in the vocational guidance and placement of children. Unfortunately, in only comparatively few communities are such agencies fully developed and capable of meeting the needs of all the children, and probation officers are often forced to carry all or practically all the burden of the guidance and placement of their charges or to leave the choice and securing of positions largely to the discretion and initiative of the children themselves.

In the boys' department of the San Francisco court one of the probation officers specialized in employment problems. He was in touch with certain firms willing to take boys whom they knew to be wards of the court. The boys, however, were encouraged to get jobs themselves if possible, and in such cases the employer was not informed that the boy was known to the court. Efforts were made to stimulate the boys' ambitions and direct them along right lines. The principle of specialization was also followed in the girls' department, one officer having charge of all employment work in that department and cooperating closely with the State employment office. Girls were sometimes placed in homes where they could attend school, receiving an average wage of \$15 a month. Visits were made to employers and reports secured from them by telephone only in cases in which the position had been secured by the probation officer.

In the other courts studied no one officer specialized on employment problems. Four courts did not give special attention to the vocational aspects of probation and very seldom got in touch with the employers of the children, though they cooperated to a greater or less degree with such agencies as the junior employment office, vocational schools, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the school-attendance department.

The probation officers in the Minneapolis court encouraged the boys to take positions with a future. The probation office did not, as a rule, find employment for the children and did not keep in touch with employers but cooperated with the attendance department, the Big Brother organization, and similar agencies.

In Seattle the public-school department of vocational education placed children in positions, and boys on probation were often referred to that department. The probation officer in boys' cases did not usually keep in touch with employers. Girls were helped to take vocational courses and to find employment. The probation officers were in close touch with employment managers of stores or factories. The majority of employed girls were in domestic service, some of them having been placed as mothers' helpers. In such cases the probation officers frequently conferred with the employers and visited the homes.

The boys' department in the Los Angeles court did little along vocational lines but referred the children to the public-school department of vocational guidance and child welfare. Boys who lived in the county outside the city were sometimes placed on farms through the efforts of the probation officers. The women officers frequently found employment for girls and in such cases kept in touch with the employers by telephone or letter and sometimes by personal visits. The welfare workers in stores cooperated helpfully with the probation department.

In each case in the District of Columbia decision was made as to whether or not the probation officer was to get in touch with the employer. The city lacked organized facilities for junior placement, and to some extent the probation officers found positions for children, but they were able to give little time to such work.^{83b}

^{83b} It is reported (1924) that this situation has been remedied to some extent. The United States Employment Service is utilized, the Big Brothers and Big Sisters assist in finding work for the children, and the greater development of case supervision has also helped to increase the service rendered in connection with the child's occupational life.

The probation officers in Boston cooperated with State and private employment offices and with the continuation school, which did placement work. A vocational counselor employed by an industrial school was helpful in finding positions and adjusting difficulties between the boys and their employers. In some cases the probation officers themselves found positions for the children, and this was particularly true in girls' cases. One of the probation officers stated that he frequently consulted employers if the boys did not report regularly and that this practice had never resulted in the discharge of a child. Girls placed at housework were frequently visited in their places of employment, and reports from the employers were received by telephone and letter.

SUPERVISION OF CASE WORK.

Supervision by the chief probation officer, assistant chief probation officer, or department supervisor of the case work done by the individual officer, both in the making and in the carrying out of plans of treatment, has been referred to from time to time in the discussion. The work of a probation officer who has behind him the authority of the court to insist that plans be carried out is certainly as much in need of careful supervision as the work of an agent of a family-welfare or child-caring agency. Yet in many courts, even in some of those with relatively large probation staffs, the emphasis is still on the individual responsibility of each probation officer for his own cases, as opposed to any effective system of centralized responsibility and control. The result is uneven work, uncertain policies, unnecessarily prolonged probation periods, and often friction within the staff and complicated relationship with outside agencies and institutions.

Effective supervision of case work includes the following:

1. Prior to hearing: Review of social history and physical and mental findings and assistance in the formulation of the general outlines of a plan of treatment to be presented to the judge for his guidance in disposing of the case.
2. At the beginning of probation: Consultation with the probation officer with a view to defining the main ends to be achieved by probation and formulating the detailed plan by which these results may be achieved.
3. Periodically during probation: Review of the progress of the case, of achievements and failures, and advice as to modifications in the original plan which may be necessary from time to time. This periodic review will hold the officers to definite constructive programs from the beginning of the probation period and will result in closing cases as soon as they are ready for discharge.
4. When special problems arise that can not be solved satisfactorily by the probation officer or when a case is to be reheard for any reason: Special consultation and review of case with the probation officer.

The failure to make definite plans for meeting the needs disclosed in each case was one of the most serious weaknesses in most of the courts studied. Periodic review of cases was somewhat more frequent, but in four of the courts supervision of case work consisted mainly in consultations with the chief probation officer or other supervisor when special difficulties arose, and other occasional conferences.

In one of these four courts the chief probation officer supervised children under the care of the assistant probation officers during the time that the assistant probation officers were on vacation; he felt that this gave him an opportunity to ascertain from first-hand knowledge of the cases the quality of the work that was being done. In this court, also, all cases coming before the court for hearing were discussed informally with the chief probation officer just prior to the hearing. The chief probation officer in another court held frequent conferences with the probation officers and passed on all cases of violation of probation or application for discharge from probation or supervision; if a child got beyond the control of the probation officer the chief probation officer sometimes had the child report to him for a time. In a third court the chief probation officer conferred informally with members of the staff, received monthly reports from the probation officers, and kept for each boy on probation a record of all changes in disposition. He was consulted in cases involving disagreement between the parents and the probation officers and also whenever the question arose of excusing a child from reporting.

The judge in one court and the chief probation officer or some other supervising officer in four other courts reviewed probation cases with the probation officers every month or, in one court, every week. In a sixth court the supervisor of one of the departments tried to read the probation histories once a month, but other duties prevented her from adhering closely to this plan. The judge in several courts was consulted frequently in regard to cases presenting problems of special difficulty.

Staff meetings for the general discussion of policies and methods and of matters affecting the welfare of the court were held weekly or semiweekly in Minneapolis and at irregular intervals in St. Louis and Los Angeles. Some of the Minneapolis staff meetings were open to volunteers. Interesting cases, methods of work, and reports of visits to other courts were among the subjects of discussion.^{53c}

Staff meetings for the discussion of cases were held regularly in only one of the courts studied—the San Francisco court. Its organization was noteworthy for the centralization of responsibility and the constructive supervision of case work that had been developed. It will be remembered that the chief probation officer exercised general supervision over the probation staff, the detention home, and the clinic, and was the executive secretary of the probation committee. Although the probation staff was divided into three departments—the boys' department, the girls' department, and the family-relations department—and responsibility for the conduct of each department was placed upon the department head, the chief probation officer himself served as "case supervisor" for all departments. In the girls' department, however, the details of supervision were delegated to the head of that department.

In San Francisco cases of delinquency were heard by the judge Thursday morning and those involving dependency and neglect Thursday afternoon, one Thursday afternoon each month being set aside for county-aid cases. The evening before the hearing the chief probation officer read over all reports in continued cases. Every

^{53c} The chief probation officer in Minneapolis now (1924) has weekly conferences with county allowance workers, weekly conferences on clinical cases, and monthly conferences with probation officers.

Friday morning he conducted a "case conference" of the family-relations department, which dealt with problems of dependent and neglected children. Each case that had been before the court the previous afternoon was discussed; the chief probation officer stated the disposition and its purpose, and the conference considered what the next step was to be. The statement made by the chief probation officer was entered on the calendar by the stenographer of the department. Following the family-relations department conference, a similar conference of the boys' department was held. The disposition of each case heard the day before was stated by the chief probation officer, and if the order was probation he assigned the case to an officer of the department and stated the conditions of probation. If the case was continued suggestions were made as to the work that should be done during continuance. The disposition of the case and special directions were entered on the calendar. The same day the chief probation officer reviewed with the head of the girls' department all girls' cases heard the day before and entered on the calendar the orders and special directions. The staff conference of that department was held on Monday, the chief probation officer not being present. At this conference cases to come before the court at the next hearing were discussed, and directions were given as to the work to be done prior to the hearing. All continued cases and cases of girls in the detention home were also reviewed. In addition to the staff of the department the matron of the detention home, the woman physician, and a representative of the bureau of social hygiene of the State board of health were present. Student volunteers attended the conferences of the departments to which they were assigned.

Once a month, prior to the hearing of the county-aid cases, a case conference attended by representatives of the family-relations department and of private agencies was held. Budgets were checked and recommendations determined. The representatives of the agencies were case workers and not executives.

A monthly conference of all departments of the San Francisco court was held under the chairmanship of the chief probation officer and was open for general discussion. Monthly summaries of all probation cases were prepared and were reviewed by the chief probation officer.

The method of case supervision that had been worked out in the District of Columbia differed in many respects from the San Francisco system just described. Supervision of case work was delegated to a case supervisor.⁸⁴ Conferences participated in by all the probation officers or those dealing with particular types of cases were not held, but the supervision of cases was carried on through individual conferences between the case supervisor and the probation officers.

The case supervisor in the District of Columbia maintained chronological records of all probation cases.⁸⁵ The method of supervision has been described by the case supervisor as follows:⁸⁶

⁸⁴ At the time of the study the case supervisor was also acting as chief probation officer, following the resignation of the former head of the probation department, who subsequently returned to the court; on his return, the plan of having a special case supervisor working under the general direction of the chief probation officer was again followed.

⁸⁵ See p. 207.

⁸⁶ Ezekiels, Jeannette: "New methods in probation supervision." *Probation and the Prevention of Delinquency*—Proceedings of the National Probation Association, 1923. New York, 1924.

The supervisor is held responsible for the kind of work done, and in all cases the probation officers report directly to her. She is available at all times for consultation or advice or to meet the emergencies that continually arise.

Probation officers report to the supervisor at regular intervals * * * every two weeks * * * for conference covering a minimum period of two hours. Cases are discussed and recommendations made for increased and adequate follow-up in cases where plan has previously been discussed. New cases are taken up and suggestions made for meeting immediate difficulties; for example, the making of appointments for physical and mental examinations, reentering children in school, securing work for older boys and girls, and referring to the appropriate agency such problems as had better be handled by them—such as relief or nursing service, or where health or housing conditions require attention; acute cases or cases needing immediate court action—such as those in which the probation officer feels that he can go no further and those who are arrested upon new charges. Concerning these the probation officer is advised as to procedure or is assisted to assemble the proper and necessary information required by the court for hearing that the case may be properly and promptly disposed of and is assisted in any other work necessary to bring the record up to date.

During conference cases that have been referred to the social-hygiene clinic or to the tuberculosis clinic are checked to ascertain whether those cases reported by the clinics to the supervisor as not reporting for treatment are being properly supervised by the probation officer. In many cases it has been necessary to instruct the probation officer to personally take the probationer for treatment and in other cases to send the boy or girl to the hospital for proper treatment * * *; these of course are difficult cases and sometimes necessitate commitment to ensure treatment.

To supplement the case conferences, where the discussions necessarily center about the individual and immediate problems or needs, group meetings at the call of the chief probation officer are held at regular intervals. At these meetings the more general aspects of probation work are presented and discussed; any change in policy is made known and changes in program are offered for discussion and suggestion. These group reactions are helpful and welcomed.

The probation officers are, at the present time, making a careful study of case-work standards and methods. A small group * * * three * * * take charge of the program and present to the others the result of their reading or study. Both the chief probation officer and the case supervisor are present at these meetings and enter the group discussion as members of the group. It is thought that this method will cultivate initiative and independence of thought and expression and develop greater confidence in carrying out the policy of the court.

A recent order directs that all probation officers, before reporting to the supervisor for conference, make a careful study of their individual cases and within two weeks after the case has been placed on probation submit to the supervisor a written plan for approval. This plan may or may not be taken up during the conference for the reason that if approved it goes back to the probation officer and becomes effective. When a plan is approved it is entered upon both the supervisor's and probation officer's record and thus becomes a part of the probation history.

LENGTH OF PROBATION PERIODS AND TERMINATION OF PROBATION.

Definite probation periods were specified by the judge in two of the courts studied—those of Boston and Minneapolis. In both these courts probation could be extended at the discretion of the judge, and especially in Boston, the probation period was often extended a number of times. In Denver the maximum probation period was two years and in Buffalo, three years. Probation periods in six courts were indefinite, but in only three of these—in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle—could they be extended until the child reached the age of 21 years if supervision was needed for so long a time. In St. Louis the court might retain jurisdiction during the child's minority, but under the Missouri law girls attained their

majority at 18.^{86a} The Massachusetts law permitted the court to retain jurisdiction until the child reached the age of 18 years—one year beyond the age to which jurisdiction extended in new cases. Children could be kept on probation in the District of Columbia and in New Orleans until the age of 17—the upper limit of juvenile-court jurisdiction.

The probation period specified by the Minneapolis court was usually six months. Discharge might be recommended by the probation officer before the expiration of that period, or continuance beyond six months might be requested by the parent or the probation officer. Continuances were usually for periods of one to three months. It was stated that in the majority of cases the child was dismissed at the end of the first six months and if he had done well was given "honorable dismissal." The officers of the court believed that the short probation periods kept down the number of probation cases, stimulated the probation officers to constructive work early in the probation period, and encouraged the child by holding out hope of early dismissal.

The average probation period for formal cases in Denver was said to be 18 months and for informal cases, from 8 to 10 months. The children were kept on probation as long as help was needed, and if they were not ready for dismissal at the end of the two-year period they were continued under informal supervision.

Comparatively long probation periods characterized the work of the Los Angeles court. Children placed on probation were made wards of the court and were subject to supervision until they reached the age of 21 years unless sooner discharged. It was the policy of the court to keep children on probation as long as there was any question about conditions in the home or the conduct of the child.

Statistical information concerning the length of time children had been on probation was gathered in six courts—those of Boston, Buffalo, the District of Columbia, Seattle, San Francisco, and St. Louis. Of 411 children who had been placed on probation in the Boston court between September 1, 1919, and August 31, 1920, 265 had been released from supervision and 97 were still under care on February 1, 1921.⁸⁷ The original probation order for 83 per cent of the total number had been for periods of less than 6 months. Of the 265 who had been dismissed from probation, 44 per cent had been released at the close of the period originally specified. The probation period for 26 per cent had been extended once; for 18 per cent, two or three times; and for 12 per cent, four, five, or even six or more times.

Table 30 shows the duration of the probation periods for groups of children discharged from probation in five of the courts.

^{86a} By Missouri Laws of 1921, p. 399, the age of majority for girls was made 21 years.

⁸⁷ The remainder had been committed to institutions or to the State department of public welfare, or had disappeared.

TABLE 30.—Duration of probation; children discharged from probation in five courts.

Court.	Limitations on probation period.	Period covered.	Children discharged after specified period on probation.											
			Total.	Less than 6 months.		6 to 11 months.		12 to 17 months.		18 to 23 months.		2 years and over.		
				Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	
Boston...	Definite periods; maximum age, 18 years.	Sept. 1, 1919—Feb. 1, 1921 ¹	265	177	66.8	83	31.3	25	9.4	1.9	-----	-----	-----	-----
Buffalo...	Maximum probation period of 3 years. ²	(4)	138	46	33.3	52	37.6	38	27.5	-----	-----	2	1.4	
District of Columbia.	Maximum age, 17 years.	July 1, 1919—June 30, 1920.	166	43	26.0	72	43.4	26	15.6	8	4.8	17	10.2	
San Francisco.	Maximum age, 21 years.	July 1, 1919—June 30, 1920.	115	8	7.0	21	18.3	16	13.9	21	18.3	64	42.5	
St. Louis.	Maximum age, 21 years for boys, 18 years for girls. ³	Sept. 1, 1919—Dec. 31, 1919.	102	3	2.9	19	18.6	24	23.5	27	26.4	72	28.4	

¹ Including only children placed on probation between Sept. 1, 1919, and Aug. 31, 1920. Of the whole group of such children 97 were still on probation on Feb. 1, 1921, 265 had been dismissed from probation, 35 had been surrendered and committed to institutions or to the State department of public welfare, 10 had been lost sight of, and the status of 4 was not reported.

² Twelve to 17 months and 18 to 23 months combined.

³ Court had jurisdiction until 16 years of age, and probation might be extended for three years, making 19 the upper age limit for probationary supervision.

⁴ Children placed on probation between January and October, 1917. Information secured in March, 1920.

⁵ Figures available only for boys discharged from probation.

⁶ Including 28 on probation 2 years but less than 3, 10 on probation 3 years but less than 4, and 11 on probation 4 years and over.

⁷ Including 15 on probation 2 years but less than 3, 6 on probation 3 years but less than 4, and 8 on probation 4 years or longer.

⁸ Since 1921 the maximum age for both boys and girls has been 21 years.

It appears from the information available that of the five courts those in Boston and Buffalo held children on probation the shortest periods and those in San Francisco and St. Louis the longest. In Boston 66.8 per cent had been on probation less than six months, and in Buffalo 33.3 per cent had been dismissed within that time; but in San Francisco and St. Louis the corresponding percentages were 7 and 2.9. In each of the two latter courts more children had been on probation for two years or longer than for any other time period, the percentages being 42.5 and 28.4, respectively. In Seattle data relating to the length of time current probation cases had been under supervision showed that the duration of probation up to the time information was secured was less than six months in the cases of 51.7 per cent of the children and two years or over in the case of 11.3 per cent.⁸⁸ Had figures for duration of probation been available for Los Angeles they would probably have shown a larger proportion of children under supervision for the longer periods than was found in any of the courts for which data were secured.

⁸⁸ Including cases both of dependency and of delinquency.

In all the courts studied the judge made the decision with reference to release from probation. In most cases, however, the child was not required to appear in court but was notified by mail that probation had been terminated. Sometimes the child came before the judge, who endeavored to impress him with the importance of right conduct in the future. In San Francisco the order might be either "release from probation" or "petition dismissed and all orders vacated." The Minneapolis court frequently placed children on probation "without adjudication" and dismissed the cases at the termination of probation without the children's ever having been adjudged delinquent. When cases were "placed on file," as was the practice in some of the courts, and were not dismissed they could be reopened at any time during the period when the child was within the age jurisdiction of the court.

If probationary supervision has been developed constructively, with a view to correcting personal and environmental maladjustments, the termination of probation should imply that the child is ready to meet his problems with no other aid than that which can be expected from the home, the school, the church, and such agencies as settlements, clubs, and scout troops. Successful probation service will have connected the child with these agencies, and their continuing interest in the child after his discharge from probation may be most helpful.

Few of the courts studied placed emphasis on securing follow-up care. Six courts reported that no special efforts were made in this direction; two of these courts reported that children were kept under probationary supervision as long as there was any need for it, and one court placed children on informal probation if conditions were not satisfactory at the end of two years. One of the six courts reported that during probation the interest of recreational and other agencies had been enlisted and that these agencies would probably continue their relationships with the child.

For follow-up work with children released from probation one court was expecting to utilize a Big Brother organization just being organized. Another occasionally arranged for follow-up care from Big Brother and Big Sister organizations. In a third court cases were sometimes referred to representatives of religious organizations and to a child-protective agency which had a Big Brother department; and in a fourth, churches, Big Brother and Big Sister organizations, and the juvenile protective association sometimes undertook after care of children dismissed from the supervision of the court.

In some cases, at least, it seems evident that the courts were falling short of fulfilling their obligations toward the children for whose supervision they had assumed responsibility unless at the close of the probationary term they made sure that some agency in touch with the child understood the problems that had been involved, the constructive work that had been attempted, and the directions in which special help might still be needed.

RESULTS OF PROBATION.

Measurement of the extent to which probation is successful is extremely difficult and in many courts has not been attempted. Some courts have used as an index the proportion of probationers who have violated probation and have been committed to institutions.

Others have divided cases discharged from probation into the following groups: Discharged, showing improvement; discharged, without any improvement; committed for violation of probation. Such attempts to measure the results of probation are of value only if their limitations are recognized. It is not enough to have carried a child through a period of supervision without a recurrence of the difficulty that brought him into conflict with the law. Improvement in conduct may be due almost entirely to the child's desire to comply with the conditions of probation and win prompt release and may cease when supervision is removed. Careful study of the results of probation as compared with the problems involved in each individual case would contribute much to the development of scientific methods of dealing with juvenile delinquents.

Information with regard to the proportion of children whose conduct was unsatisfactory and whose probation was terminated by commitment to institutions was secured for only a few of the courts studied. Of 411 children who had been placed on probation in the Boston court between September 1, 1919, and August 31, 1920, 265, or 64 per cent, had been dismissed from probation by February 1, 1921; 35, or 9 per cent, had been surrendered and committed to institutions or (in 3 cases) to the State department of public welfare; 10, or 2 per cent, had been lost sight of; and 97, or 24 per cent, were still on probation. Twenty-seven of the children who had been surrendered from probation had been under supervision less than six months. The report of the Massachusetts Commission on Probation for the year ended September 30, 1920, gives the following results of probation reported by the Boston juvenile court.⁸⁹

	Number.	Per cent.
Total results reported.....	1, 303	100. 00
Surrendered to court for violation of probation.....	48	3. 68
Disappeared and defaulted (failed to appear).....	24	1. 84
Probation ended by new arrest.....	1	. 08
Term of probation extended.....	862	66. 15
Case filed or probationer discharged.....	368	28. 24

In his report of the first five years of the Boston juvenile court⁹⁰ (August 1, 1906, to August 1, 1911) Judge Baker stated that of the 418 children placed on probation the first year, 164, or 39 per cent, were either committed for failing on probation or were found delinquent again during the five years for some offense other than violation of ordinances or license regulations. Statistics for the second five years (1911 to 1916) showed that of 379 children placed on probation in 1911-12, 143, or 37 per cent, were either committed for failing on probation or found delinquent again during the five years, including for this period, also, children found delinquent for some offense other than violation of ordinances or license regulations.

In commenting on the figures for the first five years Judge Baker called attention to the fact that they do not show the full amount of

⁸⁹ The Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Annual Report of the Commission on Probation for the Year Ending Sept. 30, 1920, p. 53. Boston, 1921. "Results reported" means results of each probation case. Since children are placed on probation for definite short terms and probation is frequently extended the number of children involved is much smaller than the number of results reported.

⁹⁰ Harvey Humphrey Baker—Upbuilder of the Juvenile Court, pp. 34, 104. Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, 1920.

repeating because they do not include⁹¹ (1) instances never discovered or never prosecuted by the authorities; (2) instances where a later offense was committed in another jurisdiction; (3) instances occurring after the defendants had passed the age limit of the jurisdiction of this court. He says, however: "On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that in a substantial number of instances not all the offenses for which the child was found delinquent were serious, even though they were other than the violations of ordinances and license regulations * * *. It is not practicable to eliminate such instances from the computation, and they may be considered to offset to some extent (though not wholly) the unincorporated instances above mentioned."

Discussing further the statistics of repeated offenses by probationers and the possibility of comparing results achieved by different courts, Judge Baker pointed out certain elements to be taken into consideration:⁹²

(a) The greater the percentage of commitments, the less will be the percentage of repeating in any limited period. A large percentage of commitments means, first, that some of the less promising children (who would be tried where there is a small percentage of commitments) are not tried on probation at all; and, second, that those who prove unstable are early surrendered—a child in an institution can not repeat.

(b) In some jurisdictions first offenders who pretty clearly need no oversight are placed on probation just to impress them or their parents or their associates with the seriousness with which the court regards their conduct. Such jurisdictions will show a less percentage of repeating among probationers than jurisdictions which dispose of such cases either with a reprimand or some suitable punishment without using probation.

In the course of the study of the Boston court made by the Children's Bureau cases of children placed on probation during 1919-20 were traced through the card index of the central information bureau maintained by the Massachusetts Commission on Probation. This organization received reports of all arrests and the dispositions made in all cases from courts in and near Boston. Of 411 children placed on probation in the Boston juvenile court between September 1, 1919, and August 31, 1920, 61, or 15 per cent, had committed new offenses by February, 1921, and had been brought before courts reporting to the probation commission. Thirty of these children had been before other courts than the Boston juvenile court during the period.^{92a}

In Buffalo, of 171 children who passed from the supervision of the court in 1920,⁹³ 65 per cent completed the probationary period and were discharged showing improvement; 3.5 per cent were discharged without any improvement; 31 per cent were rearrested and committed; 0.6 per cent had left the jurisdiction of the court.

Statistics obtained in Buffalo during the course of the Children's Bureau study showed for 199 children placed on probation during the nine-month period from January to October, 1917, the number of offenses committed during the probation period and prior to

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

^{92a} A recent study of the results of probation, which does not, however, include the Boston juvenile court, has been made by the Massachusetts Commission of Probation and published as Senate No. 431, March 15, 1924. The study covered 312 juveniles placed on probation in 1915. Of the boys discharged from probation to the community, 60 per cent had no subsequent court record and 87 per cent had not subsequently been committed to institutions.

⁹³ Ninth Annual Report of the Children's Court of Buffalo, 1920, p. 21.

October, 1920. Seventy-six children, or 38 per cent, committed new offenses during the period of supervision; 22 of these children, or 11 per cent, committed more than one such offense. Table 31 gives the length of time on probation and the number of offenses.

TABLE 31.—*Length of time on probation and number of offenses committed during the probation period; children placed on probation in Buffalo, January to October, 1917.*

Length of probation.	Children committing specified number of offenses while on probation.					
	Total.	None.	1	2	3	4
Total.....	199	123	54	19	2	1
Under 6 months.....	89	48	34	7		
6 to 11 months.....	62	42	12	7	1	
1 year.....	40	29	5	4	1	1
2 years and over.....	2		2			
Not reported.....	6	4	1	1		

Information similar to that obtained in Buffalo was secured for a group of 102 children discharged from probation by the St. Louis court during the four months from September 1 to December 31, 1919. Of these children, 76 had committed no new offenses during their periods of probation and 26 had committed such offenses, of whom 3 had two and 1 had four offenses noted on their probation records.

The 1919 report of the Los Angeles juvenile court showed that of 2,545 children who were wards of the court and under supervision during that year in their own homes, in other family homes, or in private institutions or public institutions under county management,⁹⁴ 360, or 14 per cent, were brought before the court during the year for violation of probation. The total number of children included 1,251 continued on probation from former years and 1,294 placed under supervision during the year. Among the 1,689 boys, 307, or 18 per cent, violated probation, while among the 856 girls, only 53, or 6 per cent, failed so completely that they were brought before the court for violation. Because of the inclusion of children in institutions the figures are not comparable with those of other courts.

In a group of 115 children whose probation was terminated by the San Francisco court during the year ending June 30, 1920, 100 were released from probation, 1 child died, and 14 were sent to institutions—all but one of them to private institutions.

In the District of Columbia during the year July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, approximately 1,000 children were on probation.⁹⁵ During the same period a total of 280 cases of violation were heard formally, and 29 cases were heard unofficially by the chief probation officer. A new rule was adopted during the year that violations of probation should be heard unofficially unless it was felt that commitment was necessary. A total of 173 probationers were committed—98 to the District of Columbia Board of Children's Guardians, 54 to the

⁹⁴ All these children were considered to be under probationary supervision.

⁹⁵ The report for the period July 1, 1917-June 30, 1920 (in manuscript) gives the total number of children on probation June 30, 1920, as 488. The number placed on probation during the year ending on that date was 524.

National Training School for Boys, and 21 to the National Training School for Girls. Of 1,125 delinquent children officially before the court in 1919-20, 67, or 6 per cent, had previously been on probation in the juvenile court. In each of the two previous years the number of former probationers before the court was only 3 per cent of the total number of delinquent children formally before the court.

In connection with this study judges and chief probation officers were asked to state their opinion of the extent to which probation was successful. Some of them had no statistical information on which to base judgments, and in all cases the replies were valuable only as indicating in a general way the impressions of those who were responsible for the direction of the probation work. The following summaries for some of the courts indicate the judges' and probation officers' estimates of the degree of success attained:

Court A.—The chief probation officer believed that probation was successful in a very large percentage of cases. In 80 to 90 per cent something constructive was accomplished.

Court B.—The chief probation officer believed that probation was successful in the majority of cases. One of the probation officers supervising boys stated that it was difficult to estimate the success of probation, but he believed that it was of benefit in the majority of cases. He stated that more intensive work could be done if each officer had fewer cases under supervision. Formerly he had had not more than 50 cases and had been able to visit the homes once a week. Boys were then not carried on probation so long as at the time of the study.

Court C.—The probation officers felt that they could do much better work if they had fewer cases under supervision. One probation officer stated that he had to decide what cases it was safe to neglect in order to do necessary work on other cases. Two of the officers thought they ought not to have more than 50 cases under supervision if neglect cases were to be handled as well as delinquent, since neglect cases took more time. Two others thought they could handle 75 to 100 cases if not more than 20 delinquency cases were included. Other officers estimated 50 or 75 cases as the maximum that should be carried by one officer.

Court D.—About three years prior to the time of the study the chief probation officer made a composite chart showing the progress of probationers (100 cases selected at random). Each officer had kept for each child a record of the child's progress from month to month. The charts showed success, to the extent that no commitments had been necessary, in 95 per cent of the cases. The chief probation officer thought probation work could accomplish better results than were being achieved at the time of the study if the staff were not so overburdened.

Court E.—One of the probation officers who had a responsible position stated that probation was successful in about 75 per cent of the cases. The judge stated that probation was handicapped by an insufficient number of probation officers. He believed that the purpose of probation should be to teach the child the meaning of legal and moral responsibility.

Court F.—One of the probation officers who had been with the court for a long time stated that she believed probation to be successful in the majority of cases. The greatest trouble, she said, was with children who were mentally incompetent.

Court G.—The judge attributed to the probation system the fact that delinquency had not increased over a period of years and that statistics for the year prior to the time of the study showed a decrease. The chief probation officer believed that still better results could be obtained if the probation officers were less overburdened and could develop more personal relationships.

RECORDS AND STATISTICS.

IMPORTANCE OF RECORDS AND REPORTS.

Juvenile-court records are of three kinds: (1) The legal records, which show that the procedure required by law has been complied with and furnish the basis for statistics on the volume of work, the charges, and the dispositions made; (2) the records of the social investigation and the scientific study of the child, which should contain the diagnosis of the case and form the basis for disposition by the court and for subsequent measurement of the results obtained; and (3) the records of supervision, which should show the plans made, the work done, and the results. These three types of records are essential to the work with each child. They also form the basis for statistical measurement of the problems dealt with over a period of years, in comparison with other courts, in comparison with other groups of children, and according to the types of problems, the facilities available, and the methods used.

The legal records are of fundamental importance in court work and should be in such condition as to facilitate the work of the court and safeguard the legality of its orders. For them the clerk of the court is responsible. The amount of record keeping required of the clerk and his assistants differs in different court systems, and the care with which records were made out and filed varied greatly. It is important that all information be entered currently, that the filing be systematic, and that an index be kept in such a way that cases may be identified readily and information with reference to previous appearances of children coming before the court quickly obtained. In the course of the study it was found that the index was often kept in a bound book which made strict alphabetical entry impossible and often necessitated searching through several pages to find a name.

The social records—principally the records of investigation and of supervision—are of vital importance as a part of the equipment of the court for service to the children. These records are kept by the probation department, and the confidential nature of the information can be strictly safeguarded since they in no sense constitute legal records. The inadequacy of the social records, particularly the records of probationary supervision, was marked in most of the courts studied. It was usually impossible to determine from reading them even the frequency with which the probation officer had been in touch with the child; the information given rarely showed the constructive work that was attempted; and except in a most general way it did not show the results obtained.

The juvenile court has had a sufficiently long history to make feasible some agreement upon terminology and methods of compiling and presenting statistical material, but in fact the diversity between courts is so great that combination or accurate comparison of the statistics of different courts is impossible. Even the unit of tabulation differs, being sometimes the case, sometimes the child, and sometimes groups

of children involved in a single complaint. No general agreement exists with reference to classification of offenses or of dispositions made or to the social information which it is practicable to present.⁹⁶

In many courts—even those in large cities—no funds are available for printing the annual report, or sometimes even for compiling statistical material.

LEGAL RECORDS.

The legal records of the court must be kept on forms determined by the need for exact legal language; but, as Flexner and Baldwin point out, it is possible to draft the forms and keep the legal records so that, while meeting the requirements of the law, they will also represent the spirit and the procedure of the children's court.⁹⁷ The legal papers commonly in use by juvenile courts may be outlined as follows:⁹⁸

1. The petition or complaint on which a child is brought to court, sworn to by the complainant, a probation officer, or an attendance officer.

2. The citation or summons, the subpoena, and the warrant, used to secure the attendance of children and witnesses in court, a warrant being issued in children's cases only after a summons has failed.

3. Probation orders and commitments to institutions, used in disposing of cases.

4. The court docket, usually kept in a book and providing for entry of the names of the children or, in adult cases, the defendants; a notation of the charge; the finding of the court; and the disposition of the case. In courts of broad jurisdiction separate dockets are often kept for various types of cases—children's cases, mothers' pension cases, adult cases, and so forth.

5. The daily sheets or calendars, which constitute a list of the cases coming before the court on a given day and on which notations are made that are usually entered later in the docket.

6. The index, which should preferably be an index to both the clerk's records and the probation records but which frequently is an index only to the former.

7. Other records which must be kept by the clerk, including minutes, financial records, and so forth. These differ in different court systems.

Petition or complaint.

In five of the courts delinquency cases were brought officially to the attention of the juvenile court through the filing of a petition, and in five through an "information," "complaint," or "affidavit."⁹⁹

Informations read "The State v. _____," and petitions read, "In the matter of," "On behalf of," "In the interest of," or "In re the welfare of." For instance, the form used in the San Francisco court read "The people of the State of California on behalf of John Doe, alleged ward of the juvenile court." The facts alleged which would bring the child within the provisions of the delinquency law, or in the courts operating under quasi-criminal procedure the exact provisions

⁹⁶ The U. S. Children's Bureau is endeavoring to promote the compilation of uniform statistics. A committee of the National Probation Association is at work on the subject of juvenile-court statistics.

⁹⁷ Flexner, Bernard, and Baldwin, Roger N.: *Juvenile Courts and Probation*, pp. 194, 196. The Century Co., New York, 1914.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-197.

⁹⁹ See *Legal processes prior to hearing*, p. 50.

of the statutes alleged to have been violated, were stated in the petition or information. In courts of the latter type different forms of information or complaint are usually necessary for different types of offenses.

In Seattle no printed form of petition was used, but the contents of each petition were separately dictated by the chief probation officer. A typical petition for Seattle is given in Appendix II, page 257, and samples of petitions for the Denver and San Francisco courts are shown on pages 257 to 260. It will be noted that the Denver petition names not only the child alleged to be delinquent but the parents or guardians whose rights to the further care and custody of the child are in question by reason of the child's delinquency.

Petitions were used in dependency and neglect cases in seven of the courts. In four of these courts the form of petition was the same as that used in cases of delinquency. In the District of Columbia the dependency petition was a petition to commit the child to the Board of Children's Guardians.

Notice and summons.

The child and his parents were notified of delinquency hearings through summons, notice and summons, or, in the California courts, citations. These notices were usually required by law to be served a given number of hours prior to the hearing, but in most courts service might be waived by the parents if they consented to an earlier hearing.¹ Warrants were issued if the summons or citation was not sufficient to insure the child's presence in court. Witnesses were served with subpoenas.

The form of citation used in the Los Angeles court is reproduced on page 260, blue forms being used for hearings by the judge and yellow for hearings by the referee. Other forms reproduced are the summons and notice to parents or guardian used in the Denver court, the warrant and the waiver of service used in San Francisco, the Denver order for detention, and the pledge signed by St. Louis parents or guardians to be present in court and to be responsible for the appearance of the child.²

Docket and calendars.

The docket usually serves as the permanent chronological record of cases. The Seattle "juvenile-appearance docket," for example, contained for each day a list of the cases heard, with the following information concerning each: Parents' names, date of birth, the name of the petitioner, the nature of the action, the date filed, the date of hearing, notations with reference to the service of notice and summons, and the disposition of the case. The specific offense was not entered.

The daily sheets or calendars usually called for the name of the child, the charge, and the disposition of the case. In some courts—those of San Francisco and Minneapolis, for instance—the calendars constituted the minutes of the court. In some of the courts the calendars contained only the names of the children and the numbers of their cases.

¹ Idem.

² See Appendix II, pp. 257-266.

Findings and orders.

The entry on the docket was usually sufficient record of the orders made in children's cases, except when the child was committed to an institution or agency. In such cases an order of commitment was made out in duplicate, addressed to the superintendent of the institution or the executive of the agency to which the child was committed. In some of the courts a special journal or register of actions was kept in addition to the docket, in which orders of probation, of commitment, or of any other kind were entered. The disposition of the case was sometimes noted on the petition or summons.

The form used for the findings and orders in the Minneapolis court and the commitment forms used in San Francisco are reproduced on pages 267 to 271.

Methods of recording orders.

Although in some of the courts the calendars constituted the minutes of the court, in others special journals were kept. In Seattle, for instance, typewritten minutes and orders were entered in a journal. The minutes included the date and for each case heard on that date, the case number, the name of the child, the nature of the action, and the disposition and order. For each minute entry there was an order of some kind. The Denver court kept separate books for commitments of delinquent children, for orders in dependency cases, and for commitments in adult cases. The minutes of the court were bound.

Keeping a complicated system of books is a considerable item of expense. It is essential that the legal record system of the juvenile court be adequate to insure that all changes of status of the children are recorded in due form and that the business of the court is conducted in an orderly fashion. The amount of record keeping required of the clerk's office should be the minimum needed to comply with these requirements.

The index.

A card index of cases coming officially to the attention of the juvenile court was kept in six courts—in Denver under the supervision of the clerk of the court and in Boston, Buffalo, San Francisco, Seattle, and St. Louis under the direction of the chief probation officer. In Seattle and Denver the index included both formal and informal cases, though in Denver it related only to children coming to the attention of the court on complaints of delinquency. A special card index for cases dealt with informally by the boys' department was kept in San Francisco. The Denver index consisted of a series of loose-leaf books, 5 inches by 8 in size, each page being devoted to the facts concerning one child.

In some of the courts in which a card index was kept indexes to the dockets were also kept—in book form. For instance, in one court all cases were looked up both in the book index of official cases and in the card index kept by the probation office. The book index contained only the name and the number, whereas the card index contained a considerable amount of social information.

In the four courts in which card indexes were not kept indexes to official cases were kept in the clerk's office, sometimes on the first pages of the dockets and sometimes in separate books. In these

courts as well as in those using card indexes each case was looked up to determine whether the child had previously been before the court.

The card index serves primarily as a guide to the files containing information about the case, and hence in some courts contains only the name of the child, the file number, and the address. The St. Louis card illustrates this type of index. The Denver index gives, in addition, each previous appearance of the child, the complaint, and the disposition. The Buffalo index adds to this information concerning previous appearances a considerable amount of social information obtained at the time of the first investigation. The Seattle card, though somewhat simpler, calls for similar information. Index cards are shown on pages 271 to 273.

The simple indexes calling only for name, file number, and address can be kept up at a minimum cost, but they have the serious disadvantage of making identification difficult because of differences in spelling of names and changes of address. Such additional items as the date of birth of the child and the names of the parents are great aids in identification. The inclusion of many social facts, such as those related to the status of the parents and the conditions in the home, is probably unwise, since such facts are constantly changing and the information should be given in full in the records of investigation and supervision. Index cards, filed alphabetically and usually covering a period of years, do not readily lend themselves to statistical analysis, which should be provided for through special statistical forms.

It is, however, desirable that enough facts concerning the family be included to make it possible to connect new cases with cases of other children in the same family who have been known to the court. It is surely desirable to know the families, as well as the children, who are coming more than once to the court's notice.

Special card indexes, for example, of children committed to institutions or of children placed on probation, are kept in many courts, usually in the probation office, and are very helpful. They will be included in the discussion of the social records of the court.³

The filing system.

In five courts the legal and the social records were separately filed, the former in the clerk's office and the latter in the probation office. Four courts filed legal and social records in the same folders, and in one court practically no social records were kept. The separation of legal and social records has been deemed to be important for the reason that often legal records can not be withheld from inspection upon demand, whereas social records constitute confidential and unofficial memoranda.⁴ However, in six of the courts studied the legal records were to some extent held to be confidential. In Minneapolis and Seattle, for instance, the juvenile court held that none of the records were public records, and access to them was permitted only to the child's family or their attorney. In three of the courts in which social and legal records were filed together they were so arranged that the social records could easily be removed

³ See p. 208-209.

⁴ See *Juvenile Courts and Probation*, by Bernard Flexner and Roger N. Baldwin, p. 195.

before the folder was given for inspection. For instance, in San Francisco the two classes of records were clipped together, and the legal papers only were given out unless the judge specifically ordered that the social records also be shown.

When the legal records were filed in the clerk's office the files were usually less carefully kept than when they were filed with the social records in the probation office. The Seattle court was an exception. There the clerk was responsible for the filing of both the legal and the social records, which were kept together in flat legal-size folders. In some of the courts in which the clerk had charge of filing the legal papers they were folded and placed in jackets and kept in open shelves unprotected from dust.

The work of the court is greatly facilitated if one numbering system is used throughout the records of the clerk's office and the probation office, so that all the records with reference to a given case carry the same number. The methods of numbering and of filing vary greatly in different courts. In Seattle all records pertaining to one family were given the same number and placed in the same folder, the folder number corresponding to the docket number. Even though no member of the family was under care at the time when a petition is filed, if any member of the family had previously been before the court, the old case number was used for the new records. This system had the very great advantage of bringing together all the records pertaining to a given family. In one court, on the other hand, in the files of social records a separate folder was given to each child, but the unit was considered to be, not the child nor the family, but the "case" of delinquency. For instance, if five boys were involved in one complaint, they would all be given the same file number, the children being distinguished by the letters "a," "b," "c," "d," or "e." This system is less useful than the preceding one. In San Francisco, except when several children of the same family were included in the same petition, each child was given a separate folder, and the same number was kept for the child throughout the court's contact with him. A somewhat similar system was used in Los Angeles. In that court, when several children in the same family were dealt with, the folder pertaining to one child was made a complete file and so marked. The other folders were marked "complete in file No. —."

Various devices which enabled one to determine quickly the legal status of the case were in use. For example, in Seattle a memorandum on the folder showed the facts relating to the petition, notice and summons, and order. A blue card attached to the folder in Los Angeles showed the orders.

In some courts cases of delinquency and dependency were placed in the same file, and a consecutive numbering system was used. In Minneapolis, where this practice was followed, cases of dependency and neglect were filed in folders with right-hand tabs and cases of delinquency in folders with left-hand tabs. When the family is the unit in the filing system it is difficult to make this distinction, as some of the children of one family may be under care as delinquent and others as dependent or neglected. Separate files were often maintained for mothers' pension cases and for contributing-to-delinquency or other adult cases.

SOCIAL RECORDS.

Statement of reason for complaint.

Prior to the filing of legal papers bringing cases formally to the attention of the court most of the courts required of the police officer or other complainant, a written statement giving sufficient information to enable the probation office to proceed with an investigation, as well as the conditions complained of. In some courts the written report of the police was usually accepted in lieu of the personal appearance of the police officer at the hearing. This was the custom in Buffalo. A typical police report to that court is given on page 273. The form used in San Francisco for the police report is also reproduced, as are the various forms used for complaints by the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.⁵

Social investigation.

In all but one court written records were made of investigations, but the amount of information recorded varied from a few notes on a card to a complete history of the child and the conditions in his home. In six courts the report of the investigation was typewritten—sometimes from dictation, but usually from penciled entries on a blank similar to the blank used for the typewritten report, of a size that would fit into a small notebook, or, in one court, on rough, pencil paper. The use of special forms for the investigators' writeup, in which notes can be entered in the field, saves time that would otherwise be used for dictation, but when this practice is used the notes made in the field should be carefully edited and revised by the investigator before being turned in for copying.

The amount of information called for by the investigation forms in use in the various courts has already been described.⁶

The forms used for the reports of investigations in dependency cases placed more emphasis on the home conditions and the financial condition of the family and less on the histories of the children than did the forms used in delinquency cases.

In two courts—those of Los Angeles and Seattle—the report of the investigation was principally in the form of a narrative prepared according to an outline of points to be covered. A few printed questions were included on the form. A report of one of the Seattle investigations is given in Appendix II, page 276.

The reports of the social investigation of the District of Columbia court were quite complete and included a number of items with reference to the family, the home, and the child's history, and a comprehensive summary prepared according to a carefully planned outline. The field notes for the investigation were taken on notebook sheets $5\frac{1}{2}$ by $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches in size, which contained all of the items covered by the final report, $8\frac{1}{2}$ by 14 inches, and which were carried in a notebook. The investigation form, the outline for the summary and the school report, together with the investigation form used in dependency cases in the Seattle court, are given in Appendix II, pages 277 to 284.

⁵ See Appendix II, pp. 274-276.

⁶ See p. 91.

Records of studies of the children.

For records of physical examinations various forms, some very general and some more detailed, were used. The blank in use by the Judge Baker Foundation of Boston is reproduced on page 287. For intelligence tests the record booklet for the Stanford revision of the Binet-Simon tests as described in Terman's *The Measurement of Intelligence* was used in the Denver court, and other record blanks for Binet tests were used in other courts. The Minneapolis court used 5 by 8 cards for all cases given physical and mental examinations, a buff card being used for the physical record, orange for the intelligence tests, and blue for sociological and pedagogical records. The physical, sociological, and pedagogical cards are reproduced on pages 285 and 286 together with the form used for the card index kept by the nurse on the staff of the court. The form for the parents' consent to treatment is also given (p. 289).

The Judge Baker Foundation of Boston kept two card indexes, one for statistical purposes, summarizing the physical findings, type of delinquency, home conditions, and so forth, and the other showing recommendations and adjustments. The cards for the two indexes are shown in Appendix II, page 288. Different-colored cards were used for different types of cases, brown indicating a defective girl, blue a normal girl, red a mentally defective boy, and yellow a normal boy. A clipped left-hand corner indicated a repeater and a clipped right-hand corner, a child of doubtful mentality. The follow-up cards were filed according to the agencies caring for the children.

Detention-home records.

Several forms are necessary in the administration of a detention home. The most common of these are (1) the slip signed by the police officer requesting that the child be received into custody, (2) the ledger on which are entered in chronological order the names and identifying information concerning all children received, (3) the card index of children cared for in the detention home, and (4) the records of the children, containing sometimes a considerable amount of social information. When the detention home is a part of the juvenile-court organization it is usually not considered necessary to keep any considerable social information on file in the home. Sometimes the physical and mental examinations are considered a part of the administration of the detention home, and the records of physical and mental examinations are included among the detention-home records.

A page from the record book used by the Seattle detention home is reproduced on page 289, and on subsequent pages are the slip used in San Francisco for requests by the police that children be received into custody, the card record kept by the Denver detention home, and the form of report to the court used in Los Angeles. It will be noted that the last-named form calls for information concerning the child's record while being detained. A very complete record of each child, containing social information, a report of the physical examination and mental tests, illnesses in the home, and record while in the home was kept in Los Angeles. This record included the following items: Discipline; kind of work, quality, attitude; playground report; reading; interests and ambitions; attitude to officers; attitude to children; school report; remarks; recommendation.

Records of supervision.

The most important record in connection with the supervision of children on probation or of families under the care of the court is the record of supervision, which should contain information concerning the status of the case at the beginning of supervision, plans made, contacts with the child, his family and others interested, and results accomplished. This record is the responsibility of the individual probation officers, but if the information it contains is to be of value it should be carefully planned and frequently and regularly reviewed by a supervising officer. Records of this kind are usually kept either in the form of a 4 by 6 inch or 5 by 8 inch card index, filed in a tray on the probation officer's desk, or in a loose-leaf notebook of correspondence size, kept by the probation officer. Small field notebooks containing names and addresses of children on probation, in which notes may be entered, are essential.

Other records commonly in use include the card given the child, notifying him that he has been placed on probation and stating what the conditions of probation are; the letter notifying the parents that their child has been placed on probation and calling upon them for cooperation; forms for school reports and parents' reports; special summaries and reports; the recommendation for discharge from probation; and the card signed by the judge in discharging a child from probation and given to the child.

The histories of supervision used by the Buffalo and Seattle courts were quite similar and consisted of a four-page, correspondence-size form, the first sheet of which contained identifying information about the case and a digest of supervision, showing the dates the home was visited and the dates the child reported, the other three pages being left blank for a full chronological history. The Seattle form is shown on page 291. The Los Angeles form was very much like the Seattle form, except that it was a single sheet, to which additional sheets could be attached for a chronological history.⁷ In Boston blank sheets filed with the investigation sheet were used.

The probation record used in San Francisco was in the form of a chart calling for entries according to a code under each date. No narrative record was kept, except as summaries and special reports were called for. The headings of the charts were as follows: Month and year; in touch with probationer; home (harmony, discord, etc.); church attendance (regular, irregular); health; habits; recreation; school; employment record; financial data (earnings, savings, etc.); discipline and data on arrests, police complaints, or special progress. A similar record was kept for dependency cases.

In Minneapolis and St. Louis card records were kept. Such records involve the minimum amount of clerical work but do not give sufficient space to record fully the plans made, changes in conditions, progress, and so forth. In the District of Columbia a large card was formerly used, but the system has recently been changed to that of a correspondence-size face sheet and chronological summary.

The District of Columbia form, a sheet from the notebooks kept by probation officers, a blank used to notify the probation officer when a child is placed on probation, and an outline for special reports are shown on pages 293 to 295 of Appendix II. The record system,

⁷ See Appendix II, p. 292.

which in 1922 underwent thorough revision, was described by the case supervisor, Miss Ezekiel, in her paper given at the 1923 annual meeting of the National Probation Association, in part as follows:

A new form was designed to conform to the face sheet of the investigation form. It provided for an adequate desk record and made it a simple matter for any one of the typists to copy the needed information without direct supervision. It also relieved the probation officers of unnecessary clerical work and gave them the benefit of immediate information, which previously had to be entered in long hand or necessitated constant recourse to the investigation files. In addition, a field blank was designed which could be carried in a pocket loose-leaf binder upon which the necessary facts about the probationer could be entered and provided space for the record of all work done. A daily report blank was also designed to be carried in the same binder with the field record and includes not only the record of work done by the probation officer each day, but also the time spent in the field and in the office.

In May, 1922, we introduced the method by which the supervisor and probation officer are both made responsible for the history of children who are placed on probation. A chronological record is kept in each case * * * the supervisor entering one group of items and the probation officer entering another group. These records parallel, but do not duplicate, each other. They rather supplement and complete the history and serve to check the work of the probation officer, and by the use of this double-entry method the children have the benefit of careful case study and treatment.

* * * On the form kept by the supervisor all items that come to the attention of the probation department are entered, such as telephone messages from parents and others interested; school reports, reports from clinics, reports from cooperating agencies, reports from police precincts and the house of detention, and any casual happening in a case that requires the attention of the probation officer. This information is immediately sent to the probation officer. There are also entered upon the supervisor's form the suggestions, recommendations, or instructions to the probation officer at the time of conference. On the probation officer's form are entered all visits, all reports, all developments in the case, as well as the suggestions, recommendations, and instructions received at the time of conference.

The instructions given a child placed on probation in the District of Columbia, the letter sent to parents or guardians in boys' cases in Los Angeles, and the card used for a similar purpose in Denver, the parents' report, the school report, and the post card used when a child fails to report in St. Louis, the card used in Minneapolis when a child is discharged from probation, the application for discharge from supervision used in St. Louis, and the form used in Buffalo for reports of violation of probation, are reproduced in Appendix II. A special form worked out by the Seattle court is that used for reports on the competency of applicants for the care of children under the supervision of the court. It is shown on page 300.

Indexes and files.

In some of the courts in which a general card index did not serve both the clerk's office and the probation officer, a card index of all cases known to the probation office was kept. Special indexes were usually maintained; for instance, for active probation cases, for children in institutions and under the care of agencies, and for complaints.

A general card index of all cases known to the probation office was kept in St. Louis, and three special indexes were maintained—one for active probation cases, one for children in public institutions (filed according to sex), and one for children in private institutions (filed by institution). Each probation officer had his own card file

of active probation cases. The private-institution index and the active-probation index were checked each month.

In the Seattle court a card index of all cases, formal and informal, was kept by the secretary to the chief probation officer. In the same office was maintained, on blue cards, an index of all institution commitments, with notations showing whether or not the children had been paroled or discharged. A card index of all cases under supervision was kept by the probation officer in charge of supervision. This index contained for each case a summary of the court order, the date placed under supervision, the name and address of the child, the name of the custodian, and the probation officer to whom the case was assigned.

The filing system of the probation office usually included a central file in which were kept all social records—and sometimes the legal records also⁹—pertaining to cases investigated and cases under supervision; a "correspondence file," which in some courts contained, in addition to special correspondence, data relating to cases handled informally; and the files of active cases kept usually by the probation officers. Usually the general file was in the form of a flat file, the folders being correspondence size or legal size, and it was usually numerical, whereas usually the correspondence file was alphabetical.

In most courts each probation officer had either a loose-leaf notebook of correspondence size in which the probation histories for his cases were kept, or a card index on large or small cards, containing the names of children under supervision and other identifying information concerning them and records of the probation officers' contacts with the children and their families.

In developing a filing system it is important that all papers which will eventually go into the same file be of uniform width. The length may vary according to the purposes to be served but should not be longer than the folder.

REPORTS AND STATISTICS.

Methods of compiling statistics.

Only one of the courts—the Los Angeles court—employed a full-time statistician to take charge of the statistical work of the probation office, and the person holding this position had not had special statistical training.¹⁰ In eight courts the statistical work was done by probation officers or clerks whose main duties were other than statistical and who had had no training in statistical method. The St. Louis court depended for statistical service chiefly upon students of the Missouri School of Social Economy, who were occasionally employed for short periods to compile material for the annual report.

In Boston statistics were compiled by the clerk of the court and by a clerk on the staff of the probation office; in Buffalo, by the chief probation officer; in Denver, by a member of the clerk's staff; in the District of Columbia, by clerks in the probation office; in

⁹ See p. 203.

¹⁰ The report of the committee on records and statistics of the National Probation Association, presented at the seventeenth annual conference of that organization, May 15, 1923, stated that as far as the committee had been able to learn, the municipal court of Philadelphia was the only one in the country employing a statistician of recognized professional standing.

Minneapolis, by a member of the probation staff (not a probation officer); in New Orleans, by the chief probation officer and an assistant; in San Francisco, by members of the various departments of the probation office; and in Seattle, by the secretary to the chief probation officer.

The methods of compiling statistics were in most courts cumbersome and time-consuming. In one court, for instance, the persons responsible for the statistical work went through the docket three or four times a year and summarized the cases by offenses. The number of cases and not the number of children was ascertained, several children often being included in a single case. Statistics for the St. Louis court, which were gathered only once every four or five years, were compiled from the dockets and the investigation sheets. In Boston the clerk was required to make an annual statistical report to the department of correction; this was compiled by going through the docket at the end of each year. Every five years a special statistical summary was prepared by the probation department, a card being made out for each child whose case was not immediately dismissed.

In four courts statistical data were being currently compiled—a method more accurate and more economical than the plan of waiting until the end of the year to abstract statistical data. In Denver a summary, or tally sheet, was kept, based on docket information. In San Francisco a monthly tally sheet was kept currently by each department, and it was planned to combine the information on these sheets at the end of the year. The headings were inserted on a sliding rule and the sheet fastened to a drawing board. A pencil check in the first column indicated that the case was closed. If the case was reopened, the check was erased. The items included were: Age, school grade, charge, date of petition, and disposition, with dates.

The daily check system was also used in Seattle. In Los Angeles two statistical sheets were kept currently by the statistician. Preliminary reports of investigations were turned over to her and checked with the transcripts of evidence before the data were entered on the statistical sheets. Dispositions of cases were checked with the minutes of the court. When a case was dismissed the probation officer's report went to the statistician, who entered on the statistical sheet the reason for dismissal after checking it with the minutes of the court. The first sheet showed the reason for filing the petition and the disposition of the case; the second, the nationality and ages of the children, the agencies filing the petitions, the nationality of the parents, the family religion, the conjugal condition of the parents, and so forth. It was planned in the future to distinguish between new cases, recurrent cases, and violations of probation.

Monthly reports.

The method of compiling statistics now (1924) in use in the District of Columbia makes it possible to show the work of the probation department at any time during the year. The desired data for the annual report are entered daily from the court calendar upon cards designed for this purpose. Every disposition, official or unofficial, is cleared through the desk of the person responsible for the statistical work, and the proper entry recorded. As soon as an investiga-

tion is completed that, too, is routed through this desk and all necessary information is also recorded. For statistical purposes cards of four colors are used—white for white boys, buff for white girls, blue for colored boys, and salmon for colored girls. All entries are kept up to date, so that comprehensive tables for the year ending June 30, 1924, were prepared and submitted on July 1, 1924.

In all but three of the courts monthly reports showing the numbers of cases dealt with and the amount of work done were prepared by the probation officers and submitted to the chief probation officer. A monthly summary covering the work of the entire probation office was compiled by one of the three courts and by four others, in which the summary was based on the reports of the individual probation officers. In three of the eight courts which prepared a monthly summary the summary was in the nature of a report to a State probation commission (Boston and Buffalo) or to a State board of charities (St. Louis).

The probation officers' reports in Los Angeles combined a daily report of activities with a summary of cases continued from the preceding month, new cases received, and cases passed from supervision. This form is shown on page 301. The St. Louis report summarized the volume of work, the new cases, and the removals, divided according to sex and color, and this is also reproduced. (See p. 302.) In the District of Columbia a daily report was kept by each officer in a loose-leaf notebook, and a monthly report was prepared, summarizing for each child under supervision and for each day of the month the services rendered. These forms are shown on pages 303 and 304.

The monthly report made by the Boston court to the Massachusetts Probation Commission gave for children placed on probation the age, sex, and offense. The data were compiled from the docket and daily sheets. The Buffalo report made to the State probation commission showed on the face information with reference to juvenile probationers and on the reverse similar information with reference to adult probationers. It will be remembered that the Buffalo children's court had broad adult jurisdiction. The report made by the St. Louis court to the State board of charities, which was formerly sent in quarterly, but at the time of the study, monthly, is reproduced on page 305.

Monthly reports showing the number of children given meals and lodging were usually required from the detention home. The forms used in St. Louis are reproduced in Appendix II. In Los Angeles a statistical report of the detention home was compiled monthly, showing for each day of the month the number of boys and girls in each department and the average number per day.

Annual reports.

All the courts studied compiled some sort of annual statistical statement, but in only four was a report published each year or every other year. In the other courts a report covering the work of the court was published occasionally—perhaps every four or five years, perhaps even less often. The Boston court had never published a report of its work, but certain information was included in the annual report of the Massachusetts Probation Commission, and material concerning the first and second five years of the court's

work was published by the Judge Baker Foundation.¹¹ A compilation of material covering the third five years, which ended in 1922, was planned. The annual report of the New Orleans court was included each year in the printed report of the Louisiana Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

For seven courts printed reports and for three others manuscript reports, covering periods of one to five years, were available at the time the study was made or shortly thereafter. Nine of these covered the work of the court and one, the work of the probation office only. All but one of the printed reports included a statement of the personnel of the court and of the probation office, and all but one included some descriptive material relating to the jurisdiction of the court, the methods used, or the problems dealt with. One of the manuscript reports, which was written for publication but which could not be printed because of the lack of funds, included a considerable amount of descriptive material. All the reports presented statistical tables, and six of the printed and one of the manuscript reports gave at least a slight analysis or interpretation of the most significant facts shown by the tables.

In some of the reports it was difficult to determine what the unit of tabulation had been, but in most of the reports it appeared to have been either cases, with each child counted as many times as he had been before the court on a new charge during the year, or cases for some tables and for others, children with duplications eliminated. Most of the tables seem to have been based upon the number of cases brought to the attention of the court by petition or complaint, though one court appears to have based its figures on cases heard during the year. Cases adjusted without formal court action were combined with cases dealt with formally in the Seattle court report, so that it was impossible to distinguish the two types of cases. In the report of the District of Columbia court unofficial cases and cases in which no court action was taken were presented in separate tables, and for the former the charges, ages, and dispositions were shown. Some information concerning boys' cases handled informally was given in the San Francisco report. In three courts totals only were given for cases settled without formal action, and in four no information whatever was given for this type of case.

The charges on which the children were brought to court were shown in all the reports, but the classifications of charges differed widely. The reports of most of the courts gave separate tables for delinquent children and for neglected or dependent children; but in California no distinction of this kind was made in the law, and the Los Angeles report gave the two types of cases only in the table showing offenses charged. A procedure similar, though not occasioned by the law, was found in reports of two other courts. The organization of the San Francisco court into departments made it possible to distinguish in a general way between children dealt with by reason of delinquency and other children. The dispositions of the cases were shown in the reports of nine courts, and most of these reports gave the names of the institutions to which children were committed and the number of commitments to each.

¹¹ Harvey Humphrey Baker—Upbuilder of the Juvenile Court. Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, 1920.

The ages of the children were given in eight reports, and in a ninth a table showing the ages of children brought to court for larceny and kindred offenses was included. The nativity or nationality of the children was shown in five reports and that of the parents in six, though the classification was sometimes limited to "native born" and "foreign born." The family religion was shown in five reports. Eight gave facts with reference to home conditions, such information being limited in one report to the item of the death of the father or mother and in another to the item of whether or not the parents were living together, but in other reports extending to such items as intemperance, insanity, confinement in penal institutions, and the employment of the mother. The District of Columbia table on parental condition showed the status of the parents and with whom the child was living. The Minneapolis report included a table showing the number of cases in which there had been other juvenile delinquents in the same family.

The source of complaint and the agencies filing the petitions were shown in three reports; the child's grade in school in three; the number of children reappearing in court on new charges in seven; the number of working children in two and the number of employed girls in one other; and the status of probationers in four. Medical and psychological data concerning both boys and girls were given in three reports, and concerning girls only, in one. Five courts gave some comparisons of the statistics for the years dealt with and those for previous years.

Only three of the reports gave statistical information with reference to detention homes, and these showed only the movement of population in the detention home and the average number of days children had been detained. In no court had information been compiled showing what proportion of children before the court had been detained.

Methods of increasing the value of statistical material.

From the preceding analysis of the statistical material compiled by the juvenile courts studied it is evident that, except for a few of the most obvious items, there was no general agreement as to the subjects which it was desirable to present, nor was there agreement as to the unit of tabulation or the classifications to be used in statistical presentation. It is, therefore, impossible to make any but the most general use of the statistical data available. This situation is by no means peculiar to the courts included in this investigation. The report of the nation-wide study of courts hearing children's cases made by the Children's Bureau in 1918, pointed out that for the country as a whole available figures give only an inadequate approximation of the totals for all courts reporting numbers of cases, and fair comparison of any one State with other States was found to be practically impossible.¹² A committee of the National Probation Association reported in 1923 that wide variation existed in the statistical year, in the statistical unit of measurement, in the classifications of causes bringing children before the courts, and of dispositions made by the courts.¹³

¹² Courts in the United States Hearing Children's Cases, by Evelina Belden, p. 59. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 65.

¹³ Report of the Committee on Records and Statistics, Probation and the Prevention of Delinquency—Proceedings of the National Probation Association, 1923. New York, 1924.

If juvenile-court statistics are to be of more than local value statistical methods must be improved and made more nearly uniform. Before this result can be achieved there must be agreement among those responsible for juvenile-court administration as to the purpose and uses of statistical material. The committee of the National Probation Association referred to above attempted to set forth in a brief statement the purposes of juvenile-court and other social-court statistics. According to this statement all courts should gather on a uniform basis statistics furnishing an index of the general nature and extent of the problems dealt with and the extent and kinds of service given. This information should be cast in such form that it may be comparable from year to year for the same court, for different areas, and for the country at large. Additional statistics, based on careful case records, the committee believed, should be compiled, when facilities for research were available, and should point out significant causal factors and the extent to which service given by the court has been effective.

The juvenile court is a public institution expending each year large sums of money and dealing with vital social problems. Public interest requires at least that minimum amount of stock taking which will show for the States and for the Nation the volume of juvenile delinquency and the methods of treatment which are employed. This requires agreement as to the unit of measurement, generally accepted definitions of the terms used, the compilation of statistical material by competent persons, and the services of central coordinating agencies which can promote uniformity and efficiency in statistical processes, exercise leadership in the development of definitions and classifications, and assemble, interpret, and publish statistical material from the different courts. An increasing number of States are vesting advisory or supervisory powers with reference to juvenile courts and probation in some central State body. Of the courts studied, six were required to make statistical reports to a State probation commission or State board of charities. More than a third of the States have now made some provision for assistance by State departments in the development of juvenile-court work. The Federal Children's Bureau is planning to make a beginning in the collection of juvenile-court statistics on a national scale by drafting simple table forms which will be submitted for criticism to juvenile-court officials. These table forms will then be given to courts undertaking to cooperate by annually sending to the bureau statistical information compiled according to a common plan and presented in the form of the tables agreed upon.

State agencies having authority to require reports are in a position to make the greatest contribution to the movement for securing better juvenile-court statistics and hence a more adequate evaluation of the work being done. The data requested by the State agency should be an incentive for the compilation of the right kind of statistical data and not, as sometimes happens, merely a request for data so general that they have no special significance. Moreover, the State agency can supply to the smaller courts that trained statistical service which only the largest courts can now afford. By advising in the planning of record systems and record forms, devising the best methods for the current compilation of statistical material on tally sheets or on cards, assisting in the formulation of definitions and

classifications, and checking the accuracy of the statistical returns the State agency can secure a far greater degree of uniformity and efficiency within the State than now exists. Moreover, through interchange of information with other State agencies and with national agencies, uniformity on a nation-wide scale may, in a measure at least, be secured.

Any court that is intelligently interested in the problems it deals with and the work it is doing will wish to make, at intervals, special studies which will reveal causal factors and will show the results of methods of treatment. The inclusion of such special studies adds greatly to the interest and value of annual reports. Such analyses are impossible unless adequate case records are kept, and even then the staffs are usually too limited to make practicable such inventories of their problems and accomplishments. In some courts such studies can be made in cooperation with the social-research departments of colleges and schools of social work. The committee of the National Probation Association has suggested the joint employment of a statistical expert by a number of social agencies in a city. State agencies to assist in promoting juvenile-court work are the logical sources of trained service, not only for the compilation of general information on a uniform basis but also for making special research studies of problems and results. Such an agency, in addition to the minimum statistical information that is now required, might call for information each year on some special problem. It might also organize special intensive studies in communities where an increase in delinquency appeared, some problem seemed especially serious, or some new method of treatment seemed to promise results.

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK OF THE COURT.

The term "administrative work," when applied to juvenile courts, properly refers to the entire work of the probation office and the management of detention homes or of institutions. As the term is commonly used it refers to the administration of mothers' allowances or public aid to dependent children in their own homes, to the placement of children in family homes, and to the administration of institutions other than detention homes. Only half the courts studied engaged to any extent in one or all of these special administrative functions. Mothers' allowances or public aid was administered by five courts. Two of these, however, dealt with only a part of the mothers' aid problem, as other public agencies also handled this type of case. Only one court placed any considerable number of children in family homes; the others did placing out very rarely or, in one case, not at all. Two courts were concerned in the administration of county institutions for delinquent children, and one court had developed a special method of providing for feeble-minded children.^{13a}

MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES.

Seattle.

The mothers' pension law in Seattle was administered by a separate department of the juvenile court in charge of a commissioner, who had on her staff an investigator, two home visitors, and a stenographer. Applicants for pensions were first interviewed by the commissioner at the office. After this a social investigation was made. The hearings, which have already been described,¹⁴ were more in the nature of case conferences than of court hearings. When a pension was granted the mother was notified by letter, and prior to the first payment she was required to come to the office for a letter of identification. At this time she had a long talk with the commissioner. Visits of supervision were usually made every month. At the time of the study 220 families were receiving aid; from 12 to 14 new cases were added each month.

No definite family budgets were worked out. The law specified a maximum of \$15 a month for the first child and \$5 a month for each additional child, and it was stated that the maximum was almost always granted. Practically all the mothers were said to work on part time. The pension was sometimes supplemented by orders for groceries or fuel given by the public department of charities.

In addition to administering the mothers' pension fund the court had authority to order the county to pay not more than \$12 per month per child for not longer than six months, to cover emergency cases. Not more than two or three families a year were granted aid of this type.

^{13a} See p. 142.

¹⁴ See p. 132.

Minneapolis.

In administering county allowances in Minneapolis the juvenile court had enlisted the cooperation of an advisory board of three members—the county poor superintendent, the superintendent of the Jewish associated charities, and the assistant general secretary of the associated charities. This committee was formerly on an unofficial basis, but at the time of the study it constituted a committee of the county child-welfare board.

The first step in securing a county allowance was an interview with a member of the court staff. Following this an application was filled out and sworn to and the statements contained therein verified by one of the four investigators on the staff of the court.¹⁵ The investigator also estimated the amount needed according to a standard budget. Each member of the advisory committee and the chief probation officer were furnished with a typewritten summary of the investigation. The committee considered the investigation and the budget estimate and made a recommendation to the court. The case was then set for hearing. Before the hearing all cases were reviewed by the chief probation officer. The method of conducting the hearing has been previously described.¹⁶

The maximum amount that could be granted to a family was \$45, and deficits in the amount estimated as necessary for adequate support were made up so far as possible by other organizations. These deficits were said to total about \$6,000 a year.

Visits of supervision were made by the investigators at least once in three months and often more frequently. Allowances were reconsidered once a year. The mothers called at the court for their monthly checks.¹⁷

Denver.

The Denver juvenile court had designated the city and county bureau of charities as the agent of the court in the administration of the mothers' compensation law.¹⁷ All of the work of investigation and supervision was done by the county bureau, but the mothers had the right to protest to the court against reduction or cessation of pensions.¹⁸ By a law passed in 1923 the juvenile court is given power to grant maternity aid for a period not exceeding six months before or six months after the birth of the child. This law is to be administered in the same way as the mothers' compensation law.

San Francisco.

In San Francisco the work of the widows pension bureau was limited to mothers who could meet the very strict requirements imposed. Children of other mothers and children in boarding homes or in institutions, through the juvenile court, were granted county aid to the amount of \$17.50 a month for each child. The State reimbursed the county to the amount of \$10 if the child was an orphan, a

¹⁵ The number of investigators has since been increased to six.

¹⁶ See p. 132.

¹⁷ For a more complete description of the administration of county allowances in Minneapolis and in Denver, see *Standards of Public Aid to Children in Their Own Homes*, by Florence Nesbitt, pp. 43-54 and 59-68 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 118, Washington, 1923). At the time of Miss Nesbitt's study visits were made in Minneapolis at least every two months.

¹⁸ For method of hearing, see p. 132.

half orphan, or abandoned.²⁰ It was stated that most of the recent orders had been for the maximum amounts.

The application for county aid to children in their own or in foster homes came through one of three children's agencies—a Catholic agency, a Jewish agency, or the children's agency of the associated charities. Applications coming direct to the court were referred to one of these agencies after brief interviews by a member of the staff of the family-relations department of the court. The agency receiving the application made an investigation, following which the case was taken up in a conference of the head of the family-relations department of the court and representatives of the three children's agencies. Recommendations were made to the court.

In order to secure county aid it was necessary that the child be adjudged a ward of the court.²¹ He was then committed to his mother under the legal control of one of the agencies or committed to one of the agencies. The responsibility for supervision, for supplying clothing and milk, where needed, and for otherwise supplementing the aid granted, rested entirely with the agencies. Every six months the cases came before the court for renewals of orders. Prior to the renewal hearing reports were made by the agencies and were reviewed by an investigator on the staff of the court. If necessary the court's investigator made a home visit at this time. All institutions caring for children who were receiving county aid were visited once a year by this investigator.

When a family that had been receiving aid through the court had improved so that the standards were acceptable to the widows' pension bureau, or otherwise became eligible for aid, the case was referred to that bureau.

Los Angeles.

The general policy in Los Angeles was that cases involving only dependency should be handled entirely by the county department of charities, but occasionally such cases were dealt with by the juvenile court on petitions alleging that the parents were unable to provide. County aid was ordered by the juvenile court in behalf of wards who were cared for in boarding homes or institutions. In order to receive county aid through the court the child had to be adjudged a ward, and the procedure was the same as in other cases, except that county-order cases were heard by the referee at a special time. The maximum allowed per child was \$20 a month.^{21a} State reimbursement was obtained for part of the aid given for orphans, half orphans, and abandoned children. At the time of the study from \$7,000 to \$8,000 a month was paid by the county through the court for the care of children in their own homes, in boarding homes, or in institutions. Parents reimbursed the county to the extent of \$800 or \$900 a month.

²⁰ In 1921 this aid was extended to children of fathers incapacitated for gainful work by permanent physical disability or by tuberculosis. The aid for foundlings was increased to \$15 a month.

²¹ For description of hearing, see p. 131.

^{21a} An additional amount of \$10, making the maximum \$30, is now (1924) allowed in cases of delicate, especially troublesome, psychopathic, or feeble-minded children. The staff now includes a superintendent of county orders and of payment of board of children in private homes and institutions.

PLACING CHILDREN IN FAMILY HOMES.

Every court is confronted with the problem of providing for the child, dependent or delinquent, who can not be cared for in his own home but who is not in need of institutional care. When other agencies, public or private, are able to undertake the placing of such children it is usually considered better for the court not to assume the responsibility for this specialized task. In many communities, however, facilities for child placing, particularly for temporary care, are relatively undeveloped, though the realization of the possibilities of home care for delinquent children as well as dependent children is increasing. Although only one of the courts studied engaged in child placing to any considerable extent, seven occasionally placed children in family homes. When such work was undertaken it was often for older boys who would benefit by a summer with a farmer's family or for older girls for whom placement was desired in a home where they could earn room and board and at the same time attend school.

In Los Angeles the only child-placing agencies were home-finding societies placing children in free homes, and the juvenile court in 1919 ordered 188 boys and 276 girls placed in family homes, of whom 117 boys and 134 girls were to receive county aid. Figures showing the number of these children who were delinquent and the number who were dependent were not available. The children were placed by the probation officers, who found most of the homes. The homes had to be approved by the public-welfare commission of the county. The commission itself found some of the homes in which children were placed, as did the nurses on the staff of the health department. If more than one child were placed in a home permits from the city health department and from the State board of charities were required. A list of certified homes was kept by the chief probation officer. Probation officers included in their monthly reports the number of homes found. The supervision of children placed in homes was of the same kind as the supervision of children in their own homes and the same records were kept.

In Seattle, also, placement in free homes was the only type of placement engaged in by other agencies, and the court sometimes placed children, usually those whose parents or relatives could pay board. Older girls were sometimes placed at housework or as mothers' helpers. The parents might be ordered by the court to pay board, but no fund for boarding children was available to the court. Lists of boarding homes and of homes in which girls might be placed at housework or as mothers' helpers were maintained by the case supervisor, who investigated all homes in which children were placed. For boarding homes the approval of the child-welfare division of the city health department was required. The probation officers supervised the homes.

The Minneapolis court sometimes placed boys on farms for the summer, but such homes were recommended by private agencies. Placing of dependent and neglected children was done by private agencies. Supervision of boys placed on farms was by correspondence only.

Placement of children by the San Francisco court was confined principally to girls who were placed in homes from which they might attend school. Older boys attending school or working were

sometimes placed in homes. Placement of younger children was left entirely to private agencies.

The Boston court, whenever possible, secured the cooperation of a private agency when a child was in need of home placement. It was sometimes necessary, however, for the court to place children directly. This work was chiefly limited to the summer placing of boys in farm homes and to the placing of older girls as mothers' helpers in homes which were carefully selected and closely supervised.

MANAGEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS.

Aside from the administration of detention homes the management of institutions was a function of only two courts, those of Los Angeles and Minneapolis. El Retiro, the school for delinquent girls maintained by Los Angeles County, was under the jurisdiction of the probation committee and for administrative purposes was considered a branch of the detention home. The superintendent of Juvenile Hall, as the detention home was called, was also the superintendent of El Retiro. The El Retiro staff included an assistant superintendent, three matrons, a teacher assigned by the city department of education, and a farmer. One of the matrons was a domestic-science instructor, one taught manual arts, and one was a trained nurse and playground instructor. The detention-home physician also served El Retiro, and the probation officers kept in touch with the girls during and after their stay in the school.²²

The judge of the Minneapolis court and the county commissioners were jointly responsible for the management of the Hennepin County Home School for Boys and the Hennepin County Home School for Girls. The judge was actually responsible for most of the administrative work. He appointed the superintendents, who were probation officers *ex officio*. Three teachers were assigned by the board of education to the boys' school and one to the girls' school.²³

²² For a fuller statement concerning El Retiro, see p. 146-147. A full-time trained field worker is now employed (1924). She cares for all girls who have left the school under supervision, until they are dismissed by the court.

²³ See p. 145.

RELATION OF JUVENILE COURT TO ADULT CRIMINAL CASES INVOLVING CHILDREN.

ADULT CASES DEALT WITH BY JUVENILE COURT.

The jurisdiction conferred upon the courts over such types of adult cases as contributing to delinquency or dependency, nonsupport and desertion, the determination of the paternity of children born out of wedlock, and offenses against or involving children has been summarized in another section of this report.²⁴ One of the courts²⁵ had no jurisdiction over cases of this type, and three had none except with reference to contributing to the delinquency of children, and this jurisdiction was seldom if ever exercised.

In Los Angeles and San Francisco the juvenile court had original jurisdiction over cases of contributing to the conditions which brought a child under the juvenile court law, but it conducted the preliminary hearings only, holding the defendants to another branch of the superior court for final action. The preliminary hearings were held by both these courts on one afternoon each week. In San Francisco preliminary hearings in cases of failure to provide for children under the care of the juvenile court were also held in the juvenile court on the same afternoon as contributing cases.

Except for the time of women probation officers who were present in court during the hearings of cases in which girls were required to testify, the probation department of the Los Angeles court had no functions with reference to contributing cases until the defendant was placed on probation. The probationary supervision was undertaken by the probation officers of the juvenile department. Girls held as witnesses were usually made wards of the court and assigned to the supervision of probation officers.

The arrangement for dealing with adult cases which had been worked out in San Francisco by the district attorney's office and the juvenile court was resulting in a considerable degree of success in fixing responsibility for the delinquency of young girls. An assistant district attorney was assigned to the juvenile court for part-time service and had an office in the juvenile-court building. He spent three afternoons a week at the court and such other time as was necessary. Since November, 1917, a woman investigator employed by the district attorney had been assigned to the juvenile court for full-time service and worked with the assistant district attorney. She had previously worked nine months as a volunteer in the same capacity. The age of consent in California was 18 years, but it was believed that there was little chance of securing convictions on rape charges in cases of girls over the age of 16 years. That section of the juvenile-court law relating to the performance of any act or the omission of the performance of any duty, which act or omission

²⁴ See pp. 13-15.

²⁵ The St. Louis court, which, however, might order the parents of a neglected child committed to the care of an institution or agency to make payments toward the support of the child.

causes or tends to cause or encourage any person under the age of 21 years to come within the provisions of the act, since it applies not only to parents but to other persons was sometimes used effectively in reaching men responsible for the delinquency of girls under the age of 21 years. It was not a prerequisite to prosecution that the girl should be declared a ward of the court. The penalty provided was a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment in the county jail for not more than two years, or both such fine and imprisonment, or release on probation for a period not exceeding five years.

It was stated that 90 per cent of the contributing cases in San Francisco involved sex offenses and that the remainder were usually in behalf of boys—pool-room cases, and so forth. Every girl sex offender coming to the attention of the juvenile court who was willing to make a complaint against the man responsible for her delinquency was brought by the head of the girls' department to the woman investigator assigned by the district attorney's office. If the interview with this investigator showed that there were grounds for filing a complaint the assistant district attorney served citations on the man or the men involved, requiring them to come to the office for an interview. The man was interviewed by the assistant district attorney and also by the woman investigator. If a settlement was not made a preliminary hearing was held by the juvenile-court judge, sitting as committing magistrate. If at this preliminary hearing it appeared that the case could be handled without further court action it was placed on the reserve calendar, and the man thus became subject to probationary supervision during the continuance, which might be renewed from time to time over a five-year period. Unless the man was under the age of 21 years the supervision was assumed by the adult probation office. Marriages were not encouraged except in unusual cases. When the man was held to answer to the superior court, a volunteer worker went with the girl to that court. The final trial was by jury unless the man pleaded guilty. Hearings in the juvenile court were public unless in a special case the judge ordered the doors closed. At the juvenile-court hearing the girl was accompanied by the probation officer in charge of the girls' department. If the man was found to be under 21 years of age the case was dismissed and a petition filed in the juvenile court. Girl witnesses were usually cared for in the juvenile-court detention home until after the preliminary hearing and were then, with the consent of the district attorney, released under supervision, their cases being continued or probation being ordered.

Collections of the payments ordered in failure-to-provide cases and in those contributing cases in which money payments were arranged were made by the collector on the staff of the San Francisco court, who also acted as complaining witness in the former class of cases when the wife refused to make the complaint. Failure-to-provide cases were usually continued after the preliminary hearing, pending the payments of the required amounts.

The Buffalo and New Orleans courts had jurisdiction over adults committing offenses against or involving children, contributing to the delinquency of children, or violating the child-labor laws. The New Orleans court also had jurisdiction over cases of nonsupport and desertion of children. In Buffalo hearings in the adult part of

the court were held every morning, and more than a fifth of all the children's court cases concerned adults. One probation officer in Buffalo gave full time to adult work. Hearings in adult cases were usually public, but the judge sometimes cleared the court room and often conducted part of the hearing in his private office. Adult hearings in New Orleans were held two days a week and special hearings, at other times. At least half the time of the judge was devoted to work with adults, and about one-third of the cases were adult cases. First hearings of nonsupport cases and hearings of cases involving immorality were held in New Orleans in the judge's private office; in nonsupport cases the judge made special efforts to reconcile the parents.

The District of Columbia juvenile court had, at the time of the study, jurisdiction over nonsupport and desertion,²⁶ contributing to delinquency or neglect, determination of the paternity of children born out of wedlock, and violations of the child labor law. Adult hearings were held twice a week, and the probation officers gave a small amount of time to adult cases.²⁷ In the year ended June 30, 1920, 605 nonsupport cases were filed, 92 illegitimacy cases, 36 cases of violation of the child labor law, 4 cases of contempt of court, and 1 case of contributing to delinquency. The total number of children's cases, including delinquency and dependency, was 2,000.²⁸ An assistant corporation counsel was detailed to the juvenile court and assisted in dependency and adult cases. He conducted preliminary examinations in adult cases and whenever possible adjusted cases without court action. Because of the importance of establishing paternity illegitimacy cases were not settled out of court if there was sufficient evidence to warrant court action. Nonsupport cases were often continued by the assistant corporation counsel, subject to call, on condition that payments for support be made through the precinct station in the precinct of the defendant's residence. Hearings were public and were usually without jury. Defendants pleading guilty or found guilty were almost always placed on probation under suspended sentence. At the time the 1920 report of the court was compiled 324 persons were paying through the court.

The jurisdiction of the Denver court covered cases of contributing to delinquency or dependency; child labor law violations; nonsupport; and controversies concerning the custody of children in divorce and other cases, these cases being brought before the juvenile court as dependency cases. From 1907 to 1915 the court had jurisdiction over cases of offenses against children. The court lost this jurisdiction, so far as it related to statutory offenses, by a supreme-court decision but regained it by a law passed in 1923.²⁹ When the study was made the judge was devoting about half of his time to adult cases. One probation officer gave a considerable amount of time to adult work, and the major part of the time of the special police officer assigned to the juvenile court was devoted to cases of this type. In the year ended July 1, 1920, about 22 per cent of the cases filed were adult cases.

²⁶ In April, 1922, the provision under which the juvenile court exercised jurisdiction in nonsupport cases was held to be unconstitutional. See p. 14.

²⁷ A probation officer now gives full time to adult cases, supervising about 210 men who are paying for the support of children born out of wedlock.

²⁸ Not including cases dealt with unofficially.

²⁹ See p. 14.

Adult hearings in Denver were in the judge's office, except that nonsupport trials were by jury when the defendant pleaded not guilty. Cases of contributing to delinquency or dependency might be dealt with under either chancery or criminal procedure.³⁰ Alleged fathers of children born out of wedlock were often dealt with under the contributing-to-dependency law, and paternity was determined as part of that proceeding. The district attorney had charge of the prosecution of criminal complaints of contributing to delinquency or dependency.

COOPERATION OF JUVENILE COURT WITH OTHER COURTS.

Some of the courts had worked out special plans of cooperation with other courts hearing cases involving children, either for the purpose of securing in a larger proportion of cases action against adults responsible for the delinquency of children or of protecting child witnesses in criminal courts. In Denver, for instance, the special police officer assigned to the juvenile court worked up the evidence in cases which were taken into the criminal court, submitted memoranda to the district attorney, and was present at the trials. The judges of some of the courts sometimes directed that prosecutions of adults be initiated, and in St. Louis the probation officers took steps to have prosecutions begun when such action was deemed to be desirable. In Minneapolis the chief probation officer filed complaints in other courts and appeared as a witness, and the other probation officers also made complaints and gave evidence. Some of the judges and probation officers expressed great discouragement because of the difficulty of securing convictions in cases of adults responsible for the delinquency of girls.

In several of the courts a woman probation officer or a woman volunteer was with the girls during their interviews with prosecuting officers and during their testimony in criminal cases. For instance, in Los Angeles women probation officers accompanied the girls when they went before the grand jury, the superior court, or Federal courts.

³⁰ See p. 13.

THE COURT AND THE COMMUNITY.

Of the community agencies concerned with child welfare the juvenile court has a unique opportunity for perceiving conditions and influences favorable and unfavorable to children and informing the public with reference to them. In dealing with individuals and with community problems the court must combine the functions of diagnostician and general practitioner. It does not specialize in improving civic conditions, the prevention or relief of poverty, the conservation of home life, the promotion of health, mental hygiene, education, recreation, child placing, or institutional care; yet the court is daily brought into close contact with the social forces of the community which determine both the extent of its problems and the constructive work which it can accomplish. In correcting maladjustments in home or school and in diverting from antisocial into social channels the energies of the young people for whom it assumes responsibility the juvenile court is largely dependent upon the outside resources which it can call to its aid.

The court in the large city where there are available social agencies equipped for child protection and constructive work with families has a task far different from that of the court in the community where there is no organized social action for child protection. Yet some courts of the former class fail to see the possibilities of cooperation with existing agencies. These courts attempt to assume the whole responsibility for protective and constructive work, as well as the duties of studying the cases that come before them, discovering the treatment best adapted to the needs of each child, and providing probationary supervision. The court should recognize its place in the child-welfare program of the community, utilize the agencies available, and let itself be understood and used by them. The real danger in the court's assumption of too wide a range of preventive and constructive activities lies in the almost inevitable neglect of its own immediate field of work.

Perhaps the most concrete evidence of relationship between juvenile delinquency and social conditions is to be found in the large percentage of children who come from broken homes, or homes from which some element of parental guidance is lacking. An analysis of all the delinquency cases coming before seven courts in a year—involving 10,845 children—showed that 40 per cent came from homes in which death, desertion, divorce, or separation of the parents had disrupted the family.³¹ (See chart, p. 236.) Analysis of the home conditions in the 60 per cent in which both parents were living in the home would undoubtedly show, as analysis on a smaller scale has done, that in a large proportion of these cases the waywardness of the children was directly traceable to absence of the mother from the home because of outside employment or to abnormal conditions in the home.

It is the community's responsibility to provide the resources that are essential to the safeguarding and healthful development of children. This includes clean civic conditions, proper housing, ade-

³¹ Combining data from the juvenile courts in Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and Philadelphia.

quate policing, good school facilities adapted to both normal and sub-normal children, and industrial or other training that will provide an incentive for continuing in school. Means must be provided for supplementing family resources and preventing family breakdown. Recreational facilities should be available to provide wholesome activities as an outlet for youthful energies.

The juvenile court, dependent upon public funds, can do only the grade of work that the public permits. Inadequate appropriations; restrictions of size of staff and of salaries that may be paid; failure to provide the necessary resources for detention, for study of the children, and for care through properly equipped agencies and institutions of children who can not be cared for by their own families—these conditions limit the service which the juvenile court can render. Nevertheless, the court can not disclaim responsibility for such community neglect unless it has tried by every means in its power to interest the community in its problems and to awaken the conscience of the public to the necessity for providing adequately for its children.

The chart on page 227 shows some of the most significant relationships of the juvenile court in a city of the size of those included in this study.

From scientific diagnosis and expert treatment the emphasis in both health activities and social work is fast shifting to prevention. If the juvenile court were an isolated social unit without contact with the conserving and constructive forces of the community its workers would soon become discouraged with the daily grist of problems. Only as the juvenile court endeavors to reach back into causes and direct attention to preventive possibilities can its task be regarded as hopeful.

THE SCHOOL AND THE COURT.

Opportunity of the school in the prevention of delinquency.

The school is in a very favorable position for discovering those early signs of adverse home conditions which forewarn of neglect and delinquency and for dealing with conduct disorders when they first appear before they become so serious as to require court action. Realizing this fact, some students of the court have held that the school should take over most if not all of the functions of the probation department.³² For many reasons this proposal seems to be impractical—at least under present conditions.³³

³² For a discussion of this subject in relation to informal work by probation officers see p. 109.

³³ For arguments in favor of the assumption by the school department of some or all of the functions of the juvenile court see:

Baker, Judge Herbert M.: "The court and delinquent child." *American Journal of Sociology*, September, 1920.

Additon, Henrietta S., and Deardorff, Neva R.: "That child." *The Survey*, May 3, 1919.

Should the Schools Take Over the Work of the Children's Courts? *Social Courts and Probation—Annual Report and Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Conference of the National Probation Association*, 1919.

Eliot, Thomas D.: *The Juvenile Court and the Community*. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1914.

———: "The back to the school movement. The unofficial treatment of predelinquent children." *Journal of Delinquency*, Whittier, Calif., Vol. VII, No. 6, November, 1922.

———: "The treatment of misbehaving children by noncourt agencies." *Probation and the Prevention of Delinquency—Proceedings of the National Probation Association*, 1923.


For dissenting opinions see:

Thurston, Henry W.: "Is the juvenile court passing?" *The Survey*, Oct. 22, 1921.

Waite, Judge Edward F.: "The outlook for the juvenile court." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. CV, January, 1923, p. 229

Court officials, however, have often been among the first to realize the importance of correcting conditions tending to cause delinquency before it becomes necessary to bring the child to court and have been the means of stimulating school departments and social agencies to

THE JUVENILE COURT IN RELATION TO SOCIAL FORCES OF THE COMMUNITY



a greater sense of the possibilities in this direction. It has often been difficult for the juvenile court to shift back upon the school department the responsibility which logically belongs to the school. Overburdened teachers and attendance officers have been too ready, in some communities, to demand from an equally overburdened

juvenile-court staff assistance in problems of attendance and discipline that should not require judicial action.

The awakening of the schools to their own responsibility for the development of the child's character as well as his mind and body is a sign of the greatest promise. In some instances this awakening, which has found expression chiefly in the socializing of attendance departments, has come about as a result of the reluctance of the court to be used as a place to which children or their parents could be brought when attendance officers, with little training and few resources of their own, needed backing. In one of the cities included in this study effective arrangements by the attendance department for handling its own difficulties were the direct result of the refusal of the juvenile-court judge to handle any more truancy cases until some reform should have been made in the methods of the attendance department. The work of Judge Baker, the first judge of the Boston juvenile court, in changing methods of dealing with truancy problems is noted in an explanation of the decrease in the number of truancy cases during a 10-year period as follows:³⁴

Judge Baker's comments under this heading [truancy] in his report for the first five years indicate the cause for what practically eliminates truancy from the court docket. Had another written the paragraph on truancy he would surely have given Judge Baker himself much of the credit for the changed attitude toward the handling of truancy as an offense among children. It was perfectly patent to the disinterested observer that the new method inaugurated by Judge Baker for the handling of truants on probation was what aroused the school department to greater activity in the way of suppressing truancy. The school teachers would probably be the first to sanction this statement. The practice before the juvenile court was established was to consider that when a child was brought to court he had had his probationary period and was therefore ripe for commitment. This is clearly indicated by the fact that 99, or 84 per cent, of the 118 children brought before the former court for truancy the year before the establishment of the new court were committed. Judge Baker's method was to give the children a trial on probation in the court—a method which resulted in a very radical reduction in the number of commitments. The efforts of the schools themselves to cure truancy without resort to the court proved so successful that it was decided that there was no longer need for a truant school. Accordingly the parental school was abolished. Now truants must first be sent to a disciplinary day school before they can be complained of in the court for truancy.

As is very often the chronology in the development of social resources, departments of education have frequently left to the last the logical first step in methods of handling attendance and conduct problems. The order has been: Establishment of parental schools or resident schools to which children who are truant or incorrigible may be sent either by the court or, with the consent of their parents, by school authorities; employment of trained attendance officers; and last, employment of visiting teachers or other social workers who become familiar with home conditions and deal with conduct problems.³⁵ In some cities special day schools or classes for difficult


³⁴ Harvey Humphrey Baker—Upbuilder of the Juvenile Court, p. 101.

³⁵ In 1921 a survey of the visiting-teacher movement in the United States showed visiting teachers in at least 28 cities in 15 States in all parts of the country. See *The Visiting Teacher in the United States*; A survey by the National Association of Visiting Teachers and Home and School Visitors, published by the Public Education Association of the City of New York, June, 1921. See also a description of the demonstrations of visiting-teacher work being conducted in a number of communities by the National Committee on Visiting Teachers as part of the Commonwealth Fund's program for the prevention of delinquency, in *The Commonwealth Fund Annual Reports, 1922*, p. 16 (New York, 1923), and 1923, p. 22 (New York, 1924).

children take the place of or supplement parental schools. The employment of deans or vocational advisers in high schools and the utilizing of school nurses in the absence of visiting teachers to make initial contacts and report circumstances requiring special attention are also among the measures employed by school departments for handling their own problems and applying social-service methods at the beginning instead of waiting until the child has become a community liability.

The supplanting of the old-time truant officer, wearing his badge of authority and threatening the intervention of the court, by the

PERCENTAGES OF TRUANCY CASES AMONG DELINQUENCY CASES^a DEALT WITH BY EIGHT JUVENILE COURTS



trained social worker equipped to diagnose conditions responsible for nonattendance and other social difficulties and to utilize the resources of the community in combatting these influences is one of the most hopeful signs of progress in our educational system.³⁶ In an article describing the bureau of attendance and child welfare

^a Including only cases dealt with formally by the court except for Seattle figures, which include both formal and informal cases.

^b New cases during year.

³⁶ For discussion of the schools and exceptional children and the schools and social work, see the following articles in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. XCVIII, November, 1921 (Philadelphia, 1921):

"Public-school provision for exceptional children," by Arnold Gesell, Ph. D., M. D.

"The visiting teacher," by Jane F. Culbert.

"The relation of teacher and social worker," by Anna Beach Pratt.

of the New York City public-school system the qualifications of attendance officers have been described as follows: ³⁷

The new attendance officer * * * must be sympathetic and social minded. He must know the general principles and aims of education and the organization of the school system, of which he is a part; he must be a student of juvenile delinquency, its causes and manifestations; he must study the theories controlling the common modes of dealing with all forms of delinquency; he must know of every social and charitable agency that contributes toward child welfare in his district.

Equipment of school departments for prevention of delinquency.

Work of school-attendance departments.—In all the cities studied there were special departments which included in their field of work school attendance. These departments were in six cities termed the attendance department or division; in three, the department of school attendance and vocational guidance, or of vocational guidance and school attendance, or of vocational education; and in one, the department of compulsory attendance and child welfare. In addition to attendance work, and in four cities in addition to visiting-teacher work, the functions of these departments included the issuing of employment certificates in seven cities and of "poverty excuses" in one, and in one or two cities each the maintenance of a continuing school census, vocational guidance or juvenile placement, the regulation of street trades, the supervision of boys on parole from the parental school, and the responsibility for classes for mothers and for evening schools and part-time schools.

A full-time supervisor of the attendance department was employed in all but one city (San Francisco), in which the chief attendance officer was also the principal of the largest intermediate school.^{37a} He had only three assistants and a stenographer, and this staff was responsible for issuing employment certificates and enforcing the compulsory attendance law in a city of more than 500,000 inhabitants. In New Orleans, which had nearly 400,000 population, one full-time chief attendance officer, two men attendance officers for white children, and one visiting teacher paid by private funds and working with colored children, constituted the staff of a department responsible for the enforcement of school attendance and excusing from school children of needy widowed mothers. In contrast to the situation in these cities was that in St. Louis, which had a population of nearly 800,000. Here the attendance department, which also issued employment certificates and was responsible for the maintenance of a continuing school census, had a staff of 20 persons including attendance officers, officers issuing employment certificates, and 3 persons specializing in problems of neglect and delinquency. In Los Angeles, with a population of almost 600,000, according to the 1920 census, the department of compulsory attendance and child welfare, which also issued employment certificates, had besides the director, a staff of 6 women and 10 men attendance officers; in addition, 33 home teachers were employed by the school department. These teachers visited the homes, gave instruction to illiterate mothers, and in various ways promoted understanding and harmony between the home and the school. They reported special difficulties to the attendance department and were said to have assisted greatly in securing improved school attendance.

³⁷ Klapper, Paul: "The bureau of attendance and child welfare of the New York City public-school system." *The Educational Review*, November, 1915, p. 384.

^{37a} San Francisco now (1924) has a full-time supervisor.

Boston, with a population in 1920 of approximately 750,000, had 30 attendance officers (including the chief attendance officer and 4 temporarily employed); Buffalo, with a population of about 500,000, 16; the District of Columbia, with more than 400,000 inhabitants, 9; Denver, with about 250,000 inhabitants, 5. The Boston department issued employment certificates and supervised minors licensed to engage in street trades, but the attendance officers were not required to assist in this work, as they did in Denver.

The Seattle department, in addition to attendance work, issued employment certificates, gave vocational advice and secured employment for children, and was responsible for the supervision of mothers' classes, part-time schools, and evening schools; it also undertook special work for delinquent children, including the supervision of boys on parole from the parental school. The population of the city of Seattle was 315,000. The supervision of the attendance work was the responsibility of a supervisor of attendance, working under the director of the department. He had three men assistants. A woman "home visitor" specialized in the problems of delinquent girls, and such problems also received the personal attention of the woman assistant superintendent of schools. An Americanization worker who visited the homes was helpful in improving the attendance of children of foreign-born parents, and a man and a woman, called respectively, "industrial coordinator" and "commercial coordinator," specialized in vocational guidance and juvenile placement.

In Minneapolis, with a population of 380,000, the attendance work, which was assigned to one branch of the department of school attendance and vocational guidance, was the responsibility of a supervisor of attendance and four attendance officers, who had the assistance of six visiting teachers working in eight grade schools and three visiting teachers working in junior high schools. The visiting teachers were assigned to districts which had the most difficult problems, and their first responsibility was in connection with school attendance. Attendance officers did not go into districts covered by visiting teachers except in court cases or especially difficult cases referred by the visiting teachers. The latter assisted in such activities as Americanization work and the organization of mothers' clubs.

It is interesting to note that in one city all the attendance officers were men, while in some of the cities all were women. The salary paid attendance officers was in one city only \$105 a month. An increase of \$300 in the yearly salary was expected for the following year, and an attempt was being made to secure grade teachers' salaries for attendance officers. In another city the salaries of attendance officers were from \$1,600 to \$2,400 on a 10-month basis, and the director received \$3,600; in this city also the salaries of attendance officers were lower than the salaries of teachers. Fourteen of the 16 officers were college graduates, and it was planned to require both pedagogical and social-service training for members of the attendance department. In contrast to these two cities was Seattle, where the attendance officers received the same salaries as high-school teachers. One of these officers had been a successful probation officer in the juvenile court.

In Seattle and Minneapolis "vocational advisers" or "boys' and girls' advisers" were assigned to the senior high schools—in the former city a boys' adviser and a girls' adviser in each high school, and in the latter a vocational adviser in each high school. These advisers

were of service in discovering and helping to remedy unfavorable conditions in home or school, though they gave less of their time than did visiting teachers to work with families.

In several cities special mention was made by the chief attendance officer of the cooperation of school nurses in reporting difficulties and helping to adjust problems. In Seattle one nurse was employed for every 1,500 pupils, and in Minneapolis almost every school had a nurse. Psychological clinics in the school departments were also of great assistance to the attendance department, especially in Seattle, where practically all children coming to the attention of that department were examined by the child-study laboratory of the public schools.

Special day schools and special classes.—Classes for truant, unmanageable, or incorrigible children were in operation in Boston, the District of Columbia, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and St. Louis. Seattle, also, had during the year prior to the study a "prevocational" class for 18 unmanageable boys and was planning an "opportunity school" for difficult children. It was believed by the head of the Seattle attendance department that half the commitments to the parental schools could be avoided if such a day school were established. In Denver the school-attendance department had the privilege of transferring children to the detention-home school, where they were day pupils. Special classes for backward and subnormal children, as well as those for truant and unmanageable children, were of help to the attendance departments in adjusting school life to the needs of individual children. The former were more common than were classes for children presenting conduct problems.

The Boston disciplinary day school was organized in 1914. At the time of the study this school, located in a public school building in Roxbury, comprised three classes, one covering fourth and fifth grade subjects, one sixth-grade subjects, and one seventh and eighth grade subjects. In each class were 14 or 15 pupils. To these classes children came from all over the city, their car fare being paid by the school department. As far as possible the work was adapted to the individual needs of the children, and the teachers endeavored to present the subjects in an especially interesting way. "Habitual school offenders" were transferred to the disciplinary classes by the chief attendance officer on the authority of an assistant superintendent of schools. The children remained in the classes for varying periods, but an effort was made to return them to their regular classes as soon as possible. The teachers encouraged the parents of the children to come to the school.

Ungraded classes in the District of Columbia cared for truant children and children who presented serious conduct problems.³⁸ There were six ungraded classes for white children in four localities and five for colored children—four for boys and one for girls. No separate class for white girls had been established. The maximum number of children in a class was 25. Transfers to ungraded classes were recommended by attendance officers and authorized by the "supervisor of special activities." The classes were divided into the first four and the upper four grades. Special time was devoted to

³⁸ The classes for subnormal children were called "atypical."

manual training and handwork. The average length of stay in ungraded classes was said to be one and a half semesters. The teachers received the same salaries as other teachers and were appointed as a result of special examinations.

In St. Louis there were three special classes for truant and unmanageable boys—two classes caring together for 36 white boys and one class caring for 16 colored boys. The teachers of two of the classes were men. Manual training had a prominent part in the curriculum. The Opportunity School in Minneapolis cared for 100 incorrigible and retarded boys in the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. The Ethan Allan School in San Francisco was organized in 1904 to provide for difficult boys on a day-school basis. Children were transferred to this school by school principals, with the approval of the deputy superintendent of schools, who was said to allow transfers only as a last resort. The attendance department was usually asked to ascertain the facts before the transfer was approved. From 100 to 125 boys were cared for in the school, in which the classes were small and in which special attention was paid to industrial work and gardening.

Los Angeles was one of the pioneer cities in the establishment of special day schools for truant, semidelinquent, incorrigible, and run-away children, the first such school in that city having been organized in 1906. There were nine of these special day schools and four others maintained in connection with Juvenile Hall, El Retiro, and a private institution receiving boys from the court. All of the schools except those in connection with institutions were for boys only, but girls with delinquent tendencies were sometimes placed in a prevocational room for girls only, maintained by one of the intermediate schools. Ten of the 13 principals of special schools were college graduates. They were paid \$51 a month in addition to their regular salaries on condition that they spend time after 3 o'clock in the afternoon visiting homes. They were expected to visit the homes of all children under their supervision.

Local institutions.—Parental schools under the management of the school department were found in only one of the cities studied—Seattle. In Minneapolis and St. Louis county schools for delinquent children served practically the same purpose as the Seattle parental schools, and the educational work of these schools was also directed by the departments of education. In all three cities children could be received by the institutions only through court commitment. About 75 per cent of the cases in which children were committed to the Seattle Parental School originated with the school department. Parole work for the boys' school was done by the attendance department and for the girls' school by the superintendent of the school. The length of stay was determined by the school department. The superintendents of the parental schools had the sole power to appoint the teachers, who were selected from the city school-teachers.³⁹

In Buffalo and Boston parental schools formerly in existence had been abolished. The Boston Parental School was abolished in 1914,⁴⁰ and the Suffolk County Training School for Delinquent Boys, which

³⁹ For a brief description of the Seattle parental schools see pp. 145, 146.

⁴⁰ See p. 146.

also served Boston, was closed in 1920. A few boys were later committed from Suffolk County to the training school of an adjoining county.⁴¹

The Buffalo Parental School was closed by the health department in 1919. Children had been transferred to this school with the written consent of the parents, without having been brought before the juvenile court. At the time of the study children were being transferred in the same way to three private institutions. The children remained for not more than two years. During about 11 months ended in January, 1920, 6 boys were transferred from the Buffalo public schools to one of these institutions, and during 5 months ended in March, 1920, 23 were transferred to another institution. Their board, clothing, and the like were paid for out of school funds. When the children were released from the institutions they were placed on parole to the school-attendance department.

Methods of dealing with problem children.

As would be expected from the great variation in the size of the staff of the attendance departments, the amount of intensive work which attendance officers or visiting teachers could do in special cases of maladjustment or misconduct varied greatly. The St. Louis department was the only one which had assigned special officers to cases of this type. There, special work with delinquent children other than truants began in an incidental way in 1905 and in 1911 was further developed. In 1914 it became more fully specialized, and at the time of the study a man gave full time to delinquent boys, a woman to delinquent girls, and another woman to neglect cases. To these officers cases were referred by teachers and attendance officers. It was understood that the latter were not to question the children with regard to delinquency but were to refer immediately to the special officers cases in which there were evidences of serious misconduct. When it was necessary to bring cases to the attention of the juvenile court a petition or an information was made out by officers of the school-attendance division, and facts concerning the case were furnished on the history blank shown on page —.

The chief attendance officer in St. Louis stated that he did not believe the school department should undertake to handle delinquency problems not directly connected with the schools. The types of delinquency he thought should be handled by the school department included nonattendance and incorrigibility; vicious or immoral conduct which made the child a school problem; destruction of school property; any delinquent act committed on school premises or while the child was under the jurisdiction of school authorities; illegal employment; interference with the school department in the discharge of its duties; and adults contributing to the delinquency of school children. The attendance department endeavored to deal with these types of cases, with the cooperation of the police when necessary, bringing the children or adults before the proper court if the cases could not be settled satisfactorily in some other way. During the summer the attendance department continued in operation, the officers alternating in three weeks' vacation periods. Cases on which

⁴¹ This arrangement was permitted by special act of the legislature, passed after the closing of the Suffolk County school.

work had begun prior to the vacation season were continued, but work on new cases was not usually undertaken.

The attendance department in St. Louis did not discourage school principals from dealing with delinquency problems. The chief attendance officer felt that they must be able to exercise discretion in dealing with problems of school administration and that it was often necessary for principals to refer cases direct to the police or the court in order to secure prompt action.

In Los Angeles, where a number of "home teachers" were employed and the cooperation between these officers and the attendance department was very close, all cases of difficulty were reported to the attendance department, but usually a visit to the home had first been made by a home teacher. A conference was then held at which the child's teacher, the home teacher, and the attendance officer were present. If all three agreed that the child should be transferred to a special school, this action was taken without consulting the director of the attendance department. If agreement was not reached, the case was referred to the director. About 30 per cent of the cases were reported to have been so referred. The work of the attendance department which concerned girls was under the direction of a supervisor of girls' interests. All cases of delinquency among schoolgirls coming to the attention of the teachers were referred to this supervisor.

When the size of the staff permitted, attendance officers in the cities under consideration made regular, frequent visits to the schools, checked up attendance, and dealt with any special problems that were reported. In Boston each attendance officer had three or four school districts and consulted the principals of the districts every day and the principals of the schools at least once a week. High-school cases were assigned to the district in which the child resided. The regulations of the public schools of the city of Boston defined in detail the procedure to be followed by attendance officers in securing school attendance.⁴²

They shall endeavor, by persuasion and argument, both with children and their parents and guardians, and by other means than legal compulsion, to secure the observance of the school-attendance laws, visiting children at their homes or places of employment and looking after them in the streets for this purpose. Failing by such means to secure the required school attendance of any child, or if any child shall be deemed an habitual school offender, the officer concerned shall file with the chief attendance officer a written statement giving the name, age, and residence of the child, the names of the parents or guardians of such child, the name of the school attended, and the name of the teacher, together with a brief history of the case. Thereupon, the chief attendance officer shall report the same to the assistant superintendent in charge of the attendance department who shall consider the advisability of placing such child in a disciplinary school, and may, if such action be deemed advisable, authorize the chief attendance officer to make such transfer.

The Boston regulations further provided for the institution of legal proceedings by the chief attendance officer, on authority of an assistant superintendent of schools, in the case of any child violating the rules and regulations of a disciplinary school. If the principal and the assistant superintendent in charge of a school should decide that it would be inadvisable to place an habitual school offender in

⁴² Rules of the School Committee and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Boston. Boston Public Schools, Regulations, Ch. XIX, sec. 365—2, p. 153. School Document No. 5—1919. Boston, 1919.


the disciplinary school, the chief attendance officer might be authorized to begin legal proceedings.

Attendance officers in Seattle visited the schools regularly and dealt with cases of stealing and immorality as well as of attendance and school conduct. The policy of the Seattle department was to place upon the principals as much responsibility as possible.

DELINQUENT CHILDREN

Parental homes of 10,845 children dealt with during one year by 7 city juvenile courts*.

40% of the children were from broken homes.



* JUVENILE COURTS IN:-
 Chicago
 Cleveland
 Denver
 Kansas City, Mo.
 Los Angeles
 Minneapolis
 Philadelphia

April - 1921

Attendance officers usually had police powers and served notices and citations. In some of the cities they dealt with problems of children working on permits as well as those of school children.

Close cooperation was maintained between the school-attendance departments and the juvenile courts. In Minneapolis the juvenile court sent each week to the attendance department a list of all the children dealt with by the court. Reports were also made of all children sent to or released from institutions.

Conferences with the children and their parents amounted in some cities to informal hearings. In Buffalo from two to five such hearings were held each day in the different school buildings by the chief attendance officer. The presence of the mother or the father and of the attendance officer was required, and often the teacher also was asked to be present. It will be remembered that the Buffalo school department had the power to send children to institutions if the consent of the parents was obtained. In other cities conferences or informal hearings were held to decide such questions as whether the child should be transferred to a special class.

The chief attendance officer in San Francisco had hearings every Friday afternoon in the offices of the juvenile court. Citations requiring the parents to bring the children to the probation office were signed by the chief probation officer and served by the attendance officers. In New Orleans informal hearings in school cases were held by the judge of the juvenile court, the chief attendance officer being present. All truancy cases in the District of Columbia were first heard unofficially by the chief probation officer, the attendance officer being present. Cases were made official only if the child was subsequently brought to the attention of the court.^{42a}

The Seattle attendance department had hearings at which the parents and the children were present, and usually a number of interviews with the parents preceded court action. In each case coming to the attention of the attendance department inquiry was made of the child-study laboratory of the public schools, and if the child had not been examined he was taken to the laboratory. If he was found to have an intelligence quotient below 80 or to be supernormal he was placed for at least two days in the observation class maintained in connection with the laboratory. Not more than eight children were in this class, and their special abilities and disabilities were carefully studied. Reports on home conditions were made by the school nurses, and the parents were interviewed at the laboratory. Case conferences were held, and special school programs were recommended.

In some cities—Denver, for instance—the school attendance of children on probation to the juvenile court was supervised entirely by probation officers and not by attendance officers. In New Orleans school children placed on probation were supervised only by the attendance department. The Los Angeles school department followed up the attendance of wards of the court; and the Seattle department, in addition to assuming the entire responsibility for the supervision of a few children placed on probation, did all the parole work for the boys' parental school. Such boys remained under supervision for a year, and the attendance department had the right to return them to the school without referring them to the court.

The Minneapolis attendance department had worked out an interesting method of filing and classifying cases. Children for whom special work was required to secure attendance were classified as special cases. Special history sheets were made out, and the

^{42a} In the case of *Brown v. Sellers*, Oct. 15, 1923, the United States Supreme Court denied the juvenile court of the District of Columbia jurisdiction in truancy cases. Attendance officers have since that time prosecuted parents in the police court for failure to send the children to school. All children on probation for truancy at the time of the decision were dismissed, with the exception of those who were under suspended sentence on other charges.

records were filed by families. Usually a child was not classified as a special case until the attendance department had had two or three contacts with him. Of 7,205 pupils reported as absentees during one year, 633 were special cases. Any social problem other than attendance affecting the child was referred immediately to other agencies.

The purpose and methods of special schools for truant and troublesome children in Los Angeles are outlined in detail in a report of the department of compulsory education and child welfare, published in 1918.⁴³ This report also contains studies of the causes of truancy among boys and among girls. "Special schools" are defined in this report as follows:⁴⁴

The name "special schools" is a Los Angeles term for day parental schools^s provided for under the requirements of the California statute known as "An act to enforce the educational rights of children. * * *

"* * * Like ungraded rooms, they deal with pupils in small numbers, without particular attention to grade classification, and aim to give to each pupil the maximum amount of individual attention. They differ from ungraded rooms in that they emphasize not mental progress chiefly but rather social and moral fitness.

The purpose of the special school is stated in this report⁴⁵ to be, first, to aid in saving the boy to himself and society, and, secondly, to relieve the stress on the regular school. "It does not necessarily aim to fit the boy for returning to the regular school, for the boy may be of such a type as to render the return inadvisable." The classes are limited to 12 or at the most 15 pupils per teacher, who must possess "unusual ability to interest these boys to make up lost time and also to seek to find and strengthen their best impulses. The efforts must be solely on a scientific basis, as the transformation in the pupil is a social one in which the boy has found a friend and helper who devotes himself constantly and, in a sense, exclusively to his great need." Any boy excluded for any reason from the regular grades is admitted unless a more suitable place is available.

Statistics for the 187 pupils in Los Angeles special schools on April 1, 1917, showed 169 there for the first time, 13 for the second time, and 5 for the third time. Pupils who had been in the special schools less than 7 months numbered 134; those who had been enrolled from 7 to 11 months, 16; those enrolled for 12 to 23 months, 17; and those enrolled 24 months and over, 20. Of the 127 pupils who had been enrolled in special schools and who had left between September 11, 1916, and April 1, 1917, 50 had been returned to regular schools, 29 had gone to work, 19 had left the city, 17 were in institutions, 5 were in private schools, 4 were in the detention home, 2 were in the Navy, and 1 had died.⁴⁶

Among the results of special-class work for truants and other troublesome children which are mentioned in the report is the almost perfect attendance over a period of 11 years of children in the special classes, the average percentage of attendance for the entire time being more than 98.

⁴³ Compulsory Education and Child Welfare. Los Angeles City Schools Publication No. 12. Los Angeles, February, 1918.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

The reports for the past 11 years show very clearly the improvement in our method of dealing with truancy. Before the special schools were opened all persistent truants were arrested and taken before the juvenile court. This was a very expensive and unsatisfactory way of dealing with the problem. Nearly all of these truants are now taken care of by the school department at no expense beyond the cost of their education in a public school. The special schools have demonstrated that nearly all truants can be kept in school by means at the command of the educational department.⁴⁷

Cases dealt with by school-attendance departments and cases referred to the courts.

Statistics with reference to the numbers and types of cases handled by school-attendance departments and the dispositions made in these cases were not available for all the cities studied, and it was usually not possible to ascertain the number of different children dealt with during a year, statistics being compiled on the basis of "cases," so that a child was counted each time he was dealt with. Differences in procedure make it difficult to compare one city with another. Children who in one city would be brought to court on truancy charges, in another city might be charged with being stubborn or ungovernable or if home conditions were the cause of the truancy might be classified as neglected.

The Minneapolis statistics⁴⁸ were quite complete. In 1919-20 a total of 9,650 cases were reported to the school-attendance department for investigation, of which 4,803 were new cases and 4,847 were old. The number of cases received for investigation in 1915-16 was only 5,051, and the increase from year to year was gradual. Of the total number of cases dealt with in the later year 7,698 were received from public schools, 1,198 from private or parochial schools, 64 through the school census, and the remainder from various other sources. In 5,102 cases the absence was found to be lawful and in 4,548, unlawful. The reasons for the unlawful absences were as follows:

Total unlawful absences_	4, 548	Poverty_	184
Absent on transfer_	548	Illegal employment_	129
Truant_	1, 477	Trouble in school_	43
Indifference of parents_	2, 089	Runaway_	57
		Other_	21

A total of 8,648 children returned to school, and the names of 1,002 were dropped from the register for various reasons. Cases referred to other agencies—such as the protective society, the associated charities, the health department, and the labor department—numbered 166, and 134 warning notices were served. Service of these notices was required before the juvenile court would issue summons.

The total number of "special cases," or cases requiring intensive work, in Minneapolis was 583—361 cases of boys and 222 cases of girls. In 63 of these cases the child attended school until the age of 16 years or completion of the eighth grade, without court action being necessary and in 362 cases, until the close of the year, no court action being required. Nineteen children were granted school excuses, 48 left the city, 3 were not located, and 6 did not return to school. A total of 82 children—64 boys and 18 girls—were taken to

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁴⁸ From unpublished statistics of the Minneapolis School Department and from correspondence.

court during the school year 1919-20. The number of such cases in 1915-16 was 80, and in 1918-19, 75. Forty-nine of the children referred to the court in 1919-20 were committed to institutions. The report of the juvenile court for 1919 showed 90 children referred by the school authorities, or 10 per cent of the new cases of delinquency dealt with by the juvenile court, and the same number dealt with on truancy charges.

Statistics for the Seattle Department of Vocational Education, which was organized in September, 1919, were available for the first four months of the school year, 1920-21. During this period the total number of cases investigated was 1,430. Truancy was given as the cause in 367 cases, "indiscretion" in 17, poverty and neglect in 41, nonenrollment in 217, morals in 73, cigarette smoking in 30, insubordination in 54, theft in 68, home conditions in 14. Other causes included tardiness, transfer, and violations of the child labor law. In 1,266 of these cases, or 89 per cent, agreement was reached at home, at school, at the office, or in other ways. Reference to the juvenile court was made in 116 cases and to other agencies in 37 cases. A total of 1,112 home visits were made, and 1,046 interviews at schools were reported.

Juvenile-court statistics for Seattle, as given in annual reports of the juvenile court, show 47 children brought to the court on truancy charges in 1915, 33 in 1916, 73 in 1917, 93 in 1918, 49 in 1919—the year of the reorganization of the attendance department—54 in 1920, 71 in 1921, 78 in 1922, and 88 in 1923. The percentages of conduct cases dealt with formally or informally by the juvenile court which were referred on account of truancy were as follows:

	Per cent.
1915.....	6.6
1916.....	5.3
1917.....	13.2
1918.....	21.1
1919.....	7.9
1920.....	5.5
1921.....	7.1
1922.....	6.9
1923.....	7.4

The Seattle parental-school commitments for the years 1915 to 1923 were as follows:

Year.	Boys.	Girls.
1915.....	92	30
1916.....	97	38
1917.....	103	28
1918.....	122	32
1919.....	90	23
1920.....	93	28
1921.....	71	43
1922.....	104	42
1923.....	89	32

In Boston the total number of cases investigated by the attendance department for the year ended June 24, 1920, was 54,877. Children who failed in the disciplinary day school were referred to the juvenile session of the court serving the district in which the classes were located. Only 26 such pupils were referred during the year, 12 being committed to institutions. Prior to the establishment of the day

school truancy cases from the central district came to the Boston juvenile court. The numbers of truants dealt with by the court from 1906 to 1914 were as follows: 1906-7, 95; 1907-8, 64; 1908-9, 51; 1909-10, 38; 1910-11, 19; 1911-12, 11; 1912-13, 13; 1913-14, 27.⁴⁹ In commenting on the decrease in the number of truancy cases during the first five-year period, Judge Baker said:⁵⁰

While this decrease is due chiefly to increased efficiency of the school department, it is partly due to the close cooperation between the court and the schools. By this cooperation poor school attendance on the part of children brought to court on account of other forms of delinquency is promptly discovered by the court and made an important factor in probationary oversight, so that frequent school reports are obtained during probation, and probation is not terminated until the reports show that the weakness in attendance is cured.

The decrease is also partly due to the fact that the court has time to consider carefully all applications for leave to complain, and in cases which, though appearing at first to be cases of truancy on the part of a single child, seem on further inquiry to be cases of the neglect of a whole family of children on the part of parents, the court sets in motion the proper agencies to have the whole family cared for under the neglect law.

The chief attendance officer in Boston was the chief justice of the newsboys' trial board, which dealt with all violations of the public-school regulations governing minors licensed to engage in street trades, the other three justices being newsboys. In the year ended June 30, 1920, 5 of the 433 cases heard by this board concerned truancy and 5, poor conduct and attendance at school. Three of the 433 cases were referred to the juvenile court and 5 to the municipal court.⁵¹ Of 428 cases of violations of license regulations dealt with by this board from September 16, 1920, to April 28, 1921, only 17 were brought to the juvenile court.⁵²

The St. Louis attendance division dealt with 79,569 cases reported for investigation in the school year 1920-21, of which 42,483 were found to be cases of absence due to lawful excuses and 37,086, of absence due to unlawful excuses. The former number included all children receiving employment certificates, which were issued by the attendance division. Truancy cases numbered 2,799; cases of nonattendance with unlawful excuse, 3,372; and cases of "juvenile offenders," 921. A total of 134 children were referred to the juvenile court, and 30 children were taken to the detention home.⁵³ In the year 1918-19 a total of 65,225 cases were investigated, 143 children were referred to the juvenile court, and 22 were taken to the detention home.⁵⁴

The St. Louis school reports included tables for truancy cases showing age, grade, and conditions contributing to truancy. In 44 per cent of 731 truancy cases dealt with in 1920-21, one or both parents were dead or the parents were separated or divorced.⁵⁵ One hundred and nineteen cases of juvenile delinquency dealt with by the division were analyzed, 66 per cent being cases in which the homes were broken.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ Harvey Humphrey Baker—Upbuilder of the Juvenile Court, pp. 22, 100.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁵¹ Annual Report of the Superintendent, Boston Public Schools, pp. 81-82. School Document No. 13-1920. Boston, 1920.

⁵² Information furnished by the chief attendance officer.

⁵³ Statistical Report of the St. Louis Public Schools: Advance Print from the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Instruction, 1920-21, p. 103. Board of Education, St. Louis, October, 1921.

⁵⁴ Annual Report of the Superintendent of Instruction, 1918-19, p. 96. Board of Education, St. Louis.

⁵⁵ Statistical Report of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1920-21, p. 105.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

The numbers of cases of delinquent and of neglected children referred to the St. Louis juvenile court by attendance officers during the period 1909-1920 were as follows: ⁵⁷

Year.	Delinquent.	Neglected. ⁵⁸
1909.....	254	99
1910.....	219	70
1911.....	178	153
1912.....	65	72
1913.....	47	28
1914.....	76	51
1915.....	19	44
1916.....	14	25
1917.....	32	20
1918.....	22	18
1919.....	16	13
1920.....	20	14

In the review of the work of the St. Louis juvenile court for the five-year period 1908-1913 special attention was called to the steadily decreasing number of children brought to court by attendance officers. This decrease was attributed to the fact that "the school authorities look upon truancy as essentially a school problem to be handled within the school system itself."

The New Orleans attendance department reported that for the year 1918-19 there was a total of 3,160 complaints, of which 802 were of nonattendance, 2,266 of irregular attendance, and 92 of tardiness. Of the total, 2,072 related to boys and 1,088 to girls. The causes were listed as illness in 508 cases, parental indifference in 784, truancy in 73, poverty in 73, and other causes in 1,722. A total of 149 cases were referred to the juvenile court. The judge placed 43 children on probation and in 106 cases "admonished" the parents and children.

Truancy cases referred to the New Orleans juvenile court were handled informally by the judge, summonses being issued.⁵⁹ Reports of the court showed 445 such cases in 1916, 567 in 1917, 240 in 1918, and 300 in 1919.

Buffalo school figures for 1915-16 showed 32,077 cases reported to truant officers. Eighty-five children were committed to the parental school with the consent of their parents, 33 were placed in "probation classes," 97 cases were referred to the adult department of the children's court, and 30 to the juvenile department.⁶⁰ The annual reports of the Buffalo children's court showed 26 children charged with truancy in 1916, 37 in 1917, 37 in 1918, 28 in 1919, and 15 in 1920.⁶¹ For the same period the numbers of adults arraigned in the adult department of the court for violations of the compulsory education law were as follows: 1916, 110; 1917, 119; 1918, 136; 1919, 125; 1920, 120.

In Denver in the year 1919-20, according to records of the attendance department,⁶² 19 children were referred to the juvenile court

⁵⁷ A Review of the Work of the St. Louis Juvenile Court for the Five-Year Period, Apr. 30, 1908-Apr. 30, 1913, pp. 5, 6 (St. Louis, 1914). Report of the Juvenile Court and Probation Office for the years 1914 and 1915, pp. 13, 14 (St. Louis, 1917). Report of the Juvenile Court and Probation Office for the years 1916 to 1920, inclusive, p. 38 (St. Louis, 1921).

⁵⁸ Frequently more than one child was involved in a "case."

⁵⁹ Affidavits were used in all official cases.

⁶⁰ Annual Report of the Superintendent of Education, Buffalo, 1917, pp. 141-148.

⁶¹ In 1923 only 2 children were in court for truancy from school; 91 adults were arraigned for violations of the compulsory education law.

⁶² Information obtained by representatives of the Children's Bureau.

by the attendance department, and 433 school children were referred to the court by other agencies. Two children were placed in the detention-home school by the attendance department and 8 in the detention home.

The 1917 report of the Los Angeles department of compulsory education and child welfare showed an increase in the number of pupils in city schools from 37,877 in 1905-6 to 110,672 in 1916-17. The number of cases taken to the juvenile court by the school authorities was 56 in 1905-6, the year the department was organized, and dropped to 30 the next year and to 1 the year following. Thereafter the number never exceeded 8 except in 1915-16, when 10 boys belonging to one gang were referred to the court, raising the total so referred to 16.⁶³ The juvenile-court jurisdiction included territory outside the city of Los Angeles, and the number of truancy cases reported by the court was, therefore, larger than the number reported by the attendance department. Juvenile-court statistics for 1916 showed 24 cases of habitual truancy; for 1917, 22; for 1918, 34; and for 1919, 36.⁶⁴ The number of cases referred by school departments was 21 in 1916, 11 in 1917, 22 in 1918, and 21 in 1919.⁶⁵

The boys' department of the San Francisco court dealt with 26 truancy cases in 1916; in 1917 the number of truancy cases was 19; in 1918, 19; and in the year ended June 30, 1920, 31. The girls' department of this court handled 1 truancy case in 1917, 3 in 1918, and 4 in 1919-20.⁶⁶

Comparison of the percentages of delinquency cases referred on truancy charges to the eight courts for which such information was available is graphically shown on page 229. Three courts—Buffalo, the District of Columbia, and St. Louis—had less than 3 per cent of their cases referred on truancy charges; two other courts—Los Angeles and San Francisco—had less than 5 per cent; and three courts—Denver, Minneapolis, and Seattle—had 7 per cent or more of their cases so referred. In Denver, Seattle, and the District of Columbia a large number of cases were dealt with informally, and such cases are included in the Seattle and District of Columbia figures, but not in those for Denver. The practice in the District of Columbia was to make no formal charge of truancy until after an informal hearing and warning by the chief probation officer in the presence of the child's parents and the attendance officer. Sixty-nine truant children were reported to the court and heard unofficially in 1919-20; 30 of these upon again being truant were brought formally to the attention of the court.⁶⁷

Development of school facilities for prevention of delinquency.

The foregoing brief and incomplete review of the equipment of the school departments of 10 cities for dealing with problems of delinquency and neglect and of the types of problems dealt with shows something of the progress being made in the development of facilities and methods. In many of the cities the number of attendance officers and the provision of special classes for difficult children was so inade-

⁶³ Compulsory Education and Child Welfare. Los Angeles City Schools Publication No. 12, p. 35.

⁶⁴ Annual Report Los Angeles County Probation Department for the Year Ending Dec. 31, 1919, p. 9.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶⁶ Data secured from annual reports, published and unpublished.

⁶⁷ Manuscript report of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, 1918-1920.

quate as to make it impossible to do intensive work with all the children in need of attention.

Among the conditions which would make it possible for educational systems to do more effective work in the prevention of delinquency the following have been indicated in the course of this study:

1. A sufficient number of attendance officers and visiting teachers, having an understanding of pedagogical problems and training in social case work.
2. Special day schools or classes sufficient to provide for all children needing such individual attention, in charge of specially trained teachers, the classes small enough to make possible intensive individual work.
3. Provision for the medical and psychological study of problem children, leading to recommendations for treatment.
4. A definite understanding with the other agencies of the community with reference to the cases to be handled by the school department alone and the cases to be referred to other agencies.
5. The general introduction into the school organization of flexibility of curriculum and methods that will make it possible to meet the varying needs of the children, and provision for study to determine these needs.
6. Provision of the number of rooms and teachers necessary to eliminate the half-day attendance which has been occasioned by overcrowded conditions and which, in the opinion of some of the judges and probation officers interviewed, has contributed to delinquency by leaving the children too much undirected free time.

RELATION OF THE COURT TO SOCIAL-SERVICE AGENCIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

In describing the methods used in the study of the case, the adjustment of cases without formal court action, the court order, methods of probation, and the administrative work of the court, reference has been made constantly to the relation of the court to the other social agencies of the community. The social-service exchange was consulted in the course of social investigations invariably in three courts and less frequently in five, while another court made inquiry of the social-service exchange whenever a child was placed on probation or under supervision.⁶⁸ The practice of securing information from social agencies if it was known that they had dealt with the child or his family and of giving information to social agencies having legitimate interest in particular cases was general. Investigations and follow-up in cases of dependency and neglect were left to private agencies by two courts, and a third court relied upon a public agency for investigations in such cases.⁶⁹

The detention service furnished to the Boston juvenile court by the Boston Children's Aid Society under a cooperative arrangement has been described in detail,⁷⁰ as has the relation between that court and another private agency—the Judge Baker Foundation—which made studies of the physical and mental condition of the children.⁷¹ Other courts utilized for mental examinations clinics maintained by

⁶⁸ See p. 92.

⁶⁹ See p. 93.

⁷⁰ See p. 78.

⁷¹ See p. 103.

school departments or universities. Five of the six courts in which the proportion of cases adjusted without the filing of a petition or complaint was considerable sometimes referred cases of this type to other agencies. In the three courts, however, for which detailed information on this point was obtained the number so referred was very small.⁷²

Children were committed by the courts to child-placing agencies and institutions, public and private,⁷³ and such agencies sometimes cooperated by caring for children who remained under the supervision of the court and had not been formally committed. In probation work in certain delinquency cases seven courts used the services of agents of other public departments or of private societies.⁷⁴ Public-relief departments, family-welfare societies, churches, settlements, recreational agencies of various kinds, Big Brother and Big Sister organizations, hospitals, dispensaries, and clinics, were all used by the probation officers of the several courts in the supervision of children on probation. Family-welfare or child-caring agencies cooperated closely with the courts of Minneapolis, Denver, and San Francisco in the administration of mothers' allowances.⁷⁵

In several of the courts the judges were taking part in social-welfare activities,⁷⁶ and most of the chief probation officers were in close touch with settlements, Big Brother organizations, and councils of social agencies, some of them serving on boards and committees of various kinds. University lectures on juvenile-court problems were given by the judge of one court and by the referee of another, and the chief probation officer in a third court gave lectures on court problems to university students who were assigned to the court for observation and practice work. The work of the individual probation officers is of very great importance in the maintenance of co-operative relationships with other agencies, and some of the probation officers encountered in the course of this study were contributing greatly in their daily activities to the harmony, understanding, and coordination of effort existing between the court and the social agencies. Advisory boards, such as those organized under the term "probation committee" in connection with the California juvenile courts, may furnish a means of bringing the public in closer touch with the court. The San Francisco probation committee had a subcommittee on relations and one on institutions.⁷⁷

In six of the communities studied the feeling between the court and the other social agencies was thoroughly cooperative, but in four there was considerable friction. Among the complaints made by some of the social agencies were the following: The judge was too lenient. In neglect cases he waited too long to remove children from their homes. He was self-seeking. He did not try to cooperate with other agencies or consult with reference to general policies. He was influenced by political considerations. The court failed to register cases with the social-service exchange. The judge did not treat representatives of social agencies with proper consideration.

⁷² See p. 119.

⁷³ See The relation between the court and the institution, p. 150.

⁷⁴ See p. 33.

⁷⁵ See p. 217.

⁷⁶ See p. 21.

⁷⁷ See p. 37.

Some of these criticisms were doubtless justified, but, on the other hand, some of the officials of social agencies who complained of the court did not appear to be thoroughly familiar with its work, its possibilities, and its legal limitations. The critics usually failed to cooperate with the court; one judge in particular complained of this. A prominent critic of one court was found never to have attended a hearing of that court; he failed to give the judge any credit for the constructive work he was accomplishing with individual children.

Better understanding of the courts by the social agencies and the development by some of the judges of a broader social viewpoint and a more cooperative spirit would bring about better feeling and make possible the greatest use of the resources of the community.

PARTICIPATION OF JUVENILE COURT IN CHILD-WELFARE MOVEMENTS.

The judges and probation officers of some of the juvenile courts had been very much interested in securing improved child-welfare laws and in increasing the community resources for the care of children. Two judges had served on State commissions or committees engaged in the study and revision of child-welfare legislation—one of them as chairman of the commission—and a third judge had aided in framing several important laws affecting children passed by the legislature. Many of the judges and probation officers were active members of State and National associations concerned with the promotion of juvenile-court and probation work.

In general, because of the lack of adequate resources for the tabulation and interpretation of statistical material and for its publication, the courts studied were unable to make the most effective use of the information which came to them concerning the conditions and influences contributing to the delinquency and dependency of children.⁷⁸ Scientific research based on the material in the court files and effective publicity based on such research would help in securing wider opportunities and greater safeguards for children.

In addition to their work with individual children brought before them the courts had made, despite various handicaps, no small contribution to child welfare. Among the achievements which should be placed to the credit of one or more of the courts included in the study may be mentioned the following:

1. Assisting in drafting and arousing interest in securing the passage of child-welfare laws, including particularly juvenile-court laws, laws relating to adults contributing to the delinquency or dependency of children, age-of-consent laws, mothers' aid laws, child-labor laws, workmen's compensation laws, and other laws relating to industrial conditions.
2. Securing adequate buildings and equipment for the juvenile court and the detention home.
3. Assisting in securing child-study clinics serving not only the court but also other agencies.
4. Organizing and developing schools for delinquent children, having constructive programs for character building.

⁷⁸ See p. 213.

5. Focusing the attention of school departments on problems of attendance and conduct and on possibilities of preventive work.
6. Promoting the organization of playgrounds and recreational agencies, such as boy and girl scout troops and clubs.
7. Promoting the work of councils of social agencies and other agencies working toward the coordination of social forces.
8. Giving lectures on juvenile-court methods and training student volunteers.
9. Contributing to the understanding of problems of juvenile-court administration and popularizing the juvenile-court idea through speeches and writings.
10. Serving in State and National organizations of juvenile-court workers and of social workers and assisting in the formulation of standards which should govern juvenile-court and probation work.

In carrying out the duties of the Bureau, the Commissioner is
 assisted by a staff of clerical and technical personnel. The
 Bureau also maintains a library of books and pamphlets on
 subjects connected with the work of the Bureau. The
 Commissioner is also assisted by a staff of volunteer
 workers who are active in the community. The Bureau
 also maintains a list of all the organizations in the
 State which are interested in the work of the Bureau.
 The Bureau also maintains a list of all the
 organizations in the State which are interested in
 the work of the Bureau.

APPENDIXES

80306°—25†—17

249

APR 11 1918

RECEIVED FROM THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF ST. LOUIS

APPENDIX I.—JUVENILE-COURT STANDARDS.¹

I. THE COURT.

A. Court given jurisdiction.

1. There should be available to every community a court equipped to deal with children's cases.

2. The laws of each State and local conditions determine whether the juvenile court should be an independent court or a branch of a court, and in what court system it should be placed. In order that the court may serve rural as well as urban population, it is usually desirable that the county should be the unit of jurisdiction.

3. The juvenile court should be a court of superior jurisdiction and a court of record. The disposition of a child in the juvenile court, or any evidence given in a juvenile-court proceeding, should not be lawful evidence against the child in any civil, criminal, or other cause or proceeding in any other court.

B. Nature of proceeding.

In children's cases the proceeding should be chancery or equity, and not criminal, in nature. The juvenile court should, however, be vested with criminal jurisdiction in adult cases such as contributing to delinquency and dependency of children.

C. Extent of jurisdiction.

1. The juvenile court should be vested with exclusive jurisdiction over the following classes of cases:

(a) Children alleged to have violated laws or ordinances of the State or of any subdivision thereof, or children whose conduct or associations are alleged to have rendered them in need of the care and protection of the State. The juvenile court should not have the power to waive jurisdiction and certify cases for trial in another court.

(b) Children whose custody is to be determined by reason of their being in need of protection and supervision, homeless, abandoned, destitute, without proper parental care or guardianship, neglected or cruelly treated, or in surroundings dangerous to morals, health, or general welfare.

(c) Adoption cases.

(d) Children in need of protection or custodial care by reason of mental defect or disorder.

(e) Violations of school-attendance laws beyond the provisions for control by school administration.

(f) Contributing to delinquency or dependency. A finding of delinquency or dependency of the child should not be necessary to adjudication. Action should not be limited to parents or guardians in cases of delinquency.

(g) Nonsupport or desertion of minor children.

(h) The determination of paternity and the support of children born out of wedlock.

2. The age limit under which the court may obtain jurisdiction in children's cases should be not lower than 18 years. Marriage of the child should not terminate jurisdiction. Jurisdiction once obtained should continue until 21 years of age unless the case is sooner dismissed or passes out of the jurisdiction of the court.

¹ Report of the Committee Appointed by the Children's Bureau, August, 1921, to Formulate Juvenile-Court Standards. Adopted by a conference held under the auspices of the Children's Bureau and the National Probation Association. Washington, D. C., May 18, 1923.

This report on standards is available as Publication No. 121.

D. The judge.

1. The judge should be chosen because of his special qualifications for juvenile-court work. He should have legal training, acquaintance with social problems, and understanding of child psychology.

2. The tenure of office should be sufficiently long to warrant special preparatory studies and the development of special interest in juvenile work, preferably not less than six years.

3. The judge should be able to devote such time to juvenile work as is necessary to keep detention at a minimum, to hear each case carefully and thoroughly, and to give general direction to the work of the court.

II. PROCESS BEFORE HEARING.

A. Relation between the court and the police department.

1. The jurisdiction of the court should begin as soon as petition is filed or as soon as a child is taken into custody or placed in charge of an officer of the court. Whenever a child is taken into custody the parents or the person with whom the child resides should be notified at once by the police officer or other person holding such custody. The responsibility for such notice should rest with the court.

2. A child taken into custody should immediately be placed in the care of an officer of the juvenile court, and only if necessary taken to a place of detention for juveniles.

3. The police and peace officers should be required to work in close cooperation with the juvenile court in the handling of juvenile cases, and should be given a clear understanding of the difference between the procedure in children's cases and that in cases of adult offenders.

4. The police should not attempt to handle unofficially cases of juvenile delinquency after the child has been taken into custody. Police authorities should not be empowered to place children on unofficial probation without referring them to the court.

5. The police should not be authorized nor should they have the power to hold children in a station house. When the child is taken to a place of detention for juveniles, the authority of the police should cease except for giving information as to the cause of the child's arrest and filing a formal petition or complaint.

6. From the moment a child is taken into custody he should be sheltered to the greatest possible extent from public observation and from conditions that tend to mark him as an offender. Transportation in a police van, escort by a police officer in uniform, and any visible physical restraint are objectionable and should be avoided. Transportation of girls to a place of detention or elsewhere should be by women officers.

7. With rare exceptions no collateral, bail, or appearance bond should be required in children's cases.

B. Reception of complaints and adjustment of cases.

1. The judge, or a probation officer designated by him, should examine all complaints and after adequate investigation determine whether a petition should be filed or other formal action should be taken. It should be the duty of the court to bring about adjustment of all cases without such formal action whenever feasible.

2. Supervision should be exercised in cases handled informally when it is desirable thus to safeguard the child or keep in touch with developments.

3. The judge should exercise general supervision over all the work of the court, even though he is not able to give individual attention to all cases.

III. DETENTION.

A. Detention policy.

1. The number of children detained and the length of detention should be kept at a minimum, and so far as possible those who must be detained should be provided for in private boarding homes. Detention should be limited to children for whom it is absolutely necessary, such as:

(a) Children whose home conditions make immediate removal necessary.

(b) Children who are beyond the control of their parents or guardians, run-aways, and those whose parents can not be relied upon to produce them in court.

(c) Children who have committed offenses so serious that their release pending the disposition of their cases would endanger public safety.

(d) Children who must be held as witnesses.

(e) Children whose detention is necessary for purposes of observation and study and treatment by qualified experts.

2. Children should not be detained in jails or police stations.

3. No child should be detained without an order from the court for a longer time than is necessary to obtain such court order, unless the parents consent to detention or unless the parents can not be reached at once and need for detention is indicated, and in these cases decision as to detention should rest with the judge or some one designated by him, usually the chief probation officer.

4. Constant effort is required to keep the period of detention in each case as short as possible. This may be accomplished through frequent hearings, prompt investigation, sufficient court staff to expedite the movement of cases, and adequate facilities for institutional care.

B. Methods of detention.

1. For temporary detention either a public detention home or boarding homes under the supervision of the court should be provided, available to the entire area over which the court has jurisdiction.

2. The essential features of a detention home are the following:

(a) The juvenile court, if not actually operating the detention home, should control its policies and the admission and release of children.

(b) Provision should be made within the home for segregation of sexes and types of children, and for adequate isolation facilities and medical care.

(c) Adequate facilities should be provided for the study of the child's physical and mental health, but except in rare instances, the detention home should not be used primarily for this purpose.

(d) There should be specialized school work for the children detained, and recreational facilities should be provided. The daily program of activities should be full and varied in order that constructive interests may supplant morbid tendencies and undesirable companionships. Opportunity should be given for the exercise of the child's religious duties.

(e) Effective supervision should be maintained at all times.

(f) The detention home should not be used as a disciplinary institution.

IV. STUDY OF THE CASE.

1. Social investigation should be made in every case, and should be set in motion at the moment of the court's earliest knowledge of the case.

2. The minimum essentials of adequate study of a case of delinquency are: Study of the child himself, including a physical and a mental examination and study of his behavior, developmental history, school career, and religious background; study of his environment, including his family and home conditions; an estimate of the essential causal factors responsible for his behavior; and in the light of this estimate, recommendations for treatment.

3. Psychiatric and psychological study of the child should be made at least in all cases in which the social investigation raises a question of special need for study and should be made before decision concerning treatment, but only by a clinic or examiner properly qualified for such work.

4. The clinic for study of the child should be a separate branch of the court or a separate organization fully available. The personnel required includes a physician trained in psychiatry, a psychologist, and one or more social investigators.

5. The physical examination should be thorough, and all the community facilities for diagnosis and treatment should be utilized. Physical examinations of girls should be by women.

6. For rural communities facilities for study of the child may be provided through the development of centers in urban communities or through traveling clinics under the auspices of State boards or commissions or institutions.

V. HEARING.

A. Children's cases.

1. The hearing should be held as soon as proper notice to parents or custodians can be given, and within 48 hours.
2. There should be no publicity in a juvenile-court case. The hearing should be private, with no one present other than those directly concerned in the case. Witnesses should not be permitted in the court room except when testifying. Adequate provision should be made for children awaiting hearing, and they should be protected from publicity and given necessary supervision.
3. One or both parents or the legal guardian of the child should be required to be present.
4. The hearing should be conducted with as little formality as possible, and the formal adherence to the practice and rules of procedure that characterizes the criminal court should be avoided.
5. The purpose of the juvenile court is to prevent the child's being tried and treated as a criminal; therefore, all means should be taken to prevent the child and his parents from forming the conception that the child is being tried for a crime. In the ascertainment of facts the court should always bear in mind the rules of evidence. This does not imply, however, that in the application of these rules the court must conduct a formal hearing.
6. In all cases there should be a written report of the proceeding, not official in the sense that affidavits and petitions are official but unofficial and private, to be used by the court for the purpose of record and interpretation.
7. In every case the court should explain to the child and parents the nature of the proceeding and the disposition made of the case.
8. Under no circumstances should jury trials be permitted in children's cases. They are inconsistent with both the law and the theory upon which children's codes are founded.
9. Children should not be present at the hearing of neglect or dependency cases except for the time required for identification, when identification is necessary.

B. Cases involving adults.

In cases involving adults, such as cases in which adults are charged with contributing to the delinquency or dependency of children, the usual court procedure in criminal cases is necessary, as the defendant is entitled to all the safeguards that the law and Constitution throw around him. In the trial of these cases children who are involved should be protected to the extent that they should not appear in the court room except for the purpose of testifying, and while in the court room should be accompanied by a probation officer.

C. Use of referee.

1. It is desirable that girls' cases should be heard by a properly qualified woman referee.
2. Where the area of jurisdiction is so large that the judge can not attend promptly to cases in all sections, the court should utilize properly qualified referees.
3. In all cases heard by referees the judge should pass on findings and recommendations and review all dispositions. The judge should have general oversight of policies and each part of the district should be given a fair proportion of his time.

VI. DISPOSITION OF CASES.

1. Sufficient resources of various types should be available for the supervision of children in their own homes, and for the care in family homes or in institutions of those who can not remain with their own families, so that in disposing of each case the court may fit the treatment to the needs of the child.
2. Institutional care should be utilized only when careful study that includes a knowledge of the needs and possibilities of the individual clearly indicates the necessity for it, or when repeated attempts to adjust the child to home life in the community have failed.
3. Fines should never be imposed in children's cases. Restitution or reparation should be required only in cases where they seem to have disciplinary value or to instill respect for property rights.
4. A complete copy of the social investigation and reports of physical and mental examinations, and a summary of the work done by the court on the case,

should accompany the order of commitment to an agency or institution. These records should be unofficial and private.

5. Children placed under the care of private agencies or institutions should remain under the jurisdiction of the court, and there should be close cooperation between the court and the agency or institution. The court should have the power to require reports concerning the progress of the child and to visit agencies and institutions to which children are committed. All private agencies and institutions receiving children from the court should be subject to State supervision.

6. Administrative work such as placing dependent or neglected children in family homes should not be undertaken by the court itself, unless suitable agencies are not or can not be made available for this type of service.

7. The court should be authorized to order the parents of children committed to the care of agencies or institutions to contribute to the support of the children.

8. When its jurisdiction does not include offenses by adults against children, it should be the responsibility of the juvenile court to see that proceedings are initiated in other courts whenever such action is advisable. There should be close cooperation in these cases between the juvenile court, the prosecuting authorities, and the criminal court, and the juvenile court should use all possible means of protecting child witnesses in other courts.

VII. PROBATION AND SUPERVISION.

1. The probation staff should be appointed by the judge from an eligible list secured by competitive examination, subject to approval by a supervising board or commission.

2. The minimum qualifications of probation officers should be as follows:

(a) Education: Preferably graduation from college or its equivalent, or from a school of social work.

(b) Experience: At least one year in case work under supervision.

(c) Good personality and character; tact, resourcefulness, and sympathy.

3. The compensation of probation officers should be such that the best types of trained service can be secured. The salaries should be comparable with those paid to workers in other fields of social service. Increases should be based on records of service and efficiency.

4. Not more than 50 cases should be under the supervision of one probation officer at any one time. Officers handling girls' cases should be assigned a smaller number.

5. If volunteer service is used, the persons performing such service, or the executive organization of volunteers, should be directly responsible to the court.

6. Girls' cases should always be assigned to women officers; cases of boys under 12 years may be assigned to women officers, but all cases of boys 12 years of age and over should be assigned to men.

7. The district system is frequently an economical method of assignment, but fitness of particular officers for special kinds of work must also be taken into account.

8. A definite plan for constructive work, even though it be tentative, should be made and recorded in each case and should be checked up at least monthly in conference with the chief probation officer or other supervisor.

9. A general minimum probation period of from six months to one year is desirable, but exceptions should be allowed on recommendation of the supervisor or chief probation officer. The length of probation in each case should be determined by study of the case, needs disclosed, and progress made.

10. Reporting by a child to a probation officer at regular intervals should be required only if it seems clearly to be for the good of the probationer, and should never be made a substitute for more constructive methods of case work. When rightly safeguarded, reporting gives opportunity for acquaintance with the child and free conversation regarding his interests and surroundings and is a means of training in habits of regularity and punctuality.

11. Regular reporting should usually be limited to delinquent boys over 12 years of age, and they should report at a suitable place away from court and approved by the judge or chief probation officer. Mingling of boys reporting should be avoided through using different days in the week and fixing a certain time for each child to report.

12. Except in rare cases, home visits at least once every two weeks are essential to effective supervision, knowledge of the assets and liabilities of the family, and correction of unfavorable conditions.

13. In probation work due consideration should be given to language, racial psychology, and religion.

14. Reconstructive work with the family should be undertaken whenever necessary, either by the probation officer himself or in cooperation with other social agencies. Whenever other agencies can meet particular needs their services should be enlisted. In cases in which two or more agencies are concerned with the same family frequent conferences are necessary for good teamwork.

15. Special detailed school reports for each child on probation are advisable. The educational authorities should be requested to cooperate through weekly reports, frequent conferences, and other means; but care should be taken to preserve harmony, faith, and good will between the teacher and pupil, the probationer and probation officer.

16. The probation officer should assist and guide children of working age in the choice of a vocation.

17. Whether or not an employer should be informed with reference to the child's delinquency depends on the type of employer. Tact and judgment should be used in protecting the interests of both the employer and the child.

18. Planning for the "spare time" or recreation of probationers is a very important part of a probation officer's functions.

19. In rural communities it is often practicable and desirable to combine probation work with other types of social service. The form of combination and the division of work will vary according to local conditions and needs. The probation officer, however, should not hold other office in relation to the court, nor an office identified with the prosecution of cases, such as clerk of the court, police officer, or sheriff. Reporting of probationers is usually not practicable, and it may be necessary to use volunteer aid to a larger extent than in urban communities. Volunteer workers should be carefully selected and should be under the supervision of a paid officer. Emphasis should be placed on the strict accountability to the court of all officers, paid and unpaid, doing probation work. The officers should be provided with adequate means of transportation.

20. Supervision of the work of probation officers should be exercised by a State commission or board, either specially created or definitely charged with this duty, or by a State supervisory officer. The supervision should be advisory both to the probation officers and the courts as to all features of the service but with power to require the keeping of prescribed records and to compel periodic reports to the supervisory board or officer.

VIII. RECORDS.

1. Every juvenile court should have a record system which provides for—

(a) The filing of the necessary legal records.

(b) The filing of social records covering the investigation of the case, the study of the child, and the work done by the officers of the court and the probation staff. These social records should be deemed privileged and confidential records of the court and should be at all times safeguarded from indiscriminate public inspection.

2. The filing system should be such as to permit ready identification of cases.

3. The records of the social investigation and the study of the child should include all the facts necessary to a constructive plan of treatment.

4. The records of supervision should show the constructive case work planned, attempted, and accomplished, and should give a chronological history of the supervisory work.

5. The court should compile annually statistical information which will show the problems dealt with and the results.

6. In order that it may be possible to compile information covering a period of years and to compare the work of one court with that of others it is essential that uniform terminology and methods of statistical tabulation and presentation of fundamental items be agreed upon. By this means only can significant social data concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and neglect be obtained.

APPENDIX II.—SELECTED FORMS USED BY COURTS STUDIED.

PETITIONS.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR THE COUNTY OF KING.

JUVENILE COURT.

In re the welfare of } No. 0000. Petition.
JOHN DOE.

To the honorable judge of the superior court:

Your petitioner, _____, represents unto your honor that John Doe, who was born on or about January 30, 1906, is a dependent child in this that his parents, John and Mary Doe, with whom he resides at blank address, Seattle, fail to provide him with adequate guardianship and social control and he is in need of care and protection by the court.

Therefore your petitioner prays your honor to inquire into the condition of John Doe and to enter such an order in the premises as shall be for his welfare.

Petitioner.

Police Department.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 16th day of January, 1920.

Clerk.

By _____

Deputy.

Set for hearing January 16, 1920.

N. & S. to parents.

Report by _____

[Face.]

PETITION FOR DELINQUENCY. JUVENILE COURT, DENVER.

STATE OF COLORADO, }
City and county of Denver, } ss.

IN THE JUVENILE COURT.

In the matter of the people in the interest of

Delinquent child _____, and the rights of

} Petition.

to the further care and custody of said child--

because of _____ delinquency.

-----, on this ----- day of ----- 191..., presents this complaint and petition to the honorable juvenile court of the city and county aforesaid, and respectfully alleges:

That -----
child ----- sixteen years of age or under, and ----- not ----- inmate ----- of a State institution, and that the said child -----, ----- delinquent child ----- in this, to-wit: -----

That the names and addresses of the parents or guardian -- of said child ----- are as follows:

Your complainant and petitioner therefore prays that this honorable court proceed to hear this cause in order to determine the delinquency of said child ----- as alleged herein; that citation or summons be issued to the parents or guardian -- of said child ----- of the filing of this petition and of the time and place of the hearing thereof, not less than forty-eight hours prior thereto, unless such notice be waived; and that the said child ----- may be dealt with according to the statutes of the State concerning delinquent children, and that the rights of said parents or guardian -- to care for or correct said child ----- or retain ----- future custody may also be heard and determined in the interest of said child ----- and with due regard to the rights of said parents or guardian -- and the people of the State of Colorado.

Probation officer.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ----- day of ----- A. D. 191---

Clerk of the Juvenile Court.

[Indorsement.]

No.-----

IN THE JUVENILE COURT

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER.

WITNESSES.

The people of the State of Colorado in the interest of

**PETITION FOR
DELINQUENCY.**

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Department No. 2 Juvenile.

The people of the State of California on behalf of

Alleged ward of the juvenile court.

Petition.

To the above entitled honorable court:

Your petitioner,-----, respectfully represents:
That there is now----- within the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, the following named person-----, under the age of 21 years, to-wit:

Name.	Age about.	Name.	Age about.
-----	-----	-----	-----
-----	-----	-----	-----

That said person----- comes within the provisions of subdivision----- of section 1 of the juvenile court law of the State of California, approved June 5, 1915.

That petitioner is informed and believes and therefore on information and belief alleges that the facts bringing said person----- within the provisions of such subdivision are:

That said person----- now in the custody and control of-----

That the father of said person----- is----- who resides at-----, and the mother of said person----- is----- who resides at-----

Wherefore, your petitioner prays that this honorable court set a time for the hearing of this petition; that----- be cited to appear at said time and bring with----- said person-----, and to show cause, if any----- have, why such person----- should not be adjudged a ward----- of the juvenile court;

And that this honorable court at such time inquire into the truth of the statements of fact herein alleged, and in pursuance of the statute in such cases made and provided, make such order in the premises as to this honorable court may seem meet and proper.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, }
City and county of San Francisco } ss.

Petitioner.

-----, being duly sworn, deposes and says: That----- he is the petitioner in the foregoing matter; that----- he has read the foregoing petition and knows the contents thereof; that the same is true of----- knowledge, except as to those matters therein stated on information or belief, and that as to those matters,----- he believes the same to be true.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of-----, 191-----, A. D.-----

Petitioner.

Deputy county clerk, ex-officio clerk of the Superior Court.

Address-----

[Back]

ORDER SETTING TIME AND DIRECTING CITATION TO ISSUE.

Upon the filing of the within and foregoing petition, the hearing of said petition is hereby set for the _____ day of _____, 191____, at _____ o'clock, in the _____ noon of said day, in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the city and county of San Francisco, Department No. 2, Juvenile, at the court room of said court, 150 Otis Street, in the city and county of San Francisco, State of California.

Citation shall issue requiring _____ to be present at said time and to bring with _____ said person _____

County clerk and ex-officio clerk of the Superior Court.

No. _____

DISPOSITION OF CASE.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Department No. 2.

JUVENILE.

The people of the State of California on behalf of

Alleged ward _____ of the juvenile court.

PETITION.

NOTICES AND SUMMONS.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

Juvenile department.

In the matter of

A person under the age of twenty-one years.

Citation.

The people of the State of California, To _____

By order of this court you are hereby cited and required to appear before the judge of this court in the court house in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, at the court room of department No. 8, on _____ the _____ day of _____ 19____, at _____ o'clock _____ M. of that day, and bring with you the above named _____ a person under the age of twenty-one years, then and there to show cause, if any you have, why said person should not be declared to be a ward of the juvenile court, according to the petition on file herein.

And for a failure to attend and bring said person with you, you will be deemed guilty of a contempt of court.

Witness, Hon.-----, judge of the Superior Court, sitting in separate session in the exercise of his jurisdiction as judge of the juvenile court at the court house, in the county of Los Angeles, and the seal of said court, this-----day of-----19-----

Attest my hand and seal of said court, the day and year last above written.

Clerk.

By-----
Deputy clerk.

[Back]

Sheriff's office,
County of Los Angeles. } Certificate of service of citation.

I hereby certify that I received the within citation on the-----day of-----19-----, and personally served the same on the-----day of-----19-----, at the said-----county of-----upon the within named-----

by delivering to-----personally, on the day last aforesaid, and more than twenty-four hours before the time stated therein for said hearing, at the said county of-----a copy of said citation.

Dated-----19-----

Sheriff of the County of Los Angeles.

By-----
Deputy sheriff.

Asst. probation officer, Los Angeles County.

No.-----

Dept. No. 8

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE COUNTY OF
LOS ANGELES.

JUVENILE DEPARTMENT.

In the matter of

A person under the age of twenty-one
years.

CITATION.

STATE OF COLORADO, }
City and County of Denver, } ss.

IN THE JUVENILE COURT.

In the matter of the people }
In the interest of ----- }
----- }
a child under the age of ----- }
years. }

Summons and notice to parents or guardian.

To -----
the parents of ----- :
You are hereby notified that a ----- has been filed in the juvenile
court of the city and county aforesaid, in which it is claimed and represented to
the court that the said -----, your -----,
is a juvenile delinquent person in this, to wit: -----

You are further notified that said cause will be heard on the ----- day
of -----, at the hour of ----- o'clock, before the judge of said
court.

You are therefore hereby summoned to appear and show cause on said day, or
at such time or times as said case may be continued, why you should have the
right to the custody, control or guardianship of said child, otherwise your default
will be entered and the court will proceed in said case to hear and determine
your rights to the custody, care or control of said child, in accordance with the
law and the evidence; and the court may at such time continue the case for
further hearing from time to time; or may place the said child in the temporary
custody of the detention home, or probation officer, or require it to report to the
court at stated times, or to otherwise conduct itself in a becoming and proper
manner with a view of overcoming and correcting its delinquency, if any there be,
or in order to determine your right to its care, custody or control; and the court
may at such time or at such other time as the case may be continued, enter final
judgment in said case, making a final disposition of the custody of said child,
and finally determining your right to its care, custody or control.

Parents are expected to heed this notice and summons of the court, and to be
present with the said child at all hearings of said case, since their right to its
care, control, custody or guardianship will be finally determined in the said case.

Under the rules of the juvenile court this summons must be served on parents
or guardians at least two days before the first hearing or trial of the case, unless
waived, and continuances of the hearing will be granted for reasonable times upon
good cause shown.

Your written or verbal promise may be taken by the officer to produce said
child in court at the time of such hearing, and upon failure to comply therewith,
you may be proceeded against as for contempt of court.

Witness -----, clerk of the juvenile court of the city
and county of Denver, and the seal thereof, at Denver, in said county, this
----- day of -----, A. D. 19-----.

----- Clerk.
By ----- Deputy.

[Back.]

STATE OF COLORADO, }
City and county of Denver, } ss.

PROMISE OF PARENT OR GUARDIAN FOR APPEARANCE OF CHILD.

I, _____, of said _____, mentioned in the within summons, hereby promise that said _____ will be present at the session of the juvenile court mentioned in the within notice, or any adjournment thereof at which the within entitled cause is set for hearing, and hereby agree to be responsible for the presence of the said _____ at such hearing, or at any other time directed by the court.

Witness my hand and seal this _____ day of _____, A. D. 19_____.

_____[SEAL]

The above promise may be taken in lieu of bond.

STATE OF COLORADO, }
City and county of Denver, } ss.

I, _____, a _____ in and for said county and State, do hereby certify that I served the within summons by leaving a copy thereof _____

on the _____ day of _____, A. D. 19_____. I further certify that _____ promised

to be responsible for the presence of the said child mentioned in the summons or notice, at the hearing of said case, upon the said date or at any other time to which the same may be adjourned or continued by the court.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, A. D. 19_____.

No. _____

SUMMONS TO PARENT OR GUARDIAN.

In the matter of the people in the

interest of _____

residing at _____

Served as per within return on the _____

day of _____, A. D. 19_____

[Indorsement.]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, }
City and county of San Francisco } ss.

The within named _____
_____ may be admitted
to bail, by bond, in the sum of _____
_____ dollars or by the deposit
of _____ dollars in coin.

*Judge of the Superior Court, Dept. 2, of
the city and county of San Francisco.*

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, }
City and county of San Francisco. } ss.
Superior Court, Dept. 2.

This warrant may be served and
executed day or night, and the arrest,
as commanded in this warrant, is
hereby authorized and directed to be
made at any time of the day or night.

Dated this _____ day of _____
_____ 191_____

*Judge of the Superior Court of the city
and county of San Francisco.*

WAIVER OF SERVICE.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Department No. 2—Juvenile.

The people of the State of California on behalf of }
alleged ward _____ of the juvenile court. } Waiver of service of citation.

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, am the _____
of the above named person _____; that I do hereby waive service of citation
on me, and do hereby consent to a hearing of the petition filed in the above
entitled cause before the above entitled court on the _____ day of
_____, 191_____, at _____ M.
San Francisco, California, _____, 191_____

Witness to signature: _____

[Indorsement.]

No. _____

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

DEPARTMENT No. 2—JUVENILE.

The people of the State of California on
behalf of _____

Alleged ward _____ of the juvenile
court.

Waiver of service of citation

of _____

80306°—25f—18

DETENTION ORDER.

ORDER FOR DETENTION OF JUVENILE.

STATE OF COLORADO,
City and county of Denver }^{ss.}

IN THE JUVENILE COURT.

In the matter of the people in the interest of }
a child ----- years of age or under } Order for detention.

It appearing to the court in the above entitled cause that it is necessary to insure the attendance at the juvenile court of said ----- at such times as may be required, or otherwise secure its obedience to its orders, the court has directed that the said child be held in the ----- until further order of court.

Witness my hand and the seal of said court, this ----- day of -----
A. D. 191 --

By ----- Clerk of the Juvenile Court.
----- Deputy.

[Indorsement.]
RETURN.
No.-----
ORDER FOR DETENTION CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER--JUVENILE COURT.
I hereby certify that, in accordance with the within directions of the juvenile court, I have delivered the custody of the child named herein to -----

PROMISE TO APPEAR.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
CITY OF ST. LOUIS.

Date -----

PLEDGE.

I hereby agree, on my honor, that I will personally appear before the judge of the juvenile court, at the Children's Building, 1321 Clark Avenue, when notified so to do.

I, the undersigned, do pledge myself to be responsible for the appearance of ----- before the judge of the juvenile court on the above named date.

Signed ----- Prin.

Address -----

Signed ----- Security.

Address -----

FINDINGS AND ORDERS.

No.-----

DELINQUENT.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, }
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN. }ss. Juvenile court.

In the matter of ----- }
----- as a delinquent child. } Findings and order.

The above entitled matter came on regularly for hearing at the regular term of said court on the ----- day of -----, 191--, before the Hon. ----- judge of said court, upon the petition of ----- duly filed herein, said child and his father and mother ----- being present; -----

and it appearing to the court that all persons entitled thereto have had due and sufficient notice of these proceedings according to the statute in such case made and provided; and the court having heard all the evidence adduced at said hearing, and being fully advised in the premises, makes the following

Findings of fact.

That the allegations of said petition are true in substance, and that said child is a delinquent child;
That said child was born at -----, on -----

that the father of said child is -----, whose residence is -----; that the mother of said child is -----, whose residence is -----

It is therefore ordered, that said child be and --he is hereby declared, adjudged and determined to be a delinquent child; that said child be and --he is hereby committed to the care of the Minnesota ----- School for Boys, Girls, located at ----- county of ----- and State of Minnesota, and that said child shall remain there until --he shall attain the age of 21 years unless sooner discharged by due course of law -----

Let judgment be entered accordingly.

By the court,

Judge.

Dated Minneapolis, Minn., ----- 191-----

[Indorsement.]

No.-----

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN.

DISTRICT COURT,
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT.

IN JUVENILE COURT.

In the matter of

as a delinquent child.

FINDINGS AND ORDER.

Filed.....

Clerk of District Court.

By..... Deputy.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Department No. 2—Juvenile.

The people of the State of California
on behalf of

} Commitment to private institution.

Ward... of the juvenile court.

The above named person...,
having been regularly brought before the above entitled court on the ... day of ..., 19..., upon the verified petition of ..., the ... of said person

due and legal notice having been given to all parties entitled thereto, and

It duly appearing to the said court that said person... come... within the terms of Subdivision ... of section 1 of the juvenile court law, approved June 5, 1915, that ... he... should be adjudged ... ward... of the juvenile court, and that said court should make such further order as may be necessary for the care of said ward...;

Now, therefore, it is hereby expressly found that all statements of fact contained in said petition are true, and

It is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed that said ... ward... of the juvenile court; that ... he... be and hereby ... committed to the care of ... a corporation embracing within its objects the purposes of caring for or obtaining homes for such persons and willing and able to receive and care for said ward, until said person... attain... the age of 21 years; and

This court, finding that ... the ... of said person... is ... able to pay toward the cost of the support and maintenance of said person... the sum of ... dollars per month,

It is hereby further ordered that said ... do pay monthly, in advance, for the expense of the support and maintenance of said ward... to the probation officer of the city and county of San Francisco, the sum of ... dollars per month, beginning on the ... day of ..., 19..., and continuing so long as said person... shall remain under such care, or until the further order of this court; and further that said probation officer do pay any sums collected from said parent... for the support and maintenance of said person... to the city and county of San Francisco; and

It is hereby further ordered that the sum of _____ dollars be paid monthly, in advance, from the county treasury of the city and county of San Francisco to _____ beginning on the _____ day of _____, 19____, and continuing for a period of six months from said date.

Done in open court this _____ day of _____, 19____

Judge of the Superior Court

[Indorsement.]

No. _____

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

DEPARTMENT NO. 2—JUVENILE.

The people of the State of California on behalf of _____

Ward ___ of the juvenile court.

COMMITMENT.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.

Department No. 2—Juvenile.

The people of the State of California on behalf of _____

} Commitment to State school.

Ward of the juvenile court.

The above named person _____

having been regularly brought before the above entitled court on the _____ day of _____, 191____, upon the verified petition of _____ the _____

of said person having been cited to appear at said hearing by service of citation (or having waived service of citation), due and legal notice having been given to all parties entitled thereto, and

It duly appearing to the said court that said person comes within the terms of subdivision _____ of section 1 of the juvenile court law, approved June 5, 1915, that _____ he should be adjudged a ward of the juvenile court, and that said court should make such further order as may be necessary for the care, custody, and control of said ward;

Now, therefore, it is hereby expressly found that all the statements of fact contained in said petition are true and that the welfare of said person requires that he _____ custody and control be taken from him _____; and

It is hereby ordered, adjudged and decreed that said _____ is a ward of the juvenile court; that he _____ be and hereby is (are) wholly deprived of the custody and control of said person and that _____ he be and hereby is committed to the care, custody, and control of the _____ until said person attains the age of twenty-one years on the _____ day of _____, 191____, unless sooner legally dis-

charged, provided that said person, if a boy, may, upon the agreement of the superintendents of the Preston School of Industry and the Whittier State School, be transferred from one institution to the other without the further order of this court; and

This court, finding that _____, the _____ of said person is able to pay toward the cost of the support and maintenance of said person the sum of _____ dollars per month,

It is hereby further ordered that said _____ do pay monthly, in advance, for the expense of the support and maintenance of said ward to the probation officer of the city and county of San Francisco, the sum of _____ dollars per month, beginning on the _____ day of _____, 191____, and continuing so long as said person shall remain in such custody and control, or until the further order of this court;

And this court further finding that said _____ is unable to pay the whole expense of the support and maintenance of said ward, it is hereby further ordered that the sum of _____ dollars be paid monthly from the county treasury of the city and county of San Francisco to _____, beginning on the _____ day of _____, 191____, and continuing for a period of six months from said date;

And it is hereby further ordered that the sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco do forthwith take into custody said _____ and deliver said person to the superintendent of the said State school, together with this commitment, and this is to authorize the said State school to receive, safely keep, support and maintain said person in its custody and control until _____ he attains the age of twenty-one years, unless sooner legally discharged.

Done in open court this _____ day of _____, 191____

Judge of the Superior Court.

(N. B.: The original commitment must be filed with the county clerk. A certified copy should be delivered, with the person committed, to the sheriff.)

[Back.]

Name _____

Date of birth _____

Place of birth _____

If foreign born, state country, and number of years he has been in the United States.

Parents—Divorced? _____ Living apart? _____

FATHER: Name _____ Living? _____

Address _____

Place of birth—United States? _____ Foreign? _____

If foreign born, state country, and number of years he has been in the United States.

Occupation _____

Character—Intemperate _____ In jail or prison? _____

MOTHER: Name _____ Living? _____

Address, if divorced, remarried, or living apart from husband _____

Place of birth—United States? _____ Foreign? _____

If foreign born, state country, and number of years she has been in the United States.

Character—Intemperate _____ In jail or prison? _____

If parents are dead, or lost, name and address of guardian or near relatives _____

Defendant's character—Use tobacco? _____ Cigarettes? _____

Intemperate? _____

Former convictions _____

Witness my hand this _____ day of _____, 191____

Judge.

No. -----
 COMMITMENT
 OF

Offense: -----

RECEIVED FROM

Deputy sheriff of -----
 County, Cal., this -----
 day of ----- 19-----
 Superintendent.

INDEXES.

[Probation office index—Seattle.]

Family name		Given name	Birth date
File No.	Phone	Address	
Date	Source and nature of complaint		Disposition

[Back.]

Father (Dead, Divorced, Separated, Normal.)		Mother (Dead, Divorced, Separated, Normal.)	
School	Grade	Employment	Income
Home condition			
Physical condition			
Mental condition			
Prognosis or remarks			

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK.

[Probation-office index—Denver.]

Name	Address	Age

[Index—Buffalo.]

INDEX JUVENILE COURT—Name		Nickname (if important)		Case No.	Original Entry by..... 19					
Facts at time of original entry	Sex	Age—birthday—year	Color	Race		Country of birth	Length of residence			
				father	mother	Child	father	mother	in U. S.	here
	Complexion	Eyes	Hair	School		Occupation	Religion		Lives with	
							father	mother		
	Family — name — occupation — remarks					Home conditions				
father					Remarks					
mother										
others in family										

JUVENILE COURT AND INSTITUTIONAL RECORD.

Date arraigned	Residence	Docket No.	Complaint	Investigation	Disposition—Remarks	Entry by
, 19						
, 19						
, 19						
, 19						
, 19						
, 19						
, 19						

[Court cases—Index card of Massachusetts Probation Commission.]

Name		Address			Age
1					
2					
3					
4					
Birthpl.	Ht.	Wt.	Comp.	H. or W.	
Occupa.			Parents		

LINE	DATE	OFFENSE	Ct.	DISPOSITION

POLICE REPORTS AND COMPLAINTS.

BUFFALO, N. Y., -----1920.

State of New York, }
 County of Erie, } ss.
 City of Buffalo.

J----- O-----, being duly sworn, deposes and says: I am captain of the Buffalo city police force, commanding the -----th Police Precinct; that at 8.05 p. m. to-day I arrested F----- W-----, 14 years old, of No. -- W----- Street; charge juvenile delinquency, Viol. Sec. 1897 penal law, upon complaint of C----- H-----, of No. ---- A----- Street, who alleges, that the defendant broke window, caused by a bullet from 22-caliber rifle, fired by defendant.

He was turned over to his parents, who were directed to produce the boy in juvenile court No. 44 Breckenridge Street at 3 p. m. Wednesday, March 10, 1920.

Signed-----

Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 6th day of March, 1920.

Commissioner of Deeds in and for the city of Buffalo, N. Y.

SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Police District No. -----

JUVENILE REPORT.

Station -----

----- 191--

To ----- *captain of police:*

I respectfully submit the following report regarding

Name ----- Age ----- Address -----

Police officer.

To the probation officer, juvenile court:

Sir: The above report is forwarded for your information and action. The above named minor and his parents have been directed to report at your office

at 10 o'clock a. m. on ----- the -----

day of ----- 191--

Captain of police.

(Please set these hearings for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Saturday and have reports filed with the chief of police at least 48 hours before the date of hearing.)

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

REPORT OF POLICE FOR PROBATION OFFICE.

----- 192--

Name	Age	Birth date
Address		
Name father		
Name mother	Address	
When and where arrested	Address	
Date and place offense occurred		
Name of officer and precinct		
Disposition after arrest		
Charge		

Complainant	Address
Witnesses	Address

Others involved

Complaint No. ----- Complainant notified ----- by -----

Docket No. ----- Information filed ----- by -----

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

COMPLAINT OF CHIEF ATTENDANCE OFFICER.

Date _____

Name _____ Age _____ Color _____ Birth date _____

Address _____

Father's name _____ Address _____

Mother's name _____ Address _____

Guardian or custodian _____ Address _____

School _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____

School record:

 Date of illegal absences _____

 Dates actually truant _____

 Number school days to date _____ Number days tardy _____

 Conduct _____

 Scholarship _____

Number of times reported to Attendance Officer _____

Attempted adjustment before complaint being made _____

Remarks _____

Signed _____
Chief attendance officer.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

COMPLAINT.

_____ 192 _____

Complainant _____ Address _____

Says: That on or about _____ 192 _____

_____ Address _____

_____ " _____

_____ " _____

_____ " _____

_____ " _____

_____ " _____

did _____

and he asks that this court deal with the above offender according to law or in such other manner as it may deem advisable.

Witnesses:

----- Address -----

 ----- Signed -----

INVESTIGATIONS.

[Copy of current case. Reports are brief and dictated in this story form for reading by judge at time of hearing.]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

FOR THE COUNTY OF KING.

THE JUVENILE COURT.

In re the welfare of
 JOHN DOE

File No. 0000
 Report of investigation
 By -----
 For January 16, 1920.

Conduct.—John was arrested by the police at 2 a. m. January fourth while prowling in an alley adjacent to the Westlake Market. A police interview revealed his association with two other boys in a theft of food from one of the stalls the same night.

His behavior during the last six months has been increasingly unsatisfactory. Loitering out nights until ten or eleven o'clock was the first irregularity noted by his parents. Some truancy followed and twice he was away from home all night. The present investigation revealed the fact that he sold papers until midnight on two occasions and slept in a downtown hotel with a newsboy companion. Several petty thefts have been committed by him during the last three months, each time in company with other boys older than he.

Family.—He was born in ----- and lived in a mining section of that State until two years ago when the family including father, mother, a brother, Clarence, 16, John, 13, and a sister, Mary, 7, moved to Seattle. The father and Clarence secured work at once in the shipyards and have been continuously employed until the present.

Promptly upon their arrival John enrolled in the ----- School and made an uneventful record until about six months ago when his scholarship slumped. He was then doing sixth-grade work and since has failed of promotion.

Although the parents are morally stable, industrious and devoted to the child's interests, the home has provided but little of special interest. The family occupy a four-room apartment on the second floor of a three-story tenement building in the ----- district where the social conditions are generally unfavorable.

Personal condition.—About six months ago John's mental interests became altered because of (1) active pubescent development and (2) precocious social interests growing out of relations with a group of boy companions in his neighborhood, several of whom are newsboys of vagrant inclination.

His mental ability is normal. The recent failure in school is attributable to the social influence mentioned.

Recommendation.—If he is kept under intelligent and sympathetic restraint with his family until he shall have become familiar with his new physical interests and responsibilities, I believe there will be no further misconduct on his part. This can be accomplished by the removal of the family to a more wholesome neighborhood and a few months' supervision.

[Back—Matter in roman in the printed blank; matter in italics is filled in]

Child *John Doe* Age *13* years on *January 30, 1919*
 Resides with *Parents* Address _____
 Telephone *Ell 643* Religion *Protestant* Nationality *American*
 Father *John Doe* Address _____
 Step-father Address _____
 Occupation *Employee* ——— *shipyard* Monthly income _____
 Mother *Mary* Address _____
 Step-mother Address _____
 Occupation Monthly income _____
 Other members of household _____
 Type of living quarters *Apartment* Number of rooms *4* Monthly rental _____
 School work began when *6* years old. Now enrolled in the *6* grade at _____ school

Attendance Department _____
 Industry Scholarship _____
 Occupation Monthly income _____
 Physical condition as reported *Jan. 16, 1920* by Dr. _____
General development satisfactory. Pubescent during last six months and somewhat neurotic because of hygienic faults. Some dental caries
 Mental condition as reported *Jan. 16, 1920*, by Dr. _____
Normal ability

PROBATION OFFICE	JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INVESTIGATION	File No.
------------------	---	---------------

NAME	ADDRESS
------------	---------------

Alias	Nickname	Lives with	Came from
-------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------

Sex	Age	Is birth recorded?	Color	Nationality		Nativity		Length residence	
				Father	Mother	Father	Mother	In U. S.	Here
	Birth date	Verified?							
	Birth place								

Charge	Complaint
Officer and precinct	Date of arrest—Spoken to
Others involved	Disposition others

FAMILY

IS FATHER A CITIZEN?

Name	Relation	Birth date	Occupation	Weekly wages	Health	Religion	Other address—Remarks
.....	Fr.
.....	Mo.

OTHER PERSONS LIVING IN HOME..... ROOMERS?..... BOARDERS?.....

Name	Relation	Age	Occupation	Remarks

OTHER RELATIVES.....

Name	Relation	Occupation	Religion	Address

HOME AND NEIGHBORHOOD.....

Type of dwelling.....	Occupying room with child.....
Number of families in building.....	Appearance of home.....
Number of rooms occupied by family.....	Sanitary condition.....
Rent per month.....	Moral condition.....
Number of persons in household.....	Neighborhood.....
How long at present address.....	Remarks.....
Previous addresses and dates.....	

FAMILY INCOME			SOCIAL AGENCIES ACQUAINTED WITH FAMILY		
Source	Weekly amount	Remarks	Name	Date	Remarks
Total income.....			Registered confidential exchange.		

[Page 2 of report.

SCHOOL RECORD.....

Name	Teacher	Grade	Days present	Days absent	Conduct	Scholarship	Term from to	Remarks

Was child attending regularly at time of arrest?.....

Comment from teacher or principal.....

EMPLOYMENT RECORD.....

Employer	Address	Occupation of child	Period employment from to	Weekly wages	Hours of work	Reasons for leaving

Has child permit? Was child working at time of arrest?

CHURCH AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS.....

Name	Pastor or leader	Address	Remarks

ASSOCIATES.....

Associates and (if a boy) gang.....

Give File No. associates having court record..... Are any on probation?.....

SOURCES OF INFORMATION.....

Investigated by..... Date..... Revised by..... Date.....

COURT RECORD.....

Date of hearing	Judge	Docket No.	Complaint	Disposition

[Page 3 of report].

SUMMARY AND GENERAL INFORMATION.

INVESTIGATION—OUTLINE FOR SUMMARY.¹

JUVENILE COURT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

CHARGE:

FAMILY HISTORY:

Background and heredity.—National or racial characteristics. Previous residence of parents. (Urban or rural life.)

Environment.—Location of home; type of neighborhood; school facilities; play space.

Home conditions.—Type of dwelling; sanitation; space; furnishings; employment of mother, either in or away from home.

Family group.—Members; relationship between parents and children, brothers and sisters; especially cases of preference for one child; influence of one member of the family upon another; leadership in family.

Family's attitude toward life: Hopes, fears, and plans.

Unusual personalities in home.

Degree of supervision and control in home.

Relatives: In the same community; in other places.

Recreational opportunities and advantages.

Name and location of nearest playground.

Use of leisure time: Where spent; companions.

Any of the family or relatives having court or institution records.

¹ Prepared by Jeannette Ezekiels, chief probation officer.

HEALTH: ----- Name of family physician.

1. *Physical*—General physical condition, neurological, venereal, gland disturbance; personal habits; play habits and activities.

NOTE—Medical history from birth to present time; any affection of organism; injuries.

2. *Mental*²

a. *Psychiatric*: To disclose presence or absence of mental disease; to outline personality; the make-up and any character defects.

b. *Psychological*: To estimate intellectual development; vocational aptitude.

NOTE—Mental development; exceptional tendencies and traits; aptitudes and interests; personality defects; and character maladjustments as causative factors responsible for the child's behavior.

EDUCATION:

Intellectual atmosphere of home—schooling of parents.

School status of minor children attending school.

Schooling of wage earners in family (children).

School record, shortcomings in the various studies.

Progress in school; development of exceptional tendencies and traits; aptitudes and interests.

Playground facilities.

Activities on playground—evidences of leadership and initiative.

Relationship between teacher and child.

Cooperation between parents and teacher.

CHURCH:

1. Church affiliation.

2. Religious and moral atmosphere of the home.

CHARACTER:

Habits.

Interests.

Tendencies.

Abilities.

Shortcomings.

Associates and previous record, if any.

EMPLOYMENT AND FAMILY INCOME:

Occupation, wages, hours, length of service, past and prospective advancement.

BUDGET:

1. Considered from standpoint of standards.

2. Considered in relation to child's employment.

a. Whether or not earnings are needed to supplement the family income.

b. Whether or not earnings are applied to child's needs.

c. Whether or not the purpose is to encourage industry and thrift.

d. Proportion of earnings given to home; kept for spending money.

Boy's (or Girl's) Story: Docket No.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION:

Child's story.

Family.

Doctors and health agencies.

Schools.

Employers, past—present, if possible.

Confidential exchange.

Court records.

Other social agencies.

² *Personality-analysis suggestions*.—Aggressive and active, domineering, practical, inactive, lacking initiative, easily led, suggestible, fearful and timid, a dreamer, easily discouraged, worrier, resentful, jealous, cruel, kind, affectionate, hate reactions, straightforward, underhand.

Tantrums? If so, caused by what, how severe an outbreak, and attitude toward it afterward.

Blames others for difficulties?

If sociable, what type of friends? Is he liked or disliked? Does he lead, or is he lead by them? Is he laughed at? Is he solitary?

Conduct disorders, such as lying, stealing, sex delinquency. Exact description of act committed. How done, why, and with whom. Attitude toward it.

Interest and ambitions.

Aptitudes.

Odd or compensatory behavior.

Present trouble.—Description of the particular episode or situation which causes the visit to the clinic. If because of mental illness, give description of symptoms and the time of onset and duration.

[School report.]

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, WASHINGTON.

Chief probation officer.

To

From

Subject

School year	Days present		Days absent		Number of times tardy	Department	Effort	Arithmetic number	Composition	Grammar	Geography	History, Civics	Spelling	Reading	Writing	Selections memorized	Phys. training	Shop work hand-work	Cooking	Sewing	Algebra	Word analysis	Health habits	
	Pr.	Ab.	T.	D.																				
19																								
19																								
First																								
Second																								
Third																								
Fourth																								
Fifth																								
Sixth																								
								Promoted to			Year			Grade										

Name and opinion of former teacher.....

Name and opinion of present teacher.....

Tendencies, traits, and interests.....

Defects of personality.....

Evidence of leadership and initiative.....

Any known physical defect, or an unusual health condition or appearance.....

Recommendation of school physician or nurse. Was recommendation carried out? If so, when.....

Cooperation of parents.....

Signature of supervising principal.....

[Page 1.]

Name of child

Docket Number

DEPENDENCY RECORD OF SEATTLE
JUVENILE COURT

Address

Investigation and report by

Date of birth
Name of father
Name of mother
Name of petitioner
Address of petitioner
Date of petition

REPORT OF INVESTIGATOR AND SUMMARY OF CASE HISTORY (*Report to be typewritten*)

[Page 2 is blank.]

[Page 3.]

Surname | Man's first | Woman's first | Date of application

Previous application	Claims pending	Social state
Industrial insurance	Money in bank	

Residence No.	Street	Rent	Flat or residence	Rooms	How long	Car line	Phone

First names	Date of birth	Birth-place	Occupation or school with grade	Wages	Left school at age of—	Amt. of ins.	Prem.	Cause of death	Date of death	Mental or physical defects and illiteracy
Man 1										
Woman's Maiden Name 2										
Children 3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
Other members in family 10					Kinship	To	Contributes to family			
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										

Union	Lodge	Benefit society	Other sources of income	Debts to—	Amt.	For—
		Weekly benefits				

Race	Length of time in—			Marriage		Previous marriage	Property
	County	State	U. S.	Date	Place		
Man							Do you own any?
Woman				By whom			What, if any, did your husband leave?
Relatives, references	Address	Kinship		Agencies and persons interested		Relief given	
Occupation	Wages	How long		Church or Sunday School			
				Man			
				Woman			
				Children			

[Page 4.]

STATE OF WASHINGTON, }
 COUNTY OF KING. }ss:

 Being first duly sworn, on oath doth depose and say that the written statements under the various printed headings on the preceding page of this application were voluntarily made by this affiant and written thereon by direction of this affiant, and that the statements therein, both written and printed, are true in substance and in fact.

 Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____,
 A. D. 191_____

_____, Clerk.
 By _____ Deputy.

Date of hearing. Court orders and subsequent history:

REPORTS OF PHYSICAL AND MENTAL EXAMINATIONS.

[Minneapolis.]

PHYSICAL RECORD.

Name _____ Age _____ Color _____ Sex _____ Date _____
 Nationality _____
 Father _____
 Mother _____
 Brothers and sisters _____
 Relations _____
 Prenatal history _____
 Birth history _____
 Infancy _____
 Childhood _____
 Anatomical _____ Height _____ Weight _____ Puberty _____
 Head. Circumference _____ Ant. post _____ Lateral _____ Index _____
 Anemia _____ Malnutrition _____ Glands _____ Tonsils _____ Adenoids _____
 Nasal obstruction _____ Orthopedic defect _____ Vision _____ Hearing _____
 Teeth _____ Heart _____ Lungs _____ Foreskin _____
 Balance _____ Nervous _____ Epilepsy _____ Reflexes _____

[Back.]

Heredity _____ Alcohol _____ Epilepsy _____
 Insanity _____ X _____
 Mentally defective type _____
 Operation and treatment _____
 Results _____

[Minneapolis.]

SOCIOLOGICAL RECORD.

Name _____ Age _____ Date _____
 Father. Nationality _____ Occupation _____
 Religion _____ Steady work _____ Use of liquor _____
 Tobacco _____ Home evenings _____ Literature read _____
 Native ability _____ Attitude toward children _____
 Mother. Religion _____ Nationality _____
 Outside work _____ Use of liquor _____ Clubs or societies _____
 Leisure time _____ Native ability _____ Attitude toward children _____
 Children. Number _____ Living _____ Dead _____
 Mother's opinion of their intellect _____
 Spare time spent how _____ Out evenings _____
 Social friends _____ Moving pictures _____
 Money allowance _____ Dances _____ Church attendance _____
 Literature read _____
 Playground facilities _____
 Home. No. of rooms used _____ No. in sleeping room _____ Ventilation _____
 No. of meals _____ Character of same _____
 General sanitation and hygiene _____

[Minneapolis.]

PEDAGOGICAL RECORD.

Name-----Age-----Date-----
 Address-----School-----
 Years in school-----Kindergarten-----Grade-----Others-----
 Age on entering-----Years in each grade-----
 Absent for sickness-----
 Native ability-----Application-----
 Especially proficient in-----
 Especially deficient in-----
 Temperament { Normal-----
 Insolent----- Mentality { Bright-----
 Forward----- Restless-----
 Shy----- Sluggish-----
 Expression of feeling { Responsive-----
 Indifferent-----
 Sullen-----

[Back.]

General estimate by teacher-----

 Subsequent history-----

[Card index kept by nurse—Minneapolis.]

Name-----Court No.-----
 Address-----Case-----

 Father-----Mother-----
 Phys. Exam.-----
 Operations-----

 Treatments-----
 Dental work-----
 Psychological-----Chron. age-----Mental age-----

[Back.]

Visits and remarks-----

[Record of Physical Examination—Judge Baker Foundation, Boston.]

Name	Age	Date	
P. A.		Plain	
Headache		Vertigo	
Ep.		Habits	
Exam: Pers. Cl.		Deformity	
Attitude			
Expression			
Speech		Stigmata	
Nose			Thyroid
Throat	Tonsils	Adenoids	
Eyes	R.		
	Vision	Fields	O. D.
	L.		
	Pup. form	Reactions	Strab
Movements	Ptosis	Nyst	Diplop.
R.			
Hearing		Otorrhea	
L.			
Reflexes: Conj.	Palat phar.	U.	
		Abd.	
		L.	
Arm	K. J.	Achilles	Clonus
Sensation			
		Low. extr.	
Motor: Strength up. extr.		Coord. low. extr.	
Coord. up extr.		Tremor	
Gait		Bones	
		Adenopathy	
Trophic: Musc.			
Thorax		Lungs	
Heart			
			Appet.
			Bowels
Temp	Pulse	Blood	Ur.
			Rect. tone
			Phimosis
Teeth: Crowded		Carious	Hutch.
	Ft.	In.	Circ.
		Chest	Insp. Head Length
Weight	Height	Exp.	Breadth

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK.

Develop: Pub.
Genl. devel.
Compl.

Bre.

Mens.

Nutrition
Physiogn.

[Statistical Card—Judge Baker Foundation, Boston.]

		Age	Born F M	Grade		
Wt	Dev Nutr Sx	Vis Ears Tth	Nerv Ep	Tons Nas	Gon Was	Sm Tc M Aic
Ht		Ante	Nat	Inf	ills	
Home St	F					
Shop St						
Petty St	Gf					
Auto St						
Larc	Gm	Illeg.				
B & E		Alc				
Pk Pt	M	Pov				
Forg		Hyg				
Loaf	Gf	M wkg				
Vag		Crowd				
Gam	Gm	Quar				
Lyg		Negl				
Sx						
Ab Sx						
Try						
Rny						
Out N		Cont				
Bkg						
A & B	Sbs	D Div Sep Rem				

MENT.
Sup
Good
Irreg
Fair
Poor
Sub
F M
Sp A
Sp Dis
Psych
Psy Per
Con I

[Follow-up card.]

Age	Physl 1 2 3 4	Educ Work	Recr Comp	Env	Hab Sm Tc M En Aic	Conf												
							Adjust	Date	Agency	Loc	Mos	P-P	Phys	E-W	R-C	Hab	Conf	Outcome, etc.
1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6																		
7																		
8																		
9																		
10																		
11																		
12																		

PARENT'S CONSENT TO TREATMENT.
 THE MINNEAPOLIS JUVENILE COURT.
 DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH.

----- 191 -----

child ----- I consent to my -----

 receiving -----
 medical -----
 surgical treatment -----

 Parent. Guardian.

DETENTION-HOME FORMS.

[Seattle.]

KING COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME.

No.	Date received.	Name.	Age.	Address.	Received from—	Reasons for detaining child and instructions.	Date released.	Disposition.

[Form for requests by police for detention.]

SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE COURT.

Date -----, 191----- Time of arrest ----- M.
 Superintendent Juvenile Detention Home:
 Please receive into custody:
 Name ----- Age -----
 Address ----- Phone -----
 Charge -----
 Arresting officer -----
 Desk sergeant ----- Station -----
 Have parents been notified? -----
 Remarks -----

[Back.]

TO BE FILLED IN BY SUPT. OF DETENTION HOME.

Case number ----- Age -----
 Entrance date -----; time ----- M. Boy ----- Girl -----
 Release date ----- Days in Detention Home -----
 Where sent -----
 Condition on entrance, clean or otherwise -----
 Well nourished or not -----
 Condition of clothing -----

 Data secured by -----

 Signature.

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK.

[Record kept by Denver Detention Home.]

DETENTION HOME SCHOOL, DENVER.
_____, Supt.

Name

Address

Age

School Grade

Complaint

Officer

Father { Name

 { Occupation

Mother { Name

 { Occupation

Family { Boys Girls

 { Nationality

 { Religion

Date

Remarks

.....

[Form of report to court by detention home, Los Angeles.]

JUVENILE HALL REPORT.

Name Age Dept.

Date admitted Length of stay

Repeater

Medical examination by Dr. Date

Laboratory report

Weight on entrance On leaving Date

Recommendation

Illness in hall

Mental examination by Dr. Date

Age Mental age Retarded Accelerated

Diagnosis

Institution record: Officer in charge

Kind of work Quality

Reading

Interest

Temperament

Discipline

School report

Summary

For complete report see Respectfully submitted

Juvenile Hall files Superintendent Date

RECORDS OF SUPERVISION.

Docket Number		Name of child	
SEATTLE JUVENILE COURT			
HISTORY OF SUPERVISION		Address (with date)	
Supervision began	Supervision ended	Date of birth	
Probation officer		Name of father	School
Court order		Name of mother	Grade

Part I. Digest of supervision

Month	Dates ward was seen			Dates communi- cated with probationer otherwise	Progress and remarks
	At home	At office	Elsewhere		
1 19					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					

(For full chronological history, see next page.)

[Page 2.]

Part II. *Full chronological history.*

Dates		Detailed account in diary or journal form of what occurs during probation, and remarks—(Including conduct and surroundings of probationer; things said, done and learned by probation officer; things done by others; instructions; actions by court, etc. Entries to be made in ink.)
19		

[Pages 3 and 4, chronological history continued.]

[Los Angeles.]

III. PHYSICAL AND MENTAL REPORT

PHYSICAL CONDITION:

Weight	lbs.	Height	feet	in	Age at puberal onset	years
Growth and nourishment						
Naso-pharynx				Teeth		
Vision				Audition		
Heart				Lungs		
Nervous system						

Genitalia

MENTAL CONDITION:

School work began when _____ years old. Now enrolled in _____ grade at school.
 Remarks on pathology of mind or significant traits

Statement of habits or other influences unfavorable to child's development

Treatment recommended:

Date of examination

Signed

M. D.
Examiner.

[Probation record.]

Probation officer	JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	File No.
-------------------	--------------------------------------	----------

Name	Address
------	---------

Sex	Age	Is birth recorded?	Color	Nationality		Nativity		Length residence	
	Birth date			Father	Mother	Father	Mother	In U. S.	Here
	Birth place	Verified?						Citizen?	

Family: Name	Relation	Birth date	Occupation	Weekly wages	Health	Religion	Other address—Remarks
	Fr.						
	Mo.						

Relatives: Name	Relation	Occupation	Religion	Address

School: Name	Teacher	Grade	Days present	Days absent	Conduct	Scholarship	Term from—to	Remarks

Employment: Employer	Address	Occupation of child	Period employment from—to	Weekly wages	Hours of work	Reasons for leaving

Church: Name	Pastor or leader	Address	Remarks

Record: Date of hearing	Judge	Docket No.	Complaint	Disposition

[Notice to probation officer of child placed on probation—District of Columbia.]

Name ----- File No. -----
 Probation officer -----
 Date placed on probation -----
 Date probation officer notified -----

 Date first home visit -----
 Date parent interviewed -----
 Date probationer interviewed -----

This report, properly filled out, is to be returned to the chief probation officer not later than the third day after probation officer is notified.

OTHER PROBATION FORMS.

[District of Columbia Juvenile Court.]

PROBATION HISTORY—OUTLINE SPECIAL REPORT.

PROBATION OFFICERS:

State facts only.
 Omit opinions and conclusions.
 Omit recommendations.

- I. Read the investigation and bring it up to date.
- II. Make a short statement regarding the following:
 1. (a) Reasons for bringing boy or girl into court. (b) If on complaint of other person, get child's story.
 2. (a) Explanation of previous charges and dispositions.¹ (b) When boy or girl was placed on probation and charge.
 3. Date when child and parents were last seen; also, number of visits and number of reports.
 4. School: Grade; record of attendance; conduct and scholarship. (Name, location, and teacher to be inserted in investigation.)
 5. Work: Nature of employment. (If possible, employer's opinion and prospect of advancement.) (Employer's name, location, and wages to be inserted in investigation.)
 6. Church: Attendance (regular or irregular). If irregular, what attempts have been made to connect family with church?
 7. Leisure time: How and where spent.
 8. Physical defects: Have they been corrected? If not, why?
 9. General remarks: What has been done for the child? What has the attitude of the probationer been? The response of the parents? Improvement in home conditions?

¹ NOTE.—Your attention is called to revision of 2(a).

Chief Probation Officer.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

WASHINGTON.

Chief Probation Officer.

 You are placed on probation in order that the court may help you in your efforts to do better and you will be under the supervision of Probation Officer ----- If you do well, you will be dismissed from probation; if not, you will again be brought before the court.

You must follow these instructions:

- (1) Go to school regularly; keep steadily at work and hold present job until a better one is secured and probation officer consulted.
- (2) Report as directed by the probation officer, and if unable to report, write or telephone your excuse promptly.
- (3) Secure probation officer's permission before leaving the District of Columbia.
- (4) Notify probation officer at once if you change your address.
- (5) The probation officer represents the court, and you are expected to obey all directions of the probation officer.

Retain these instructions for future reference.

[Boys' conditions of probation blank.]

THE JUVENILE COURT,

LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

_____, Judge.

Department No. 8, Hall of Records.

_____, Chief Probation Officer.

_____, 1st Assistant Probation Officer.

Los Angeles, Calif., _____

To the parents or guardian of _____:

In an action before the juvenile department of the Superior Court, heard and determined on the _____ of _____, 191____, _____ was declared to be a ward of the court, and placed under the probationary care and supervision of _____, as his probation officer, who will visit _____ from time to time in _____ home, and will exercise such supervision over _____ as may seem necessary to prevent a repetition of similar actions in future. The term of probation is _____, and the conditions of the probation are as follows: _____ will be required to report at probation office on the _____ of each month between the hours of _____ and _____ M. _____

No excuse except illness will be accepted for failure to report. (In case of illness send word to the probation officer either by mail or telephone.)

All reports must be made in person except as otherwise ordered.

That the best interests of the child may be conserved, you are expected to cooperate with the court and the probation officer, and see to it that their instructions in regard to reporting, school attendance, etc., are strictly complied with. All communications by telephone, correspondence, or otherwise, must be addressed to the probation officer direct.

Your earnest cooperation in carrying out the above instructions will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Chief Probation Officer.

NOTIFY THE PROBATION
OFFICE AT ONCE IF YOU
CHANGE YOUR RESIDENCE.

Phones

Main _____

THE JUVENILE COURT, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, COLO.

To parents or guardian:

Your son _____ recently got into trouble. We are giving him a chance to do better by placing him on probation. This means that so long as he obeys his parents, guardian and teachers, does right and keeps out of trouble, brings good reports from school, home and neighborhood, and keeps his word with the Juvenile Court he will not be committed. Otherwise he will be.

You, as parents or guardian, are expected to see that he fully understands all this, and to let the court know immediately if he fails to do what is expected of him. You are also expected to see that he goes to his teacher before school closes for his report slip and brings it to the court at 9.30 a. m. on report days as designated on the other side of this card. This is to help and not hurt your son, and we earnestly ask your cooperation.

Do not destroy this card.

----- Judge.

[Back.]

Juvenile court report days for year 1916-1917.

September 16	December 9	March 10
September 30	December 23	March 24
October 14	January 13	April 14
October 28	January 27	April 28
November 11	February 10	May 12
November 25	February 24	May 26
		June 9

[Parent's report—St. Louis.]

PARENTS ARE REQUESTED TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, WRITING IN INK.

A TRUTHFUL REPORT AIDS THE COURT IN HELPING YOUR BOY.

Behavior at home is -----

What time does he get home at night?-----

Where does he spend his time in the evening?-----

Where did he go last Sunday?-----

How many days has he been absent from school or work since last report?-----

Why has he been absent?-----

Date ----- Parent's signature -----

[St. Louis.]

SCHOOL REPORT.

Name ----- School -----

Attendance -----

Conduct-----

Scholarship-----

Remarks-----

Date ----- Principal or Teacher -----

Any additional information may be written on the back of this card

80306°—25†—20

PROBATION OFFICE.

CHILDREN'S BLDG., ST. LOUIS-----

You did not report as directed on-----
I want you to come and see me on-----
at-----o'clock without fail.

Very truly yours,

PROBATION OFFICE,
CHILDREN'S BUILDING,
Fourteenth Street and Clark Avenue.

Minneapolis, ----- 19--

This certifies that -----
residing at ----- has been this day honorably
discharged from probation in the juvenile court of Hennepin County for con-
tinued good conduct.

Judge.

Recommended by

Probation Officer.

[St. Louis.]

APPLICATION FOR DISCHARGE FROM SUPERVISION.

Application of -----probation officer
for the discharge of ----- living with -----
at ----- who has been in my care ----- months.

School or employment record.

Name of school or place of employment.	Time.	Remarks—Regularity, wages, etc.

RECORD OF SUPERVISION.

No. visits to home-----
No. visits to school or employer-----
No. visits to relatives or interested parties-----
No. reports to probation officer-----

I believe that the child's hearing resulted from.....

.....

I feel that there is no further need of supervision because.....

.....

(Date)..... (Signed).....

CITY OF BUFFALO—CHILDREN'S COURT—PROBATION BUREAU.

REPORT ON VIOLATION OF PROBATION.

Docket No. Date.....

Name of child..... Parent's address.....

Date of birth..... Placed on probation..... By justice.....

Previous record.....

REPORT.

Respectfully submitted,

.....
Probation Officer.

To Hon.
Justice, Children's Court.

REPORT ON APPLICATION FOR CUSTODY OF CHILD.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR THE COUNTY OF KING.

JUVENILE COURT.

In re the welfare of

No. _____
Report on competency of
applicant for child

On the _____ day of _____ 191____ I visited the home of _____
who resides at _____

and after careful investigation I recommend the said applicant as a suitable
custodian for the said child on the basis of the following information regarding
the applicant, which I have verified:

Relation of applicant to child	Other members of household
Age _____ years. Nationality _____	What work will be assigned to child?
Education _____	Health _____
Monthly income \$ _____	Religion _____
Type of dwelling _____	Source _____
Does applicant own this property? _____	Size of ground _____
Sanitary condition _____	Number of rooms _____
Evidence of thrift _____	Distance from home _____
School child will attend _____	

What charge will applicant make for board of child? \$ _____ monthly.
Character endorsements _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____

Investigator.

191____

_____, Clerk.

By _____, Deputy.

[Indorsement.]

No. _____

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR THE
COUNTY OF KING.

JUVENILE COURT

in re the welfare of

REPORT ON COMPETENCY OF APPLICANT
FOR CHILD

MONTHLY AND DAILY REPORTS.

PROBATION OFFICER'S REPORT.

For month of ----- 192--

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

I. Number continued under my probationary oversight from preceding month.....

II. Number added during the month:

- 1. New cases.....
- 2. Received by transfer.....
- 3. Returned from State schools.....

Total added.....

III. Total handled during the month.....

IV. Number passed from my oversight:

- 1. Dismissed.....
- 2. Transferred to other probation officers.....
- 3. Transferred to other counties.....
- 4. Committed to State schools: Whittier (), Preston (), Ventura ()
- 5. Committed to home finding societies.....
- 6.

Total disposed of.....

V. Number on my list at close of month.....

Boys	Girls

Boys	Girls

Total		Grand total
Boys	Girls	

VI. Office work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	Total
1. Cases in court.....																																
2. Reports by probationers.....																																
3. Office interviews.....																																
4. Telephone interviews.....																																
5. Dictation (letters, notices, reports).....																																
VII. Outside work.																																
1. Calls on probationers.....																																
2. Calls on investigations.....																																
3. Investigations, other jurisdictions.....																																
4. Positions secured.....																																
5. Homes found.....																																
6. Papers served.....																																
7. Children escorted to and from homes.....																																
VIII. Preventive work.																																
1. Cases adjudicated without filing.....																																
2. Calls of investigation.....																																
3. Number on voluntary probation.....																																

Signed.....

Assistant Probationer Officer.

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK.

PROBATION OFFICER'S REPORT.

ST. LOUIS JUVENILE COURT.

Month of _____

	Total	Boys		Girls	
		White	Col.	White	Col.
Total under supervision 1st of month					
I. Additions—					
1. Delinquents					
a. From court					
On probation					
On parole					
b. By transfer from					
2. Neglected					
a. From court					
b. By transfer from					
II. Removals—					
1. Delinquents					
a. By court discharge					
From probation					
From parole					
b. By commitment for violating prob. or parole					
Probation					
Parole					
c. By transfer to					
2. Neglected					
a. By court release from supervision					
b. By commitment to institutions					
c. By transfer to					
III. Total under supervision—					
1. Delinquent children					
On probation					
On parole					
2. Neglected children under supervision					
3. Whereabouts unknown					
IV. Volume of work—					
1. Reports, visits, etc.					
Reports recorded					
Visits recorded					
Special investigations					
2. Cases in court					
a. Delinquent					
On order of probation officer					
By arrest on offense					
b. Neglected					
3. Days absent					

Probation Officer.

JUVENILE COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Monthly report—probation department.

PROBATION OFFICER.....

	July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.	January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.
Cases on probation first of month.....												
Cases received during month (gross).....												
Total cases on list during month (A).....												
Cases removed from probation (B).....												
Total cases on list last day of month.....												
Total number of hours in field (C).....												
Total number of hours in office (D).....												
Total number of cases not requiring full supervision (E).....												
Total number violations of probation (F).....												
(A) TYPES OF CASES.												
Probationers carried over from.....												
Probationers received by transfer.....												
Probationers received—new cases.....												
Total.....												
(B) REMOVALS.												
Dismissed from probation.....												
Committed B. C. G. during minority.....												
Committed National Training School.....												
Transferred to other probation officers.....												
Placed on inactive list.....												
Total.....												
(C) FIELD WORK.												
Number visits—probation cases.....												
Number visits—investigations.....												
Number investigations.....												
Number investigations revised.....												
Number absconding probationers brought back to jurisdiction.....												
(D) OFFICE WORK.												
Number hours in conference with supervisor.....												
Number hours attending court, in clerical work and interviews.....												
Number probationers reporting at court.....												
Number special reports.....												
(E) CASES NOT REQUIRING FULL SUPERVISION.												
Number of absconders.....												
Number probationers temp. committed to B. C. G. schools.....												
Number probationers attending private boarding schools.....												
Number probationers under supervision of other courts.....												
(F) VIOLATION OF PROBATION.												
Official—probation officer.....												
Official—arrest or complaint.....												
Unofficial—probation officer.....												
Unofficial—arrest or complaint.....												

REMARKS.....

[St. Louis.]

STATE BOARD OF CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

Report of the juvenile court of _____ County
for the month ending _____, 191__

	Total.	Boys.		Girls.	
		White.	Colored.	White.	Colored.
I. Disposition of court cases:					
1. Total number children before court.....					
2. Delinquent children.....					
a. Placed on probation.....					
b. Committed to institutions.....					
c. Fined or costs assessed.....					
d. Discharged or dismissed.....					
e. All other dispositions.....					
3. Neglected children.....					
a. Placed under supervision of proba- tion office.....					
b. Committed to institutions.....					
c. Committed to individuals.....					
d. Dismissed.....					
II. Probation office:					
1. Additions during month.....					
2. Removals during month.....					
a. By court discharge or removal from supervision.....					
b. By commitment to institutions.....					
3. Total number under supervision.....					
a. Delinquent.....					
b. Neglected.....					
c. Whereabouts unknown.....					
4. Volume of work.....					
a. Reports recorded.....					
b. Visits recorded.....					
c. Special investigations.....					
III. Institutions:					
1. Total number of children in institutions at end of month.....					
a. Delinquent.....					
(1) State institutions.....					
(2) Local institutions.....					
b. Neglected.....					
(1) Public institutions.....					
(2) Private institutions.....					

I hereby certify this report to be correct.

Chief Probation Officer.

Date _____

Quarters end January 1, April 1, July 1 and October 1. Report promptly at the end of each quarter.

JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK.

[St. Louis.]

HOUSE OF DETENTION.

Report for month ending -----

	Meals.					Lodgings.	
	Total children.	Boys.		Girls.		Employes.	Children only.
		Wh.	Col.	Wh.	Col.		
<i>Total No. lodging and meals.</i>							
1st.....							
2nd.....							
3rd.....							
4th.....							
5th.....							
6th.....							
7th.....							
8th.....							
9th.....							
10th.....							
11th.....							
12th.....							
13th.....							
14th.....							
15th.....							
16th.....							
17th.....							
18th.....							
19th.....							
20th.....							
21st.....							
22nd.....							
23rd.....							
24th.....							
25th.....							
26th.....							
27th.....							
28th.....							
29th.....							
30th.....							
31st.....							
Average lodgings and meals.							

[St. Louis.]

HOUSE OF DETENTION.

Report for the month ending -----

	Total.	Boys.		Girls.	
		Wh.	Col.	Wh.	Col.
I. Total admissions.....					
1. As delinquents.....					
(a) By police officers.....					
(b) By probation officers.....					
(c) By attendance officers.....					
(d) By sheriff.....					
(e) By all others.....					
2. As neglected.....					
(a) By police officers.....					
(b) By probation officers.....					
(c) By attendance officers.....					
(d) By sheriff.....					
(e) By all others.....					
II. Total releases.....					
1. As delinquents.....					
(a) To relatives on bond.....					
(b) To court.....					
(c) To institutions on order of court.....					
(d) To all others.....					
2. As neglected.....					
(a) To relatives on bond.....					
(b) To court.....					
(c) To institutions on order of court.....					
(d) To all others.....					

- (j) Provision for vacations, leave of absence, expense of conferences, membership in professional bodies, professional library.
- (k) Training and personality of present staff of probation officers:
Attitude toward work:
- 4. *Other officers of the court:*
 - (a) The clerk—method of appointment:
Qualifications:
Term:
Attitude toward work:
 - (b) Physicians and mental specialists (describe method of appointment, qualifications, duties, etc.):
 - (c) Superintendent, matron, and employees in detention home (describe method of appointment, qualifications, duties, personality, etc.):
 - (d) Other employees of the court:
- 5. *Advisory board:*
 - (a) Personnel:
Method of appointment:
Qualifications:
Term: Compensation:
 - (b) Duties:
- 6. *Chart of organization and staff of court:*

B. The court room or building.

- 1. *Physical features:*
 - (a) Plan of room or building:
 - (b) Description of room or building:
- 2. *Special arrangements for privacy of hearings:*

C. Process before hearing.

- 1. *Reception of complaints:*
 - (a) Persons receiving complaints:
 - (b) Amount of information obtained at time complaint is taken:
- 2. *Investigation made prior to issuance of petition, summons, or warrant:*
 - (a) By whom made:
 - (b) Informants:
 - (c) Amount of investigation:
- 3. *Use of petition, summons, and warrant, and by whom served:*
- 4. *Where are children who are arrested taken after arrest?*
- 5. *Release:*
 - (a) On bond:
 - (b) On written promise:
 - (c) On oral promise:
- 6. *Proportion of cases disposed of before hearing, by type of case:*
- 7. *Social work done in complaint cases not brought to court:*
(Reference of other agencies, interviews with parents and others for purpose of assisting in improving situation, informal supervision, etc.)

D. Hearing.

- 1. *Separate hearings:*
 - (a) Are children's cases heard entirely separate from adult cases?
 - (b) Are delinquent, neglected, and destitute cases heard separately?
Plan of separation:
- 2. *Privacy of hearings:*
 - (a) Are the hearings open to the public?
If not, what are the restrictions imposed?
 - (b) Are any hearings in chambers? In what types of cases?
 - (c) Is any effort made to secure as much privacy as possible in hearings in open court?
- 3. *Frequency of hearings:*
 - (a) How often are children's sessions held?
- 4. *Provision for children awaiting hearing:*
- 5. *Evidence and witnesses:*
 - (a) Is the child always asked to tell his story?
Are different policies pursued in this respect with reference to destitute, neglected, and delinquent children?
Under what conditions do children testify in cases involving adults?

- (b) Are the parents or guardians always required to be present and to state the facts of the case?
 - (c) Under what conditions do witnesses testify?
 - (d) Does the judge have before him in every case the facts gained from investigation and mental and physical examinations? If not, what policy is pursued?
 - (e) Are women present in girl's cases? If so, how much protection do they afford the girls?
6. *Use of references:*
 7. *Legal formalities observed:*
 - (a) What legal forms are observed?
 - (b) Are the children ever represented by attorneys?
 8. *Jury trials:*
 9. *Description of hearing.*

E. Method of investigation.

1. *Investigation force:*
 - (a) Who assigns and directs investigations?
Amount of supervision:
 - (b) Are investigations made by paid probation officers designated to act exclusively as investigators?
If not, what paid probation officers make investigations?
Proportion of time spent in investigation:
Are part-time or volunteer probation officers used?
In what types of cases?
Are outside agencies used?
For what cases?
 - (c) Reports of police to court or probation officers in regard to children taken into custody—when made?
Information contained?
In delinquent child cases, must the specific offense be recorded?
2. *Frequency of investigations:*
 - (a) Are investigations made in all cases?
 - (b) If not, what types of cases are not investigated?
3. *Scope of investigations:*
 - (a) Interviews with child (amount and kind of information obtained; under what circumstances is child interviewed?):
 - (b) Interviews with parents (in the probation office or at home; amount of information obtained, etc.):
 - (c) Interviews with other relatives or friends (under what circumstances, and for what purposes):
 - (d) Information obtained from school:
 - (e) Information obtained from employers:
 - (f) Is the confidential exchange used?
Is information secured from and given to social agencies?
4. *Records of investigations:*
 - (a) Are investigations prepared according to a uniform plan? (Specify.)
 - (b) Are all investigations recorded in written form?
5. *Physical examinations:*
 - (a) Provision made for physical examinations.
 - (b) What children are examined, and who determines whether examinations are to be made?
 - (c) Under what conditions are the examinations given?
 - (d) Care of venereally diseased children:
6. *Mental examinations:*
 - (a) Provisions made for mental examinations:
 - (b) What children are examined and who determines whether examinations are to be made?
 - (c) Under what conditions are the examinations given?
 - (d) Method of examination:
 - (e) What consideration is given to the physical examination and social history in making the diagnosis of mentality?
7. *Summary of results of investigations, and prognosis:*
 - (a) Are the results of the investigations and physical and mental examinations assembled and summarized, or are separate reports made?
 - (b) Who summarizes the cases and advises as to disposition?
 - (c) Are case conferences held?
 - (d) Are persons making the investigations present at the hearings?

F. Methods of detention.

1. *Types of detention used:*
 - (a) In what types of cases are children detained in the detention home?
 - (b) Purpose of detention in detention home?
Average length of stay in detention home?
 - (c) Are any children detained in boarding homes?
Under what conditions?
How are the homes selected?
How supervised?
Average length of stay:
 - (d) Are any children detained in jail or lock-up?
Under what circumstances?
What provision is made for separation from adults?
Average length of stay:
 - (e) Other places of detention (specify types and when used):
2. *Management and equipment of detention home:*
 - (a) How is the home supported?
 - (b) How is it managed?
 - (c) Staff (how appointed, qualifications, attitude toward work, etc.):
 - (d) Equipment of home (give detailed description of building, sleeping provisions, dietary, educational and recreational facilities):

G. Disposition of cases.

1. *Fines or costs:*
 - (a) Are fines or costs assessed against children? In what proportion of cases, and for what types of offenses?
 - (b) May fines or costs be paid in installments?
 - (c) Are parents expected to pay fines or costs for the children?
2. *Restitution:*
 - (a) Is restitution for damages or reparation for injury ordered by the court?
In what cases?
3. *Commitment to institutions:*
 - (a) Institutions to which children are committed, and types of children committed:
 - (b) Proportion of cases of various types in which commitments to institutions were made during the last fiscal year:
 - (c) In what cases are children committed to institutions without a period of trial on probation?
 - (d) Are commitments to institutions indeterminate?
If not, what are the usual periods specified?
 - (e) Does the court retain control of child, and consent to release, in case of commitment to institutions for delinquents?
For neglected children?
For destitute or dependent children?
For truant children?
 - (f) What records are sent to the institution by the court?
 - (g) Does the court receive reports of the progress of the child in the institution?
 - (h) Does the court do any parole work for institutions?
4. *Probation or supervision:*
 - (a) Proportion of cases of various types placed on probation or under supervision:
 - (b) Length of probation period:
 - (c) Are cases released from probation or supervision without the child's appearance before the judge?
What formalities accompany release from probation or supervision?
5. *What dispositions are made in cases of truancy?*
6. *Cases discharged upon hearing:*
 - (a) Proportion during last fiscal year:
 - (b) Types of cases discharged, and reason for discharge:
7. *Are the parents and child always informed by the judge as to his decision?*
8. *Adequacy or inadequacy of facilities for disposition of various types:*

H. Methods of probation.

1. *Volume of work:*
 - (a) Number of children of various types on probation during last fiscal year:
 - (b) Average number any one time:
Average number of children on probation to one paid officer at any one time (classified according to type):
Largest number:
Smallest number:
 - (c) Do probation officers engaged in supervision have other duties?
Proportionate amount of time devoted to supervision:
2. *Conditions of probation:*
 - (a) Does the judge, in placing on probation, define the conditions of probation? If so, what conditions are usually specified?
 - (b) Does the probation officer, immediately after the child is placed on probation, explain to the child and his parents the conditions of probation? What requirements are usually specified in cases of various types?
 - (c) How much discretion is vested in the probation officer with reference to decisions as to the requirements and failure to live up to them?
What are the functions of the chief probation officer in this matter?
Of the judge?
3. *Reporting:*
 - (a) In what types of cases are reports to probation officers required?
 - (b) How often are reports required?
 - (c) Where and when are reports made?
 - (d) How many children report at a time?
 - (e) How much time is spent with each child that reports?
 - (f) What is expected to be gained from the reports?
 - (g) What safeguards are provided against undesirable mingling of children waiting to report?
 - (h) Opinion of probation officers in regard to value of reporting:
4. *Home visits:*
 - (a) How often do officers make visits to homes of probationers?
 - (b) At what times of day are visits made?
 - (c) With whom does the probation officer talk?
 - (d) What purposes are accomplished through home visits?
Checking up the information obtained through reporting?
Obtaining further information in regard to the child's conduct and needs?
Obtaining information in regard to home conditions?
Maintaining a personal and helpful relationship with the child and his family?
 - (e) What is required of the family in case of bad neighborhood or home conditions?
 - (f) Opinion of probation officers in regard to the value of home visits, desirable frequency, etc.:
5. *The relation of the probation officer to the school:*
 - (a) Reports required from teachers:
 - (b) Visits made to school:
6. *The relation of the probation officer to the child's employer:*
 - (a) Reports required from employer:
 - (b) Visits made to place of employment:
 - (c) Efforts made to guide choice of occupation and encourage vocational training (through cooperation with other agencies or otherwise):
7. *The relation of the probation officer to the child's recreation:*
 - (a) Efforts made to direct the child's recreation:
 - (b) Cooperation with recreational agencies.
8. *The termination of probation:*
 - (a) What determines the length of the probation period and release from probation?
 - (b) Are there any efforts made to secure after care from private agencies, where such follow-up seems to be needed?
9. *The relation of the judge to probation work:*
10. *Supervision of work by chief probation officer:*
(Details as to amount of supervision, case conferences, etc.)

11. *Probation or supervision by private societies:*
 - (a) How many children of various types are assigned for probation or supervision to private societies during the year?
 - (b) What determines such disposition of cases?
 - (c) How much supervision over the work of the societies is exercised by the court?
12. *Results of probation:*
 - (a) What proportion of delinquent children placed on probation are later committed to institutions?
 - (b) What proportion of delinquent children released from probation are brought before the court for a new offense?
 - (c) What proportion of delinquent children have their probation terminated for purpose of commitment to institutions?
 - (d) Probation officers' and judge's estimate of success:
13. *Parole:*
 - (a) Do probation officers supervise children on parole from institutions? How many each year?
 - (b) Are children assigned to the same officers supervising them before commitment?
14. *Informal supervision:*
 - (a) Do probation officers exercise informal supervision over any children who have not come to court, but have been dealt with informally? How many such children are supervised each year?
 - (b) Do probation officers act as neighborhood police, settling quarrels among children, neighborhood rowdiness, and the like?

I. Records and reports.

1. *Individual records and reports:*
 - (a) Is a written record made of each investigation?
In what form?
 - (b) Are later visits to the child or reports from him recorded in writing?
In what form?
 - (c) Does every probation officer make regular reports on each child?
How often?
What do such reports contain?
 - (d) Are social records filed with legal records or filed separately?
 - (e) What provisions are made for the confidential use of the information?
 - (f) Filing system:
2. *Monthly reports:*
 - (a) Does the court make a monthly summary of all cases before it and the probation office?
What does this summary contain?
Is it in the nature of a report?
3. *Annual reports:*
 - (a) Does the court compile an annual report with full record of its business?
Analysis of statistics?
Complete statistical tables?
 - (b) Is the report printed?
4. *Method of computing statistics:*
5. *Statistics for last fiscal year:*
(Number of cases of various types, results of physical and mental examinations, and any other information available.)

J. The administrative work of the court.

1. *Placing children in family homes:*
 - (a) Does the court place out children in family homes other than their own for purposes other than temporary detention?
What types of children are so placed, and under what circumstances?
 - (b) Number of children of various types placed out during last fiscal year?
 - (c) How are such homes secured? (By court; other public agency; private agency.)
 - (d) What standards govern the selection of homes?
 - (e) Is any compensation paid; and, if so, how much and under what circumstances?
 - (f) How much supervision is given, and by whom?
 - (g) Proportionate amount of time devoted to this work:

2. *Administration of aid to mothers:*
(Give detailed description.)
3. *Institutions:*

K. Relation of court to handling of adult criminal cases.

1. *Method of handling adult cases:*
 - (a) Proportion of work, if any, devoted to adult cases:
 - (b) Numbers of adult cases of various types handled in last fiscal year:
 - (c) Detailed description of methods:
2. *Cooperation with courts handling adult cases:*
(Describe interchange of information and plans of cooperation.)

L. Cooperation with police.

1. *Functions of police in apprehension of children:*
2. *Use of police in preventive work:*
3. *Special methods of cooperation with police:*

M. Relation of the court to the community.

1. *Through advisory board:*
(Describe functions and work of advisory board.)
2. *General cooperation with other organizations, including participation in general movements for community betterment.*

N. State supervision and assistance.

1. *Type of State supervision:*
2. *Relation to the appointment of court officers:*
3. *Amount and kind of supervision and court work:*
4. *Amount and kind of other assistance given:*
5. *Reports required:*

80306°—25†—21

INDEX.

- Adequacy of the court's resources, 159-160.**
- Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109-122.**
- Comparison of formal and informal cases, 115-118.
 - Definition of "informal adjustment," 109.
 - Disposition, 118-119.
 - Extent, 114-115.
 - Methods, by cities, 109-114.
 - Policy for delinquency problems, 109.
 - Success of, 119-122.
- Administrative work of court:**
- Management of institutions, 220.
 - Mothers' allowances, 12-13, 37, 93, 216-218.
 - Placement of children in family homes, 219-220.
- Adoptions, 13.**
- Investigations, 93.
- Adult cases:**
- Investigations, 93.
 - Jurisdiction of juvenile court over adult cases involving children, 14, 221-224.
 - Contributing to delinquency or dependency, 13-14, 221-224.
 - Nonsupport and desertion, 14-15, 221, 222, 223.
 - Offenses against children, 14, 221, 222, 223.
 - Other cases, 15, 221.
 - Violations of child-labor laws, 14.
- Advice in choice of occupation and supervision of employment of children on probation, 186-188.**
- Advisory boards of courts, 37-38.**
- Age limitation of court jurisdiction, 10-12.**
- Delinquency cases, 10-12.
 - Dependency and neglect cases, 12.
- Agencies (public and private):**
- Cases referred by, 40.
 - Child-placing—Delinquency cases, 143-144.
 - Commitment in dependency and neglect cases, 155-156.
 - County aid to, 150, 154, 157.
 - Investigations by, 90, 162-163, 165.
 - See also* Investigations, social.
 - Probation work by, 31-33.
 - Relation to court with reference to orders in cases of dependency and neglect, 157.
 - Social-service, relation to court, 244-246.
 - Supervision of children in their own homes, 155, 162-163.
 - Vocational guidance for children on probation, 186-188.
- Appeals, 134-136.**
- Appointment:**
- Judge, 19, 21.
 - Probation officers, 23-27.
- Area served, 6-8.**
- Arrests, 40.**
- Baker (Judge) Foundation of Boston. *See* Judge Baker Foundation of Boston.**
- Boston juvenile court—Continued.**
- Cases—**
- Adjustment without formal action, 109.
 - Classes under jurisdiction of court, 9-10, 12.
 - Number under supervision of one officer, 171.
 - Study of, 88, 90, 92-93, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103-108.
- Child-placing agencies, placing delinquents under care of, 143-144.**
- Commitments—**
- Delinquency cases, 143-144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152-153.
 - Dependency and neglect cases, 155, 156.
- Community and the court, 228, 231, 232, 233-234, 235-236, 240-241, 244.**
- Complaints, reception of, 41.**
- Complaints and arrests, 40, 51.**
- Cooperation with—**
- Agencies, 44, 143-144, 146, 147, 148-149, 151, 155, 156, 158.
 - Police department, 43-44.
 - Court room and probation offices, 16, 17.
- Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13.**
- Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8-9.**
- Delinquency. *See subject heading.***
- Dependency and neglect, 12, 130, 155, 156, 158.**
- See also subject heading.*
- Detention, 55, 56, 57-58, 59, 60-61, 62, 63.**
- Boston plan, 78-87.
 - Care of children during, 63, 80-81, 83-84.
- Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138, 139.**
- Dispositions, 143-144, 147, 148, 149, 152-153, 155, 156, 158.**
- Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 140.**
- Hearings, 124, 127, 128, 130, 134-136.**
- Informal adjustment of cases, 109.**
- Investigations, social, 50, 88, 90, 92-93, 162-163.**
- Jails and police stations, detention in, 63.**
- See also* Detention.
- Judge, 19.**
- Judge Baker Foundation of Boston, 78, 90, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103-108, 144, 175, 195, 206, 211-212, 228.**
- Jurisdiction, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13.**
- Mental examinations, 97, 99, 101.**
- Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.**
- Orders, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143-144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 155, 156, 158.**
- Organizations cooperating with or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—Boston.**
- Physical examinations, 96, 97, 101.**
- Placement of delinquents, 143-144, 146, 147, 148, 152.**
- Police, relation to, 43-44.**
- Probation, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28-30, 33, 142, 162-163, 171, 174, 175, 176, 177, 182, 183, 185, 186, 188, 191, 192, 193, 195-196.**
- Psychological examinations, 97, 99, 101.**
- Quasi-criminal procedure in delinquency cases, 127, 128.**
- Reports (monthly and annual), 211-212.**
- School and the court, 228, 231, 232, 233-234, 235-236, 240-241.**
- Staff, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28-30, 33, 34, 36.**
- Study of the case, 88, 90, 92-93, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103-108.**
- Supervision—**
- Boarding homes giving detention care, 82.
 - Dependent children in their own homes, 155, 162-163.
 - Probation cases, 171, 188.
- Vocational guidance for children on probation, 188.**

- Buffalo juvenile court:
 Adult cases, 14, 222-223.
 Age limitation of jurisdiction, 12.
 Agencies cooperating with. *See* Organizations—Buffalo.
 Appointments, 19, 24.
 Area served, 7, 8.
 Arrests, 40.
 Cases—
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 10, 12, 14.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 94-95, 97, 98, 100, 101.
 Child-labor laws, violations of, jurisdiction over, 14.
 Child-placing agencies, commitment of delinquents, 144.
 Commitments by courts—
 Delinquency cases, 144, 149, 150, 153, 154
 Dependency and neglect cases, 156.
 Community and the court, 231, 233, 234, 237, 242, 243.
 Complaints, reception of, 41.
 Complaints and arrests, 40.
 Cooperation with—
 Agencies, 144, 149, 157.
 Police department, 43 (footnote 11), 49-50.
 Court room and probation offices, 16, 17.
 Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 14, 222-223.
 Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8.
 Delinquency. *See subject heading.*
 Dependency and neglect, 12, 155, 156, 157, 158.
 See also subject heading.
 Detention, 36, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 73.
 Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138, 139.
 Dispositions, 144, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.
 Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 140.
 Hearings, 127-128, 129, 132.
 Investigations, social, 50.
 Judge, 19.
 Jurisdiction, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14.
 Jury trials, 132.
 Legal processes prior to hearing, 51.
 Mental examinations, 34, 97, 98, 100.
 Mentally defective children, 158.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 Offenses against children, 14.
 See also Adult cases.
 Orders, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—Buffalo.
 Physical examinations, 34, 94-95, 97.
 Police, relation to, 43 (footnote 11), 49-50.
 Probation, 16, 17, 23, 24, 27, 28-30, 31, 33, 142, 162, 171, 176, 177, 181, 184-185, 191, 192, 193, 196-197.
 Psychological examinations, 34, 97, 98, 100.
 Quasi-criminal procedure in delinquency cases, 127-128.
 Reports, monthly, 211.
 School and the court, 233, 234, 237, 242, 243.
 Staff of the court, 19, 23, 24, 27, 28-30, 31, 33, 36.
 Study of the case, 94-95, 97, 98, 100, 101.
 Supervision—
 Dependent children in their own homes, 155.
 Probation cases, 171.
 Records of, 208.
 Support of children, 157.
 See also Nonsupport and desertion.
- Cases:**
 Adjustment without formal court action, 109-122.
 Comparison of formal and informal cases, 115-118.
 Dispositions, 118-119.
 Extent, 114-115.
 Methods, by cities, 109-114.
 Policy for delinquency problems, 109.
 Success of, 119-122.
- Cases—Continued.**
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of courts, 9-15.
 Adoptions, 13.
 Contributing to delinquency or dependency, 13.
 Delinquency, 9-12.
 Dependency and neglect, 12-13.
 Mentally-defective children, 13.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 14-15.
 Offenses against children, 14.
 Other, 15.
 Violations of child-labor laws, 14.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 88-108.
 Children studied by Judge Baker Foundation of Boston, 103-108.
 Correlation of physical, mental, and social findings, 100-101.
 Importance of adequate study, 88.
 Recommendations as to treatment and follow-up work, 101-102.
 Social investigation, 88-93.
 Adoption cases, 93.
 Adult cases, 93.
 Delinquency cases, 89-93.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 93.
 Types of cases investigated, 88-89.
 Study of the child, 94-100.
 Need of scientific study, 94.
 Number of children studied, 99-100.
 Physical examinations, 94-97.
 Study of child's mental capacities and mental life, 97-99.
- Chancery (or equity) procedure, 8, 126, 127.
 Child-labor laws, violations of, jurisdiction over, 14.
 Child-placing agencies, commitment of delinquents, 143-144.
 Child-welfare movements, participation of juvenile court in, 246-247.
 Classification of children in detention homes, 70-72.
 Commitments:
 Delinquency cases—
 Child-placing agencies, 143-144.
 Institutions—
 Court's relation to children committed, 150-152.
 Policy governing commitments, 147-148.
 Private, 148-150, 151-152, 154.
 Proportion of children committed, 152-155.
 Public, 144-148, 154.
 Dependency and neglect cases—
 Agencies, child-placing (public or private), 155-156.
 Institutions (public and private), 156.
 Community and the court:
 Participation of juvenile court in child-welfare movements, 246-247.
 Relation of court to social-service agencies and institutions, 244-246.
 School and the court, 226-244.
 Cases dealt with by school-attendance departments and cases referred to courts, 239-243.
 Development of school facilities for prevention of delinquency, 243-244.
 Equipment of school departments for prevention of delinquency, 230-234.
 Methods of dealing with problem children, 234-239.
 Opportunity of school in prevention of delinquency, 226-230.
 Complaints and arrests, 40, 41-42.
 Continuances, 141, 142.
 Cooperation of juvenile court with—
 Agencies—
 Delinquency cases, 143-152.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 156-157.
 Other courts, 224.
 Police, by cities, 42-50.
 Correlation of physical, mental, and social findings, 100-101.
 County aid to—
 Mothers, 13, 93, 132, 216, 217, 218.
 Private institutions, 150, 154, 157.
 Public institutions, 154.

- Court room and probation offices, 16-18.
 Arrangement of court room, 17-18.
 Arrangement of probation offices, 18.
 Location, 16-17.
- Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13-15, 221-224.
- Criminal or quasi-criminal procedure in juvenile cases, 8-9, 127-129.
- Delinquency:**
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109-122.
 Comparison of formal and informal cases, 115-118.
 Dispositions, 118-119.
 Extent, 114-115.
 Methods, by cities, 109-114.
 Policy of, 109.
 Success of, 119-122.
 Contributing to, 13-14, 221-224.
 Hearings, 126-130.
 Chancery (or equity) procedure, 8, 126-127.
 Criminal or quasi-criminal procedure, 8-9, 127-129.
See also Hearings.
- Informal treatment of cases. *See* Adjustment of cases without formal court action.
- Investigations, scope of, 89-93.
- Jurisdiction of court according to—
 Age limitation, 10-12.
 Nature of offense, 9-10.
- Orders of court, 137-155.
 Commitments—
 Child-placing agencies, 143-144.
 Policy governing, 147-148.
 Private institutions, 148-150.
 Proportion of total orders, 152-155.
 Public institutions, 144-148.
 Continuances, 141-142.
 Dismissal, 137-139.
 Fines and costs, 139-140.
 Probation, 142-143.
 Restitution and reparation, 141.
 Variations between courts, 137.
- School in relation to prevention—
 Cases dealt with by school-attendance departments and cases referred to courts, 239-243.
 Development of school facilities, 243-244.
 Equipment of special departments, 230-234.
 Local institutions, 233-234.
 Special day schools and special classes, 232-233.
 Work of school-attendance departments, 230-232.
 Methods of dealing with problem children, 234-239.
 Opportunity of, 226-230.
See also subject headings.
- Denver juvenile court:
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109, 110, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119-121.
 Administrative work of the court, 217 (*see also* footnote 17).
 Adoptions, 13.
 Adult cases, 13, 14, 15, 223-224.
 Age limitation of jurisdiction, 11, 12.
 Agencies, cooperation with. *See* Organizations—Denver.
 Appeals, 134.
 Appointments, 19, 27.
 Area served, 8.
 Cases—
 Adjustment without formal court action, 110, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119-121.
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 11, 12-13, 14, 15.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 93, 97 (footnote 47a), 101.
 Chancery (or equity) procedure, 126-127.
 Child labor laws, violations of, jurisdiction over, 14.
 Commitments—
 Delinquency cases, 148, 152, 153, 154.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 157.
 Community and the court, 231, 232, 237, 242-243, 245.
 Complaints, reception of, 41.
- Denver juvenile court—Continued.
 Cooperation with—
 Agencies, 148, 157.
 Other courts, 224.
 Police department, 43, 48.
 Court room and probation offices, 16-17.
 Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13, 14-15, 223-224.
 Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8.
 Delinquency. *See subject heading.*
 Dependency and neglect, 12-13, 93, 130, 132, 157, 158.
See also subject heading.
 Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.
 Detention, 36, 55, 56, 59, 63, 68, 73.
 Dismissal of delinquency cases by court order, 137-138.
 Dispositions, 118, 119, 148, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158.
 Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139.
 Hearings, 124, 126-127, 130, 132, 133, 134.
 Informal adjustment of cases, 109, 110, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119-121.
 Investigations, social, 50, 93.
 Jails and police stations, detention in, 63.
See also Detention.
 Judge, 19, 21.
 Jurisdiction of court, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-13, 14, 15.
 Jury trial, 133.
 Mental examinations, 34, 97 (footnote 47a).
 Mothers' allowances, 217.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 14-15.
See also Adult cases.
 Notice and summons, 201.
 Offenses against children, 14.
See also Adult cases.
 Orders, 137-138, 139, 142, 143, 148, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—Denver.
 Police, relation to, 43, 48.
 Probation, 16-17, 23, 27, 31, 142, 143, 165, 168, 171, 176-177, 181, 184, 185, 191, 192.
 Psychological examinations, 34, 97 (footnote 47a).
 Referees, use of, by judge, 21.
 School and the court, 231, 237, 242-243.
 Staff, 19, 21, 23, 27, 31, 36.
 Study of the case, 93, 97 (footnote 47a), 101.
 Summons and notice, 201.
 Supervision—
 Probation cases, 171.
 Records of, 208.
- Dependency and neglect:
 Contributing to, 13.
 Hearings, 130-132.
 Investigations, 93.
 Jurisdiction of courts, 12-13.
 Orders of court in cases of, 155-158.
- Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.
- Detention:
 Boston plan, 78-87.
 Advantages and disadvantages, 86-87.
 Expense, 84-86.
 History, and extent of service, 78-79.
 Homes, boarding—
 Description, 82-83.
 Discharge records, 84.
 Number and financial arrangements, 79-80.
 Number and type of children cared for and length of stay, 80-81.
 Physical care of children, 83-84.
 Selection, 81-82.
 Supervision, 82.
- Facilities, extent to which used, 56-62.
- Homes—
 Equipment and management, 67-78.
 Classification of children, 70-72.
 Daily programs, 75-78.
 Physical equipment, 67-70.
 Staff—
 Appointment, 36-37.
 Personnel, 72-74.
 Supervision of children, 74.
See also under individual courts.
- Jails or police stations, detention of children, 62-67.
- Methods of detention in courts studied, 55.
- Principles governing detention in children's cases, 52-54.

Dismissal of delinquency cases, 137-139.

Dispositions:

Adjustments without formal court action, 118-119.

Orders of court—

Commitments in delinquency cases—
 Child-placing agencies, 143-144.
 Policy governing, 147-148.
 Private institutions, 148-150.
 Proportion of total orders, 152-155.
 Public institutions, 144-148.

Commitments in dependency and neglect cases, 155-158.

Private institutions, 156.
 Public institutions, 156.
 Public or private agencies, 155-156.
 Supervision of children in own homes, 155.

Support of children in institutions, 157.
 Summary of dispositions in cases of dependency and neglect, 157-158.

District of Columbia juvenile court:

Adequacy of court's resources, 160.
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109, 112-113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121.

Adult cases, 13, 14-15, 223.

Advice in choice of occupation and supervision of employment of children on probation, 187.

Age limitation of jurisdiction, 12.

Agencies, cooperation with. *See* Organizations—District of Columbia.

Appointments, 19.

Area served, 7, 8.

Cases—

Adjustment without formal court action, 109, 112-113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121.
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 88, 90, 91, 92 (footnote), 94, 96-97, 99-100, 101.

Child-labor laws, violations of, jurisdiction over, 14.

Child-placing agencies, commitment of delinquents, 143.

Commitments by court—

Delinquency cases, 143, 144, 148, 152, 153, 154.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 156.

Community and the court, 231, 232-233, 243.

Complaints, reception of, 41.

Cooperation with—

Agencies, 143, 144, 148, 156.
 Police department, 42, 46.

Court room and probation offices, 16, 17.

Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13, 14-15, 223.

Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8.

Delinquency. *See subject heading.*

Dependency and neglect, 12, 13, 130, 131, 155, 156, 157, 158.

See also subject heading.

Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.

Detention, 55, 56, 59, 61, 62, 68, 73.

Dismissal of delinquency cases by court order, 138.

Dispositions, 119, 143, 144, 148, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.

Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139.

Hearings, 123 (footnote 14), 124 (footnote 16), 125-126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 133.

Informal adjustment of cases, 109, 112-113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121.

Investigations, social, 50, 88, 90, 91, 92 (footnote), 163, 164.

Judge, 19, 21.

Jurisdiction, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15.

Jury trials, 133.

Legal processes prior to hearing, 51.

Mental examinations, 34, 97, 99-100, 101.

Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.

Nonsupport and desertion, 14.

Offenses against children, 14.

Orders, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 148, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160.

Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—District of Columbia.

District of Columbia juvenile court—Continued.

Physical examinations, 94, 96, 101.

Police, relation to, 42, 46.

Probation, 16, 17, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 33, 142, 143, 163, 164-165, 171, 174, 175, 176, 181-182, 183-184, 185, 187, 192, 193, 197-198.

Psychological examinations, 34, 97, 99-100, 101.
 Quasi-criminal procedure in delinquency cases, 127, 129.

Referees, use of, by judge, 21.

Reports—

Annual, 212, 213.

Monthly, 210-211.

School and the court, 231, 232-233, 237, 243.

Staff, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 33.

Study of the case, 88, 90, 91, 92 (footnote), 94, 96-97, 99-100, 101.

Supervision—

Dependent children in their own homes, 155.

Probation cases, 163, 164-165, 171, 187, 190-191.

Records of, 207-208.

Supervision and investigation, separation in organization of probation staff, 163, 164-165.

Equity procedure. *See* Chancery procedure.

Feeble-minded children. *See* Mentally defective children.

Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139-140.

Forms used by courts studied, 257-306.

General law, prosecution under, 9, 10.

Hearings:

Appeals, 134-136.

Delinquency, 126-129.

Chancery (or equity) procedure, 8, 126-127.
 Criminal or quasi-criminal procedure, 8-9, 127-129.

Dependency, 130-132.

Frequency, 123-124.

Girls' cases, 129-130.

Jury trials, 132-133.

Privacy, 124-125.

Provision for children awaiting hearing, 125-126.

Socialization of procedure, 123.

Informal adjustment of cases, 109-122.

Intelligence tests. *See* Mental examinations.

Investigation, social:

A doption cases, 93.

Adult cases, 93.

Delinquency cases, 89-93, 163, 164.

Essentials of investigation and sources of information, 89.

Information from child, 89-90.

Information from parents and home visits, 90-91.

Information from social-service exchange and social agencies, 92-93.

School history, 91-92.

Working history, 92.

Dependency and neglect, 93, 162, 163, 165.

Prior to filing of petition or complaint, 50.

Separation from supervision in probation department, 163-165.

Types of cases, 88-89.

Jails, detention in, by cities, 62-67.

See also Detention.

Judge, 19-22.

Appointment and term, 19-21.

Previous experience and interests, 21.

Referees, use of, 21-22.

Time devoted to juvenile work, 19.

Judge Baker Foundation:

Children referred for study by Boston juvenile court, 97, 103-108, 195-196.

Information secured concerning child's history, 90.

Mental examination, 99, 101.

Physical examination, 96, 101.

Recommendations, 102, 105-108, 144, 175.

Records, 206.

Juvenile court's work (first and second five years), published by, 78, 195-196, 211-212, 228.

- Jurisdiction of courts, 6-15.
 Area served, 6-8.
 Classes of cases, 9-15.
 Adoptions, 13.
 Contributing to delinquency or dependency, 13.
 Delinquency, 9-12.
 Age limitation, 10-12.
 Nature of offense, 9-10.
 Dependency and neglect, 12-13.
 Mentally defective children, 13.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 14-15.
 Offenses against children, 14.
 Other cases, 15.
 Violations of child-labor laws, 14.
 Court system, 6.
 Type of jurisdiction, 8-9.
 Jury trials, 132-133.
 Juvenile-court movement, progress of, 1-3.
 Juvenile-court standards adopted by United States Children's Bureau and National Probation Association, 251-256.
 Juvenile courts studied, 4.
- Legal processes prior to hearing, 50-51.**
 Los Angeles juvenile court:
 Adequacy of court's resources, 159 (footnote 62), 160.
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109, 113, 114, 118 (footnote).
 Administrative work of court, 218, 219, 220.
 Adoptions, 13.
 Adult cases, 15, 221, 224.
 Advice in choice of occupation and supervision of employment of children on probation, 187.
 Advisory board of court, 37, 38.
 Age limitation of jurisdiction, 10, 12.
 Agencies, cooperation with. *See* Organizations—Los Angeles.
 Appointments, 23, 24.
 Arrests, 40.
 Cases—
 Adjustment without formal court action, 109, 113, 114, 118 (footnote).
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15.
 Number under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 88, 90, 95, 97, 98, 102.
 Chancery (or equity) procedure, 127.
 Child-placing agencies, commitment of delinquents, 143.
 Classification of children in detention home, 71, 72.
 Commitments by court—
 Delinquency cases, 144, 147, 149, 151-152, 154.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 154, 155.
 Community and the court, 230-231, 232, 233, 235, 237, 238, 243.
 Complaints and arrests, 40, 41.
 Cooperation with—
 Agencies, 144, 146-147, 149, 151-152, 157.
 Police department, 42-43, 47.
 Other courts, 224.
 Schools, 150-151.
 Court room and probation offices, 16-17, 18.
 Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 15, 221, 224.
 Delinquency. *See* subject heading.
 Dependency and neglect, 12, 13, 130, 154, 155, 157.
See also subject heading.
 Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.
 Detention, 36, 37, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 65-67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 76-78, 95, 98, 146-147, 220.
 Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138.
 Dispositions, 118 (footnote), 144, 147, 149-150, 155, 157.
 Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139-140.
 Hearings, 123, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132.
 Informal adjustment of cases, 109, 113, 114, 118 (footnote).
 Investigations, social, 50, 90, 163.
 Jails and police stations, detention in, 65, 67.
See also Detention.
 Judge, 19, 21.
 Jurisdiction of courts (juvenile and other), 6, 8, 9, 10 (*see also* footnote 16), 12, 13, 15.
- Los Angeles juvenile court—Continued.
 Jury trials, 132.
 Legal processes prior to hearing, 51.
 Mental examinations, 34, 97, 98.
 Mentally defective children, provision made by court, 158-159.
 Mothers' allowances, 218.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 15.
 Notice and summons, 201.
 Offenses against children, 15, 221.
 Orders, 137, 138, 139-140, 143, 144, 145, 146-147, 149, 150-152, 154, 155, 157, 160.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—Los Angeles.
 Physical examinations, 56, 95.
 Police, relation to, 42-43, 47.
 Probation, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 27, 32, 33, 143, 163, 165, 167, 171, 176, 183, 185, 187, 191, 192, 193, 197.
 Psychological examinations, 97, 98.
 Referees, use of, by judge, 21-22.
 Reports—
 Annual, 212.
 Monthly, 211.
 School and the court, 230, 232, 233, 235, 237, 238-239, 243.
 Staff, 19, 21-22, 23, 24, 27, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38.
 Study of the case, 88, 90, 92, 95, 97, 98, 102.
 Summons and notice, 201.
 Supervision—
 Probation cases, 163, 167, 171, 187, 189.
 Records of, 207, 208.
 Supervision and investigation, separation in organization of probation staff, 163.
 Support of children—
 In institutions, 157.
See also Nonsupport and desertion.
 Vocational guidance for children on probation, 187.
- Mental examinations, 34, 97-101.**
 Clinics, 34, 97-99.
 Correlation of mental, physical, and social findings, 100-101.
 Mental specialists, 34.
 Provision for, 34, 97-99.
 Psychiatric tests, 34, 97, 99.
 Psychological study, 34, 97-100.
 Psychopathic cases, 98, 160.
 Mentally defective children, provision made by court, 13, 98, 107, 142, 155, 158-159, 160, 216.
 Minneapolis juvenile court:
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109.
 Administrative work, 217, 219, 220.
 Adult cases, 15, 224.
 Advice in choice of occupation and supervision of employment of children on probation, 187.
 Age limitation of jurisdiction, 10-11, 12.
 Agencies, cooperation with. *See* Organizations—Minneapolis.
 Appointments, 19, 23 (footnote), 27.
 Area served, 8.
 Arrests, 40.
 Cases—
 Adjustment without formal court action, 109.
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 10-11, 12, 15.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 93, 95-96, 97-98, 100, 101, 102.
 Chancery (or equity) procedure, 127.
 Child-placing agencies, commitment of delinquents, 143.
 Commitments—
 Delinquency cases, 143, 145, 148, 152, 153, 154.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 154, 155-156.
 Community and the court, 231-232, 233, 236, 237-238, 239-240, 243, 245.
 Complaints and arrests, 40, 41.
 Cooperation with—
 Agencies, 143, 145, 148, 150-151, 157.
 Other courts, 224.
 Police, 45-46.

Minneapolis juvenile court—Continued.

- Court room and probation offices, 16-17, 18.
 Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 15, 224.
 Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8, 9.
 Delinquency. *See subject heading.*
 Dependency and neglect, 12, 93, 130-131, 132, 155, 156, 157, 158.
See also subject heading.
 Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.
 Detention, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 63-65.
 Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138.
 Dispositions, 143, 145, 148, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.
 Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139.
 Hearings, 123, 127, 129, 130-131, 132, 133.
 Informal adjustment of cases, 109.
 Investigations, social, 37, 50, 93, 163.
 Jails, detention in, 63-65.
See also Detention.
 Judge, 19 (*see also* footnote 3).
 Jurisdiction, 6, 8, 9, 10-11, 12, 15.
 Jury trials, 133.
 Mental examinations, 97-98, 100-101.
 Mothers' allowances, 12, 37, 93, 132, 217.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 15.
See also Adult cases.
 Orders, 138, 139, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 148, 150-151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—Minneapolis.
 Physical examinations, 95-96, 97, 100-101.
 Police, relation to, 45-46.
 Probation, 16, 22, 23 (footnote), 27, 28, 33, 142, 163, 171, 176, 177, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 191, 194.
 Psychological examinations, 34, 97-98, 100-101.
 Reports, annual, 213.
 School and the court, 231-232, 233, 236, 237-238, 239-240, 243.
 Staff, 19 (*see also* footnote 3), 22, 23 (*see also* footnote), 25, 27, 28, 36, 37.
 Study of the case, 95-96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102.
 Supervision—
 Aid-to-mothers cases, 12, 37, 93.
 Dependent children in their own homes, 155.
 Probation cases, 171, 187, 189.
 Records of, 207, 208.
 Vocational guidance for children on probation, 187.
 Mothers' allowances, by city, 12-13, 37, 93, 216-218.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 New Orleans juvenile court:
 Adequacy of resources, 160.
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109.
 Adult cases, 14, 15, 222, 223.
 Age limitation of court jurisdiction, 12.
 Appeals, 134.
 Appointments, 19.
 Area served, 8.
 Cases—
 Adjustment without formal court action, 109.
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 12, 14.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 88-89, 97.
 Child labor laws, violations of, jurisdiction over, 14.
 Commitments—
 Delinquency cases, 145, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154.
 Community and the court, 230, 237, 242.
 Complaints, reception of, 41 (footnote 7), 42.
 Cooperation with—
 Agencies, 145, 146, 148, 149.
 Police, 43, 45.
 Court room and probation offices, 16, 18.
 Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 14, 222, 223.
 Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8.
 Delinquency. *See subject heading.*
 Dependency and neglect, 12, 130, 157, 158.
See also subject heading.
 Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.

New Orleans juvenile court—Continued.

- Detention, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60.
 Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138, 139.
 Dispositions, 145, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158.
 Informal adjustment of cases, 109.
 Investigations, social, 50, 88-89.
 Judge, 19.
 Jurisdiction, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14.
 Legal processes prior to hearing, 14-51.
 Mental examinations, 34, 97.
 Mentally defective children, provision made by court, 158.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 14-15.
See also Adult cases.
 Offenses against children, 14.
 Orders, 138, 139, 145, 146, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 157, 158, 160.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—New Orleans.
 Police, relation to, 43, 45.
 Probation, 16, 18, 23, 27, 31, 162, 171, 176, 177, 183, 184, 185, 192.
 Psychological examinations, 34, 97.
 Reports, annual, 212.
 School and the court, 230, 237, 242.
 Staff, 19, 23, 27, 31.
 Study of the case, 88-89, 97.
 Supervision of probation cases, 171.
 Nonsupport and desertion:
 Jurisdiction of courts, 14-15.
 See also Adult cases.
 Notice and summons, 201.
 Offenses against children:
 Jurisdiction of juvenile court, 14.
 See also Adult cases.
 Orders of courts:
 Adequacy of courts' resources, 159-160.
 Delinquency cases, 137-155.
 Commitments—
 Child-placing agencies, 143-144.
 Institutions—
 Court's relation to children committed, 150-152.
 Policy governing commitments, 147-148.
 Private, 148-150.
 Proportion of children committed, 152-155.
 Public, 144-148.
 Continuances, 141-142.
 Dismissal, 137-139.
 Fines and costs, 139-140.
 Probation, 142-143.
 Procedure in, variations among courts, 137.
 Restitution and reparation, 141.
 Dependency and neglect cases, 155-158.
 Commitments—
 Private institutions, 156.
 Public institutions, 156.
 Public or private agencies, 155-156.
 Dispositions (summary), 157-158.
 Relation between court and agencies or institutions, 157.
 Supervision of children in their own homes, 155.
 Support of children in institutions, 157.
 Mentally defective children, 158-159.
 Records of orders, 202.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from, courts:
 Boston—
 Children's Aid Society—
 Detention in boarding homes, 59, 79, 80-81, 244.
 Placements, 33, 44, 78, 144.
 Supervision by, 81, 82, 84-86.
 Confidential Exchange, 92-93.
 Council of Jewish Women, investigations by, 33.
 Disciplinary day school, 232.
 House of the Good Shepherd, 148.
 Institutions Department of Boston, 155.
 Judge Baker Foundation of Boston, 78, 90, 96, 97, 99-100, 101, 102, 103-108, 144, 175, 195, 206, 211-212, 228.
 Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare, by, 57-58, 59, 79, 130, 134-135, 143, 155.

- Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from, courts—Continued.
- Boston**—Continued.
- Massachusetts Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children—
 - Detention, 44, 58, 59, 79, 155, 156.
 - Investigations in neglect cases, 33, 162.
 - Physical examinations, 96.
 - Presentation of neglect cases, 130.
 - Parental School, abolition of, 228, 233.
 - School-attendance department, 231, 235-236, 240-241.
 - Suffolk County Training School for Delinquent Boys, abolition of, 233-234.
- Buffalo**—
- Big Brother organization, probationary supervision by, 33.
 - Catholic boys' institution, 149.
 - Children's aid society, 144.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, 149.
 - Parental school, abolition of, 233, 234.
 - School-attendance department, 231, 234, 237, 242.
- Denver**—
- Bureau of charities of city, and county department of health and charities, investigation and supervision by, 12-13, 132.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, commitments to, 148.
 - School-attendance department, 231, 232, 237, 242-243.
 - University of Colorado, physical and mental tests, 34.
- District of Columbia**—
- American Red Cross, investigations by, 33.
 - Board of Children's Guardians—
 - Commitments, 143, 148, 155, 160, 183-184, 197, 201.
 - Investigations in dependency and neglect cases, 33, 131, 165.
 - Supervision, 55, 59.
 - National training schools, commitments to, 143, 144, 156, 184, 198.
 - School-attendance department, 231, 232-233, 237, 243.
 - United States Public Health Service—
 - Mental tests by, 99-100.
 - Veneral disease treated by, 183, 184.
 - Women's bureau of police department, 129.
- Los Angeles**—
- California George Junior Republic, 149.
 - El Retiro (school for girls), 38, 146-147, 151, 154, 160, 167, 220, 233.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, 149.
 - Juvenile bureau of police department, 42-43.
 - Parent-Teacher Association, follow-up work on informal cases, 113.
 - School-attendance department, 230-231, 235, 237, 238, 243.
 - Special schools, 238-239.
- Minneapolis**—
- Children's Protective Society of Minneapolis, investigations and supervision in dependency and neglect cases by, 33, 46, 130, 155, 156.
 - County home schools (Hennepin County)—
 - Administration, 220.
 - Detention in, 59.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, commitments, 148.
 - Minnesota State Board of Control, 143, 148, 155.
 - Opportunity School, 233.
 - School-attendance department, 231, 232, 233, 236, 237-238, 239-240.
- New Orleans**—
- City school for boys, detention in, 55, 59.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, detention in, 45, 59, 149.
 - Louisiana Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, investigations made by, 14, 33.
 - Louisiana State training institute, commitments, 145.
 - School-attendance department, 230, 237, 242.
- Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from, courts—Continued.
- St. Louis**—
- Bellefontaine Farms, commitments, 145-146.
 - Big Brother and Big Sister organizations, 33.
 - Board of Children's Guardians—
 - Detention care, 59.
 - Supervision, 55.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, commitments, 148.
 - Missouri School of Social Economy, statistical work for court, 209.
 - School-attendance department, 230, 234-235, 241-242.
- San Francisco**—
- Ethan Allan School, 233.
 - School-attendance department, 230, 233, 237, 243.
 - Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Children, 166.
 - University of California, clinic maintained by, 95, 98.
 - Widows' pension bureau, 13, 217-218.
- Seattle**—
- Department of vocational education, 240.
 - House of the Good Shepherd, commitments, 148.
 - Parental schools of Seattle, 145, 151, 156, 233, 240.
 - School-attendance department, 33, 231, 232, 236, 237, 240.
 - University of Washington, 31, 33.
 - Gatzert Foundation, 98.
 - Women's Industrial Home and Clinic, 145.
- Physical examinations, 34, 94-97.**
- Correlation of physical, mental, and social findings, 100-101.
- Police, relation to juvenile court, by city, 42-50.**
- Police stations, detention in, by cities, 62-67.
 - See also Detention.
- Privacy of hearings, 124-125.**
- Probation:**
- Advising in choice of occupation and supervising employment of children on probation, 186-188.
 - Conditions, 172-174.
 - Health of children on probation, safeguarding of, 182-184.
 - Home visits, 179-182.
 - Individual treatment, planning of, 175.
 - Length of probation periods and termination of probation, 191-194.
 - Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 - Offices, location and arrangement, 16-18.
 - Orders of courts in delinquency cases, 142-143.
 - Relation of probation officer to school, 184-185.
 - Relation of probation to recreation, 186.
 - Reports by probationers, 175-179.
 - Results, 194-198.
 - Staff of court, 22-33.
 - Hours of work and provision for vacations, 28-30.
 - Length of service, 31.
 - Method of selection, 23-27.
 - Number, 22-23.
 - Organization, 161-171.
 - Plan of organization, by city, 161-163.
 - Relative advantages of various types, 168-171.
 - Police officers, volunteers, and public and private agencies, use of, 31-33.
 - Salaries, 27-28.
 - Training and experience, 30-31.
 - Supervision of case work, 188-191.
- Psychological examinations:**
- Clinics, 34, 97-99.
 - Correlation of mental, physical, and social findings, 100-101.
 - Mental specialists, 34.
 - Provision for, 34, 97-99.
 - Psychiatric tests, 34, 97, 99.
 - Psychopathic cases, 98.
- Quasi-criminal, or criminal, procedure in juvenile cases, 8-9, 127-129.**

Referees, use of, by judge, 21-22.**Reports:**

Annual, 211-213.

Monthly, 210-211.

St. Louis juvenile court:

Adjustment of cases without formal action, 109, 113-114.

Adoptions, 13.

Adult cases, 13, 15, 221 (footnote 25), 224.

Age limitation of jurisdiction, 11, 12.

Agencies cooperating with. *See* Organizations—St. Louis.

Appeals, 134.

Appointments, 19-21, 23-24.

Area served, 7, 8.

Arrests, 40.

Cases—

Adjustment without formal court action, 109, 113-114.

Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15.

Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.

Study of, 88, 94-95, 97.

Chancery (or equity) procedure, 127.

Commitments, 145, 148, 151, 153, 154, 156.

Community and the court, 230, 232, 233, 234-235, 241-242, 243.

Complaints, reception of, 42.

Complaints and arrests, 40, 42.

Cooperation—

Agencies, 145, 146, 148, 151, 153, 154, 156.

Other courts, 224.

Police, 49.

Court room and probation offices, 16, 17, 18.

Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13, 221 (footnote 25), 224.

Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8, 11.

Delinquency. *See* subject heading.

Dependency and neglect, 12, 130, 156, 157, 158.

See also subject heading.Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.

Detention, 36, 55, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 68, 73.

Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138, 139.

Dispositions, 145, 148, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158.

Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 140.

Hearings, 127, 130, 133, 134.

Informal adjustment of cases, 109, 113-114.

Investigations, social, 50, 163-164.

Jails, detention in, 63.

See also Detention.

Judge, 19, 21.

Jurisdiction, 6 (*see also* footnote 2), 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15.

Jury trials, 133.

Legal processes prior to hearing, 51.

Mental examinations, 34, 97.

Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.

Nonsupport and desertion, 15.

See also Adult cases.

Notice and summons, 201.

Orders, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 145, 148, 151, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158.

Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—St. Louis.

Physical examinations, 34, 94-95, 97.

Police, relation to, 49.

Probation, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 27, 33, 142, 163-164, 171, 176, 183, 184, 191, 192, 193, 197.

Psychological examinations, 34, 97.

Referees, use of, by judge, 21.

Reports, monthly, 211.

School and the court, 230, 232, 233, 234-235, 241-242, 243.

Staff, 19-21, 23, 24, 27, 33, 36.

Study of the case, 88, 94-95, 97.

Summons and notice, 201.

Supervision of probation cases, 163-164, 171, 189.

Supervision and investigation, separation in organization of probation staff, 163-164.

San Francisco juvenile court:

Adjustment of cases without formal action, 109, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.

Administrative work, 217-218, 219-220.

Adult cases, 13, 15, 93, 221-222.

San Francisco juvenile court—Continued.

Advice in choice of occupation and supervision of employment of children on probation, 187.

Advisory board, 37.

Age limitation of jurisdiction, 10 (footnote 16), 12.

Agencies, cooperation with. *See* Organizations—San Francisco.

Appointments, 24, 27.

Cases—

Adjustment without formal court action, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.

Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15.

Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.

Study of, 90, 93, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102.

Chancery (or equity) procedure, 127.

Classification of children in detention homes, 71, 72.

Commitments, 144, 145, 147-148, 149-150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156.

Community and the court, 230, 232, 233, 237, 243, 245.

Complaints, reception of, 42.

Continuances—Court order in delinquency cases, 142.

Cooperation with—

Agencies, 145, 147-148, 149-150, 151, 157.

Police, 49.

County aid, 13, 93, 132 (footnote 21), 217-218.

Court room and probation offices, 16, 17.

Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13, 15, 221-222.

Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8, 9.

Delinquency. *See* subject heading.

Dependency and neglect, 12, 13, 93, 131-132, 155, 156, 157, 158.

See also subject heading.Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.

Detention, 36-37, 55, 56-57, 60, 61, 62, 65, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73.

Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138.

Dispositions, 118, 119, 145, 147-148, 149-150, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158.

Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139.

Hearings, 127, 129-130, 131-132.

Informal adjustment of cases, 109, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.

Investigations, social, 50, 90, 93.

Jails, detention in, 65.

See also Detention.

Judge, 19, 21.

Jurisdiction, 6, 8, 10 (footnote 16), 12, 13, 15.

Jury trials, 132-133.

Legal processes prior to hearing, 50.

Mental examinations, 34, 97, 98, 100, 101.

Mentally defective children, provision made by court, 98, 158.

Mothers' allowances, 13, 93, 132 (footnote 21), 217-218.

Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.

Nonsupport and desertion, 15.

Notice and summons, 201.

Orders, 137, 138, 139, 142, 143, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154.

Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from, court. *See* Organizations—San Francisco.

Physical examinations, 56, 95, 101.

Police, relation to, 49.

Probation, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 142, 143, 165-167, 171, 175, 176, 182, 183, 185, 187, 191, 192, 193, 194, 197.

Psychological examinations, 34, 97, 98, 100, 101.

Referees, use of, by judge, 21.

Reports, annual, 212.

School and the court, 230, 232, 233, 237, 243.

Staff, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 30, 31, 34-36, 37.

Study of the case, 90, 93, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102.

Summons and notice, 201.

Supervision, records of, 207.

Supervision of probation cases, 171, 187, 189-190.

Support of children, 157.

See also Nonsupport and desertion.

Vocational guidance for children on probation, 187.

- Schools and the court, 226-244.
 Cases dealt with by school-attendance departments, and cases referred to courts, 239-243.
 Development of school facilities for prevention of delinquency, 243-244.
 Equipment of school departments for prevention of delinquency, 230-234.
 Local institutions, 233-234.
 School-attendance departments, 230-232.
 Special day schools and special classes, 232-233.
 Methods of dealing with problem children, 234-239.
 Opportunity of school in prevention of delinquency, 226-230.
- Seattle juvenile court:
 Adjustment of cases without formal court action, 109, 111-112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.
 Administrative work of court, 216, 219.
 Adoptions, 13.
 Adult cases, 15.
 Advice in choice of occupation and supervision of employment of children on probation, 187.
 Age limitation of jurisdiction, 10, 11, 12.
 Agencies, cooperation with. *See* Organizations—Seattle.
 Arrests, 40.
 Cases—
 Adjustment without formal court action, 109, 111-112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.
 Classes of, under jurisdiction of court, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Study of, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 98, 101, 102.
 Chancery (or equity) procedure, 127.
 Child-placing agencies, commitment of delinquents, 144.
 Commitments, 144, 145, 148, 150, 154-155.
 Community and the court, 231, 232, 233, 236, 237, 240, 243.
 Complaints, reception of, 42.
 Complaints and arrests, 40, 42.
 Cooperation with—
 Agencies, 144, 145, 146, 148, 150, 151, 157.
 Police, 42, 48.
 Court room and probation offices, 16, 17, 18.
 Criminal cases of adults involving children, jurisdiction over, 13.
 Criminal jurisdiction over children, 8, 9.
 Delinquency. *See subject heading.*
 Dependency and neglect, 12, 13, 93, 130, 132, 155, 157.
See also subject heading.
 Desertion. *See* Nonsupport and desertion.
 Detention, 36, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 68, 69-70, 73.
 Dismissal of delinquency cases, 138.
 Dispositions, 118, 119, 144, 145, 148, 150, 154-155, 157.
 Fines and costs in delinquency cases, 139.
 Hearings, 127, 129, 130, 132.
 Informal adjustment of cases, 109, 111-112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121.
 Investigations, social, 50, 90, 93, 163, 164.
 Jails and police stations, detention in, 65.
See also Detention.
- Seattle juvenile court—Continued.
 Judge, 19.
 Jurisdiction, 6, 8, 9, 10-11, 12, 13, 14, 15.
 Legal processes prior to hearing, 50-51.
 Mental examinations, 97, 98, 101.
 Mentally defective children, provision made by court, 158.
 Mothers' allowances, 216.
 Neglect. *See* Dependency and neglect.
 Nonsupport and desertion, 15.
See also Adult cases.
 Orders, 137, 138, 139, 141, 142-143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 150, 151, 154-155, 157.
 Organizations cooperating with, or receiving children from. *See* Organizations—Seattle.
 Physical examinations, 95, 101.
 Police, relation to juvenile court, 42, 43, 48.
 Probation, 16, 17, 18, 23, 27, 30, 31, 33.
 Psychological examinations, 97, 98, 101.
 Reports, annual, 212.
 School and the court, 231, 232, 233, 236, 237, 240, 243.
 Staff, 19, 23, 27, 30, 31.
 Study of the case, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 98-99, 101, 102.
 Supervision—
 Probation cases, 163, 164, 171, 187.
 Records of, 207, 208.
 Supervision and investigation, separation in organization of probation staff, 163, 164.
 Support of children, 157.
See also Nonsupport and desertion.
 Vocational guidance for children on probation, 187.
 Social investigation. *See* Investigation, social.
 Societies. *See* Organizations.
 Staff of courts:
 Advisory boards, 37-38.
 Clerical staff, 34-36.
 Detention-home staff, 36-37.
 Judge, 19-22.
 Probation staff, 22-33.
 Standards, juvenile-court, adopted by conference held under auspices of U. S. Children's Bureau and National Probation Association, 251-256.
 Study of the case, 88-108.
 Importance of, 88.
 Social investigation, 88-93.
 Study of the child, 94-100.
 Summons and notice, 201.
 Supervision:
 Case work, 188-191.
 Dependent children in their own homes, 155.
 Detention homes, 82.
 Probation cases—
 Employment, 186-188.
 Investigation separated from supervision, by city, 163-165.
 Number of cases under supervision of one officer, 171.
 Records of, 207-208.
 Supervision and investigation, separation in organization of probation staff, 163-165.
 Support of children:
 In institutions, 157.
See also Nonsupport and desertion.
- Vocational guidance for children on probation, 186-188.

