


MS

No. 5573.149

201-210



GIVEN BY



5573.149
201-210

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
CHILDREN'S BUREAU PUBLICATION No. 201

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
IN MAINE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
PUBLICATION NO. 201

92.48

Handwritten musical notation on a page with a mottled background. The notation consists of several lines of notes and rests, arranged in a structured format typical of a musical score. The notes are small and densely packed, with some larger notes and stems visible. The overall appearance is that of a page from an old manuscript or a printed score with a textured, aged paper background.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
IN MAINE



Bureau Publication No. 201



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1930

W. C. ... 15, 1934.

U. S. SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	v
Purpose and scope of the survey.....	1
State provision for the care of delinquent children.....	2
State department of public welfare.....	2
Courts.....	2
Jurisdiction and judges.....	2
Probation service.....	4
State institutions.....	5
Child study.....	5
Extent of juvenile delinquency in Maine.....	6
Cases reported.....	6
Sex and age of children.....	7
Methods of dealing with delinquent children in Maine.....	9
Preliminary treatment of juvenile delinquency.....	9
Agencies responsible.....	9
Investigation of complaints.....	9
Unofficial handling of cases.....	11
Case histories illustrating unofficial handling.....	13
Work of the courts.....	20
Court procedure in official cases.....	20
Detention before and after hearings.....	22
Disposition of cases by municipal courts and trial justices.....	25
Disposition of cases by superior and supreme courts.....	27
Case histories illustrating the work of the courts.....	28
Probation.....	39
Case histories illustrating probation.....	41
Provision for care of delinquent children away from their own homes.....	49
Care in institutions.....	50
Case histories illustrating commitment to the State training schools.....	53
Case histories illustrating commitment to the State reformatory.....	73
Placement in family homes.....	76
Case histories illustrating placement in family homes.....	77
Situations affecting the delinquency problem.....	82
Enforcement of school attendance.....	82
Regulation of employment of minors.....	84
Prosecution of adults contributing to delinquency of children.....	85
Provision for recreation.....	86
Recommendations.....	89

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, February 11, 1930.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a report on juvenile delinquency in Maine made at the request of the State department of public welfare. The report consists of a study of the extent of juvenile delinquency in Maine and the methods of dealing with juvenile delinquents and of detailed case histories of a selected group of children who had come before the courts in a 6-month period. The survey was made and the report written by members of the social-service division of the Children's Bureau.

Acknowledgment is made of the cooperation given the bureau by the State department of public welfare and other agencies interested in child welfare.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN MAINE

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE SURVEY

This survey of juvenile delinquency in Maine was undertaken by the Children's Bureau at the request of the Department of Public Welfare of Maine, which, in accord with several other groups and interested individuals, felt the need for more adequate provision for the care of juvenile delinquents. The Children's Bureau was asked to study the present methods of dealing with juvenile delinquents and to suggest a program for providing more adequate care adapted to the needs and conditions in the State.

As no records were kept of children who had come before the courts in Maine, and as it was important to obtain as much information as possible in regard to the juvenile-delinquency problem, the first step in the study was the preparation and distribution of forms to be filled out by the courts, trial justices, police, sheriffs, probation officers, and social workers throughout the State for all cases of juvenile delinquency coming to their attention during the period selected for study, February 1, 1928, to July 31, 1928. The information requested on these forms included name and address of the child, parents' names, date of child's birth, sex, date on which the child came to the attention of courts or workers, charge or offense, action taken, and date of action. These record forms were distributed by the State department of public welfare, which took the responsibility for sending out follow-up letters early in the summer and also for having the forms returned at the end of the period of study.

The investigation of methods of dealing with juvenile offenses included two aspects: First, a fairly complete study in selected counties of the community resources for preventing delinquency or for caring for delinquent children; and, second, detailed case histories of the actual care given to a selected group of children who had come before the courts in the 6-month period studied. In the selection of cases consideration was given to the various types of dispositions used by the courts, especially probation and commitment to the State school for delinquent boys, the State school for delinquent girls, and the two reformatories. Forty-one cases were studied. In every case the child was interviewed and his home was visited. So far as possible interviews were also obtained with his teacher, school principal, school-attendance officer, probation officer, judge hearing his case, police, and any other workers having contact with him. Most of the cases selected had been under care in the three counties (Cumberland, Androscoggin, and Penobscot) chosen for intensive study, but a few cases were from two other counties (Washington and Aroostook).

Although most of the field work was done in the five counties, a number of other counties were visited and various persons who had dealt with juvenile cases were interviewed. The field work was done during the summer and early fall of 1928.

STATE PROVISION FOR THE CARE OF DELINQUENT CHILDREN

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

The State department of public welfare is responsible in large measure for the care that is given in the State to dependent children.¹ This department is authorized to provide for the maintenance and education of all dependent and neglected children committed to it by the courts and of dependent children placed in its custody by parents or other persons. In cooperation with local boards it administers aid given to dependent children in their own homes, generally known as mothers' aid.² It is also responsible for investigation and supervision of all State charitable and correctional institutions and for all institutions partly or wholly supported by State funds. A large proportion of the private institutions and agencies in the State caring for children are included in this last group.

The responsibility of the State department for delinquent children is less comprehensive. Through its inspecting and supervising powers the department is concerned with the development of adequate standards of care in the State school for boys and the State school for girls. It is also authorized to provide care for children who, because of willful neglect or failure of parents, have been found frequenting places injurious to their morals and have therefore been committed to the guardianship of the State by the courts.³

At the time of the study the department had 14 field workers to carry on its work with children throughout the State.

COURTS

JURISDICTION AND JUDGES

Some jurisdiction over dependent, neglected, or delinquent children is vested in each of the courts of the State. At the time of this study jurisdiction over delinquency cases was vested in 154 trial justices, 43 municipal and police courts, 4 superior courts, and the supreme judicial court.⁴ Jurisdiction over dependency and neglect cases is

¹ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 147, secs. 3-6, 9, 11. This department is so designated by Laws of 1927, ch. 48.

² Laws of 1917, ch. 222, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 17, and Laws of 1929, ch. 204.

³ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 64, secs. 53-54, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 171, and Laws of 1929, ch. 267.

⁴ Since this survey was made the statutes have been revised and amended by the eighty-fourth legislature in an act effective Jan. 1, 1930. (Laws of 1929, ch. 141.) The four superior courts of Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, and Penobscot Counties have been united and consolidated into one court known as the superior court. Provisions have been made for the appointment of three additional justices and for an extension of the powers, duties, and jurisdiction of this court to all the counties in the State, trial terms to be held at times and places designated by law. The jurisdiction of the superior courts, thus consolidated into one court, is unchanged with respect to their judicial activities discussed in this study. The powers, duties, and jurisdiction of the supreme court have been correspondingly modified so that the State now constitutes but one district within which this court shall hold eight sessions each year at times and places specified by the chief justice.

vested in the municipal courts of cities and towns and in the probate courts of counties.⁵

Trial justices are appointed and commissioned by the governor for 7-year terms, to act within the county from which they are appointed. They are not required to be attorneys. Their services are paid for by fees rather than salaries. Trial justices have original jurisdiction concurrent with other courts over juvenile offenders.

Municipal and police court judges are required to be members of the county bar. They are appointed by the governor and council for 4-year terms.⁶ As a rule their judicial duties do not occupy their full time, and most of them are practicing law. Although provision is made for adjournment from time to time, municipal courts are considered to be in constant session for the trial of criminal offenses. (In some jurisdictions the judge of the municipal court occasionally transfers his juvenile cases to the court recorder for hearing, although there appears to be no statutory authority for such procedure.)

Municipal courts and trial justices have original and concurrent jurisdiction with certain restrictions as to territory over the following: Prosecutions under the child labor law; violation of school attendance laws; desertion and nonsupport of families; crimes against children other than sex offenses; and commitment to State training schools for boys and for girls.⁷ Trial justices and municipal courts do not have jurisdiction over juvenile cases in which the offense if committed by an adult would constitute a felony. Such cases are bound over to the higher courts.

Probate court judges are elected for 4-year terms at the biennial general election. Their major activity is the administration of estates of deceased persons, trusts created under wills, and wills. These courts have concurrent jurisdiction with municipal and police courts in cases of dependent or neglected children. They may grant leave to adopt children, and they appoint guardians for minors. They have jurisdiction as to persons under guardianship, proceedings for support of family, and certain cases involving custody of children.

A superior court presided over by one justice had been established at the time of the study in Androscoggin, Cumberland, Kennebec, and Penobscot Counties. Justices were appointed by the governor and council for terms of seven years. These courts had original and appellate jurisdiction in all criminal matters in the respective counties, except cases exclusively cognizable by municipal and police courts or trial justices, and exclusive original jurisdiction in divorce cases, including the awarding of custody of children involved, and illegitimacy cases.⁸ Children's cases bound over or appealed from the lower courts were heard at the quarterly terms of the court when criminal business was transacted.

⁵ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 64, sec. 53, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 171, and Laws of 1929, ch. 267.

⁶ Laws of 1917, ch. 269; Rev. Stat. 1916, Constitution, art. 6, sec. 8.

⁷ The supreme judicial and superior courts have concurrent jurisdiction except in school-attendance cases. Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 64, sec. 53, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 171, and Laws of 1929, ch. 267; ch. 49, sec. 31; ch. 16, sec. 71; ch. 120, sec. 42, as amended by Laws of 1923, ch. 157; ch. 125, sec. 26; ch. 144, sec. 3, as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 129; sec. 20, as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 55; and sec. 23.

⁸ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 102, sec. 3; ch. 65, sec. 2, as amended by special statutes establishing superior courts, and sec. 14, as amended by Laws of 1917, ch. 175.

The supreme judicial court, consisting of a chief justice and seven associate justices appointed by the governor and council for 7-year terms, has jurisdiction over all felonies and misdemeanors and all civil actions and general superintendence of all lower courts.

PROBATION SERVICE

Maine is one of the few States having a state-wide probation service.⁹ According to the law, county probation officers handling both adult and juvenile cases may be appointed by the governor with the consent of the council. At the time of the study such officers had been appointed in 13 of the 16 counties in the State.

A special legal provision is in effect in Cumberland County whereby probation officers are appointed by the judge of the Portland municipal court with the approval of the judge of the superior court for the county. This law antedated the authorization of state-wide probation service and was left unchanged. The term of office is two years for the Cumberland County officers and four years for the officers in other counties, probation officers being eligible for re-appointment.

Cumberland is the only county in which the probation work is on a full-time basis. The probation officer has the assistance of a full-time associate probation officer; both are men. Each of the other counties may have, if the governor and council consider it necessary, one or more associates who may be women. At the time of the study two women were serving; one as an associate, the other as the only officer actively engaged in probation work in her county.

The law requires only that a probation officer be a citizen of the county in which he is appointed and of good moral character. So far as could be learned, the officers had had little if any special training or experience to fit them for the work. This is illustrated to some extent by the fact that most of them were devoting the greater part of their time to such various occupations as chief of police, railroad detective, insurance agent, clergyman, deputy sheriff, and storekeeper.

The duties of the county probation officer are definitely prescribed in the statutes.¹⁰ He serves all the courts hearing criminal cases and supervises adult and juvenile offenders placed on probation by these courts. He is expected to attend the supreme judicial court or superior court during the times when persons convicted of crimes are sentenced; and so far as the performance of his duties permits, he is also expected to attend the sessions of other courts having criminal jurisdiction in his county. His services on these occasions consist in giving to the court upon request "such information with reference to any individual accused or convicted of crime as shall be in his possession."¹¹

In addition to these general duties, probation officers may provide some special service for children; they may serve as truant officers, assume custody of children pending trial, and make investigations of cases previous to the hearing if called upon by the judge.¹²

⁹ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 137, sec. 10, as amended by Laws of 1923, ch. 6; secs. 11-18; sec. 19, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 76; secs. 20-24.

¹⁰ Id.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, sec. 11.

¹² *Ibid.*, secs. 15-18; sec. 19, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 76; secs. 20, 21, 23.

Although these services have been given to children in isolated cases, the juvenile work done by probation officers was found to be primarily supervision of children placed on probation by the courts. In several of the counties visited adult work only was done by these officers.

STATE INSTITUTIONS

Institutional care is provided for boys 11 to 16 years of age, inclusive, in the State school for boys and for girls of 9 to 16 years in the State school for girls. These two schools are fairly similar to State training schools elsewhere. Both are built on the cottage plan. The school for boys has four cottages built on the dormitory plan, each with a capacity of 35 boys, under the supervision of a "cottage master" and "house mother." The school for girls has five cottages, accommodating from 12 to 45 girls (total capacity 150); several of these cottages have 2, 3, 4, and 5 bed dormitories, but the majority of the rooms are single; each cottage is under the supervision of a matron, and each of the four larger ones also has a resident teacher and a housekeeper.

Boys over 16 years of age may be committed to the State reformatory for men; but, in case of an offense punishable by imprisonment for less than life, the court may commit boys to the age of 17 to the State school for boys.¹³ Girls over 16 may be committed to the State reformatory for women, but girls under 17 found leading an "idle or vicious" life or in danger of becoming immoral may be committed by the court to the State school for girls.¹⁴ The reformatories make no attempt to give special care to such offenders but treat them as if they were adults.

CHILD STUDY

Legal provision has been made in Maine for extension services to be given by the two State hospitals in the district served by these institutions to school children who are "nervous, psychopathic, retarded, defective, or incorrigible" and to "children referred to the department of juvenile courts."¹⁵ Although there has been no "department of juvenile courts," these two institutions have given their services to children in their immediate neighborhood when called upon.

¹³ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 144, sec. 3, as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 129; Laws of 1919, ch. 182, sec. 1, as amended by Laws of 1923, ch. 58.

¹⁴ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 142, sec. 61, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 106; and ch. 144, sec. 20, as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 55.

¹⁵ Laws of 1919, ch. 232, sec. 4.

EXTENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN MAINE

CASES REPORTED

Records of 359 cases of juvenile delinquency occurring in the 6-month period of the study were obtained from various agencies (courts, law-enforcing officers, the department of public welfare, and several private agencies doing case work for children) to whom record forms had been sent to be filled out and from the records of the State institutions for juvenile delinquents and of two private institutions caring for delinquent girls needing maternity care. About half the cases (186) were reported by only one agency; the rest were reported by two or more.

The 359 cases recorded do not represent the total amount of juvenile delinquency in Maine dealt with officially or unofficially in the 6-month period. In addition, several persons reported cases which they had handled unofficially without having kept any record of them. Moreover, although many agencies and individuals receiving the record forms had taken great care to enter on them information in regard to all cases of delinquent children under 18 years of age or to report that no such cases had come to their attention, nearly a third of the municipal court judges and trial justices and nearly half of the police officers made no report whatever.

The reporting of cases was much more complete in some counties than in others. No reports of cases were received from any of the courts or law-enforcing officers in two counties (Oxford and Piscataquis), whereas a fairly complete record of cases was obtained from these sources in the three counties (Androscoggin, Cumberland, and Penobscot) in which the agents of the Children's Bureau made an intensive study. The lack of correlation shown in Table 1 between the number of delinquency cases of children 7 to 17 years of age reported for each county and the total number of children of the same ages in the county would seem to be a further indication of incomplete reporting.

TABLE 1.—Population 7 to 17 years of age, inclusive, in 1920¹ and number of cases of delinquent children reported dealt with by courts and agencies in counties of Maine during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928

County	Population 7 to 17 years ¹	Delin- quency cases	County	Population 7 to 17 years ¹	Delin- quency cases
Total.....	151, 573	359	Total reported—Contd.		
Total reported.....	151, 573	357	Oxford.....	7, 478	46
Androscoggin.....	12, 875	74	Penobscot.....	17, 462	46
Aroostook.....	21, 074	19	Piscataquis.....	3, 780	25
Cumberland.....	22, 314	103	Sagadahoc.....	3, 838	7
Franklin.....	3, 708	5	Somerset.....	7, 503	10
Hancock.....	5, 997	4	Waldo.....	3, 762	10
Kennebec.....	11, 796	24	Washington.....	9, 227	10
Knox.....	4, 273	5	York.....	13, 596	22
Lincoln.....	2, 890	1	Not reported.....		2

¹ Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, vol. 3, Population, pp. 411-412. Washington, 1922.

Delinquency ratios based on the number of delinquent children dealt with by the courts in a year for each 1,000 estimated population of juvenile court age have been calculated for 31 courts serving a city or a county of an estimated population of 100,000 or more that reported to the Children's Bureau in 1928.¹ Delinquency ratios for boys varied in different localities from 2.5 to 53.5, being much higher than those for girls, which ranged from 0.6 to 10.5. In Utah, the only State from which reports were received from all courts, the ratio for boys was 29.6 and for girls 4.1. Some of the factors that seem to influence the delinquency ratios in different localities are the age period over which the juvenile court has jurisdiction, the percentage of urban population in the area served, and the relation of the court to the police department and to the schools. If either of the latter is dealing with a large number of problem children without referring them to the court, the delinquency ratio of the court will be correspondingly lower.²

The 359 cases reported in Maine included only 214 cases that had come officially before the courts, the remaining cases having been dealt with unofficially by some other agency. All these would probably have been considered court cases by courts adequately equipped to deal with juvenile delinquents. Because of incomplete reporting and the short period during which cases were recorded, no attempt has been made to calculate delinquency ratios for the Maine counties. The number of cases reported from the different counties in Maine for the 6-month period is small, however, compared with the number of cases reported to the Children's Bureau by most of the courts serving counties of comparable size. The number of cases reported for the State as a whole is also small compared with the 2,589 delinquency cases reported for the calendar year 1928 by the juvenile courts of Utah.

SEX AND AGE OF CHILDREN

As 21 of the children reported had committed two or more offenses during the 6-month period, the 359 cases involved 335 children—255 boys and 80 girls. The proportion of girls among the delinquent children in Maine is somewhat higher than the proportion reported by the juvenile courts which reported to the Children's Bureau in 1928. More than half these girls, however, had been reported by agencies other than courts.

The ages of the children are shown in Table 2. More than a third of the boys whose exact age was reported were under 14 years of age, but only a fifth of the girls were as young. The number of 14 and 15 year old children was about the same as the number of 16 and 17 year old children. This age distribution of the children who committed delinquencies in Maine is similar to the age distribution of children dealt with either officially or unofficially by the juvenile courts reporting to the Children's Bureau having jurisdiction over children under 18 years of age.

¹ On July 1, 1929, about 150 juvenile courts were reporting to the Children's Bureau in connection with a plan for obtaining uniform statistics of delinquency, dependency, and neglect cases dealt with by juvenile courts. Sixty-five courts reported cases for the entire calendar year 1928.

² Juvenile Court Statistics, 1928, p. 6. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 200. Washington, 1930.

TABLE 2.—*Age and sex of children dealt with; delinquency cases reported during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928*

Age	Children dealt with in delinquency cases		
	Total	Boys	Girls
Total.....	335	255	80
Reported.....	292	225	67
Under 10 years.....	13	13
10 years, under 12.....	35	30	5
12 years, under 14.....	48	39	9
14 years, under 16.....	99	71	28
16 years, under 18.....	97	72	25
Not reported.....	43	30	13

METHODS OF DEALING WITH DELINQUENT CHILDREN IN MAINE

PRELIMINARY TREATMENT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE

In Maine no one agency has been made responsible for caring for juvenile delinquents. Complaints of offenses committed by children are received by judges, law-enforcing officers,¹ school-attendance officers, agents of the State department of public welfare, and representatives of private welfare organizations. Frequently several of these agencies receive complaints concerning the same child, and each of them undertakes to do something; but all too often they fail to coordinate their efforts and, because no one of them assumes full responsibility, each depends on the other to do the actual work.² Consequently, except in communities where an interested judge or some one of the above-mentioned agencies and individuals has definitely volunteered to do constructive work with young offenders, law-enforcing officers have assumed the initial responsibility. They decide whether a child is to be taken into custody, whether he should be referred to the court, and whether he should be detained pending court action. The courts rarely assume responsibility for deciding whether a case should be made official.

Even after a child's case has been made official³ responsibility is divided frequently between lower courts and courts of general jurisdiction. A lower court can give only a preliminary hearing to a child who has committed an offense which, if committed by an adult, would constitute a felony, and, if the evidence warrants it, must bind him over to a higher court as if he were an adult offender. In the 214 cases reported by the courts for the 6-month period, 44 children had been bound over in this way, the responsibility for them thus being shared by two courts as well as by such agencies as may have dealt with them before the court hearing.

Under juvenile court procedure the court itself determines through its judge or probation officer, after careful investigation, whether a case is to be made an official court case, and what action should be taken. Its judgment is final and there is no need to bind a child over to a higher court.

INVESTIGATION OF COMPLAINTS

Investigation of the social background and personality problems of juvenile delinquents before deciding upon the treatment needed, one

¹ Law-enforcing officers include sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, police officers, police matrons or policewomen, marshals, and constables.

² For examples of this divided responsibility see the cases of Lucy P., p. 47; Ernest and Norma P., p. 67; and Randolph L., p. 79.

³ A case is considered official if it has been entered upon the court calendar or docket and a petition or other legal paper for adjudication by the judge has been filed.

of the most important steps in juvenile-court procedure, is almost unknown in Maine. Without such an investigation the court or other agency is not in a position to determine with confidence what has caused the delinquency and hence how it can best be treated. A general acquaintance with the child and his family will not answer such specific questions as whether Johnnie's adenoids or poor eyesight may be causing his lack of interest in school work and his consequent "truancy"; whether an unusual degree of mechanical skill without proper means of expression is resulting in his "automobile larceny"; and whether arduous home duties with lack of recreational opportunities or family quarrels are leading Johnnie's sister into "danger of falling into habits of vice and immorality." Such questions can be answered only by a study of the child's mental, physical, and environmental conditions, of his school and work history, and of his play activities and companions.

Maine is not without facilities for child study, but the facilities are limited to certain localities. The State school for the feeble-minded, the State hospital for the insane, the New England Home for Little Wanderers, one or two private hospitals, and local physicians have shown their willingness to cooperate in providing mental examinations, but apparently they are called upon in extreme cases only. Of the 41 children included in the case studies, only 1 had been examined by a psychiatrist (see the case of Henry B., p. 34); and, although a large proportion of these children were retarded in school, none had been studied with a view to discovering whether mental defect or personality difficulty was involved. In three of the court hearings attended in the course of the study the mental retardation of the child was recognized by the court and considered in making the disposition, but in none of these cases was a mental examination made or even suggested.

Similarly, local health officers and private physicians are available for physical examinations, but at present physical examinations are ordered only when the disposition of the case depends on proof of venereal infection. The courts are inclined to believe that for children committed to the State schools the physical examination given on admission is sufficient and that for children disposed of otherwise no physical examination is necessary.

Schools and social agencies—as, for example, the State department of public welfare, New England Home for Little Wanderers, Children's Protective Society, and family-welfare and child-caring agencies and institutions—are all potential sources of information concerning the history of the child and his family. From school records and from teachers much valuable information may be obtained about the child's ability, his attendance, his interests, and something about his behavior in school. In most of the localities visited in Maine the lack of accurate records of transfers between public and parochial schools increased the difficulty of obtaining information from the schools. Although agencies not infrequently volunteer much information about cases appearing before the courts, and in special cases are called on by the judge to assist in reaching a decision, their records are not automatically consulted in all cases as no one is responsible for clearing delinquency cases with these agencies.

The lack of social investigation of juvenile delinquents in Maine is not due, therefore, entirely to the absence of facilities and sources of information, but is due partly to the fact that most of the communities have designated no one person or agency to be responsible for this process and the courts have not recognized this as their duty.

UNOFFICIAL HANDLING OF CASES

Types of cases handled unofficially.

In any community, even though it has a juvenile court, the police are likely to deal with children committing minor offenses without referring them to the court. If they find a group of boys gambling in an alley or two girls loitering on the streets after dark, they may consider a simple warning sufficient to prevent any repetition of the offense, and therefore see no need for referring these children to the court. In Maine, however, this practice has been extended to include offenses more serious than those indicated above. This may readily be seen from Table 3.

TABLE 3.—Charge and manner of handling case, and sex of children dealt with; delinquency cases reported during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928

Charge	Delinquency cases						
	Total	Handled officially			Handled unofficially		
		Total cases	Boys' cases	Girls' cases	Total cases	Boys' cases	Girls' cases
Total.....	359	214	179	35	145	96	49
Total reported.....	355	213	178	35	142	93	49
Stealing.....	189	144	141	3	45	42	3
Automobile stealing.....	18	14	14	—	4	3	1
Breaking and entering.....	23	18	17	1	5	5	—
Breaking, entering, and larceny.....	43	39	39	—	4	4	—
Other stealing.....	105	73	71	2	32	30	2
Truancy.....	20	13	10	3	7	6	1
Running away.....	29	—	—	—	29	20	9
Ungovernable.....	16	3	2	1	13	5	8
Sex offense.....	56	32	4	28	24	1	23
Injury to person.....	3	2	2	—	1	1	—
Traffic offenses.....	7	5	5	—	2	1	1
Violating liquor or drug law or intoxication.....	7	4	4	—	3	2	1
Acts of carelessness or mischief.....	21	7	7	—	14	11	3
Other.....	7	3	3	—	4	4	—
Not reported.....	4	1	1	—	3	3	—

All the cases of running away, more than half the cases of ungovernability and carelessness and mischief, and a large proportion of the cases of sex offense and of stealing were handled unofficially; that is, without court action. The greatest number and largest proportion of cases of stealing handled without court action fall in the group "other stealing," which includes such forms of petty larceny as the taking of candy bars, small sums of money, and articles of no great value, whereas only a small number come under the more serious types of stealing, such as automobile larceny. The reason

for dealing with these cases unofficially may be that in Maine court action for children frequently means the same criminal record, and possibly the same criminal procedure, that is used for adults. Consequently many people are anxious to dispose of children's cases without court action even when the offense is of a rather serious nature. This situation is illustrated by the fact that more than half the girls' cases were disposed of without court action, the desire to shield the girls from a criminal record being even greater than the desire to protect the boys.

The largest number of children dealt with unofficially were released—sometimes with a warning, a reprimand, or a threat, but seldom with any constructive action having been taken. The run-aways, although returned to their homes or institutions, might also be considered as released. The cases reported in which definite action was taken were those of 2 children kept under supervision and of 11 children, all of whom were girls, placed under the care of other agencies and institutions.

Some of the unofficial dispositions were made with a true social-work approach. Several judges and a few law-enforcing officers reported that they conferred with the child's parents before disposing of the case, and some reported that they made an effort to keep in touch with the child after the disposition. But most of them after disposing of the immediate problem left the child to his own devices, never giving the parents an opportunity to help with the treatment. It is not surprising, therefore, that presently these children make a second and third appearance as offenders and ultimately must be dealt with officially by the courts.

Persons handling cases unofficially.

In the 27 communities visited in the course of the study 12 municipal court judges and 1 trial justice reported that they handled some cases unofficially. Some of them cited examples of cases so handled. One judge told of having received a complaint from the owner of a boathouse which had been forcibly entered by a group of boys; the owner wished to have the boys warned but did not desire official court action; the judge accordingly spoke with the boys in private and arranged for them to come to his home once a week to talk over their activities and make an effort to keep out of mischief. Another judge had received a complaint from a mother who was having difficulty with her daughter; he spoke to the girl at length in his office, but took no official court action. Several similar cases were reported in interviews, but only one was actually recorded. It is difficult to say, therefore, how many unofficial dispositions are made by judges. Of the 145 cases reported as disposed of unofficially, 116 were disposed of by law-enforcing officers⁴ and only 29 by other agencies and individuals. Moreover, when these 29 are divided among the 8 agencies responsible for them, the significance of the law-enforcing officer becomes even more apparent.

⁴ Twenty-nine of these dispositions were made by police matrons. Policewomen, or matrons, were reported as doing unofficial work with children in five Maine communities. The general duties of these officers varied, but they included the administration of the local poor-relief fund, doing municipal welfare work, visiting public amusement places, patrolling the streets, assisting the police department in making investigations, arrests, and raids, and conducting women and girls to the State institutions to which they were committed by the courts.

These figures bear out the natural presumption that the agencies assuming the initial responsibility for a child frequently also make an unofficial disposition.

It is inevitable that when this work is being done by a considerable number of persons, representing a wide range of training and experience, the policies guiding their decisions will be not only varied but inconsistent.

In the cases reported to the Children's Bureau during the 6-month period of the study the extent to which cases were disposed of by agencies other than the courts varied greatly in the different counties. (Table 4.)

TABLE 4.—*Manner of handling case, by counties; delinquency cases reported during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928*

County	Delinquency cases			County	Delinquency cases		
	Total	Handled officially	Handled unofficially		Total	Handled officially	Handled unofficially
Total.....	359	214	145	Total reported—Con.			
Total reported.....	357	214	143	Lincoln.....	1	1	2
Androscoggin.....	74	29	45	Oxford.....	46	36	10
Aroostook.....	19	18	1	Penobscot.....	25	7	18
Cumberland.....	103	63	40	Somerset.....	7	7	
Franklin.....	5	5		Waldo.....	10	10	
Hancock.....	4	2	2	Washington.....	10	9	1
Kennebec.....	24	14	10	York.....	22	12	10
Knox.....	5	1	4	Not reported.....	2		2

In Androscoggin County, where the law-enforcing officers have adopted a definite policy of dealing with minor and first offenders without court action, the number of cases so dealt with exceeds the number handled by the court; in Penobscot County, on the other hand, the opposite seems to be true, and the majority of cases are disposed of by the court.

Unofficial case work is not incompatible with good juvenile court procedure. On the contrary, under such procedure it is considered desirable to adjust cases without formal court action whenever feasible.⁵ But in a well-organized juvenile court the unofficial as well as the official work is done by qualified officers who make the child's welfare, as determined by information concerning his needs and the conditions under which he lives, the primary consideration in determining the action to be taken.

Case histories illustrating unofficial handling

The principal question to be kept in mind in considering the cases handled unofficially is whether or not it is to the child's advantage to let the police officers or other individuals handle his case without referring it to the court.

⁵ Juvenile Court Standards, p. 3. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 121. Washington, 1923.

In the case histories that follow, the patient and kind-hearted efforts—in the one case by the police, in the other by the city welfare worker—to keep Tito V. and Alta Z. out of court merely postponed the moment when the court entered into the situation to inquire into the reasons for Tito's automobile larceny and Alta's apparent waywardness and to plan to help these children according to their needs and the resources available. When the court finally did take action, its attitude was that the children had already been given every chance and were fit subjects for commitment to the State school.

In the case of Edna C. the social agency recognized Edna as a "predelinquent" child "in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality," but dropped the case without taking action.

The stories of Colette Y. and Bertha N., on the other hand, illustrate apparently successful unofficial adjustment, for the police matron, by talking with Colette and by sending Bertha to an institution, managed to solve the immediate problems. At the same time they illustrate a complete lack of constructive planning, as the police matron did not arrange for better supervision or active recreation for Colette's after-school hours, nor did she recognize that what Bertha probably needed was not additional institutional experience but supervision in a normal family home.

TITO V.

Native white; parents born in Italy.

Age at time of offense, 13.

Municipal court, April 12, 1928: Stealing; placed on probation. April 25, 1928: Stealing; committed to State school for boys.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brother 11, sister 7, at home.

Tito is a handsome lad, slender and well proportioned, with clear eyes and rather fair complexion. He is neat and clean (except in the care of his teeth) and, according to his mother, has always taken so much pride in keeping his clothes in good condition that his friends have nicknamed him "the sheik." His manner is frank and pleasing, and for a boy of his age he has unusual poise.

The little street on which the V. family live is directly behind the city's main business district. It is untidy, with shabby, dilapidated buildings and ugly yards. The neatest house on either side is the one owned by Mr. V. It is in better repair and has been painted more recently than the rest, and Mrs. V.'s flower boxes help to make it look cheerful. It has only four rooms—two bedrooms, a living room, and a kitchen—and a bathroom. Opposite the house is a laundry garage.

Mr. V. is a skilled cabinetmaker and is a foreman in the factory in which he is employed. He has worked steadily for 14 years and has in addition taken orders for work which he has done in his spare time at home. Mrs. V. is a very motherly woman, devoted to her children and sincerely anxious about their future welfare. She takes in dressmaking from time to time in an effort to help her husband save so that they may give their children every advantage and, as soon as possible, move into a better neighborhood. Both Mr. and Mrs. V. attend church regularly. At one time they also attended English classes and social activities in a settlement house that has since gone out of existence. The two boys have been members of a well-conducted boys' club.

Last spring Tito was in the eighth grade of a private school. Because of a change in teachers no record of his work could be found, but he liked school. He used to play basket ball once a week with his classmates. He enjoyed reading and took books from the library. For a while he also took drawing lessons. He usually went to the "movies" two or three times a week, and during the winter spent some of his evenings reading or playing games at the boys' club.

During the summer preceding his delinquency he worked as an errand and stock boy in a grocery store. He earned \$5 a week, giving it all to his mother, who returned some of it for spending money.

Both mother and father were emphatic in praising Tito's conduct. They were willing to grant that Leo, the younger boy, was not always faultless, but they considered Tito exceptionally well behaved.

Last winter Tito found a new friend, a little orphan who had been brought up in a shiftless and undisciplined way. He used to bring the boy home with him, asking his mother to give him food and clothing. Together the two would go to the garage across the street and watch the drivers clean and repair trucks. Tito was quick at learning the mechanics of automobiles and was soon eager to try driving.

One day the two boys entered a parked car and took a ride. They were picked up by the police, reprimanded, and sent home; but as neither the police nor the boys reported the incident to the parents, the latter remained in ignorance of it.

No record was kept of the offenses committed by Tito or of the action taken, but from various accounts it appears that Tito repeated the offense. The police, still being reluctant to give the boy a "criminal record," placed him on unofficial probation, and the boy, in a daring spirit, reported for probation in a "borrowed" automobile. Once again he drove off in a stranger's automobile, and then the patience of the police was at an end and he was brought to court. In order that the municipal court might retain jurisdiction, the county attorney nol-prossed so much of the charge as was in excess of \$50 in value. Tito was found guilty of automobile larceny and was placed on probation for two years.

The secretary of a children's agency, knowing Mr. and Mrs. V. from the days of their settlement classes, was deeply concerned when she heard of Tito's court experience and at once arranged to see the boy. She learned his whole story, discussed the situation with the parish priest, and tried to get Tito into a Boy Scout troop. Thinking that his craving for excitement might be due to an adolescent conflict, she suggested to Mr. V. that he talk to him about his problems, and when Mr. V. confessed his inability to do so, she herself talked to Tito.

Meanwhile the parents were also making efforts to keep the boy out of difficulty. Mr. V. appealed to his employer, who gave Tito a job as janitor for after-school hours and Saturdays. Mrs. V. opened a savings account for Tito in the hope that by depositing a little each week he would have enough to buy an automobile of his own on reaching his sixteenth birthday.

About two weeks after the court hearing, however, Tito, on his way to a Boy Scout meeting, saw an automobile parked on the street. He had no sooner entered it than he was arrested.

This time the patience of the court as well as of the police was at an end. Tito was committed to the State school for boys in spite of the pleas of his parents, of a lawyer who offered to find a private boarding school, and of the secretary of the children's agency, who wanted to give the boy another chance.

Tito's conduct at the State school for boys is highly satisfactory. His institutional duties are in the laundry, where in the opinion of the laundry matron he does very well. He is still doing eighth-grade work.⁶ For recreation he takes part in the baseball games, beadwork, and similar occupations provided by the institution. He is not resentful of the treatment accorded him, but thinks he deserved commitment and will profit by the experience.

ALTA Z.

Native white of illegitimate birth; father white, nativity not reported; mother native white.

Age at time of offense, 14 or 15.

Municipal court, July 23, 1928: Sex offense; committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of disposition: Father unknown; no home maintained by mother; child living with maternal uncle and aunt and their boy 13, girl 9.

Alta appears to be a bright and healthy girl. She has dark hair and is neat and rather pretty. She seemed at ease during the interview and answered questions readily. There has been some question as to her mental capacity, but she has never been given a mental examination.

Mrs. Z. is said to be mentally deficient and barely able to support herself. After her daughter's birth Mrs. Z. married, but left her husband after a short time without obtaining a divorce. She has since married another man, whom she also left after a few weeks. From time to time she works as a domestic, usually living at her place of employment.

⁶ See p. 51 for discussion of school facilities in State school for boys.

Alta lived with her maternal grandmother until she was about 13 years of age, her mother occasionally living with them. She seems to have given no trouble at this time. One day a city welfare worker received a report to the effect that the grandmother was ill and that Alta was being neglected. The welfare worker visited the home and found that Alta was not being cared for, that her mother was "no good," and that the grandmother was indeed ill, and so she arranged to place Alta and the grandmother with the girl's maternal uncle and aunt.

Alta's uncle is a railroad clerk and apparently a steady, reliable man. Her aunt is a very active church woman and belongs to several church organizations. They have two children, a boy of 13 and a girl of 9 years. Their home is considered good and the neighborhood superior.

Alta had completed the eighth grade of the public school in June, 1926, but when she came to live with her aunt she was transferred to a parochial school and obliged to repeat the grade. She was a good student and attended school regularly, as, at her aunt's request, she was closely watched by the superior, who reported any absence immediately.

According to her aunt, Alta "behaved very well" when she first came, but after a while she became difficult to control. She began to loiter about on the streets instead of coming directly home after school; when her uncle and aunt took her to church socials she would slip away; she was "boy crazy" and wanted to run the streets; and she was untruthful and stubborn and seemed to have no mental stability. Her attitude toward her cousins had also changed and she began to be rough with them. Soon no one seemed able to do a thing with her, and when she finally stayed with some sailors for several days the aunt felt that she simply could not take her back.

Alta's version of the story is that she was expected to prepare the family breakfast and pack her uncle's lunch each morning, and, even when her grandmother tried to help her, she seldom had more than 15 minutes left in which to tidy herself and get to school. Because of crowded school conditions the pupils were divided into two sections and she was placed in the morning section. She was expected to spend the afternoon at home doing housework, which she considered an injustice. (During her second year with her uncle and aunt, while she was attending high school, the aunt began to work as a saleswoman in a department store and thus Alta's home duties were probably increased.) In general she considered herself badly treated and unhappy, and she finally ran away because she was afraid of being sent to the State school.

In July, 1928, the aunt reported to the welfare worker that Alta's disobedience and her habit of staying out nights made it impossible for her to keep the girl longer. The worker was of the opinion that possibly the uncle and aunt had been too severe with Alta; that they had constantly reminded her that she was unfortunate and that her mother was unfit; and that the aunt especially had "rubbed in" that the family was being disgraced by her presence in the home. But, concluding that the uncle and aunt had done all they could to help the girl, she decided to try placing her at work in a family home.

Alta did rather well in her new place at first. She helped to take care of the children, earning \$4 a week and her room and board. A new maid proved to be a bad influence on Alta, however, and shortly after her arrival they both left.

Another placement was tried, but this also failed. Alta went off with some sailors and was found in "one of the lowest houses in the city." After that further placements seemed futile.

The welfare worker conferred with the chief of police, and together they signed the complaint for court action. Alta was referred to the city health department for an examination, but was reported free from disease. On a charge of "being found in manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality" she was committed to the State school for girls.

On first coming to the State school she was rather belligerent, but when visited she seemed to have adjusted herself to the institutional life. She is not considered a good worker by the cottage matron, but otherwise she has been getting along fairly well.

The story which Alta told on being admitted to the State school coincides neither with the accounts of her aunt and the welfare worker nor with her own subsequent account to the agent of the Children's Bureau. In fact, in the latter she denied a previously confessed trip with a relative to Canada,

where a man "took advantage of her," and she discredited her aunt's version of her mother's past history. As the various stories were all told with considerable feeling, it has been impossible to determine which of the accounts is accurate.

EDNA C.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, not reported.

School-attendance officer, March, 1928: Truancy; talked with parents.

Family at time of disposition: Parents separated, mother seeking divorce;

Mother, brothers 16, 6, 3, sisters 15, 7, 4, 1 at home; father and one child away.

Edna is a rather pretty girl. At the time of the interview she was neatly and tastefully dressed and made a good appearance. She talked freely and without self-consciousness.

Mrs. C. and her children live on a country road in a small frame house having two rooms upstairs and two downstairs. The rooms seen were clean and orderly and looked well kept. The house belongs to Pete M., who lives with the C.'s.

The significance of Edna's story depends as yet not so much on her own history as on the recent history of her family, and for this the records of the private social agency interested in the family are the best source. The family was first referred to the social agency by a public-health nurse in April, 1925, when Mr. C., Edna's father, was sentenced to six months in jail for bootlegging. The agency worker made a home visit but decided not to take any action, as the family were receiving town aid and were in fair circumstances.

In February, 1926, Mr. C. was again sentenced to jail for bootlegging. On this occasion the police requested the social agency to make another home visit, as they suspected Mrs. C. not only of being implicated in the bootlegging but of entertaining men in her husband's absence. The social agency, the judge, and the priest then made a plan for sending Mrs. C. to the State reformatory for women and committing the children to the custody of the State department of public welfare for placement. The State department of public welfare accordingly proceeded to make arrangements for placement: Helen, the oldest sister, who was suffering from "St. Vitus's dance," was to be sent to a hospital; the four youngest children were to be sent to an aunt, who already had the second child; the remaining two were to go to their grandfather. But when the hearing was held, in March, 1926, the evidence against Mrs. C. was insufficient to justify committing her to the reformatory, and the plans for placement had to be abandoned.

Meanwhile the selectman decided that as the town was giving the family \$8 a week in aid, he could move them to a small house on the town farm, where they would be under the supervision of the overseers of the poor. Rather than acquiesce in such a plan, Mrs. C. relinquished the town aid and took her family to the home of Pete M., a former visitor at the C. home.

In June, 1926, the worker of the private agency, still hoping to provide special care for Helen, again visited the home. She found the family to be living comfortably. Since Helen's health had improved and her mother was unwilling to have her leave, the agency withdrew entirely. Its withdrawal at this time seems rather strange, as the record contains a note questioning the sleeping arrangements of Helen and her older brother, and a report (still in June, 1926) from the county health officer that Helen was four months pregnant and was being sent to the State school for girls. There was also some question as to Pete M.'s relation to the family. He was known as a steady, hard-working man who had been granted a divorce from his wife and seemed to be living with the C.'s.

Last winter the school-attendance officer was notified that Edna was not attending school regularly. On investigation she found that the girl was living with her father in a boarding house where she was not only lacking proper supervision but being exposed to undesirable conditions. The officer wished to remove Edna and place her in a convent, but Mr. C. would not hear of such a plan. The officer secured Edna's return to school and referred the case once more to the social agency.

The agency worker visited the school and learned from the fourth-grade teacher that Edna looked dirty and neglected and that she was too irregular in her attendance to be graded. She decided to place her with her paternal grandmother, but, finding that the poor health of the latter made such a plan

impossible, the agency apparently again dropped the case. Mr. C. finally questioned his ability to manage Edna and left her free to go to her mother.

At the time of the interview Edna seemed to be getting along rather well. She had been "picking potatoes" and had earned \$55, some of which she had used to purchase clothes. She said she was planning to return to school. Her opportunities for recreation seem limited to the motion pictures in town. She goes to these with a young man who is a relative of Pete M. and in whom Mrs. C. has great confidence. Mrs. C. said that she was trying to watch Edna carefully.

COLETTE Y.

Native white; father French-Canadian; mother native white.

Age at time of offense, 10.

Police matron, July 1, 1928; Stealing; dismissed with reprimand and advice.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brother 13, sister 10 at home.

Colette was washing dishes at the time of the interview and was neat and clean in her little pinafore. Although she did not act tired, her pallor and the circles under her eyes indicated that she was not in the best of health, and, in contrast to her sister, she seemed decidedly lacking in vitality. Colette had a severe attack of appendicitis last year, necessitating an operation, and perhaps she has not yet regained her strength.

The family live in a laborer's residential district made up of small tenement houses and stores, within five minutes' walk of the mills. They rent a five-room, second-floor flat for \$4 a week. The rooms are small, but fairly light and fairly well ventilated. Mr. Y. is a lumberjack, but as this work is seasonal he also works irregularly in a shoe factory. Mrs. Y. has been employed as a spinner in a cotton mill for the last six years. Except for the periods when work has been slack, she has worked regularly five days a week.

Mrs. Y. realizes that she is not in close touch with her children and is not well informed as to their activities. She sees them for a few minutes at noon and again after work, but during the rest of the day she trusts them to the supervision of her sister-in-law, who lives on the first floor and who is busy with the demands of her own household. Moreover, at noon she is hurried, and in the evening she is busy with washing, ironing, and the other housework which, because of her job, she can not do during the day. So she gets into the habit of letting the children look after themselves.

This does not mean that the children are free to do as they please; on the contrary, their activities are very much restricted. They may not play out of doors after dark; they are never allowed to go to the "movies"; and they are not permitted to bring other children upstairs with them.

Colette appears to be a very docile child. She does not do things for her mother without being told, and she needs to be "kept after" when there are dishes to be washed, but she is not independently disobedient. Her life is quiet and simple; she is in the third grade of a parochial school and likes to attend; she plays with her sister and embroiders in her leisure.

Colette used to go over to a neighborhood store after school to talk with the clerks. She was well liked in the store and encouraged to come. After a while one of the clerks began missing small sums of money from her purse which she kept in a drawer behind the counter, and presently she suspected Colette. Without accusing the child, she watched her, and, after catching her in the act, she reported the incident to the store manager.

About the same time Colette's teacher noticed that the child was bringing money to school and questioned her about it, because spending money was scarce among the pupils. Colette explained that she had received the money from her father; and as shortly thereafter she ceased to bring any, the teacher said no more about it.

Meantime the store manager asked the police matron whether she could not do something to warn Colette without referring her to the court. The police matron summoned Colette and Mrs. Y. to her office and asked the chief of police to talk the matter over with them. Colette's mother was ill with worry but made no attempt to excuse her child's offense. Later the police matron visited the home to see how the child was getting on and asked Mrs. Y. to notify her if she had further trouble with her daughter.

Colette was evidently badly frightened by the effects of her offense and has never repeated it. Mrs. Y. is grateful to the police matron for handling the situation as she did and is watching the girl more carefully.

BERTHA N.

Native white; father Canadian; mother native white.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Police matron, April 14, 1928: Sex offense; sent to private institution in another State.

Family at time of disposition: Widowed mother and sister 13 at home.

Bertha's sallow, rash-covered complexion detracts somewhat from her comeliness, but she is a neat, clean girl and has an abundant mass of dark brown curls. Her mature and womanly appearance seems to contradict her almost childish lack of responsibility for her own statements and actions.

Bertha's father was killed in an accident seven years ago when the family was living in Massachusetts. Following his death Bertha and Margaret, the younger child, were placed in a Massachusetts orphanage; and later, when Mrs. N. decided to move to her mother's home in Maine, they were transferred to a Maine orphanage. Altogether they were in institutions about five years before Mrs. N. again began to keep house for them.

The family now rents five light and pleasant rooms on the second floor of a store building on a business street. These rooms are meagerly furnished, but the floors and curtains are immaculate.

Mrs. N. has been working in a factory from 6.45 a. m. to 12 m. and 1 to 5 p. m. on three to five days a week, according to the work available. Her earnings average \$11 a week.

Bertha's transfers from orphanages to French parochial schools and public schools have left her grade classification rather doubtful. On entering the public school last year she was demoted to the fifth grade. She likes school, but finds English reading difficult.

Neither of the girls has had many "good times." Mrs. N. admits that she has not permitted them to bring their friends up to play and has never allowed them to go to the "movies." They have been taken for occasional visits to their aunt and grandmother and have played with their neighbors in the tenement halls and in a neighboring vacant lot, but in all these activities they seemed to be lacking the necessary freedom for real enjoyment. They have attended church.

Last winter Mrs. N.'s neighbors began to report that Bertha was running around the streets with "bad company" during after-school hours on the days when her mother was at work. Mrs. N. became greatly worried, especially when she found herself unable to keep Bertha away from these undesirable companions, and she began to wonder whether, after all, the girl would not be better off in an institution under constant supervision. She had seen several newspaper accounts of girls being taken to a private institution in another State by the police matron and decided to ask the latter for advice.

In the meantime, the police matron had heard rumors from other sources that in her mother's absence Bertha was inviting some of the young men hanging around the neighborhood pool room to come upstairs with her. So, when Mrs. N. came to her for advice, the police matron urged that Bertha be sent at once to the private institution lest it become necessary to send her to the State school for girls. She promised that for \$30 (to cover railroad and hotel expenses for herself and the child) she would take Bertha to the institution. When Mrs. N. complained that she could not possibly pay her \$30, she made the price \$25 and advised her to borrow the money from her pastor, which Mrs. N. did. (At the time of the interview, five and a half months later, Mrs. N. still owed \$9.50 on the \$25 which she was paying off in weekly installments; she was planning, by the same method, to raise enough money for Bertha's return trip.)

Except on one occasion, when Bertha spoke during a silence period and had to stand in the corner, she has been a model institutional inmate and has earned for herself an enviable reputation for obedience. She does whatever is expected of her, no more, no less; she takes part in all prescribed group activities—school, assembly singing, assembly "movies," group games—but during the voluntary recreation hour, when the girls are supposedly free to romp about and play as they choose, she seems to do nothing.

Bertha has not been given a mental examination, and the interview with the agent of the Children's Bureau was too brief to justify any conclusion as to whether her school retardation, her susceptibility to the influence of "bad companions," and her ready conformity to institutional routine are due to actual mental deficiency or to the lack of freedom and opportunity for self-express-

sion—both in her own home and in her previous institutional experiences—which may have arrested the natural development of initiative and a sense of responsibility.

WORK OF THE COURTS

COURT PROCEDURE IN OFFICIAL CASES

It is generally conceded that court procedure in children's cases should be equity and not criminal in nature. In criminal procedure the offender may be arrested on warrant, indicted by grand jury, and tried on specific charges in accordance with the rules of legal evidence; he must plead "guilty" or "not guilty," be subject to criminal record and sentence, and to penalties provided by statute.⁷ In equity procedure, on the other hand, the rigidity and limitations of statutory procedure are waived and the offender is judged primarily not according to the nature of his offense but according to the circumstances and conditions giving rise to the offense.

Although the Maine statutes do not provide specifically for equity or "noncriminal" procedure in children's cases, they do permit the judge to exercise his discretion in disposing of certain cases without trial, as follows:

When any child under the age of 16 years is brought before any court or magistrate for trial charged with any offense other than an offense punishable by imprisonment for life, the court may in its discretion continue such cause without trial from time to time, not exceeding 30 days at any one time, and release such child into the custody and control of the probation officer, who shall have authority to permit such child to remain in the home of such child if the same seems to him proper, or he may retain such child in his own custody, if the same can be done without expense to the county or the State. If at any time it seems to the court just and proper to discharge any such respondent without trial, the same may be done, and no child so discharged, nor any other person, shall have any right of action against any officer or other person on account of any of the proceedings in such case.⁸

Since 1919 the statutes have also provided for private hearings and special records in certain boys' cases as follows:

When a boy between the ages of 8 and 16 years (changed to between 11 and 17 in 1921) is convicted before any court or trial justice having jurisdiction of the offense, of an offense punishable by imprisonment in the State prison, not for life, or in the county jail, or in the house of correction, such court or justice may order his commitment to the State school for boys or sentence him to the punishment provided by law for the same offense. * * * The record in the event of conviction in all such cases shall be that the accused was convicted of juvenile delinquency, and the court shall have power at the hearing of any such case to exclude the general public other than persons having a direct interest in the case. The records of any such case by order of the court may be withheld from indiscriminate public inspection, but such records shall be open to inspection by the parent or parents of such child or lawful guardian or attorney of the child involved.⁹

For girls the only special safeguards that were in force at the time of the study¹⁰ applied to girls between the ages of 6 and 16 years who might be convicted of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality."¹¹

⁷ See *Juvenile Court Standards*, p. 1, sec. B.

⁸ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 137, sec. 18.

⁹ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 144, sec. 3, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 58, and Laws of 1921, ch. 129.

¹⁰ By an act of the legislature in 1929 the provision for private hearings and special records was made applicable also to girls between the ages of 6 and 16 years "found guilty of an offense punishable with fine or imprisonment, other than imprisonment for life." See Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 144, sec. 24, as amended by Laws of 1929, ch. 270.

¹¹ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 144, sec. 20, as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 55.

The disadvantage of these provisions is that, in order to derive any benefit therefrom, a child must first be found guilty of a specific offense. For example, if a boy is charged with larceny, he first pleads guilty to the charge of larceny, and, after being found guilty of larceny he is convicted of juvenile delinquency. (See the case of Steve G., p. 28.) Similarly in a girl's case, although the apparent intent of the statute is to protect girls in danger of falling into habits of vice and immorality, yet no court action is taken until proof has been established that a girl has actually committed some specific offense. In other words, these provisions, apparently designed to protect the child from routine criminal procedure, are not sufficiently well defined to establish a distinct and special procedure.

In the absence of further legal provision and state-wide policy, the judges exercise their discretion in conducting juvenile hearings. The hearings attended in the course of the survey indicated that some judges were making successful efforts to conduct informal, socialized hearings; for instance, several judges were hearing children's cases in their private offices or court chambers rather than in the court room, and one judge reported that he usually arranged to have a woman social worker present during his interviews with delinquent girls. But these isolated efforts merely serve to emphasize the general need for a radical departure from such existing conventional practices as the issuing of warrants for the arrest of children who could be expected to appear in court in response to a mere notice sent to their parents, the swearing of the child, the exacting of a plea of "guilty" or "not guilty" from the child, the pronouncing of a formal sentence, the indictment by the grand jury, and the occasional presence of newspaper reporters. These are all practices that tend to set up a defense reaction in the child and to destroy any possibility of a confidential relationship between him and the judge, the foundation of constructive case work. They are practices, moreover, which progressive courts are eager to abandon. The very fact that in some of the Maine courts an interested, sympathetic, and resourceful judge can see his way clear to get away from these practices whereas in other courts an unimaginative or indifferent judge will follow the stereotyped adult court procedure—or, on a plea of being too busy, will turn his juvenile cases over to the court recorder regardless of the latter's special interest or ability—demonstrates the injustice of allowing procedure in juvenile cases to be determined by the personality of the judge rather than by public law.

At present the lower courts have no jurisdiction over offenses which, if committed by adults, would constitute felonies and would come under the jurisdiction of the higher courts. So, unless the judge in the lower court avails himself of his authority in cases of children under 16 years of age to continue such cases without trial (see p. 20) or devises some plan for reducing the charges in children's cases to those within the jurisdiction of the court, he is obliged by law to bind the child over as if he were an adult committing a similar offense. A few courts have requested the prosecuting attorney to nol-pross so much of the charge as is beyond the jurisdiction of the lower court, thus enabling the lower court to dispose of the case without subjecting the child to the formal procedure

of a hearing in the higher court and to a waiting period of possibly several months pending the next session of the court. For example, in one case in which the charge was breaking, entering, and larceny, the county attorney nol-prossed so much of the complaint as alleged breaking and entering. Another case in which the charge was automobile stealing or larceny in excess of \$50 in value, the county attorney nol-prossed so much of the complaint as alleged larceny in excess of \$50 in value.

The problem of the jurisdiction of the lower court also enters into the matter of appeal. According to the present procedure, when the appeal is taken the order of the lower court is automatically suspended and its jurisdiction ceases. As the higher court does not assume jurisdiction until its next session, the child may remain free for several months without receiving either corrective care or constructive treatment. During the 6-month period of the survey, 7 of the 214 cases handled by the courts were appealed.

The right of appeal is accorded to children in some juvenile courts, but it is generally agreed that the lower court should retain jurisdiction and its orders remain in force while the appeal is pending.¹²

Although possibly a little more formal, the hearings conducted by the higher courts both in appealed cases and in cases bound over by the lower courts or indicted by the grand jury, on the whole are not unlike those of the lower courts. But, although the larger municipal courts hold daily sessions and the smaller municipal and trial justice courts hold hearings whenever cases present themselves, the periodic sessions of the higher courts frequently necessitate delay of several months before a final plan is made for a child. This delay is one of the most objectionable features of the present court procedure and is in direct contravention of juvenile court principles.¹³ The child either spends this time in jail, subject to the degrading influences of jail confinement, or is released on bond and is allowed to remain for a considerable period under the same conditions that may have produced his delinquency. In either case, moreover, the postponement of the treatment to be given has a bad psychological effect and makes later work with the child more difficult.

DETENTION BEFORE AND AFTER HEARINGS

Detention quarters.

Maine has no legal provision against the detention of children in institutions for adults, and consequently children are still being detained in jails and police stations.¹⁴ The only legal provision for separate detention for juveniles appears in the section on "Treatment of prisoners for debt, and minors" providing that "every prison keeper shall keep all minors * * * before or after con-

¹² See *Juvenile Courts at Work*, by Katharine F. Lenroot and Emma O. Lundberg, pp. 134-136 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 141, Washington, 1925), and *The Legal Aspects of the Juvenile Court*, by Bernard Flexner and Reuben Oppenheimer, pp. 25-26 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 99, Washington, 1922).

¹³ See *Juvenile Court Standards*, p. 5.

¹⁴ For examples of short periods of detention see the cases of Yvon S., p. 46; Harold R., p. 61; Carl H., p. 64; Earl K., p. 33. For longer periods of detention see the cases of Roger S., p. 73, and Napier D., p. 75. The case of Jack S., p. 32, contains an interesting reaction of the child's mother to his detention, and the case of Martha A., p. 65, shows neglect to notify the mother that her daughter was being detained.

viction, separate from notorious offenders, and those convicted more than once of felony or infamous crimes, so far as the construction or state of the prison admits."¹⁵ With this limited provision it is not surprising that none of the places visited that were used for the detention of delinquent children had special quarters for children.

The Cumberland County Jail, in Portland, has two wings for men and, so far as possible, the wing housing the less serious offenders is used for the detention of boys. It has only one section for women, however, thus making the segregation of the younger girls impossible. The Portland House of Detention (city jail) has special detention rooms apart from the cell blocks in both the men's and women's quarters; but these rooms, although occasionally used for boys and girls, are not primarily juvenile quarters, and they are not used for "very bad" boys nor for girls with venereal disease.

The Penobscot County Jail, in Bangor, has a cell house for men and two rooms for women reached by passing through the men's quarters. Boys are detained in the cell house and girls in the women's quarters. The Bangor City Jail is in the city hall building. The jail is old and offers little opportunity for segregation, although it has a separate detention room which may be used for women and girls, and occasionally for boys. Children are seldom detained overnight in the city jail, but sometimes boys are locked up during the day to give them an opportunity "to think."

The Androscoggin County Jail, in Auburn, has a cell house for men and separate quarters for women but no special rooms for children. The Lewiston city lock-up has cells for men and a separate detention room for women, the latter being also used for children and the former occasionally for "older boys."

The Washington County Jail has a large isolation room, entered from the main cell corridor, which is used for cases of contagious disease and for detaining women and girls. It makes no provision, however, for segregating young boys from older offenders.

The use of detention facilities other than jails and police stations was reported in several localities, the children having been held in hospitals and in boarding houses while awaiting court action or institutional commitment.¹⁶

The sanitary conditions and general equipment in the jails were, on the whole, no worse and in some instances perhaps even better than in similar institutions elsewhere. Provision for recreation seemed to be haphazard. Dominoes and checkers were seen in one or two institutions, and playing cards in others. The only literature observed was of the sensational variety. Opportunity for school work was entirely lacking. This is significant particularly in connection with children who are detained for several months while awaiting the next session of superior court and children sentenced to jail for punishment, their activities thus being limited to cleaning in the jail, helping in the preparation of meals, and lounging around with adult offenders.

¹⁵ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 85, sec. 46.

¹⁶ For examples of such detention see the cases of Mildred E., p. 54; Clarice W., p. 56; and Annette Q., p. 63.

Extent of jail detention.

Children were detained in jail in Maine both before and after court hearings. In recognition of the undesirability of detaining children in jail before the hearing, Maine has two legal provisions for assuring a child's appearance in court without detention. The first of these provides that whenever any child under 16 years of age is arrested for any offense and is confined in any jail or police station, the arresting officer shall "notify a probation officer in his county of the fact of such arrest and of the time and place of such trial. And any court having jurisdiction of the offense may upon application of such probation officer by an order in writing, cause such child to be forthwith placed in the custody of such probation officer pending the trial and final determination of said cause."¹⁷

The second, which applies only to children under 16 years of age charged with an offense other than a felony, provides that "the officer making such arrest may accept in lieu of bail and without committing such child to any jail or police station, the personal recognizance in writing, without security, of the parent, guardian, or other lawful custodian of such child to produce such child before the proper court or magistrate on the following day at a time and place to be specified in said recognizance."¹⁸

In spite of these provisions a considerable number of children under 16 years of age, even those charged with an offense other than a felony, are detained pending hearings. The probation officers do not avail themselves of the authority given them to take custody of such children but leave the question of their detention to the police. The latter almost invariably fail to take advantage of the provision allowing the children to remain free upon the personal recognizance of the parents and simply detain the children as if they were adults or release them on bail. Children who are lost or have run away and children referred to the court for official action are those most frequently detained by the police. Such children are seldom held more than 48 hours.

Children were also detained in jail under court order either awaiting a subsequent hearing in the lower court or, if bound over by the lower court, pending the next session of the superior court. As the superior courts sit as criminal courts at intervals of about four months, the children may be detained for this length of time. Of the 44 children reported as having been held for the superior courts, 11 had been detained in jail for periods varying from 1 day to 2 months and 12 days¹⁹ and 19 had been released on bond.²⁰ No information was available as to the detention of the remaining 14 children. Another group often detained after court hearings includes the children awaiting transfer to the State training schools or to penal institutions.

It was impossible to measure the actual extent of jail detention of children, even in the localities visited, because the jail records, in addition to not including the age of persons held, in many cases did not indicate clearly whether detention occurred with or without the authority of the courts.

¹⁷ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 137, sec. 17.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, sec. 15.

¹⁹ Of these 11, 2 were subsequently released on bond.

²⁰ The amount of the bond in these 19 cases was \$500 in 12 cases and \$1,000 in 5 cases; in 2 cases the amount was not reported.

Some facilities for the detention of children should be available to the courts, as a few children may need detention for safe-keeping or for observation. Many of the larger, and some of the smaller, cities throughout the United States have provided detention homes for children requiring such care under the supervision of the juvenile court. A number of cities are caring for children requiring detention in boarding homes under the supervision of the juvenile court or of an agency.²¹ The finding and development of family homes in which delinquent children may be boarded for detention care and for periods of reconstructive treatment is one of the services that should be developed in Maine.

DISPOSITION OF CASES BY MUNICIPAL COURTS AND TRIAL JUSTICES

The dispositions made by the municipal courts and trial justices during the 6-month period were classified on the same basis as the dispositions reported to the Children's Bureau by cooperating juvenile courts. Only 7 of the cases had come before trial justices, the remaining 207 cases having been heard in municipal courts.

More than a third (67) of the 179 boys' cases were disposed of by placing the boy on probation. (Table 5.) Forty-three boys were referred for prosecution in a higher court, 28 were committed to the State training school, and 10 to penal institutions for adults; 17 cases were dismissed; only 1 boy was fined, and costs were ordered in only 3 cases. It should be remembered that in nearly four-fifths (141) of the boys' cases the offense with which the boy was charged was stealing. (Table 3, p. 11.)

TABLE 5.—Disposition of case by municipal courts and trial justices and sex of children dealt with; delinquency cases reported during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928

Disposition	Delinquency cases			Disposition	Delinquency cases		
	Total cases	Boys' cases	Girls' cases		Total cases	Boys' cases	Girls' cases
Total.....	359	275	84	Dealt with by municipal courts and trial justices—Continued.			
Dealt with by municipal courts and trial justices.....	214	179	35	Child committed to institution—Continued.			
Dismissed.....	19	17	2	State institution for the feeble-minded.....	1	1	1
Restitution ordered.....	2	2	-----	Private institution.....			
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered.....	4	4	-----	Child committed to agency.	4	3	1
Child bound over to higher court.....	44	43	1	State department of public welfare.....	3	3	-----
Child placed on probation.....	76	67	9	Private agency.....	1	-----	1
Child committed to institution.....	62	40	22	Other.....	3	3	-----
State training school.....	49	28	21	Not dealt with by municipal courts and trial justices.....	145	96	49
State reformatory for men.....	2	2	-----				
County jail.....	8	8	-----				

Commitment to the State training school was the most usual disposition in girls' cases, only nine girls being placed on probation. One

²¹ Lenroot, Katharine F.: Progressive Methods of Care of Children Pending Juvenile Court Hearing. Hospital Social Service, vol. 15, No. 1 (January, 1927), p. 46.

girl was bound over to a higher court, two were referred to private agencies or institutions, and the cases of two were dismissed. All but 7 of the 35 girls had been charged with sex offenses. (Table 3, p. 11.)

Compared with the dispositions made in official cases by 62 juvenile courts reporting cases in 1928 to the Children's Bureau,²² the proportion of cases dismissed was small, 9 per cent, compared with 29 per cent in the juvenile courts. The probable explanation of this is the previously discussed tendency in Maine of referring to the courts only those children who have committed serious offenses. (See p. 11.) The proportion of cases disposed of by placing the children on probation was somewhat smaller in the Maine courts than in the juvenile courts (36 per cent in Maine and 43 per cent in the juvenile courts), and the proportion of commitments to institutions for juvenile delinquents was higher in Maine (23 per cent in Maine, 15 per cent in the juvenile courts). The most striking difference between the dispositions made by the Maine courts and those made by the juvenile courts is the number of cases referred for prosecution in the higher courts and the number of cases in which the children were committed to penal institutions. Less than 1 per cent of the cases heard by the juvenile courts had been referred to higher courts as compared with 21 per cent of the cases in Maine. Practically no children under 18 years of age were committed to penal institutions by the 62 juvenile courts, whereas 5 per cent of the Maine cases were disposed of by commitment of the children to such institutions.

Another point to be taken into consideration in studying the dispositions made by the Maine courts is that 129 of the 214 cases disposed of by municipal courts and trial justices involved children under 16 years of age. Most of Maine's legal provisions for the care of delinquent children apply only to children under 16 years of age. In Table 6 the dispositions in cases of children under 16 are compared with those of children 16 years of age and over. Larger proportions of the cases involving the younger children were dismissed or disposed of by placing the children on probation. Commitment to an institution was made more often by the lower courts for children under 16 years of age. None of the younger children was committed to a penal institution, but eight of the older children were sent to such institutions. Although the older children were more likely than the younger ones to be bound over to the higher courts, 18 children under 16 were held for prosecution in such courts.

²² Juvenile Court Statistics, 1928, p. 18.

TABLE 6.—Disposition of case by municipal courts and trial justices, and ages of children dealt with in delinquency cases disposed of during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928

Disposition	Delinquency cases			
	Total	Age of child		
		Under 16 years	16 years, under 18	Not reported
Total.....	359	226	100	33
Dealt with by municipal courts and trial justices.....	214	129	61	24
Dismissed.....	19	12	3	4
Restitution ordered.....	2	1	1	—
Fine imposed or payment of costs ordered.....	4	1	3	—
Child bound over to higher court.....	144	18	23	3
Child placed on probation.....	76	47	18	11
Child committed to institution.....	62	45	11	6
State training school.....	49	43	3	3
State reformatory for men.....	2	—	2	—
County jail.....	8	—	6	2
State institution for the feeble-minded.....	1	1	—	—
Private institution.....	2	1	—	1
Child committed to agency.....	4	4	—	—
State department of public welfare.....	3	3	—	—
Private agency.....	1	1	—	—
Other.....	3	1	2	—
Not dealt with by municipal courts and trial justices.....	145	97	39	9

¹ 6 of these boys were sentenced to the reformatory for men by the higher court.

The desire to protect or "clean up" the community without regard for the interests of the child is still the basis of too many dispositions. In four communities cases were reported in which the court had suggested (or had accepted the child's suggestion) that the child leave the community. In none of these cases did the court make any attempt to discover whether the child would be properly cared for or supervised in the community to which he was to go. The disposition was made not because it was for the best interests of the child but because it was the easiest way for the court to divest itself of responsibility.

DISPOSITION OF CASES BY SUPERIOR AND SUPREME COURTS

During the 6-month period 51 children under 18 years of age came before the higher courts—44 being bound over by the lower courts and 7 coming up on appeal. In 41 of the 44 bound-over cases the charge was stealing; in the only girl's case the charge was a sex offense; and in the remaining 2 boys' cases the charges were perjury and intoxication. Most of these cases were bound over to the superior courts in the three larger counties—Androscoggin, Cumberland, and Penobscot. The proportion of children's cases coming from the lower courts in these counties differed strikingly: In Androscoggin County the proportion bound over was 8 out of 29, in Cumberland County 7 out of 63, and in Penobscot 19 out of 36.

The dispositions made by the superior courts and the supreme court are somewhat similar in character to those made by the lower courts, with the exception that usually commitments were made to the State reformatories rather than to the State schools. (Table 7.)

All the children whose cases were appealed had been committed by the lower courts to the State schools or reformatories; only one of these cases had been heard at the time of the survey, the child being placed on probation.

TABLE 7.—Disposition of case by superior and supreme courts and method of acquiring jurisdiction; delinquency cases disposed of during the 6-month period, February 1 to July 31, 1928

Disposition	Delinquency cases		
	Total	Child bound over by lower court	Appealed from lower court
Total.....	51	44	7
Disposed of.....	31	30	1
Dismissed.....	4	4	-----
Child placed on probation.....	19	18	1
Child committed to institution.....	8	8	-----
State school for boys.....	2	2	-----
State reformatory for men.....	6	6	-----
Pending.....	20	14	3

Case histories illustrating the work of the courts

This group of case histories includes five children who were bound over and three whose cases were appealed to the higher courts.

The majority of the boys whose cases were bound over to the higher courts were charged with stealing. In a large number of these cases the offenses had been committed by the boys as members of neighborhood groups or gangs. Steve G. and Morris A. had been involved with such groups, as younger members not as leaders, and were placed on probation by the superior court. Lester J., who was also a member of a small gang, was committed to the State school; his case is interesting for its history of minor delinquencies handled unofficially by the court, as well as for its illustration of unwieldy court procedure in the handling of his last offenses.²³

The history of Jack S. illustrates the binding over to the superior court of a young child as if he were an adult. The history of Earl K. contains a picture of a particularly objectionable type of public hearing.

The histories of Henry B., Rhea R., and Irma and Gladys I. are fairly typical examples of the cases appealed. All these children were released on bond pending the next session of the appellate court, and they received no corrective treatment or supervision in the meantime.

STEVE G.

Native white; nativity of parents not reported.

Age at time of offense, 15.

Municipal court, December 2, 1927; Stealing; bound over to superior court.

Family at time of disposition: Foster parents married and living together; foster brother 34, at home; three foster brothers, over 30 years of age, away.

Steve is tall and thin and does not appear to be very strong. His mouth breathing seems to indicate that his tonsils and adenoids need medical atten-

²³ This boy had appeared in court before the 6-month period of the study, and his case was not included in the 359 reported cases.

tion. He is a quiet boy, but answers questions readily and easily and has a pleasant manner.

The G. family live in a good residential district and own their home. The house is a characteristic Maine dwelling—white with green blinds and having woodshed and barn attached. It is equipped with modern conveniences, well furnished, and in good condition.

Mr. G. works in a brickyard. He is no longer young and does not work regularly. Mrs. G. is well read and interested in current events.

Of Steve's own parents and family history nothing is known. He was taken from an orphanage and adopted by his present foster parents when he was 4 years of age.

Steve's foster parents had never had any trouble with him. They considered him a normal, healthy boy, approved of his interest in playing basket ball and reading sport news, and appreciated his willingness to help his mother with the housework. They realized he was "not smart in school" and seemed "slow"; one of his foster brothers did, indeed, suggest that he was mentally deficient. But as Steve seemed to be a good boy and got along fairly well, they were not unduly concerned over his slowness.

In December, 1927, they learned with considerable surprise that he had been a member of a gang charged with breaking into houses. Steve's own story is that he used to walk around the streets with a gang of boys, who, in their desire for excitement, broke into several houses and stole various things.

The police arrested Steve on warrant and detained him over night in the city-hall detention room awaiting next morning's session of the municipal court. He was tried on two charges of "breaking and entering with intent to commit larceny," to both of which he pleaded not guilty, and on one charge of "breaking, entering, and larceny," to which he pleaded guilty. On a judgment of "probable cause" he was bound over for prosecution in the superior court, to be released on \$1,000 bond pending the next session of that court. He was detained in the county jail for nine days until the bond could be furnished.

On January 20, 1928, he was arraigned in the superior court on the same charges. He pleaded guilty and was convicted of "juvenile delinquency." He was released on \$500 bail until February 18, 1928, when he was placed on probation.

During this time Steve was repeating the eighth grade, with no prospect of graduating. His school attendance was regular and his classroom conduct good, but in the opinion of his teachers he was "not smart"; in fact, his teachers considered him too dull to have been the leader of the gang. Steve played on the school basket-ball team and enjoyed this very much. But he finally concluded that he was too big to remain in the eighth grade, and so he dropped out of school. He blamed his failure on his own laziness.

Steve had worked in the woods during his spring vacation, and so on leaving school he soon found a job spiking pulp. At the time of the interview, however, he was stoking ovens in a brickyard from 7 p. m. to 6 a. m., earning \$15 a week and saving thriftily. He was not getting much recreation.

Apparently Steve's probation officer never took any action in regard to his leaving school nor helped him to find work. In fact, the probation officer never made a home visit, and, although Steve reports regularly at the probation officer's home on Sunday evenings, his report is frequently received by some member of the family other than the officer himself. Steve likes the officer, however, and his mother thinks the reporting is having a good effect on him.

MORRIS A.

Native white; father born in Russia; mother native white.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Municipal court, December 2, 1927: Stealing; bound over to superior court.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brothers 13, 7; sisters 18, 17, 14, 10, 8, 5, at home.

Morris is a neat and rather handsome boy. He seems to be of normal build for his age and looks healthy. In the interview he answered all questions courteously, but was reluctant to talk about himself and volunteered no information beyond that asked for.

The large, old-fashioned house in which his family live and which they own, is set well back from the street and has a big yard. It is located in a fairly good neighborhood in which most of the residents own their homes.

The family evidently believe in maintaining close home ties. They have a piano and an expensive radio and seldom go out for recreation; when they do go out, they usually go with one another.

Mr. A.'s coal and wood business is the chief source of the family income.

Mrs. A. has been in poor health for some time. All during the fall and winter months preceding Morris's last court experience, she was confined to her bed as the result of a surgical operation. She attributed some of the boy's trouble to her illness and thinks she might have kept him out of difficulty had she been able to watch him more closely.

Morris thinks he has a good home, and yet he is manifestly not quite satisfied with home conditions. He sees very little of his father, as the latter's business is in a neighboring town and he often works at night. Morris seems to feel that his mother is ill so much of the time that the children do not get all the care and attention they need.

The boy is not lazy, and, according to his mother, he is not afraid of hard work. Last summer he worked for a building contractor, who was a friend of the family. He gave his earnings to his mother, receiving from her a weekly allowance.

A rather wealthy friend of the family has shown a special interest in the boy and frequently takes him out for "good times." Morris also spends some of his leisure time in drawing, and occasionally he goes to the "movies." His mother has noticed that of late he has lost interest in his Young Men's Christian Association activities and that he does not stay at home or "chum" with his brothers and sisters as much as her other children do.

Morris was always a quiet boy and gave his mother no trouble previous to this court experience. Yet neither he nor his mother attempts to excuse his delinquency. He simply got in with a bunch of boys and did whatever they did and was guilty along with the rest of the gang.

Morris was arrested on a police warrant. His court record contains the following information:

Municipal court:

- 12-2-27 (1) Breaking and entering with intent to commit larceny. Plea "not guilty." Adjudged "probable cause." Bound over to superior court; \$1,000 bond. Surety given by father.
 (2) Breaking, entering, and larceny. Plea "guilty." Adjudged "probable cause." Bound over; \$1,000 bond. Surety given by father.

Superior court:

- 1-17-28 Arraigned. Plea "nolo contendere." Convicted of "juvenile delinquency." Bail of \$500 furnished.
 2-18-28 Delinquent. Placed on probation to county probation officer, to report weekly until January, 1929, term of court.

Morris is doing only fairly well on probation. Although he is in the eighth grade and could graduate in June, he manifests a most stubborn dislike of school and plays truant on any occasion. He tells his mother that he is hunting jobs and says that he would take any job he could get if only he could leave school, take drawing lessons, and become a cartoonist. He admits that sometimes he just goes to "shows" instead of going to school.

The probation officer has never visited the home. On one or two occasions he has met Mrs. A. and talked to her about the boy, but for the rest he has contented himself with receiving Morris's weekly reports. Morris likes him. He finds, however, that the weekly report periods are much too short to permit any discussion of his problems, and he has never confided to his probation officer his ambition to be a cartoonist or his desire to take drawing lessons. Occasionally he fails to report altogether, but never for long.

The school principal, who is thoroughly familiar with the family situation and with Morris's difficulties, has tried by talking both with the boy and with the school-attendance officer and the probation officer to help keep him straight, but he has found his efforts to be practically useless. Except for truancy, he has had no occasion to find fault with the boy's conduct in school, but he is disturbed over the fact that Morris seems to have no "backbone," that he loafs with rough boys and smokes too much, and that he is quite unmindful of his mother's concern over him. He thinks Mr. A.'s preoccupation in his business, his constant absence from home, and his lack of interest in the

children are much to blame. He also thinks that the probation service in this case is failing to do anything helpful for the boy. He has not undertaken, however, to give any special service of his own.

Morris's 13-year-old brother was also a member of the gang. He was charged with the same offense of which Morris was found guilty and bound over to the superior court by the municipal court. In the superior court his case was nol-prossed for lack of evidence.

LESTER J.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 15.

Municipal court, October 7, 1927: Two charges of stealing and one of malicious mischief; for three different dispositions see text.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brother 13 at home.

Lester is a small, wiry boy with sharp but not unattractive features. He seems bright and keen and has a sunny disposition. During the interview he was perfectly at ease and talked freely.

The family live on the edge of a very undesirable neighborhood, in which the housing is poor and the moral standards are low. Their own house, although shabby and unpleasing from without, is cheerful and cozy within, and the inexpensively furnished living room makes a brave showing with its floor lamp and pictures. The house has six rooms and a bath.

Mr. J. is a cook in a small restaurant and works regularly. He is the only wage-earner in the family.

Mrs. J. had no especially enlightening comments to make concerning her son. She considered that he had been a good boy at home and at school. She knew that he had played truant to some extent, but she did not regard this as very serious. She also knew that he had played around with a gang of boys, but in her opinion their activities were harmless. She was favorably impressed with the county probation officer to whom Lester had been obliged to report after an earlier delinquency, but she realized that the probation period had had little effect on the boy.

Lester attended parochial school until he was 9 years of age and then went to public school, reaching the eighth grade. According to the principal of the public school, he was "put out" of the parochial school because he was "too tough." His conduct in the public school seems to have been satisfactory, except that his attendance was somewhat irregular.

His first job was selling newspapers after school in the winter of 1927. During the summer vacation of the same year he worked as assistant attendant in a gasoline station, earning \$5 a week. Part of his earnings he gave to his mother and part he deposited in the bank.

Lester's opportunities for wholesome recreation were rather limited. His neighborhood had no playgrounds or community centers, but Lester and his brother used to go to a boys' club to swim. The boys also went to the "movies" and, of course, played around with other boys.

When Lester was 9 years of age he came to the attention of the police for the first time. He was brought in to be "lectured" by the chief on several occasions. Also he was twice brought before the judge, who talked to him informally in his office. At one time (court had no record of date) he was placed on probation for stealing; he reported regularly and liked his probation officer "fine."

Lester gave as his reason for his present delinquencies the fact that the other boys in his gang did "those things" and so he did, too. The court record shows that he was brought into court on two charges of larceny and one of malicious mischief, but gives no details concerning the offenses nor any information concerning the boy himself. Lester had evidently been implicated with Henry B. (see p. 34) in stealing from clothes lines, but the extent of his larcenies is not recorded. His mother said that the things he had taken were nothing but "junk."

The court handled each of the three charges separately, although all were brought at the same time. For each of the charges the court made a special disposition: For the first charge of larceny, commitment to the State school for boys; for the second charge of larceny, binding over for action by superior court; and for the charge of malicious mischief, continuance for sentence. The superior court quashed the second charge of larceny, and Lester, after being detained for three days, was taken to the State school by the sheriff.

Aside from the facts in the mittimus sheet, the State-school record contains no information other than that Lester was interviewed and given a physical examination on admission, that both his parents were living, and that he was an intelligent eighth-grade boy.

Lester seems to be fairly happy in the institution. He plays both football and baseball and takes part in whatever activities are provided for his cottage. Much of his spare time he spends in reading.

JACK S.

Native black; parents native black.

Age at time of offense, 10.

Municipal court, December 23, 1927: Stealing; bound over to superior court.

Family at time of disposition: Parents divorced; mother, brothers 14, 9, sisters 16, 12, at home.

Jack is a bright, happy-go-lucky, vivacious youngster with a mischievous twinkle in his eyes. He has good features and a fairly light skin, and at the time of the interview he looked healthy and neat.

The family live on a small side street on a steep hill. The neighborhood is not a bad one, but most of the little houses are old and in need of repair. Mrs. S. rents six rooms on the second floor of a two-family house; the rooms are attractive and comfortably furnished, and a bridge lamp, pictures, and many plants give the flat a home-like atmosphere.

Jack's grandmother is a white woman; she married a negro man from whom she was later separated. Jack's father is "not much good." Mrs. S. thinks that the lack of paternal discipline in the home is in part responsible for the delinquency problems of the children.

Mrs. S. is employed as a cook in a private family and works fairly regularly. Her work has taken her away from home a good deal, but recently she has been able to arrange to be home for the evening meal. Maxine, the 16-year-old girl, and Brewster, the 14-year-old boy, attend high school. Maxine works as a nursemaid after school and on Saturdays, thus earning enough money to pay for her clothes.

The family are not without contact with community resources. Mrs. S. is taking a night-school course in practical nursing; Maxine enters into the social activities of the high school; her 12-year-old sister belongs to the Girl Scout troop at her church; the boys belong to no organization, but they use the public library. Jack and one of his brothers were also sent to a Young Men's Christian Association camp for two weeks last summer.

The family are also known to three social agencies. Through the State department of public welfare and the municipal board of children's guardians they have been receiving mothers' aid in the amount of \$30 a month, and from a private agency, which cared for Jack and his younger brother before the granting of mothers' aid, they receive \$15 a month in rent. All three agencies are interested in the children and are conscious of Mrs. S.'s inability to give them the necessary supervision. But although they recognize the danger to which mischievous youngsters are exposed without proper supervision, they have apparently been unable to find a way out of this difficulty.

Mrs. S. has found Jack to be quiet around the house and not especially troublesome. But she knows that he is mischievous and sometimes vengeful toward his brothers and sisters, and she feels that she does not really understand him.

Jack was in the fifth grade last year. He did not like his teacher and frequently played truant. The school-attendance officer returned him to school a number of times, but never found his truancy sufficiently serious to warrant his referring the boy to court.

Just before the delinquency in question, Jack and Sam, a boy slightly older than he, had been loafing around a bakery. One morning one of the drivers parked his car in front of the bakery, leaving bills and checks amounting to more than \$100 in the automobile while he entered the bakery. Jack and Sam took the money, dividing the bills between them and hiding the checks. They purchased several small articles and two second-hand bicycles. Through the purchase of the bicycles the boys were detected, and one evening they were arrested and taken to the police station for the night.

The morning after the arrest their case was heard in the municipal court. Jack pleaded not guilty to a charge of larceny of more than \$100, but probable cause was found and he was bound over to the superior court. He was released on furnishing bond of \$300.

The three social agencies were represented at the hearing, but with the exception of the agent of the State department of public welfare, who stood as

security for the bond furnished by the mother, they did not assist in the court action.

On January 16 Jack's case was brought before the superior court. He was represented by an attorney appointed by the court and pleaded "Nolo contendere." He was convicted of "juvenile delinquency" and released on \$500 bail. On February 18 his case was finally disposed of; he was placed on probation, to report weekly until the September term of court.

On September 10 the probation officer, who had made no home visits but had had weekly office reports from the boy, reported to the court that although Jack had reported somewhat irregularly he excused this on account of the boy's age and recommended discharge from probation.

The court experience evidently made little impression on Jack. The thing he remembers with perhaps most vividness is the overnight detention in the police station. This also made a considerable impression on Mrs. S., especially as she was not notified of the arrest until the following morning, and also as her "little boy" by reason of his arrest and detention was deprived of both supper and breakfast. She thinks the experience "learned him a lesson," so far as stealing is concerned, but that it did not help his conduct in general. She still worries about him.

Sam was not interviewed, but from interviews with his mother and his school principal, and from information concerning the delinquency of both boys, the following story was obtained:

Sam's parents are separated, and he lives with his mother, two older brothers, two older sisters, and brother-in-law. Last year he was excused from school attendance because of poor health following an accident.

Sam was 14 years of age at the time of the offense. His experience was practically the same as Jack's, and his court record is like his friend's except that the bail requested in his case was \$1,000 rather than \$500. His probation report reads as follows:

"Samuel X. has fulfilled, with the utmost punctuality and scrupulous care, the terms of his probation as laid down by your honorable court and seems in every way to have learned a valuable lesson by his experience. I am therefore recommending his discharge from probation."

The comments of Sam's school principal are interesting. He considers Sam "the victim of whomever he happens to be with," and has noticed that Sam prefers the company of older boys and is easily led by them. He also considers Sam mentally deficient, and although he has placed him in the seventh grade, he did so merely to keep him in a class with boys of his own age and size.

As no mental tests have been given to Sam, it is impossible to say whether he is really deficient or merely retarded by illness, or to decide whether, in his adventure with Jack, he was allowing himself to be led by a younger boy or was himself the leader. The probation officer gives no help on this point. He seems not to have realized that punctual reporting during the probationary period is in itself no indication that a child has made progress but may, on the contrary, indicate that particularly pathetic type of mental deficiency which makes certain people do faithfully whatever they are told to do but leaves them incapable of determining whether what they have been told to do is right or wrong. It is just such persons who are most in need of guidance and supervision.

EARL K.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 17.

Municipal court, February 28, 1928; Stealing; bound over to superior court.

Family at time of disposition: Father dead, mother remarried. Earl living in boarding home as State ward.

Earl is a tall, thin, fairly healthy-looking boy. At the time of the interview he was working in a shop, dressed in khaki shirt and breeches and high boots. His manner was courteous and pleasant, but full of cautious and deliberate reserve.

Earl became a ward of the State department of public welfare when he was 14 years of age. His father's death and his mother's remarriage having left him homeless, the State boarded him with his aunt. He stayed with her about a year and was then transferred to a rural boarding home where he was able to earn most of his board by helping with farm work. After he had finished the ninth grade he left school. He wanted to go on with a trade

or technical school course; but, as the town high school offered only commercial and college-preparatory courses and as he knew of no way of getting to a trade school, he continued working on the farm.

In February, 1928, a cottage on a lake near his boarding home was broken into and various articles, among them a rifle, were stolen. Suspicion fell on Earl because he was said to have been seen near the cottage at the time of the burglary and also because he was known to have a rifle. The boy was arrested and detained in the town lock-up for one night, to be arraigned the following day.

According to one of the spectators, the hearing was arranged for the afternoon in order to enable more people to attend; and when the court room became too crowded for comfort, the proceedings were adjourned to the town hall. When Earl was brought in some one shouted, "Here comes the guy that stole the gun," and the crowd became thoroughly interested and excited. Earl felt at a disadvantage because he had no lawyer, but he defended himself as best he could, attempting to prove that he was not on the premises at the time of the burglary and that the rifle with which he had been seen was his own. His boarding parent also testified to his general good conduct. But the judge, being unconvinced of the boy's innocence, bound the case over to the grand jury, and on findings of probable cause Earl's case came before the superior court. He was defended by a lawyer in the superior court and the case was dismissed.

After the trial Earl returned to his boarding parent, who helped him find a job in a factory and a boarding home near his work.

Earl is now learning to sew mattresses; he thinks that he learns slowly, but he likes the work. He earns \$12 a week, and out of this he pays \$7 for board, buys his clothes, spends a little for movies, and saves the rest. He is hoping to save enough to enable him to go to an automobile trade school within the next year or two.

He likes to read and takes books and magazines, mostly of adventure, from the town library.

In speaking of his experience Earl said, "I've always been used right except when some one lied about me." He feels that although his case was dismissed, he is still under suspicion in the community. This doubtless accounts in part for his reserve.

HENRY B.

Native white; parents white.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Municipal court, April 4, 1927; Stealing; placed on probation for remainder of school year. May 6, 1927; Stealing; committed to State school for boys.

Family at time of disposition: Widowed mother, brother 12, sisters 19, 17, grandmother, and brother-in-law (husband of sister 19) at home.

Henry is a heavy-set, rather good-looking boy. He seems to take great pride in his appearance. His personality is pleasing, and in conversation he seems bright and alert.

Henry's father was a hard drinker and a drug addict. From time to time he had spells during which he would go off alone like a tramp or hobo. Twice he was a patient at the State hospital for the insane, where his case was diagnosed as "pathological intoxication." The immediate cause of his death was not reported.

For the past 10 years Henry's mother has been the main wage-earner in the family. She has been employed regularly during this time as a cashier. She is a young-looking woman, attractive and refined, and was spoken of highly by the various persons interviewed in connection with the case. The 17-year-old sister is a telephone operator and also contributes to the family income.

Henry always enjoyed out-of-door life. He was familiar with birds and trees, and he liked to hike in the woods. Although he was in the seventh grade at the age of 14, he never liked school; his classroom conduct was good, but frequently he played truant in order to go tramping—sleeping in the woods and living the life of a hobo. His school principal attributed these "spells" to the fact that, through his mother's employment, he had been left too much to his own devices, thus not receiving proper training, and to the fact that his father was known to have had similar tendencies. But neither the principal nor the teacher ever made any effort to counteract these tendencies.

The police had known Henry as a truant and "runaway" for several years. They had brought him before the chief for lectures and warnings, but, because

of the high standards of the family, they had kept him out of court as long as they possibly could. They made no attempt to study his behavior, his home life, or his recreational interests and resources; and no effort to guide and direct his interests into legitimate channels.

In April, 1927, Henry and a few other boys broke into a house and took some kitchen utensils which they used as drums and cymbals in a street parade. For this Henry was adjudged guilty of larceny in the municipal court and placed on probation for the rest of the school year.

He reported several times to his probation officer; but as the latter never made a home visit and never spent much time with him, they scarcely became acquainted with each other.

Henry had been on probation only a month when he stole a knife from a store and with it cut down several clothes lines on which clothes were hanging. He was charged with burglary, but adjudged guilty of "juvenile delinquency," and his case was continued for 12 days, during which time he was under observation at the State hospital for the insane. The hospital found no evidence of mental deficiency, emotional disturbance, or psychopathic tendency, but suggested that his training had been faulty and recommended suitable training to keep him occupied. He was accordingly returned to the court and committed to the State school for boys.

Henry's family considered the sentence too severe and suspected that the boy had been blamed by the police for incidents with which he was not connected. They appealed the case to the superior court and, pending the September term, had him released on a \$300 bond.

On September 24, 1927, a *capias* was issued by the superior court; on September 28 Henry was convicted of "juvenile delinquency," and on October 11 he was committed to the State school for boys. He was detained in the police station and county jail for one night at the time of the first hearings. At the time of the superior-court hearing he was detained in the county jail for about two weeks, from the time of conviction to the day of transfer to the State school. This detention was called a period of "safekeeping," so that no record of it was made in the jail register.

Henry is now in the eighth grade at the State school for boys. He has twice been strapped—once for running away and once for refusing to report the escape of other boys. He is beginning to appreciate his home and learning that he must behave himself.

RHEA R.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of first offense, 13.

Police matron, March 15, 1928: Sex offense; dismissed with warning.

Municipal court, April 28, 1928: Truancy; placed on probation. June 7, 1928:

Truancy and sex offense; continued on probation. On October 1, 1928, committed to State school for violation of probation. Decision appealed.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married, but not living together; Rhea living with divorced aunt, who is housekeeper for widower with several small children.

Rhea is tall and slender and pretty in two distinctly different ways; she is insolently pretty when she is dressed for the street in her smart flapper clothes, with her cheeks rouged and her lips thickly painted; and she is pathetically pretty sitting at home in a faded gingham dress, with no stockings on her long, straight legs, no color in her pale cheeks, and with her tired eyes and wan face betraying the need for long hours of sleep and regular, nourishing meals. Her aunt thinks she is "high strung" and hysterical, and, indeed, her conduct in the judge's office showed her to be of an unstable temperament; but her appearance and her story suggest that possibly this instability is due to the fact that she has been overtaxing her youthful strength by trying to lead the life of a vigorous and sophisticated adult.

Mr. R. deserted Mrs. R. about three weeks before Rhea was born and did not return until some time during the late war, when, according to town gossip, he reclaimed his family in order to escape the draft. He is now doing bridge-construction work in a neighboring State, and although he has not been at home for some time he still sends home part of his earnings.

Mrs. R. when first deserted by her husband went to live with her mother, both of them going out to do housework for a living. When Mr. R. returned, Mrs. R. went to live with him, leaving Rhea to be brought up by her grandmother. Rhea and her grandmother were extremely fond of each other, and when the latter died in July, 1927, Rhea was heartbroken. Instead of going to her mother, she went to live with her aunt, Mrs. K.

Mrs. K. is a large, good-natured woman who sheds quantities of tears with the greatest ease. Having obtained a divorce from her husband several years ago, she now supports herself and her young child by keeping house for a widower and his little children. Their small six-room cottage is cluttered with an untidy assortment of worn furniture, soiled cushions, ragged magazines and music, the widower's large dog, and Mrs. K.'s collection of birds and bird cages. Mrs. K. has been generous with Rhea. Of the \$5 a week that she receives from Mr. R. for his daughter's board, she returns \$1.50 to Rhea, and she is similarly indulgent with the girl in allowing her to do almost anything she wishes. Unfortunately this indulgence is not tempered with good judgment.

Last year Rhea was in the eighth grade in school. She learned easily and got on well, but she and her friend Martha A. (see p. 65) suddenly began to feel very grown up and eager for more exciting activities than those furnished by grammar school. Rhea, whose grandmother had permitted her to take dancing lessons, had an insatiable desire to go to dances; and, when there was no lodge dance to which her aunt could take her, she and Martha would go to public dances. They soon attracted the attention of the police matron, whose duties included visits to the various places of public amusement; one evening both girls were arrested, and, on the ground of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality," they were given a severe warning.

Within the following month their craving for grown-up activities took a new form. By adding a few years to their ages, they obtained jobs in a local shoe factory. Rhea was very industrious and earned altogether about \$35, every cent of which she spent on clothes. After a few weeks, however, she and Martha were discovered by the factory inspector and reported to the police matron and the school-attendance officer. On April 28 they were brought before the municipal court on a charge of truancy and were placed on probation. So far as could be learned, nothing was done for them during this period of probation; they were merely made to feel that they were under close observation and must watch their step in order to avoid being committed to the State school for girls.

On June 7 they were again brought before the municipal court²⁴ for truancy, going to dances, smoking cigarettes, keeping late hours, and in general conducting themselves in a manner unseemly for their years. The judge allowed them to remain on probation with the understanding that they leave town. Rhea, without further investigation, was to be sent to her father in the next State as soon as the school term came to an end.

In spite of her truancy, Rhea graduated from the eighth grade the following week and then went to her father. Her father's housekeeper was a distant relative whose husband was suffering from shellshock and was extremely nervous and irritable, so that life in this household was not likely either to help Rhea or to contribute to her happiness.

At the close of the summer Rhea was eager to leave her father and return to her aunt and enroll in high school. Her return was duly noted by the police matron, who at once requested the high-school principal to notify her as soon as the girl should be truant. Rhea tried during the first few weeks to lead a blameless existence; she even telephoned the police matron, asking for permission to attend two dances a month. When this was denied her she spent her evenings with a new girl friend reading sensational magazines, making fudge, and going for automobile rides in her friend's car.

In the fourth week of the school term Rhea was reported absent. She remained absent for three days, and on each of those evenings the police matron and officers watched for her at the various dance halls. On the third evening (Friday) a police officer saw her enter a lodge hall and speak for a few minutes to several of the young people. He reported the incident to the police matron who, with the judge's consent, had a warrant issued for Rhea's arrest. The hearing, delayed until Tuesday because of Rhea's illness on Monday, was held in the judge's office, in the presence of the chief of police, the police matron, the school-attendance officer, Mrs. K. and her lawyer, Rhea, her friend, and her mother; a newspaper reporter stood in the doorway. Mrs. K.'s lawyer, the counsel for the defense, tried to conduct a regular cross-examination, but

²⁴ On the occasion of one of these arrests, probably the one of April 28, Rhea was detained for a few hours in the woman's detention room until her aunt raised the required \$200 ball for her release pending the hearing.

the judge's method was quite informal. Rhea's plea was that she had been ill for three days with tonsillitis and, feeling a little better on Friday evening, had gone over to visit her friend who had taken her for a drive; they had passed the lodge hall a little after 10 o'clock and had stopped to speak to some acquaintances there, leaving after a few minutes to go home. The following day she felt less well and later, when the warrant was served, had gone to bed with a fever.

Unfortunately neither the school-attendance officer nor the police matron had visited Rhea's home during the three days of alleged truancy, and therefore the court, unwilling to accept her plea, had no means of verifying it. Unfortunately, too, the court had kept no record of its intention with regard to Rhea's stay with her father, and so a dispute arose between the judge and Mrs. K., the judge holding that as Rhea had been ordered to remain permanently with her father her return was in itself sufficient to warrant commitment to the State school, and Mrs. K. contending that Rhea had been ordered to remain with her father for the summer only.

Nevertheless the court ordered Rhea's commitment to the State school for girls on a charge of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality," apparently on the following grounds:

(1) Rhea's record of last spring for truancy, keeping late hours, attending public dances, and smoking cigarettes showed her to be a girl in need of institutional care.

(2) By leaving her father and returning to the city she had violated the condition of her probation.

(3) Her present environment was an unsuitable place for her, and her aunt, a divorced woman, an unfit guardian.

(4) An indirect and inaccurate report that Martha A., now at the State school, was being treated for a venereal disease did not look well for Rhea, who had been the girl's intimate companion (see p. 66).

(5) Her four days of absence from school (Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Monday) and her appearance at the lodge hall on Friday evening were not in her favor.

Rhea was not sent to the State school, however, as her counsel entered an appeal. She was released on nominal bond with the recommendation that she be given a physical examination and with orders not to return to school until she had been found to be free from infection. The physician's reports were negative. Rhea did not confess to having had sex experience.

In December, 1928, Rhea's case came before the superior court, and the commitment to the State school for girls was set aside. Rhea remained with her aunt.

IRMA AND GLADYS I.

Native white; parents native white.

Ages at time of offense, 13, 11.

Trial justice, March 27, 1928: Sex offenses; ordered committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of disposition: Parents divorced; brothers 16, 10, and sister-8 (with Irma and Gladys) in home of father with housekeeper and her 14-year-old daughter; brother 6 in home of mother and her second husband in neighboring town; sister 18 in State school for girls.

Mr. and Mrs. I. were divorced in May, 1927. Mrs. I. brought suit charging that her husband "wantonly and cruelly" refused or neglected to provide maintenance; that he was guilty of extreme cruelty; that he swore at her and told her to "get out" of his house; and that he threatened her life with a revolver. Mr. I. did not appear at the trial, and Mrs. I. apparently obtained the divorce with little difficulty. She was awarded custody of the children, but at that time made no effort to take them with her.

Mr. I. is a fireman in a paper mill and works steadily whenever the mill is operating. He has a pleasant 7-room house on the outskirts of the village in which he works. The place is simply furnished but clean and comfortable, and the yard is made attractive with little flower beds. His housekeeper and her 14-year-old daughter have been living in the home since April, 1927.

Mr. I.'s story of the family trouble is that Mrs. I. had shamefully neglected her children; that for three years before December, 1926, when she finally left him "for good," she had been at home only "on and off"; that from time to time she had gone off with other men and entertained men at home while he was at work; and that during her absences the children had been free to

go "where they had a mind to." He said that Mrs. I. never tried to take any of the children after the divorce until two years ago, when she suddenly kidnaped their 6-year-old boy, and she showed no interest in the girls until she heard that they were to be committed to the State school for girls.

Mrs. I.'s liberal use of cosmetics and her generally overdressed appearance at the time of the interview made her seem rather "hard." She gave as her reason for not assuming custody of the children the fact that she had been obliged to earn a living for herself and had not been in a position to make a home for them. Upon her second marriage she had tried to bring the children to her home, but had been refused permission by Mr. I. and had finally succeeded in getting the 6-year-old boy by kidnaping him two years ago. Her attitude toward Mr. I.'s housekeeper is that the latter has not given her children the proper care and guidance and that she is an unsuitable person to have in the home.

The only member of the family having a court record before the divorce was Ida, now 18 years of age, who was committed to the State school for girls in December, 1925, on a charge of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality." It was reported that Ida had gone to an "old man's" house and also that her mother had contributed to her delinquency by inviting men to the house for her. Mr. I. described Ida as having been "headstrong" and disobedient and said that she had had the opportunity to do something for herself, as a local woman had taken an interest in her and had offered her a place in which she could earn her board and room while attending school, but she had refused to accept the offer. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. I. considered Ida's experience or record as in any way contributing to the delinquency of Irma and Gladys.

Irma has light hair and good features and is neat and attractive in appearance. She is rather large for her age, and overweight, and, according to the school nurse, her tonsils need attention. She seems somewhat slow, but this may be due in part to shyness.

Gladys is much more talkative than her sister and seems brighter. Like Irma she is a neat and attractive-looking girl. The school nurse found her "all right" except that her teeth needed attention.

Last winter Irma was in the fourth grade and Gladys in the third. The school authorities considered this retardation due not so much to possible low mentality as to irregular attendance, which, in turn, they attributed to home conditions. The school took no action in regard to this irregular attendance, however, until one day the teacher sent a note to Mr. I.'s housekeeper reporting the girl's absences. Both Mr. I. and the housekeeper said that this was the first indication they had that the girls were truant. The housekeeper had felt at times that the girls were being deceitful, but neither she nor Mr. I. had had any cause for complaint of their conduct. On looking into the matter of their nonattendance Mr. I. discovered that his two daughters had been sneaking off to the "old man's" house instead of going to school, and, enticed by his money, had submitted to illicit intercourse with him. He brought a complaint against Irma and Gladys to the local trial justice.

The trial justice went to Mr. I.'s home to see the girls. He was already familiar with the family and considered Mr. I. a steady worker of the average laboring type and Mrs. I. a woman of questionable character. He had no doubt that the girls had been neglected both before and after the divorce. He arranged for a physical examination by the local health officer, who found no positive evidence of venereal disease. He also notified the assistant county probation officer, who, however, took no action in the case and was unable to be present at the time of the hearing. On March 27 he ordered both girls committed to the State school for girls on a charge of "being found in manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality." Mrs. I., represented by an attorney at the hearing, appealed, and, pending the next session of the superior court, she was awarded custody of the girls. The trial justice and the health officer, and apparently also the father, considered it imperative that the girls be removed from the community at once, but they saw no alternative to sending them to their mother.

When the June term of the superior court was held the parties to the hearing did not appear and the case was still pending at the time of the interview.

Mrs. I. asserts that her husband's complaint was merely a "frame-up" in order to rid himself of the girls and to have them cared for in the State school. She has had no difficulty in getting them to attend school regularly since they have been with her and has found them helpful and obedient in the home.

The girls themselves like their new school even though they found the work more difficult at first. In spite of the fact that their "stepfather" sometimes gets cross, they like being with their mother better than with their father. They have had few opportunities for wholesome recreation in either community, but they enjoy playing with the school children in the community in which they now live.

Their present teachers find them industrious, well-behaved pupils and do not consider their school retardation due to mental defect.

The school nurse—the only person giving any indication of Mrs. I.'s status in her new environment—reported that she had had some home contact with the mother in regard to dental work, etc., for the girls and had found her cooperative. She also reported that Mrs. I. had taken her 6-year-old boy to the pre-school clinic and had been eager to get him in good shape before he should enter school.

No record appears of any prosecution of the "old man" in this case, although from the meager evidence it appears that he is the same man with whom Ida had illicit relations before her commitment to the State school in December, 1925. As both Irma and Gladys were under 14 years, the "age of consent" in Maine, at the time of this experience, he could have been indicted on two charges of rape, punishable in Maine "by imprisonment for any term of years."

PROBATION

The most desirable method of caring for juvenile delinquents, where home and neighborhood conditions make such a plan feasible, is to allow them to remain in their own homes under the supervision of trained probation officers. Supervision in this sense is a very broad term. It means that the probation officer visits the child's home in order to become acquainted with his family and his home conditions and help him to make the necessary adjustment to any difficulties in his home situation; that he has private talks with the child to gain his confidence and help him with his personal problems; that he looks after his health, helps him to develop satisfactory school relationships and obtain wholesome recreation, and, when he goes to work, assists in finding suitable employment.²⁵ Good probation service is dependent upon an adequate and well-trained probation staff, as ample time must be given by the officer to each child so that he can be of real assistance in substituting good attitudes and habits of conduct for the undesirable ones that the child has exhibited in the past. It is generally accepted that a full-time probation officer should have under supervision not more than 50 probationers, and that officers supervising girls should be responsible for a smaller number.²⁶

In Maine probation is used to a considerably greater extent for boys than for girls. (Table 5, p. 25.) This is due partly to the fact that girls' cases seldom receive attention until they are considered sufficiently serious to warrant commitment to an institution, and partly to the fact that Maine has few agencies equipped to handle girls' cases effectively.

The courts may, and occasionally do, designate some especially interested individual—a clergyman, a social worker, or the judge himself—to supervise certain cases, but they refer nearly all probation cases to the county probation officers. The authority and powers of these officers have already been described. (See p. 4.) Study of actual cases indicates that they take little advantage of these powers.

²⁵ See *Juvenile Courts at Work*, p. 161 ff., and in particular pp. 142-143 and 179-188.

²⁶ *Juvenile Court Standards*, p. 8.

The officers attend the required court sessions and receive as probationers the children committed to their care, but they rarely request the custody of children under arrest and awaiting trial or give information helpful in making an adjustment. Their service to children is on the whole confined to receiving the minimum reports prescribed by law as follows; "The court shall have authority to order such probationer to report to the probation officer at such times and places as the court in its order shall direct."²⁷ The procedure usually is for the officer to give to each probationer a written statement as to the terms of probation and the time and place at which he is to report. Under this system the officers consider their obligations fulfilled if they see the children in their office.²⁸ They usually ask a few general questions, such as "How are you getting along? Have you been going to school every day?" and give the child a general admonition such as, "Just be good and you will stay out of trouble," or, more specifically, "Now you see you can get along all right if you try; it doesn't pay to take other people's things; it won't get you anywhere but to the reform school." A few of the officers who have a more professional attitude toward their work visit the homes of the children under their care, inquiring specifically about their school achievements and recreational interests, and advising, encouraging, and reproving them as necessary. But, although they may see possibilities for constructive work with the children, none of them is able to give enough time to carry through an effective plan of treatment.

The number of reports required of probationers varies. Most officers require weekly or biweekly reports at first, reducing the number as time goes on. They keep a card file or a ledger record of the children, and each time a child reports a dated entry is made on this record. This works well enough if the child reports, but if he fails to report the officer is frequently unaware of it, as his only way of knowing which reports are due on a certain day is by going through all the cards, or the entire ledger, to see when the last report was made in each case. For probation officers who do not keep their files cleared of old records and who have but one file for adult and juvenile cases, as well as for records of fines and costs collected, this involves too much of a task. As a result, when a child reports he is credited; when he fails to report, nothing is done, although this is doubtless the very occasion when he is most in need of his officer. In some instances probationers drop away entirely by this method without the officers ever being aware of it. (See the cases of Jacques N., p. 43; and Anton C., p. 44.)

Some children are supervised by correspondence, for in spite of the fact that probation officers are appointed for county service, most of them serve only the cities or towns in which they are located; lack of appropriation for traveling expenses and lack of time prevent their serving the county at large. Occasionally they attempt to give probation service by mail to probationers located outside their own communities. This usually means that the probationer writes a biweekly or monthly letter to which he receives no reply;

²⁷ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 137, sec. 20.

²⁸ One probation officer arranged to have probationers come to his home, and, in his absence, some member of his family received the report.

and, if his letters become irregular or cease entirely, the probation officer is likely to let the matter rest.

Nearly half the children under the care of probation officers were placed on probation by the court on a suspended sentence or during continuance of the case. In several such cases studied the supervision given the children under care was merely nominal, and on the first occasion on which the probationer by some misconduct called himself to the attention of a law-enforcing officer, his probation was considered violated and he was referred to court for commitment. (See the cases of Carl H., p. 64; Martha A., p. 65; and Ernest P., p. 67.)

In some counties the probation period varies from 3 to 12 months, in others from 6 to 24 months, and in others a year is set for all cases. The discharge procedure is very informal. As has already been pointed out, some probationers drop away of their own accord, never being formally discharged. For the rest, a gradual decrease in the number of reports and finally a word of admonition when the officer informs them that their time is up concludes the probation period.

The responsibility of the probation officers to the court with regard to children varies in different counties. Some of the courts seem to have no further contact with probationers unless they violate the terms of their probation; in other courts the judges make occasional inquiries concerning individual children and require reports of all discharges, with notes as to progress made in each case. As the officers keep no social records—without home visits and some degree of investigation social records are naturally impossible—no very detailed reports can be expected.

Case histories illustrating probation

A few cases will suffice to show some of the typical needs of the juvenile probationer and will help to make clear in just what respects Maine's present probation service is defective. Included in this group are the stories of Michael Y., who needed companionship and encouragement to build up his self-confidence, self-reliance, and independence; Jacques N., who needed advice based on a study of his mental and physical condition; Anton C. and Yvon S., who needed friendly guidance—Anton with regard to a suitable vocation, Yvon in connection with his school and after-school work, and both boys in connection with their recreational pursuits; and Lucy P., who needed every kind of sympathetic and friendly supervision (For additional examples of probation service see the cases of Carl H., p. 64., Ernest P., p. 67; Tito V., p. 14; Rhea R., p. 35; Martha A., p. 65; Steve G., p. 28; Morris A., p. 29; Lester J., p. 31; and Jack S., p. 32.)

MICHAEL Y.

Native white; parents born in Ireland.

Age at time of offense, 11.

Municipal court, March 5, 1928: Stealing; placed on probation for two years.

Family at time of disposition: Mother twice married; first husband died and second deserted; brothers 10, 6, 4, sister 8, stepbrother 18, and stepsister (age not reported) at home.

Michael is a pale, thin boy and seems unusually apprehensive and timorous for his age. Unfortunately his mother's impatient shouting does not serve to encourage him. On the evening of the interview he sat on a bed looking

like a frightened rabbit. His chin quivered pathetically, his eyes were full of tears, and he seemed unable to reply even to questions unrelated to his offense.

The Y. family live in one of the poorer districts of the city, with the river wharves and railroad tracks on one side and the business section on the other. There are several vacant lots in this neighborhood and a number of garages and dingy stores; the housing conditions are not very good. Mrs. Y. rents the second floor and attic of a shabby, old building for \$13 a month. The second floor has a parlor, a kitchen, and a tiny bedroom without an outside window. The attic has three bedrooms and a toilet. A small and very dirty vacant lot next to the house serves as a yard where the younger children can make mud pies.²⁹

Michael's father deserted the family about a year ago. He had been an occasional drinker and at times had drunk to excess, but he had never left home nor threatened to leave until last year when, according to Mrs. Y., he suddenly disappeared and has not been heard of since.

Mrs. Y. is a pale, bony woman who works very hard, gets much excited over the injustices of the world, and "hollers" nervously at her children. She is employed from 6.30 to 8 a. m. and 12.45 to 5 p. m. as a charwoman in a public school, earning about \$12.50 a week.

John and Kate, the oldest children, are children of Mrs. Y.'s first marriage. John has graduated from high school and is at present looking for a job. During the summer he was employed as a serving boy in a resort hotel. Concerning Kate, Mrs. Y. was strangely silent. Kate is employed in a factory and, from Mrs. Y.'s reluctance to discuss her school and work history, it is likely that she has been employed while under legal age.

Mark, aged 10, was in court last spring with another boy on a charge of larceny of coins to the value of 50 cents. His case was continued for three months in charge of the probation officer, but apparently he received no further attention. At the time of the interview he was spending his after-school hours selling newspapers down town.

Peter, the 6-year-old boy, is a family problem. He has a passion for making noise and will bang together any two objects on which he can lay his hands. He was slow in learning to talk, and Mrs. Y. at one time consulted a physician about him. She was advised that his retardation and his passion for making noise would disappear as he grew older. In the meantime neither public nor parochial schools will accept him, as his presence is too disruptive to the class. The day nursery has been unable to take him, as it is already overcrowded and he is really too old for its care. So Michael, Mark, and the younger sister take turns staying home from school for the afternoon to take care of him while his mother works. The youngest child is in kindergarten. Of the 8-year-old sister nothing of special interest was learned save that she helped to take care of her little brothers.

Michael seems to get on well with his family. He is in the sixth grade, likes school, and has had no trouble there. For the last year or two he has been selling newspapers after school on the main business street of the city. Although he is out from 4.30 to 6 or 7, he sells only 15 papers. He earns 1 cent for every paper he sells and usually makes about 10 cents a day on tips. The tips he reserves for his own use, but the earnings, together with those of his brother Mark, pay for the family milk supply.

Mrs. Y. complained rather severely that Michael "just walked down the street with his papers" without trying to sell them and that other boys could dispose of 25 papers while he sold 15. At one time she had arranged for him to sell magazines, but he always had so many left that she could not afford to have him continue with this enterprise.

Michael plays with other boys in the vacant lots near his home. For special recreation he goes to motion-picture shows, usually once a week. He depends on the local boys' club for picnics, for amusement on stormy nights, and for occasional shower baths.

The family's version of Michael's offense is that one day last spring on the way home from school he and about eight other boys passed a restaurant and

²⁹ A few days after the time of interview the family moved to a 5-room first-floor flat, which, although in the same neighborhood, was in a much better state of repair and had a small piazza and yard in the rear. Mrs. Y. made this change for the sake of the children and was counting on the older children to help her pay the rent, which was \$10 a month higher.

decided to help themselves to some pie. In their excitement they knocked down a jug of sirup which spilled over and spoiled other things. The owner of the restaurant made a complaint, and the judge talked to the boys, requiring them to report to the probation officer and to pay each his share of the damages, which in their opinion greatly exceeded the value of their pie.

It is difficult to check up on Michael's story. The court record merely shows that one Michael Y. was charged with larceny of pies valued at \$1 and that for this offense the municipal court judge sentenced him to the State school for boys, but suspended the sentence and placed the boy on probation for two years to a priest, as special probation officer, and to the regular probation officer.

According to Mrs. Y., the special probation officer subsequently moved away and Michael was given a card to report every second Saturday to the regular probation officer. As Mrs. Y. works at the school all Saturday morning, Michael occasionally forgets to report; but as he has been in no further difficulty the probation officer merely asks Michael how he is getting along and tells him to be good.

Michael is obviously in need of opportunities for small successes which will encourage him, give him self-confidence, and overcome his pathological timidity and fear. He is not a stupid boy nor yet a bad one.

JACQUES N.

Native white; parents French-Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 16.

Municipal court, May 23, 1928: Sex offense; placed on probation.

Family at time of disposition: Mother deserted; mother, brothers 20, 18, 2, sisters 14, 12, 6 at home; brother 22 away.

Jacques has a few prepossessing characteristics—his good color, his white teeth, and his amiable disposition. For the rest he is a dull, stunted-looking youth, with untidy, unclean clothes, and a vagabond slouch to his gait and posture. His speech is slovenly, as he scarcely opens his lips when he speaks.

Mrs. N. lives on a narrow street, near the river and railroad tracks. The neighborhood is composed of tenement houses and little shops, and the people are almost entirely French speaking. Mrs. N. has five small, second-floor rooms. The parlor contains a little organ, a sewing machine, several albums and pictures, and several old rocking chairs which creak on the oil-cloth covered floor; through the open door the polished kitchen stove with a bright and shiny array of pots and pans may be seen.

Mrs. N. is a woman whom the years have left coarse and battered in appearance in spite of her efforts to conceal the fact with rouge; her voice is still strident, but her body looks ready to cave in. She has never been married. Each year when the men have come to town from the lumber camps she has taken a boarder or two; and for so long as her boarder has come back to her and given her some of his earnings, she has considered him her husband. Her home has been raided on several occasions, as she has been known to sell liquor, and she has also been under grave suspicion of hiring out girls for purposes of prostitution. Her oldest daughter recently died following an attempted abortion.

Jacques was rather unresponsive on the subject of his home life. He said that he had a room to himself, but that his little brother had it with him. (This answer is typical of the contradictory way in which he spoke.) When the agent commented on the fact that his home had looked clean and orderly, he replied, "Sure, we're no pigs." He seemed neither to know nor to care about the relationships of the various members of his family to himself or to each other, and he seemed unmoved by the illness and death of his sister, dismissing the incident with the helpful remark, "I can't say the name of her sickness."

Jacques was only in the fifth grade when he left school. He left immediately after his sixteenth birthday because "there were only four of us to support my mother." He said that his first job was "helping a milkman"; but when he was questioned concerning his earnings and his working hours, he replied, "I can't remember all those things." He also worked for a month in a "mill," but he could not remember when he worked there; he remembered earning "\$8 or \$9 or \$10 a week," of which he kept \$1 and gave the rest to his mother. He left this job because it was "too much work."

Late in the summer he met a man who had come down from a lumber camp and was looking for a "cook."³⁰ Jacques went along and took the job. But

³⁰ Boy helper or assistant to the chief cook in a lumber camp.

he found the work hard, and he did not like being alone in camp all day with the cook, nor did he like walking through the dark woods each evening to fetch the milk. He stood it for a month, but then he felt so lonesome that he left.

His present job (which he had had only one day at the time of the interview and probably has long since abandoned) is "sorting colored clothes in a laundry" at night. He did not yet know what his earnings would be, and he seemed unable to describe the work or the place of his employment. (It was difficult to know whether he never observed details or whether his intelligence was so limited that he could not grasp them.)

The story of his delinquency was difficult to get from any source, but seems to have been somewhat as follows: He had been to a party one evening last May and on his way home had stopped in an alley and looked into a window; a woman and girl were sitting in the room. A police officer passing the place on his beat arrested the boy for window peeping and self-abuse and locked him up in the detention room for the night. The case came up before the municipal court on the following morning, and Jacques was found guilty of "wanton behavior" and placed on probation. Jacques's story is that he was just "passing by" and that as he turned he saw the girl and her mother in the room. He denies the self-abuse, and as the agent had no opportunity for studying the boy more closely and gaining his confidence the subject was dropped. The injustice to the boy was not in the charge, which may easily have been true, but in the failure to learn more about him and his needs.

Jacques never told his probation officer of his job as "cook" (although this was during his probation period), nor did he report to his probation officer on his return. Apparently the latter did not miss him and did not realize that he had not reported for even a minimum of six months. The officer had never made a home visit nor in any way attempted to help Jacques with his problems.

Jacques said that his good times were "movies" and "parties." When asked whether he played cards, he replied, "Naw, but when I play poker I play with wafers. I never play for money." When asked what he did at the "parties" which he attended, he said that he did not know; he did not dance; occasionally he sang.

The word "party" to him evidently means being with several boys and girls. He was on his way to a "party" on the evening of the interview. He did not know where it was or who was giving it, but he was going with a friend who knew all about it. The bureau agent asked him whether he intended to go as he was, with his hair and clothes untidy and his hands distressingly dirty. He replied, "Sure," but just before leaving the agent he suddenly remarked that he had decided to go to the "movies" instead. He had with him some money he had borrowed from a friend and thought he would have a better time at the "movies" than at a "party."

ANTON C.

French Canadian; parents French Canadian; father naturalized 15 years ago.

Age at time of offense, 17.

Municipal court, February 5, 1928: Stealing; placed on probation.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married, but apparently not living together; father living in boarding house, which he runs; mother, sisters 24, 22, at home.

Anton is a tall young man, strong, and well built, but neither graceful nor handsome. He was too self-conscious and shy to speak frankly or easily when being interviewed.

Mr. C. runs a workingman's boarding house near the mills. At the time of the interview, shortly before noon, the downstairs rooms were bare save for long tables which were set for the noon meal. Apparently he lives in the boarding house and supports a woman who, with her daughters, helps him with the work. The respectability of this establishment seemed questionable. The women were dressed more appropriately for a burlesque show than for kitchen work; and after satisfying their curiosity as to the agent's mission they hastily disappeared.

Mrs. C. and her two daughters live in a clean second-floor flat about a block from Mr. C.'s boarding house. The rooms are well furnished, with an upholstered parlor suite, a piano, floor and table lamps, rugs, and pictures. Everything was neat and clean at the time of the interview.

The two girls are very attractive. They work steadily as stitchers in a shoe factory and receive good wages. Their English is not fluent nor free from a French accent, but the older girl expresses herself well and seems to be a very intelligent and competent young woman. She has been decidedly

conscious of the local prejudices against "the French people" and has felt that her people have not had the same opportunities to get ahead as the native Americans have. She has always been especially anxious that Anton should not suffer any such handicaps, and in a very generous way she and her sister saved part of their earnings with a view to helping him when they could.

According to the police and municipal court records, Anton and several other boys were charged with larceny last February, were found guilty, and were placed on probation. Further information concerning the offense could not be obtained from the records nor from interviews with the probation officer and other officers of the court. Anton's account was that the boys had been skating and that they made a little raid for food on a store.

Anton began to make his weekly reports to the probation officer, but he was growing increasingly dissatisfied with life. He felt that everybody was "against" him because he was French; and then he felt that he could never get anywhere without a trade, and that there was no way of learning a trade in his home town. His story is that after graduating from the eighth grade he tried to join the Navy, but was turned down because of a crooked spine. He had helped his father cook in a lumber camp one winter, but he had not cared much for that. Part of another winter he had cut wood, but that did not appeal to him. He had also driven a taxi for a month but had decided that "there was no money in it." He finally became convinced that he wanted to study aviation; and after reading some advertisements and having a little correspondence with a Chicago school of aviation, he decided to go to Chicago. He started out some time in April, his sisters having given him \$500.

When Anton got to Albany, he stopped to see something of city life. When he got to Buffalo, he stopped again. He was reluctant to give any details concerning these experiences, but admitted that he became acquainted with some young men and women and spent a considerable part of his \$500 "seeing things." (His attitude toward these experiences is one of peculiar, aggressive defensiveness. He feels that because he was brought up in a small town it was essential to his budding manhood to have some experience in the ways of the city.)

Anton finally reached Chicago, but with insufficient money to pay tuition for his course in aviation. He went to look at the "aviation college" one day, but said nothing about enrollment. For a month he saw the sights of Chicago, spending his nights in hotels and his days on the streets, and then he started back. Near Buffalo he joined a road construction gang and went to work. He worked hard for two months, but one day he cut his hand on a concrete mixer and, in addition to being unable to work, he felt ill. He wandered about for a while, picking up odd jobs cutting wood or working on lawns, and finally boarded a freight train for Boston.

On arriving in Boston Anton was held by the railroad authorities and taken to the police station, where he was warned for riding freight cars. Then he found a job unloading freight cars in Boston, and after working at that awhile he went home.

His sisters were, of course, bitterly disappointed. (They have concluded that Anton is lazy, that he is always finding his immediate job too hard, and is looking for and yearning after something easier and more interesting; they are ashamed of his lack of ambition to get ahead.)

On his return Anton worked for his father in the boarding house for a week or so. At the time of the interview he was driving a truck between Boston and his home for a poultry dealer. His trips had to be made at night and lasted from 8 p. m. one evening to 7 p. m. the next. He was not particularly well pleased with the job, but expressed the firm intention of sticking to it awhile to show that he could make good.

Anton has a distressing inferiority complex. The brief contact with him was not sufficient to indicate whether this inferiority complex is genuine and is the cause of his continuous failures or whether it is merely the excuse behind which he wishes to hide his laziness, shiftlessness, or restlessness. The fact that he has repeatedly taken jobs necessitating hard work would seem to indicate that he is not really lazy. The consciousness of his father's irregular establishment troubles him. He did not feel free to discuss it, and yet, of his own accord, he spoke of the situation and seemed ashamed and resentful about it.

Anton's reasoning is still rather puerile: People are against him because he is French; he can get nowhere without a trade; and he can not learn a trade without money. When reminded of the money given him by his sisters he replied without shame or sullenness that he had to have some experience. When asked whether he had ever appealed to his probation officer for help in solving his problems, he expressed surprise, "He? That old man? He never did anything for me." When, on the other hand, the probation officer was questioned concerning Anton he replied pleasantly to this effect, "Anton C.? Yes, I remember him. Nice boy; sure, he's getting along all right"; and when at the agent's request he consulted his record to see when Anton had last reported, he murmured a vague reply about having discharged the boy early. Apparently he has not spoken with Anton since before the boy's trip West in April. (The minimum period of probation in this court is supposedly six months; Anton reported less than three.)

YVON S.

Native white; parents French Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 13.

Municipal court, March 17, 1928: Stealing; placed on probation. May 14, 1928:

Same. June 14, 1928: Stealing; committed to State school for boys.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brothers 15, 10, 3, 3 (twins), 9 months; sisters 12, 8, 7, 4 at home; brother 20, sister 18 away.

Yvon has a good complexion and bright eyes. His stunted size and slouchy posture indicate that he has not always lived a wholesome life, and his habit of mouth breathing makes him look dull and unintelligent. He is good-natured and pleasant in conversation.

Yvon's father is a carpenter and is usually unemployed in the winter. His mother is a toil-worn woman who has brought 12 children into the world and has never been quite certain what they should do for bread. She has been known to practically all the local social agencies—family-welfare society, overseers of the poor, public-health nurse, child-welfare clinic, general hospital, and small private organizations, but she has received help from them only in emergencies and never continuously.

The family lives on an unpaved, weedy little side street in one of a straggling row of shabby houses. Their dilapidated "rent" has seven rooms, all rather large but all ugly and shabby. The window shades were all ragged; the floors were dirty and littered with rubbish; the furniture was poor, broken, and sticky; the sewing machine and mantelpiece were piled high with a miscellaneous collection of boxes, newspapers, broken clocks, unneeded clothing, and other things; and the windows seemed never to have been opened.

The oldest son and oldest daughter do not live at home. (The daughter left after a quarrel with her father.) But the remaining 10 children, as well as 3 dogs and a cat, were living at home at the time just preceding Yvon's court experience.

Yvon was in the sixth grade at the time of his delinquency. He had already attended 6 local schools—4 parochial and 2 public. He said that he had not disliked school until he was demoted. His first demotion was due to a prolonged absence while he was suffering from a "rash"; after that he was occasionally demoted on being transferred between schools. (He could not remember the reason for these transfers.)

The parochial school he last attended had only a long series of absences marked against his name, but his public-school teacher had a vivid recollection of him to the effect that "he was absent half the time, and he smoked incessantly. His lips were actually blistered from smoking the cigarettes which he picked up on the streets. And then he was untrustworthy." This teacher thought that Yvon's school retardation was due to his continuous absence and to his smoking rather than to mental dullness, and she had discovered that he was responsive to praise. She thought that he was probably not receiving the proper discipline and supervision at home.

Yvon had never been very ambitious and cared little for jobs. He began selling newspapers when he was 9 or 10 years of age, but he was not a zealous worker and did not stay at it for more than two years. He hauled ashes a few times, but that also bored him. He preferred to make his money with less effort; namely, by robbing the church "poor boxes."

On March 17, 1928, Yvon and his brother Paul, who is two years older, were brought before the municipal court on a charge of "larceny of nickel, silver, and copper coins valued at \$1.50" from a church. Both pleaded guilty and

were committed to the State school for boys on suspended sentence and placed on probation to a local priest acting as special probation officer together with the regular officer.

On May 14, the two were again brought before the municipal court, this time with three other boys on a charge of "larceny of one bicycle valued at \$20." Both again pleaded guilty. Yvon again was committed to the State school for boys (alternative 30 days in jail) on a suspended sentence and placed on probation for two years. Paul was placed in custody of his mother on her promise to send him to Canada to a farm. Although the court made no investigation to discover whether the uncle's farm in Canada would be a suitable place for Paul, Mrs. S. feels satisfied from Paul's letters that he is doing as well as could be expected. He is doing farm work and not attending school.

On June 14 Yvon was brought in on a charge of larceny of \$22 which he had taken from a store. He pleaded guilty and this time was sent to the State school.

Yvon offers several excuses for his delinquency, but none of his excuses seems convincing. His first excuse is, "My trouble was smoking too much," and he says that he feels better and thinks he has grown since he has been at the State school and thus deprived of cigarettes. Another of his excuses is that he "did whatever the rest of the gang did"—his gang being the particular group of boys with whom he was associating at that moment. However, as he committed his last offense alone, he realizes that this excuse is not adequate. He professes to have taken things just for the fun of it and not because he needed or really wanted them.

His court experiences have made no great impression on him. He spent four nights in jail cells—two pending court hearings and two on occasions when he was picked up on runaway trips—but he did not see anything to frighten him in jail. He has concluded that, although his probation officer never paid any attention to him, he himself was responsible for breaking his probation and that the State school was probably the only solution for his problem. His mother, however, has always been convinced that he was merely led astray by his brother Paul and that he would eventually have made good on probation if he had been given another chance.

Yvon seems to be getting along fairly well at the institution. He misses his little twin brothers and the baby whom he used to "mind" frequently; apparently he enjoyed the feeling that he was able to protect them.

LUCY P.

Native white; father born in Italy; nativity of mother not reported.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Municipal court, April 26, 1928; Truancy; placed on probation.

Family at time of disposition: Father married to third wife (Lucy's own mother and first stepmother having died); brothers 17, 12; sister 13 at home; step-brother, 9 months, in boarding home.

Lucy is an attractive-looking girl in spite of her bleached hair which is growing dark at the roots. She is stockily built and well developed for her age; she uses some rouge but wears her hair in a pretty, girlish bob, and dresses neatly and appropriately.

Her family lives on one of the main thoroughfares of the city. The street is lined with little shops and stores in the rear of which the storekeepers live with their families, the second and possibly third floors being occupied by other American or Italian families. Occasional detached houses and numerous untidy yards add to the generally unprogressive atmosphere of the neighborhood. The P. family themselves occupy six rooms in the rear of their grocery store—a parlor, a "reading room," a kitchen, and three bedrooms.

An Italian mission in the community conducts classes, clubs, and religious services which are attended regularly by Mr. and Mrs. P. and sporadically by the children.

Mr. P. is a repair man on a railroad and earns \$32 a week. According to the reports of agencies who know the family, he is steady in his work but "easy-going" in his home. He has been married three times, and consequently his family has become somewhat complex. By his first marriage he has five children, of whom four (including Lucy) are now living at home, and one is in an orphanage. After the death of his first wife he employed and subsequently married a widowed housekeeper who had two children of her own. This second wife died in childbirth, and after her death, Mr. P. placed her two children in an orphanage and the new baby in a boarding

home. He then engaged another widowed housekeeper, whom he has married recently (within less than a year after his second wife's death). From time to time he has moved the children in and out of institutions and boarding homes, so that in the course of the years the family has become fairly well known to the various social agencies of the city.

The present stepmother is neat and attractive in appearance but loud in manner and speech. When interviewed by the Children's Bureau agent she talked glibly and volubly of her stepchildren and especially of her efforts in behalf of Lucy. She was evidently eager to make a favorable impression on the agent, and therefore her attitude did not bear out reports from the attendance officer, police matron, and school nurse, to the effect that she was "exceedingly rude" and "impossible." By a previous marriage she also has two children of her own, who, although partly supported by her, do not live with her.

Robert, the 17-year-old brother, was unemployed at the time of the interview. During the summer he worked for a barber, but he has had no regular occupation. Michael, Lucy's other brother, is, according to the school-attendance officer, an habitual truant, but so far no truancy charge has been brought against him. Both boys have been registered in the court docket, however, for minor offenses. In the stepmother's opinion both are "light-fingered" and help themselves to whatever they want in the store, but in view of the father's easy-going nature this is scarcely surprising.

Of Lily, the younger sister, nothing was learned except that she was sharing a bedroom with Lucy and that the two were not getting on well together.

Indeed, Lucy does not get on well with any member of her family. In her stepmother's opinion she is "strong headed," "bossy," rough and vulgar in her speech and actions at home, domineering in her attitude toward the children, and deliberately defiant in her relations with her father. Lucy herself says that her father is eager to get rid of her, and is constantly threatening to send her, as well as the other children, to the reform school. She admits that she is unable to get along well with her new stepmother and is indifferent to her sister and brothers, but when asked why she can not get along with them she merely shrugs her shoulders.

Lucy dislikes school and thinks she would prefer to work during the day and attend evening school, but as she is only 15 and in 7A grade she must attend day school for at least another year. She is skillful in drawing but dull in her other studies, and says of herself, "I am rather slow, I guess, and when the teacher asks me questions I can't always answer quickly, and then she thinks I don't know, and I am marked down."

Last summer Lucy was employed in a sardine factory for two weeks, leaving of her own accord because she "could not stand it." She later did some housework in a private home, again leaving after a few weeks, this time because she was lonesome for her friends.

Lucy always has one special "girl friend" with whom she goes to the "movies," takes walks, and in general spends most of her time. Her last friend having been committed to the State school for girls, she has recently acquired a new companion. She is much interested in the circus and in cattle ranches and reads everything she finds describing circus and ranch life. Horse-back riding fascinates her. When she draws or paints—both of which she enjoys and does well—she chooses circus girls and ballet dancers as her subjects. Although she does not attend any of the activities of the Italian mission and belongs to no clubs, she expressed an interest in the agent's suggestion that she join a girl reserve group.

Early last April a worker interested in the family, hearing various reports to the effect that Lucy was "out every night," "crazy over men," and "going with sailors," and that the housekeeper (the present Mrs. P.) seemed uninterested in the children and was unable to make Lucy mind, referred the case to a local child-welfare agency. On making an investigation of the home the social worker from the agency found that Lucy had "ransacked the property of the housekeeper" and "defied the school-attendance officer," that she was using powder and lipstick in excess, and that her father slapped her when, instead of working in the store, she ran out. From the school-attendance officer the social worker learned that during the preceding weeks Lucy had been absent frequently and that the officer was about to have a warrant taken out for her arrest on a charge of truancy, with a view to sending her eventually to the State school unless court action should prove effective. At

the request of the judge, the agency representative attended the hearing, her last contact with the case.

There is no record of the court hearing and nothing to indicate the source or nature of the testimony brought against the child. The court docket merely shows that Lucy was charged with truancy by the school-attendance officer, was "found guilty," committed to the State school for girls on a suspended sentence, and placed on probation for two years. Persons attending the hearing reported that Lucy was also questioned regarding a "joy ride with two men and another girl" and concerning sex experience—which, however, she denied having. These questions were apparently based on complaints received by the police matron from Lucy's father and from other sources concerning the girl's indiscreet conduct.

When interviewed about her court experience, Lucy seemed to regard the matter very lightly. She was, however, indignant at the judge's questions concerning "all her secrets" and resentful of the presence of "so many men [the judge, attendance officer, probation officer, and attorney] and only one woman [the police matron] at the hearing."

Lucy's probation record shows that she reported twice in May, once in July, and once in September. It contains no information concerning the place or nature of her summer employment, although she used this as an excuse for not reporting and continued to use it as an excuse for some time after she had ceased working. The probation officer has done nothing for her save to make these entries on his card when she has come to his office to report.

Although Lucy's teacher of last year reported that the girl had given no trouble in the classroom and that her general conduct was good, although the attendance officer considered her delinquency due in part, at least, to the influence of undesirable companions and difficult home conditions, and although the school nurse thought that if taken from her home and placed in a normal, healthy environment, with proper provision for school, work, and recreational activities, Lucy might become a happy and well-adjusted child, yet no one has made any suggestion for placement anywhere save in the State school for girls; no one has taken any interest in developing her talent for drawing either as a possible vocation or as a constructive outlet; no one has tried to substitute for the "undesirable companions" interest in a group of wholesome young people; and no one has definitely befriended Lucy.

At the time of the interview she was attending school with some degree of regularity, but her attendance was due less to any reformatory effect of court action or probation than to the persistent watchfulness of the attendance officer, who, with the policewoman, expressed the hopeful conclusion, "We'll have her in the State school yet."

PROVISION FOR CARE OF DELINQUENT CHILDREN AWAY FROM THEIR OWN HOMES

Unfortunately all delinquent children can not be cared for in their own homes. Boys and girls whose home conditions or neighborhood associations have contributed to their delinquency can not always be expected to respond well to corrective treatment while they remain in the same environment, and even those children whose home conditions have not been positive factors in their delinquency may be better able to overcome and forget their difficulties and to form new standards of behavior in a completely new environment. The traditional method of caring for delinquent children away from their own homes is by committing them to institutions, especially to State training schools. With the increased knowledge of conduct problems and their causes, new methods of care are being developed. Institutional care for delinquent as well as for dependent children is being supplemented with placement in family homes so that to-day some provision for the placement of delinquent children must be considered in any State plan for dealing with juvenile delinquency.

In Maine the State is providing care for most of the delinquent children for which it assumes responsibility in its State training schools, for a few in penal institutions, and for a small number of younger children exhibiting conduct problems by placement in family homes.

CARE IN INSTITUTIONS

State training schools.

No attempt was made in this survey to make a thorough study of the State training schools. The visits to these institutions and the case studies of children committed to them for care, however, suggest a few observations that may be helpful in considering the Maine problem as a whole.

A program of institutional training for delinquent children has two aspects: First, the treatment of specific conduct difficulties, and, second, the preparation for a well-adjusted and happy life in a normal community. Neither of these can be accomplished without such a complete study of the child's physical condition, mental capacity, environmental background, and his school, work, and general conduct history as will yield an understanding of his individual problems and the best way of meeting them.³¹

Neither of the State training schools has any officer who is especially designated to make social investigations either at the time a child is received or at the time he is discharged. As the courts do not provide this service, the only available information concerning the child and his home is that contained on the commitment sheet, supplemented by the boy's or girl's own story and, in the school for girls, by such information as parents supply on special blanks sent to them by the institution when the child is received. Physical examinations of the children on entrance are given in both schools, but psychometric tests are not given as a routine measure nor has any provision been made in either school for systematic study of the personality problems of all the children.

Both schools include in their program of training health supervision and school, work, and play activities, but these activities are planned for the welfare of the group as an institutional group with but little emphasis on the study and treatment of the individual or his relation to life outside the institution.

The provisions for health care are also somewhat limited. In the event of illness at the State school for boys, a physician and nurse are called in or the patient is sent to the city hospital. The school for girls, having a resident physician and two practical nurses, is in a position to care for girls who are ill and is, moreover, adequately equipped to give isolation care to incoming girls and to girls having contagious diseases. Both schools have dental equipment and weekly service from visiting dentists; the equipment at the boys' school is not sufficiently modern, however, to provide for prophylactic treatment, and, from the appearance of the boys' teeth, such care is greatly needed.

The school for girls accepts pregnant girls but does not attempt to give confinement care nor to provide for continued care of the

³¹ For further discussion of the kind of study recommended for the individual delinquent child entering such institutions see Reeves, Margaret: *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls*, p. 226. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1929.

baby by the young mother. Girls are sent to a boarding home for confinement and are received back after their babies have been committed to the State department of public welfare for adoption. This plan does not take into consideration the needs of the babies nor the possibility that the girls should be encouraged to keep the custody of their children.³²

The educational program at the State school for boys provides for academic class work through the eighth grade and some ungraded class work for boys who have completed the eighth grade. No instruction of high-school grade is provided, on the assumption that most of the boys committed to the school are not of a sufficiently high mental grade to profit by it. Yet some of the boys whose cases were studied had completed the eighth grade before commitment to the training school. The majority of the boys paroled from August 1, 1927, to July 31, 1928, were 16 years of age or older, and were thus not likely to reenter school on returning home. All but 12 of the 50 boys paroled had been in the institution for two years or more before being paroled for the first time. It would seem desirable, therefore, to provide these boys with such academic or specialized instruction as would develop any special abilities that would lead to future wage earning or personal satisfaction. In this respect the State school for girls is fortunate in that, in addition to providing some instruction of high-school grade, including several commercial courses, it is able, through one of its teachers, to give special instruction in drawing and designing which, even without providing much in the way of practical application, is furnishing some of the children with a satisfactory means of self-expression.

Neither of the schools has developed a real vocational program. With the exception of the commercial courses and whatever training is being given in connection with the maintenance work, no provision has been made for any vocational training that would help the boys and girls in their choice of occupations when they leave the institution. As 1,777 of the 3,661 boys committed to the boys' school up to June 30, 1926, came from cities having a population of more than 10,000, training given in farm work, which is the main maintenance work of the institution, would hardly seem to meet the needs of all boys.

The facilities for recreation are rather limited. Both schools have an auditorium for assembly which they use for "movies" and entertainment. The boys' auditorium is also used for chapel services, and the girls' for parties, dances, and plays. For out-of-door play the boys' school has baseball diamonds for each cottage; the girls' school has a baseball field, a volley-ball court, and some rope swings. Neither school has any playground apparatus such as flying rings, horizontal bars, and ladders, or poles for climbing, or tennis courts, or equipped indoor gymnasiums and swimming pools. The maintenance work, of course, provides some out-of-door exercise for the boys on the farm and for the girls in the garden.

There is, as yet, little conscious development of a recreation program. The cottage matrons, especially in the girls' school, help to

³² These problems are discussed in *Training Schools for Delinquent Girls*, p. 226, and *Minimum Standards for Child Welfare*, p. 13 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 62, Washington, 1920).

plan for special cottage good times, and during the summer the girls also have three weekly recreation periods under the supervision of a recreation worker. This is practically the only way in which the schools recognize the significance of planned and supervised play as a part of the treatment process.

The ultimate success of institution treatment may depend on skillful parole supervision after the boys and girls leave the institution. The officer giving this service is, in a sense, a liaison officer between the child in the institution and the child's outside world.

Both schools attempt to give certain minimum services in connection with parole. All children sent to the State schools are committed as a matter of routine until they become 21 years of age "unless sooner discharged by process of law."³³ It has been the policy of the schools, however, to discharge boys from supervision when they become 18, if their conduct has been satisfactory and they have not been discharged earlier, and to discharge girls when they become 18 unless they can be paroled and placed in working homes earlier. Boys are generally placed on parole before discharge, in which case the superintendent of the school usually obtains a written statement from a local social agency or an individual—as, for instance, a judge, a sheriff, a selectman, or a clergyman—that home conditions are satisfactory. During 1927-28, 50 boys were paroled—35 to parents, 5 to other relatives, and 10 to employers. These boys are supposedly required to make quarterly reports by mail, but no forms are provided for this purpose and the requirement is not always met.

The State school for girls has a parole officer who visits homes to which girls are to be paroled. The officers of this institution believe that practically all the homes from which their girls come are unfit and that the girls are better off if not allowed to return to them, but they do not verify this opinion either through their parole officer or by enlisting the cooperation of other agencies, nor do they attempt to improve home conditions. At the time of the study 36 girls were on parole—33 in working homes and 3 in the homes of relatives. Girls placed in working homes usually receive \$5 a week, half of which is allowed them for their own use and half saved for them by the school. Occasionally girls are placed in family homes to work for their board while they attend high school, and a few who are still attending school are placed out to work during the summer vacation. The parole officer tries to visit all girls on parole once a month. As the girls are allowed to buy their clothing at wholesale prices through the State school, some of them keep up their contact with the institution in this way.

As the State schools are permitted to refuse to accept children committed by the courts although they have no agent present at the hearing, it is necessary for the judge to provide an alternative sentence. The school for boys requires that this alternative sentence, which is usually commitment to jail or house of correction, shall be shown in the commitment papers. This privilege of refusing to accept children committed by the court is rarely used by either

³³ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 144, sec. 6; sec. 20 as amended by Laws of 1921, ch. 55.

school. Only one record was found of such a case occurring during 1927-28, and refusal in that case was based on an improper commitment. (See the case story of Norman F., p. 80.)

The State schools also have the privilege of discharging children whom they consider unfit subjects for their care.³⁴ For example, if the State school for boys receives as delinquent a boy too feeble-minded to derive any benefit from the training or even to take an active part in the institutional program, or a boy so violent that he is a menace to the other children in the institution, it can discharge him and return him to the committing court, where a new case must be initiated, for the purpose of commitment to a more suitable institution.

Case histories illustrating commitment to the State training schools

The particular aspect of State-school commitment shown by these case stories is the diversity of needs that these institutions must meet. Mildred E. and Nina B. were committed to the State school for girls to safeguard them from further delinquencies and bad influences, the State school being considered a substitute for the normal, wisely supervised home life which both of these girls lacked. Clarice W. was committed for practically the same reasons, as her home, although intact at the time of the commitment, was considered an "unfit place" for her. Louis F., on the other hand, had a satisfactory family background but was committed to the State school for discipline. (See also the case of Tito V., p. 14.)

Charlie A. and Harold R., two young truants, were committed to the State school because their families had failed to cooperate with the attendance officers in obtaining their school attendance, and Annette N. was committed to the State school both to insure her further schooling and to shelter her during her pregnancy. Martha A. was committed apparently because the court had failed to find any other satisfactory means of disposing of her case after trying probation and requiring the girl to leave town. Carl H. exhibited a number of difficult personality problems that needed more thorough study than was given by anyone.

The cases of Carl H. and Martha A. both illustrate the use of a "suspended sentence" under which a child becomes liable to commitment to the State school as soon as he again comes to the attention of the public authorities for any offense, however slight. The story of Ernest P. also illustrates this practice, whereas the stories of Ernest's brother Edward and sister Norma illustrate commitment for purposes of discipline and safekeeping.

The desirability of the commitment of some of these children to an institution is open to serious question. Constructive probation work either in the child's home or in another family home might have assisted in overcoming some of the undesirable habits exhibited by these children and at the same time have equipped them to meet more successfully the many temptations that will always be encountered in normal life in a community.

³⁴ Only one such case—that of a girl—was reported during the year ended July 31, 1928.

MILDRED E.

Native white; father American Indian; mother reported once as native white and once as French Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 15.

Municipal court, February 2, 1928: Sex offense; committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of disposition: Parents separated; mother, brothers 17, 14, sisters 14, 10, at home.

Mildred is small for her age, but sturdy and apparently in good health. She is neat about her person, and her dark skin, hair, and eyes, betraying her Indian blood, add to her attractiveness. She is very likable, and her childish manner makes her appealing. Mrs. E. said that Mildred was double-jointed and had not learned to walk until she was 3 years of age, but there is no evidence of any serious defect at present.

Mr. E. is an Indian. He is lazy and shiftless and has been in jail a number of times for his excessive drinking. About seven years ago his drinking led to a separation between him and his family.

Mrs. E. is a nervous and excitable woman and is said to "enjoy poor health." Since her separation from her husband, she and her children have been more or less constantly dependent on the State, and for the last three or four years they have been supported as paupers. The town in which they live has paid their rent, supplied them with wood, and allowed them about \$10 a week for food and clothing, collecting for these disbursements from the State appropriations for Indians. Meanwhile Mr. E. has continued to maintain his willingness to support the family provided they live with him and once, indeed, Mrs. E. tried this, but she could not stay with him. Apparently neither the town nor the State has made further effort to get Mr. E. to contribute to the support of his family.

The family live in the French section of the city, in a small 4-room shingle house. The two downstairs rooms seemed comfortably furnished, neat, and clean at the time of the interview, but the air was bad owing doubtless to the poorly ventilated toilet room in the attached woodshed.

Mildred has a rather irregular school and work history. From time to time she has stayed home from school in order to help her mother with the washing or other housework, and sometimes she has stayed out of school in order to play truant with her friend Elsie. After she began to work her school attendance became quite spasmodic.

Her first job was that of dormitory maid in a school. She earned \$7 a week and her room and board, but when, in spite of her carefully camouflaged bed, it was discovered that she spent her nights out, she was discharged.

Following her discharge she returned to school again until she found a job at a small hotel. Her duties consisted of washing dishes, making beds, and scrubbing floors, and her wages were \$7 a week. After three or four months of this she returned to school again, and then to another dish-washing job, this time in a restaurant. Some of her earnings she used for clothes, and some she gave to her mother. Just before the offense for which she was committed to the State school she was again attending school; she was in the seventh grade of the model training school and liked both her teacher and the school work.

One evening Mildred went to the "movies" with her friend Elsie. Elsie had the money to pay for their admission, but her father had forbidden her to go to the theater, and so when she entered the theater and saw her father there she was afraid to go home lest she receive a beating. So she took Mildred with her to the home of the manager of the theater, with whom they spent part of the night, later going to the next town with money that he furnished.

When Mildred did not come home from the "movies," Mrs. E. went to the theater and asked the manager if he knew where her daughter was. He replied that he did not, and, after Mildred had remained away all night, Mrs. E. notified the police.

The chief of police issued a warrant for the child's arrest, found her in the neighboring town, brought her home, and confined her in the lock-up. (The various people interviewed disagreed as to whether the girls were detained in a boarding-house in the town in which they were found or in the jail of their own town, or both, and no records could be found to settle this point. They were certainly detained somewhere for at least one night.) The chief of police was already familiar with the girls and questioned them concerning their experiences; he also requested Miss T., the woman member of the overseers of the poor, to question them.

No one seemed to remember the details of the court hearing. Mrs. E. had been notified as to the time and was present. Miss T. had asked to be notified,

but having received no word, she did not appear. On a charge of having been "wanton and lascivious in speech and behavior," Mildred was committed to the State school for girls and was almost immediately conducted there by Miss T.

Physical examination on admission to the State school showed that, although Mildred had had sex experiences, she was not diseased. She was found to be in good health, and, as she appeared to be normal, she was not given a mental test. She has been promoted to the eighth grade and gets along very well. She presents no conduct difficulties in the school and is considered a "nice child."

Mrs. E. is still indignant over the way the case was handled. She feels that the manager enticed the girls into the theater and kept them with him, and if she had known at that time what she knows now she would have tried to prevent Mildred's commitment and would have "gone after him." No action had been taken against the man at the time of the interview, eight months later, because according to the chief of police it was impossible to obtain any evidence against him.

About four months after Mildred had been committed to the State school, Miss T. received a complaint that Mildred's 14-year-old sister was also "running around." She talked the matter over with Mrs. E. and has heard no further complaint since.

Elsie, Mildred's friend, is about a month older than Mildred. She has been generally considered a tough girl and the leader of any escapades in which Mildred took part. She is one of 12 children. Her mother is French and her father is a Scotch Canadian who believes in ruling his children with an iron hand. Elsie speaks bitterly of his sternness and of his practice of whipping the children.

Elsie was known to the police before the delinquency in question. On one occasion she had run away with a man from a carnival and gone to Canada with him. Later, after she had run away from him, he was apprehended and prosecuted. She and Mildred had also been questioned by the chief of police at times when they were seen on the streets at night.

Her part in the present delinquency has been explained in connection with Mildred's story. The girls were arrested together and both committed to the State school for girls. Elsie's father was present at the hearing and was quite satisfied with the disposition.

Elsie is only in the sixth grade; according to the State-school record she "is stupid but is learning as fast as she can." She was under treatment for gonorrhoea for more than six months but has been discharged recently.

NINA B.

Native white; parents Italian.

Age at time of offense, 15 or 16.

Municipal court, April 5, 1928: Sex offense; committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of disposition: Father dead, mother deserted; two brothers, one sister, one stepbrother, one stepsister brought up in institution, all now living in different places. Nina living with married stepsister.

Nina is a pretty girl with brown hair and big brown eyes. Her beautiful, clear complexion is very fair. She is short in stature and rather stout, but neat and particular about her person. According to various reports, she is a good mimic and can sing well. She seemed eager to talk with the bureau agent, and her manner was pleasing and bright.

Mr. B.'s first wife died in Italy, leaving him with four children. He married again and had three children by his second wife. He moved his entire family to New York City, where Nina was born and where his second wife deserted him. He died soon afterward and his children were placed in an institution.

Nina's oldest half-sister Lucia left the institution after a while and went to live in Maine. She also took Nina's own sister Tracy out of the institution. In turn Tracy, who had married and gone to Rhode Island to live, took Nina out of the institution to live with her. The remaining children are now scattered about in various places.

Nina was about 13 years of age when she went to live in Rhode Island. She was frequently left at home alone, and on one such occasion her brother-in-law, who was many years her senior, attacked her. When Lucia learned that the girl was not receiving proper care, she brought her to Maine.

Lucia and her husband had not been married until after they had four children. But when Nina came to live with them they were buying their little

home and seemed to have an established domestic life. They attended church and took part in the recreational activities of the Sunday school, and during the summer the children attended the mission school and played in one of the city playgrounds.

According to Lucia, Nina was a "good girl" and gave her no trouble when she first came to live in Maine. She graduated from the eighth grade and then stayed at home for a time to help Lucia in the house. Lucia wanted her to go to high school, but Nina wanted to go to work. She attended night school for a short time.

Mrs. Y., the Sunday school teacher of Lucia's children, heard about Nina and took a friendly interest in her. In March, 1927, Nina, very much upset, came to Mrs. Y. and told her that she was afraid of Lucia's husband because he had forced her to have relations with him on several occasions, and that Lucia, when she saw her husband showing favor to her, abused her. Mrs. Y. tried to advise the girl, but as Lucia needed Nina's help at home, things went on without any great change for a while. At last Nina ran away.

Nina found a job in a large bakery. She did piecework, earning from \$12 to \$22 a week. For two or three months she succeeded in concealing her whereabouts from Lucia and Lucia's husband. But Nina was living with girls who began to have a bad influence on her, and, according to Mrs. Y., she "began to go astray." One day she was taken to the police station and given a "talking to."

She continued working at the bakery, but at last Lucia's husband met her on the street and forced her to go home with him, refusing to let anyone see her. Mrs. Y. learned of this and called in a children's agency, which removed Nina from Lucia's home and, in accordance with her own wishes, allowed her to go to Mrs. Y.

Unfortunately Mrs. Y. had no place for Nina in her own home, but she soon found a position for her in a hospital, enabling the girl to earn \$30 a month and her board and room by waiting on the table in the nurses' home. She worked there several months and for a while tried to put \$5 a week in the bank. But soon Mrs. Y. and the children's agency began to receive reports that Nina was being influenced by an undesirable companion, that she was keeping late hours, and that as a result she was too tired to do her work properly. They warned and advised the girl, but her irregular hours continued and she was finally discharged from the hospital.

Mrs. Y. was still loath to have Nina sent to an institution, so she placed her in a home where she was to help with the housework. Nina remained there only five days, however, as she "could not stand the cooking," and when Mrs. Y. found another home Nina absolutely refused to go. Mrs. Y. then took her to the municipal court and, on a charge of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality," had her committed to the State school for girls on April 3, 1928. No special investigation was made by the court, nor was Lucia or the agent of the children's agency called in for the hearing. But Mrs. Y. and the police matron (who had warned Nina on one occasion) reported what they knew of the girl, and after spending one night in the women's detention room of the jail, Nina was taken to the State school.

Nina denies having had any sex experiences except those forced on her by her brothers-in-law. She admits, however, that her choice of companions was not above criticism. She feels rather keenly that she has been cheated out of a real home life.

She has been placed in the high-school commercial class at the State school, and for maintenance work she has been assigned to the medical room to help the school physician. She likes this work so much that she thinks she would like to take a nurse's training course.

Mrs. Y. has not lost interest in Nina. She has found that Nina is gifted in music and has managed to raise some money to provide for music lessons for her at the State school.

CLARICE W.

Native white; parents French Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Municipal court, June 15, 1928: Sex offense; committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brother 3, sisters 19, 16, 9, 8 at home.

Clarice is a dainty-looking girl with a childish face and timorous manner. When seen at the State school she was in a tearful mood and said that she was very homesick and wept every day.

The family live in an ugly, barnlike frame house at the end of a short blind-alley street. The house is unpainted and the street unpaved; a cinder path, fringed with dusty weeds, leading to the rear door is the only approach. The yard space is large but equally unattractive. The rooms, although plainly furnished, are kept clean and orderly. The parlor, with its player piano and stiff chairs, has a cold and unused look, but the other rooms seem homelike. The family are buying the house and have added a number of improvements. They rent out several rooms on the second floor.

Mr. W. is a thin, worn-looking man. He works on a night shift in a mill, earning \$19.50 for a five-day week. One of the mill foremen reported that he was a hard and steady worker and added that he knew Mr. W. to go off on little wood-cutting jobs during the day to earn extra money. Mr. W. admitted drinking some, but said that he usually drank in moderation.

Mrs. W. is a crisp, neat-looking woman. She has had 11 children, 5 of whom have died. In addition to doing her housework, she tries to add to the family income by laundering hospital uniforms, for which she earns from \$5 to \$8 a week.

The two older girls, Pauline and Marguerite, are employed as hospital tray girls, earning \$8.50 and \$5 a week, respectively, plus their meals. Marguerite is fat and pale and does not look well. She complains that for the last few years she has been afflicted with a strange drowsiness and that as soon as she ceases to do active work she is overpowered with sleep and must lie down lest she faint. The other children seem healthy and lively. Mr. W. said that all the children, as well as Mrs. W., had had trouble with their eyes and had been threatened with blindness, but at present there is no evidence of this.

The general impression gained from the home visit was of a neat and orderly household and a fairly congenial, fairly normal family life. Interviews with the chief of police, the local visiting nurse, one of the overseers of the poor, and the head nurse employing Pauline and Marguerite, however, revealed the family in a rather different light. The visiting nurse reported that when the children were smaller both the house and the youngsters used to be in a deplorable state of dirt and disorder. The chief of police reported that about two years ago Mrs. W. was in the habit of spending her evenings on the streets with "questionable characters," while her husband was wandering about looking for her. She would return home after midnight, and violent quarrels would then take place between the two. The other interviews also disclosed the existence of vulgar quarrels between Mr. and Mrs. W., caused both by Mrs. W.'s conduct with other men and by Mr. W.'s ceaseless and unrestrained demands on her—ugly quarrels, overheard and discussed by the children. One of these quarrels was said to have led to a separation between Mr. and Mrs. W. last spring, Mrs. W. going to Canada for several weeks, but apparently the breach was later healed.

In 1924-25 Clarice was in the fifth grade of the public school; as her absences were many and her grades, except for music and drawing, were low, she was not promoted. The public-school files have no further record of Clarice, but one of the French parochial schools has a record showing that she enrolled there in September, 1926; the sister's recollection was, however, that Clarice left school after a few weeks to go to work. This coincides with Clarice's story that when she was 13 years of age she left school to substitute as hospital tray girl for her sister who was ill. She worked for about a year, without a work certificate, giving her earnings to her mother. During this time the school-attendance officer was either unaware of or reconciled to her absence from school, as he made no objection. According to her own story, Clarice returned to a public school again when her sister recovered, and shortly thereafter she herself had an attack of rheumatic fever which kept her out of school for several months. On her recovery her eyes troubled her, and instead of going back to school she accepted a permanent job as tray girl in the hospital. It was at this time that her mother went to Canada.

When Mrs. W. returned she found that Clarice was no longer employed but was spending her days with Stella, a motherless girl with a bad reputation. Finding herself unable to break this friendship and get Clarice back to work, Mrs. W. called on the woman member of the overseers of the poor, who advised her to call in the woman deputy sheriff to warn the girl, which Mrs. W. did. The deputy sheriff was not satisfied with warning Clarice, but coming upon the family at an unpropitious moment she concluded that they

were a disorderly, unclean, foul-mouthed, and immoral lot, and that the home was an unfit place for Clarice. She promptly removed the girl to a boarding home for the night, collecting the cost of lodging from Mr. W. The following day she took Clarice before the sheriff. Clarice confessed having had sexual relations with seven or eight men, and on the strength of this confession she was brought before the municipal court on a charge of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality."

The hearing, as described by Mr. W., was attended only by the deputy sheriff, the woman member of the overseers of the poor, Clarice, and her parents. The case was discussed, and the deputy sheriff (who was also a member of the municipal board of children's guardians and thus in a position to place children in boarding homes) recommended that for a little while Clarice be placed in some "nice home" where her parents could see her and from which they would be free to remove her. Mr. W. stated that he and his wife consented to this plan, duly signing the papers submitted to them by the judge. After obtaining their signatures the judge read the papers aloud to them, and they realized for the first time that they had consented to commit Clarice to the State school for girls, from which in spite of all their efforts, they have thus far been unable to remove her. (This probably incorrect account of the hearing could not be verified as the court record contained no details and the deputy sheriff has died.)

Clarice had never confided in her mother, and although Mrs. W. had objected to her daughter's friendship with Stella she never suspected her of any misconduct sufficiently serious to warrant commitment to an institution. Mr. W. said, "Of course those two men forced her, but she didn't know what it was all about and she was always a good girl; she never lied, never stole anything, and never was in trouble of any kind." Both parents show less concern over their daughter's present and future welfare than over the fraud that they allege was practiced on them in committing Clarice to the State school.

Clarice has little to say concerning her court experience. According to her institutional record her story on admission was that her home was "very unclean and immoral," that her two older sisters were immoral, and that she had run away from home a great deal. At present, however, she says that she has a good home and was always "well used" there and would like very much to go back. Aside from her homesickness, she seems to be getting on fairly well in the institution. She is in the sixth grade and likes her school work.

LOUIS F.

Native white; parents French Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 13.

Municipal court, March 30, 1928: Stealing; committed to State school for boys.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brothers 22, 18, 7, 5; sisters 25, 17, 16, 15, 11 at home; brothers 21, 19, sister 23 away.

Louis is small for his age, but seems well built and healthy. He has large brown eyes and would be a good-looking boy if his teeth were cleaned properly.

The F. family lives in one of Maine's smaller mill towns. They rent the second floor of a three-story flat opposite the river, not far from a mill and rather near the railroad tracks. In spite of the large family, they have only six rooms, but these are fairly large, well lighted and ventilated, and comfortably furnished.

The father and oldest son are employed regularly in the mill. The 18-year-old boy works steadily on a farm. The two girls, aged 25 and 17, work in a factory, but their employment is seasonal.

Most of the family interview was conducted with the older sisters, as Mrs. F. speaks only French. These sisters are pretty, neat, well-mannered, and intelligent girls. They are keenly aware of the existing prejudice against the "French population," which they are made to feel even though they are American-born citizens. They realize that one of the best ways of keeping young people out of trouble is to occupy and interest them in wholesome recreation, but they find that the community provides only the barest minimum of wholesome recreation facilities and that in the young people's clubs and group organizations the "French children are not wanted."

Louis attended both public and parochial schools. He gave no trouble but did not do well in either school. He was never given a mental test, so that it is impossible to say whether his failures were due to mental deficiency or to lack of interest and application. He does not appear to be a dull and backward child, nor does his developmental history show any abnormalities.

He received very little spending money from his father, but he was able to earn enough himself by delivering papers on Sunday, by picking beans on a truck farm in summer, and by shoveling snow and bringing in coal and wood in winter. He went to the "movies" about once a week and played at home with his brothers and sisters, never giving his family any trouble.

Last winter Louis received \$5 from a man who had tapped a gas meter and who wanted Louis to assume the blame. The boy accordingly pleaded guilty to the charge in court but privately related the true story to his chum. When his family learned of his innocence and reported it, he was released by the court.

After this incident Louis became less trustworthy. He frequently slipped away from home to join a group of boys at the local pool room. When his father tried to keep him in he would become sulky, and, after supposedly going to bed, he would steal off to spend the rest of the evening at the pool room. Louis worked there, setting up balls at a cent a rack from 8 to 12.30 at night. He also played pool and sometimes gambled with the boys in order to make enough money to play.

When Mr. F. went to the pool room to look for his son the proprietor would sneak the boy out of the back door, and when his sisters tried to find Louis the proprietor hid him in a closet.

One evening Louis stole \$10 from a man, in order to pay for his pool games. The theft was promptly discovered and a warrant issued, but before it was served Louis was assured that if he confessed the case would be dropped. He refused to admit the theft, was arrested, brought before the municipal court, found guilty of larceny, and committed to the State school for boys (alternative sentence of commitment to county jail). (The pool-room proprietor was required to pay the court costs and to refund the stolen money.)

Louis's family have concluded that probably the State school was the only possible disposition, and yet they think that if some one had taken an interest in the boy and tried to help him, he might have made good at home. When interviewed at the State school, Louis said that he thought he deserved commitment. He seemed to be getting along fairly well at the institution.

CHARLIE K.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 13.

Municipal court, March 20, 1928: Truancy; committed to State school for boys.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brothers 9, 7, 3, 2, living at home; housekeeper also in home.

Charlie is average in size, general development, health, neatness, and cleanliness. His manner when interviewed is at first shy, but he is frank and responsive if encouraged.

Charlie's family lives on the second floor of a large tenement house directly opposite a public school and public-school playground. They rent five light rooms, a bath, and a sunny porch for \$7 a week. The rooms seen were rugless, scantily furnished, and untidy, and the tenement halls and stairways were dark and dirty.

The neighborhood is not especially objectionable. Near by are one or two other tenements, a garage, a store or two, and one and two family detached houses. The absence of yard space for play is partly compensated for by the playground across the street for the older children and the tenement porches for the babies.

Charlie's father is a truck driver, earning, when he works regularly, \$21 a week. In the past few years, however, his employment has not been very steady.

Charlie's mother has been employed on and off for the last four years in a shoe factory, where she earns \$13 a week when work is steady. During her absence the children are cared for by a housekeeper.

The overseers of the poor have had to help the family nearly every winter. Although no social records were kept, the clerk of the overseers retained various general impressions to the effect that Mr. K. "was not very bright," that he was unable to hold his jobs, and that he had never amounted to anything. He also said that several winters ago Mr. K. had raised fancy dogs in his house and that on one occasion the town visitor had found the house so filthy that he had called in the local department of health, threatening to stop relief until the house had been cleaned.

The family has also been known to the local Red Cross. In the winter of 1928 several of the children came to the home of one of the Red Cross nurses with a "begging letter." The nurse visited the home and found that Mr. K. had been out of work for several months, that the family was without food, and that the baby was ill. She promptly put in some groceries and placed the family on the milk list. Two days later she made another visit and found that the baby had died. As the family was receiving aid from the overseers of the poor and Mrs. K. was working irregularly, and as there was no other illness in the home, the Red Cross closed the case by referring the children to the Salvation Army.

The family has had a great deal of illness. Three other children have died, the causes of death, according to the mother, being whooping cough, inflammation of the bowels, and hernia. The second oldest child has recently been taken out of a plaster cast which was supposedly correcting a tuberculous hip, and Mrs. K. has just recovered from a complicated surgical operation. On the day of the interview the youngest child was sick and wailed continuously. The three other children were playing about and quarreling with vigor, but they looked pale and thin.

Charlie has a rather mature loyalty toward his family. His version of the dog breeding was that his father had been given a dog and that one day, in one of the family bed rooms, this dog gave birth to a litter of eight or nine pups, which none of the family could bear to kill. Some of the pups were given away, but some were raised in the home.

Charlie had not yet had a real job. He sometimes helped his father wash automobiles, but whenever he was paid for this he gave the money to his father. His only earnings were for shoveling snow in the winter.

For recreation he used to go to Saturday afternoon "movies" and to Salvation Army meetings, where he and his brother had a good time "singing, praying, and testifying."

After several failures in school Charlie was placed in a special grade. His parents disagreed as to the reason for his retardation. Mrs. K. thought it was due to natural slowness, whereas Mr. K., who considers his son bright, thought the retardation was due solely to his truancy. Last winter the family received almost daily calls from the school-attendance officer, but usually at times when Mr. and Mrs. K. were not at home. Mr. K. occasionally took Charlie to school himself, but as soon as he left Charlie would leave, too.

His school principal had never given him any mental tests, but she thought that his mental capacity was subnormal. She professed an entire lack of sympathy with the boy, however, and was convinced that he had never been truthful concerning the reason for his truancy. After talking with his parents she concluded that they were lax and indifferent and that Mr. K. was "irresponsible," and, although she had never visited the home, she had no doubt but that home conditions were very bad. She felt satisfied that Charlie was unfit for any other treatment than the discipline of the State school for boys.

In March, 1928, Charlie's truancy suddenly reached its climax. The school-attendance officer decided that it was useless to waste further effort in trying to get the cooperation of the parents, and, as much of the time he was unable even to find Charlie, he referred the case to the municipal court for official action.

Charlie had no previous court record, but he had the following record with the police department:

1926—Sept. 4: Larceny.....	Released with warning
1927—July 5: Larceny of bicycle.....	Released with warning
1928—Jan. 11: Larceny of paper cups.....	Released with warning
1928—Jan. 26: Truancy.....	Released with warning
1928—Feb. 18: Larceny of coal.....	Released with warning

In view of this record and the complaint of the school-attendance officer, the municipal court, without further investigation, committed Charlie to the State school for boys.

Charlie's own story regarding his truancy is rather interesting. He told of several occasions when the family was without a housekeeper and he had had to take care of the children so that his mother would not be obliged to stay

home, from work. On another occasion his only pair of shoes met with an accident and as his father could not afford new ones he stayed at home for a while. He admitted, however, that his truancy was not always due to such necessities. He recalled having stayed out of school for an entire week on one occasion in order to play in an old barn. When he grew tired of playing, he would lie down and read a "doctor book" which he used to carry around in his pocket; he read about "lungs and things" and did not find them especially interesting, but had nothing better to do. He did not dislike school; he merely thought that he would not go.

Charlie is not unhappy at the State school. So far he has been punished only once, which he says was for refusing to eat his breakfast porridge one morning. For recreation he does beadwork, plays baseball, and takes part in the general activities provided by the institution.

The school-attendance officer has been opposed on general principles to sending boys to the State school on charges of truancy, and, during a long period of service, this has been the only case in which he recommended such a disposition. But he is convinced that the regular meals, regular hours of sleep, required school attendance, and general atmosphere of orderliness and discipline are exactly what Charlie needs and are proving a great benefit to him.

HAROLD R.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 11.

Municipal court, February 3, 1928: Truancy; committed to State school for boys.

Family at time of disposition: Widowed mother, brother 14, sister 11 at home.

Harold is a very likable little chap with red cheeks and shiny eyes. His cottage mistress had ordered a hasty clean-up for the interview, and as a result he appeared with his face well scrubbed and his hair plastered down with water, wearing an institution shirt at least three sizes too large for him. His congested breathing indicated the need for attention to his tonsils and adenoids, and his teeth were badly in need of cleaning, but in other respects he seemed healthy and vigorous. His mother reported that he had had three convulsions when he was 2½ years of age, but apparently these had no after-effects. The combination of his childish appearance and his wistfully serious manner makes him a most appealing little person. He is doubtless easily impressed and easily led, but none the less honest and frank.

Mr. R. has been dead for about seven years. He was epileptic and spent the last years of his life in the State hospital for the insane.

For many years the family had been dependent on the city. In the winter of 1928 the overseers of the poor having concluded that Mrs. R. was "crazy," that the children were being neglected, and that the family would continue to be a chronic case for aid, decided to break up the home by sending the mother to an institution and having the children placed out. Accordingly they arranged for a member of the municipal board of children's guardians to petition the court for custody of the children on grounds of "neglect and willful failure of parent to provide suitable food, clothing, and the privilege of education." Mrs. R. appealed to a lawyer who was already exercised over what he considered a growing tendency on the part of these agencies to break up homes and who, therefore, defended her case with considerable vigor. As the agencies were unable to produce conclusive evidence to prove the mother's neglect of her children, the family remained intact and, at the time of the interview, the overseers of the poor were paying for their rent, groceries, and fuel and giving them clothing. Mrs. R. supplements this aid by going out to do housework, usually two days a week, earning 40 cents an hour. At one time she applied for mothers' aid, but her application was refused.

At the time of the interview the family had just moved from a flat in a rather undesirable neighborhood near the river wharves and railroad tracks to a small house in an unpretentious residential district. Although the rooms were in need of fresh paper and paint, they had been well cleaned. The parlor furniture, consisting of an old plush sofa, a small table, several rickety chairs, and a worn rug, looked extremely old and shabby. Mrs. R. seemed to take considerable pride in the place, however, and was planning to furnish a little garret room so that when Harold returned he could have a room to himself.

Mrs. R. is a thin woman with a gnarled and angular body. Her wrinkled cheeks are pale and sunken, and she has only two or three teeth, and with her

ragged assortment of cast-off clothing she looks like a worn-out pauper; but when she begins to defend the rights of her children and rushes across the room waving her clenched fists, her flashing eyes and scarcely intelligible hisses indicate that she has enough bitter energy to continue struggling if necessary.

She has not given her children very close supervision. The fact that she has always worked out several days a week and that the boys have been encouraged to spend their after-school hours down town selling newspapers has led to considerable freedom on their part to do as they please. She realized last winter that Harold was playing truant and was hiding from the school-attendance officer, but she seemed unable to discipline him and always blamed his misdemeanors on the bad influence of the neighborhood in general and one delinquent boy in particular. (This boy did, in fact, have a bad record in the court.)

A complaint made to a protective agency in October, 1924, alleged that, according to neighborhood rumors, Mrs. R. was having epileptic fits, that she did not know how to cook for her family, and that she beat and otherwise neglected and abused her children. The records of this agency do not show that any action was taken on this complaint nor whether an investigation of the home did indeed prove such neglect and abuse to exist.

Richard, the 14-year-old brother, and Patsy, the 11-year-old sister, are attractive, healthy-looking children. On the day of the interview, which was at the end of the week, their clothes looked rather dusty, but they were otherwise neat. Both children were eager to ask questions, Richard, especially, asking some very intelligent questions about the functions of the Government. Richard adds a little to the family income by selling newspapers down town every day after school. He is very alert and rather independent; and when his mother, who has no confidence in books, tries to keep him from reading, he is not so obedient as she desires. He has a good friend in the lawyer who had befriended the family before. Noticing that Richard's adenoids were troubling him and that the agencies were not attending to the matter, the lawyer arranged for an operation, and he has kept up a very friendly relation with the boy ever since. Richard goes to his office every Saturday morning to "talk over things." Patsy's eyes are obviously in need of an oculist's attention, but, although the school nurse has pointed out the need for care, no one has taken the child to an oculist.

At the time of his delinquency, Harold was only in the fifth grade. This retardation may be accounted for in part by the fact that, although he had been living in but one city, he had already attended six different schools, transferring between public and parochial whenever any special school requirement, change of residence, or some other reason made a transfer seem desirable. His last teacher considered him bright but thoroughly unreliable, and was of the opinion that he and his delinquent companion had a bad influence on each other. Although she had never visited his home, she had had several talks with his mother, and from them concluded that home conditions were partly to blame. She referred the boy to the school-attendance officer and thus disposed of his case.

Harold's employment record is almost as irregular as his school record. He sold newspapers before he was 10 years of age. He also sold magazines on the street corners for a while, but on finding his competitors too strong for him he began selling a club of magazines with the inducement of a free theater ticket as a premium for 100 weekly sales. He also collected milk and medicine bottles, which he managed to sell. He usually gave his mother \$1.50 a week, reserving the rest of his earnings for himself. After he became interested in the "bad boys," however, and found that they did not work he, too, ceased working.

Harold's only special recreation was going to the "movies," but he also had a good time playing down by the river wharves and hanging around stores and alleys. He liked Patsy and sometimes went walking with her. His relations with his brother were less amicable, but he was more helpful to his mother than Richard.

His story of his delinquencies is as follows:

"When I was 10 years old, I learned to be a bad boy. John told me to ask some men for some money and then to go to the Five and Ten with him. Before that I never done nothing bad. One time Al and I 'took' some Christmas wreaths and sold them to a lady, but she never gave us the money. Some-

times I went in the Five and Ten and took some candy and little play toys and a rubber ball, and once the manager caught me and called the police, but the police never came, and so he let me go."

He remembered having been in court three times and to the police station once. He was scolded and warned, but the "bad boys" who were his companions proved too strong an influence for his good resolutions. He admitted that because they were older he liked to show that he could do whatever they did.

Early in February, 1928, the school-attendance officer brought Harold before the municipal court on a charge of habitual truancy. He had one court record against him: When he was 10 years of age he had been one of three boys charged with larceny, the disposition in his case being "Continued for sentence and placed on probation for one year." And so on this occasion, without further ado, he was committed to the State school for boys before the friendly lawyer had time to help him.

Harold was evidently awed and impressed by the procedure. He told of having sat for several hours in a dark "jail cell" behind a locked door both before and after the hearing, and he repeated almost reverently the judge's words of disposition, "This boy is sentenced to the State school for boys."

Harold seems to get along fairly well in the institution. He realizes that his poverty is a handicap to him here as it was at home, for he can not write to his mother except when the school furnishes the stamp (which is once a month), and he can not afford to make bead necklaces unless one of the other boys lends him some beads. He accepts the situation, however, with a resigned seriousness.

ANNETTE Q.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Municipal court, April 21, 1928; Sex offense; committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brothers 21, 16, 8, 4; sisters 11, 3, 9 months at home; sisters 25 and 20 married and in own homes; half-brothers 28, 25, and half-sister 30 in own homes.

Annette is small, but she has good color, a fairly clear skin, and, on the whole, looks healthy. She is shy and childish in her ways.

Her parents live in a shingle house on a paved road in the so-called "French town" section of their village. The house has a large yard, but like the neighboring houses, it is small and poorly built and has no running water. The first floor has but one large room with a wood-shed adjoining; the second floor has four rooms. Except for a fairly good sewing machine, the house is poorly furnished and, although warm, is dirty and cheerless.

Mr. Q. works irregularly in the woods and in the potato fields according to the season and the employment available. The oldest son also works and pays board. There are no other wage earners in the family, and during the winter of 1927-28 they received aid from the town.

Mrs. Q. has been accustomed so long to poverty and low standards that she makes little effort to improve the dirty and unkempt condition of her children. When interviewed by the Children's Bureau agent she was friendly but seemed determined to shield Annette, and she stressed the child's willingness to stay at home with the children while she went out.

The winter before the interview Annette was in the fifth grade. She liked her teacher, attended school with fair regularity, and gave no trouble. In her spare time she worked for an aunt and uncle, earning \$3 a week, which she either gave to her mother or used to purchase her clothes. In March she left school. One of the local overseers of the poor who called on the family at that time was told by Mrs. Q. that Annette was pregnant and was staying in the next town with "the P.'s" who, although not responsible for her condition, had promised to care for her.

Early in April the woman deputy sheriff of "the next town" received a complaint that Mr. P., an elderly man separated from his wife and long considered a questionable character, had a little girl living with him. The deputy sheriff promptly visited him and found Annette there. She learned from Mr. P. that he was responsible for the girl's condition and was planning to place her in a boarding home and pay the expenses of her confinement. From conversation with one of Annette's friends and from further investigation, she learned that Annette had stayed with Mr. P. on three different occasions—in October, 1927, at Christmas time, and at the time of discovery. She also heard that a railroad gate tender had enticed the child into his shack by

offering her grapes and candy and had made improper advances to her, but was not responsible for her condition.

After the deputy sheriff's visit Mr. P. went to the judge to learn his possible penalty and to offer to provide for the girl. The judge took no affidavit, but gave him to understand that the penalty would be severe. On the same day Mr. P. took Annette back to her own home. While there he heard of her experiences with the other man, whereupon he promptly revoked his confession, which, he explained, had been made merely to protect the girl. His new story was substantiated by both Annette and Mrs. Q., who were full of praise for his kindness and goodness.

Two weeks after the initial investigation the deputy sheriff had a warrant sworn for the girl's arrest. Annette was examined by the city health officer and found to be four months pregnant. At the recommendation of the deputy sheriff, who saw the need for further schooling, Annette was committed to the State school for girls and, pending her transfer to that institution, was detained in a local hospital. Apparently Mrs. Q. did not understand what happened at the hearing, as she telephoned several days later to learn what had become of Annette and was surprised to hear that she had been committed to the State school.

Annette was placed in a boarding home for confinement, after which she was returned to the State school and given treatment for gonorrhoea. Her baby was committed to the State department of public welfare for adoption.

The State school for girls made no investigation of her case, but obtained from Annette a statement admitting that other men had had relations with her, but that Mr. P. was the father of her child, and that her mother, on becoming aware of her condition, had sent her to him for care. This affidavit has been referred to the county attorney, and it is expected that Mr. P. will be indicted by the grand jury.

When interviewed, Annette expressed the opinion that she should have been allowed to remain with her mother; however, she did not appear unhappy at the institution. She is still in the fifth grade and is having the usual share of institutional work and play activities.

CARL H.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 13.

Municipal court, March 28, 1928: Stealing; placed on probation. On April 10, 1928, committed to State school for boys for violation of probation.

Family at time of disposition: Mother divorced from first husband but married to and living with second husband; stepbrother 7, stepsister 5 at home.

Carl is a heavily built and strong-looking boy. He carries himself with a slight slouch and drags his feet as if he had not yet learned to manage all of his body. In spite of the fact that he has had his tonsils and adenoids out, he still breathes through his mouth; he thinks the doctor "didn't get them all out." Carl gives the impression of being lethargic and even dull in his thinking process, but alert and cunning in planning mischief.

Mr. H. is employed at painting machinery; he earns \$23 a week and works steadily. Mrs. H. was divorced from her first husband on the ground of nonsupport. After working for several years she married her present husband. She still does occasional days of housecleaning in order to earn extra money. In being interviewed she seemed seriously and genuinely concerned over her son's delinquency and was eager to tell anything that might help to account for his conduct.

Except that he was born with "a swelling" on his head, Carl had no physical disabilities or defects. Following his parents' divorce he was cared for by his grandmother and possibly overindulged by her. He always wanted to "show off" and "act smart," and this was an aspect of his behavior which always worried his mother. She thought that he got some of these ideas from the "movies." He was always "crazy about the movies" and went often; his mother used to roast peanuts and send him down town to sell them, and whenever he made 10 cents or more profit he would stay to see a "movie" instead of coming home.

Mrs. H. and her second husband did not always agree on the way in which Carl was to be brought up, and as a result Carl did not get on well with his stepfather.

He seems to have been a rather solitary child, without chums or gang associates, and, unlike most boys, he never attempts to ascribe any of his delinquencies to the influence of bad companions. He was in the seventh grade before

his delinquency. He liked school "all right" but did not like to get low marks, and he was truant much of the time. In the course of the interview he told how he had bribed some of the older boys "that could write better" to write notes to the teacher excusing his absences, and thus he sometimes managed to "get by" without attending school more than once a week. The principal remembered him as an unruly, untidy, lazy, and truant boy who was deliberately and destructively mischievous.

He never worked much. When he was 9 or 10 years of age he helped a boy with a newspaper route, and later he tried to sell newspapers and magazines for himself for a time; but he "did not like going around so much" and so he did not keep at these jobs very long. He used his earnings in the same way in which he used his profits from selling peanuts—going to the "movies" and buying candy.

He gave the following account of his conduct: When he was little he liked "trading" his play toys whenever other boys had things he liked better. He also liked playing fireman, and one day he and another boy hacked down the side of a barn with a hatchet when they were playing fire. He liked to show off, and he liked to smoke and say "smarty things" to the boys to see whether he could impress them, and yet he was conscious of the fact that the boys disliked him for trying to act smart.

One day he broke into a schoolhouse and took several boxes of gold stars which he scattered about. Later he broke into another school and took the children's milk money, amounting to about \$8; and, after tying it up in a bag, he buried it under an ash pile. Several youngsters tunneling through the ash pile found the money and divided it among themselves. When this was reported to the police Carl's offense became known, and on March 28, 1928, he was brought before the municipal court on a charge of breaking, entering, and larceny.

He spent three days in a special detention room at the police station while his case was continued. Then his stepfather furnished \$200 bond, and Carl was released under his stepfather's supervision. The prosecuting attorney nolo-prossed the "breaking and entering" charge and on a simple charge of larceny gave him a suspended sentence for commitment to the State school for boys (alternative 30 days in jail). Meanwhile Carl was placed on probation for two years.

Mr. H. promised to give Carl a weekly allowance and to take him to the "movies" when his conduct was satisfactory, and tried by talking with him to foster his desire to do better. Carl would spend his evenings with other boys and remain out late, however, and then, according to his story, his father began to "hate" him and would himself stay away from home evenings in order to avoid further contact with his stepson.

One day when Carl was out on the street he saw a jug of sirup in a parked car; and recalling a hoax he had heard over the radio, he spilled the sirup over the upholstered seat of the car so that later the driver ruined his clothes in the mess. Carl was arrested for this offense and detained for one night in a "regular cell." The court considered his action a violation of probation, and as Mr. H. made no further pleas in his behalf Carl was committed to the State school for boys.

Carl says that he is glad to be in the State school because he can not get into trouble, whereas if he had been placed on probation he would have been in some other mischief before long. He expresses the hope that the State school will "reform" him and that when he is discharged he will no longer get into difficulties.

MARTHA A.

Native white; father native white, mother Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 14.

Police matron, March 15, 1928: Sex offense; dismissed with warning.

Municipal court, April 28, 1928: Truancy; placed on probation. June 7, 1928: Sex offense; continued on probation. July 9, 1928: Violation of probation; committed to State school for girls.

Family at time of first disposition: Parents married but father had deserted; mother and brother 15 at home; usually one or two male roomers in family.

Martha is a distressingly unattractive girl; she has stringy, stubborn hair, a pasty, rash-covered complexion, and poor teeth. Her unusually large head and strangely shaped forehead are suggestive of abnormality. She seems to make no effort to appear neat and looks incapable of alertness, responsiveness, or initiative.

Mrs. A. claims complete ignorance of the reason for Mr. A.'s desertion and of his whereabouts during the past six years. In a sentimental manner she regrets the fact that her children have been deprived of a father's care and blames their delinquencies in some measure on their lack of paternal discipline.

She earns a living for herself and the children by doing housework and general cleaning, for which she earns \$3 to \$4 a day, and by keeping roomers. She rents a 5-room basement apartment on an unattractive but respectable small-town street and has a living room, kitchen, a pantry, and three bedrooms. She usually rents two of the bedrooms to male roomers for \$2 a week.

Mrs. A. seems sadly lacking in judgment where her children are concerned. As the school-attendance officer never came to see her, she did not worry about their school attendance, although she knew that Martha was sometimes truant. Last April when Martha and her friend Rhea (see p. 36) left school in order to work she suspected, especially when she saw the girls' new clothes, that they were not attending school but were working. When asked why she did not question the girl, she replied rather lamely, "I suppose maybe I should have asked her, but I didn't; she was so big and didn't like to be bossed, and she has no head for learning anyhow."

Nor was Mrs. A. unaware of Martha's recreational interests. She knew that her daughter went to the "movies" three and more times a week, because she was herself continually giving Martha "movie money" as an inducement to wash the dishes. When she first heard that the girl had attended a dance, she "spanked her terribly," but as the only effect of the spanking was that Martha would run out of the house whenever she wanted to go to a dance, Mrs. A. thought there was no use in repeating that form of punishment. Occasionally she had accompanied Martha to dances, but she soon found that too fatiguing. She had concluded that "there is nothing wrong in dances; it's coming home from dances when the trouble begins," but she felt unable to bring Martha home and apparently ceased to worry about her.

Her son Clarence seemed to realize the dangers to which his sister was exposed and tried to keep her in nights, but he was so little older than she that he merely antagonized her.

Except that Martha was in the seventh grade when Rhea was in the eighth, the experiences of the two girls are practically the same. In the winter before the study they attended public dances together, were arrested together, and, on March 15, together received a warning from the police matron. They both falsified their ages to obtain jobs at a shoe factory; and, although Martha was less ambitious and earned less than Rhea, both used their earnings for clothes. Like Rhea, Martha was discovered by the factory inspector, arrested, charged with truancy in the municipal court on April 28, and placed on probation. On June 7 she was again brought before the municipal court with Rhea for continuing or repeating all past offenses, and, like Rhea, was continued on probation with the understanding that she leave the community.

Martha went to stay with an aunt in a neighboring small town. She stayed several weeks, but the lure of the public dances in her home town was too much for her, and one Saturday evening, early in July, she was discovered by the police matron in a public dance hall and arrested. She was held in the women's detention room of the city jail. Mrs. A. maintains that she waited for her daughter to come home and did not know where she was until Monday morning, when a neighbor showed her a newspaper account of Martha's arrest and detention.

On a charge of having violated the conditions of her probation and in view of her past record, Martha was committed to the State school for girls on July 9. Her matron there considers her "low grade mentally" and unable to learn much. Martha herself seems too incapable of any spontaneous emotional reaction to be either happy or miserable at the State school. She admits her sex experiences with an attitude of utter indifference. The only subject on which she betrays a sign of responsiveness is that of dancing; she learned to dance by watching others and is crazy about it; she and Rhea used to go to roadhouses to pick up dance partners. The girls in her cottage are allowed to dance every Saturday night, but they may not do the Charleston, and the dancing is "pretty tame."

Martha's brother Clarence also had a court experience during this time. He was 16 years of age at the time of his offense and was earning \$1 a day distributing handbills. On June 2, 1928, he and two other boys were brought before the municipal court on a charge of burglary; they were indicted by the

grand jury and held for the next term of the superior court. Clarence could not furnish the required \$1,000 bond and was detained in the county jail pending the hearing. His record showed one previous arrest, and since the evidence of leadership in the present offense was not in his favor, he was committed to the State school for boys on June 28.

On October 29 he and another boy escaped from the institution. As he was not returned in time to be interviewed, his story must remain incomplete.

Mrs. A. thinks, of course, that Clarence should have been given another chance and that it is hardly fair for Martha to be in the State school for girls unless her friend Rhea is also there, but, at the same time, she seems fairly well pleased that her two children are being so well cared for in State institutions.

ERNEST AND NORMA P.

Native white; father native white, mother born in Canada.

Ages at time of offense, 14, 15.

Municipal court:

Ernest, February 16, 1928: Larceny; placed on probation. March 5, 1928:

Probation violated; committed to State school for boys.

Norma, March 1, 1928: Sex offense; committed to State school for girls.

Composition of family on date of Ernest's first disposition: Parents married, father in sanatorium in West; sister Pearl 16, brother Victor 9 at home; brother Edward 12 (or 13) in State school for boys.

The interview with Mrs. P., Ernest, and Norma, and with various individuals having contact with the family, and the fairly detailed record of the family-welfare society clearly showed that, although Ernest and Norma were the only members of the family whose delinquencies definitely fell within the 6-month period studied, they were so closely bound up with the family situation as a whole that it would be necessary to include each member of the family in the case study.

Mr. P. was at one time a railroad employee and was twice seriously injured in railroad accidents. After one of these accidents he became tuberculous. Although he was not bedridden, he was unable to work, and so he lounged about at home, irritable and querulous, easily roused to anger with his wife and his children, and violent in his outbursts of temper.

Mrs. P. is still in her early thirties, and with her fresh, pink complexion and bobbed brown hair she makes an attractive appearance. Although she looks well, she complains of being worn out with work. She has been working on and off for the past 10 years, whenever Mr. P. has been unable or unwilling to work. When the youngest child was a baby, she worked in a rug factory, earning \$16 a week. Later when the factory closed she was employed as a laundress. Her last position has been that of hotel chambermaid.

The health histories of the children show that Pearl, the oldest daughter, had convulsions every day during the first three months of her infancy, and that as a child she was exceptionally timid and given to holding her breath when scolded. Since early childhood Ernest has had a bilateral hernia, supposedly the result of having been severely kicked by his father; although he has sometimes worn a truss, he has never had any careful medical attention. Norma has been troubled by a hernia since infancy, but like Ernest, she has never had proper medical attention for it.

The school records for all the children show many "repeated grades"; but, in the absence of mental tests or further comment, it is impossible to determine whether the failures were due to actual mental deficiency or to the very irregular school attendance which seems to have been characteristic of all the children.

Neither Pearl nor Norma finished the seventh grade. Pearl definitely left school to take a job as a nurse girl; and Norma, who was feeling very conscious of her womanly appearance and ashamed to be in school with little girls, began to stay away from school, to look for jobs, and also to "run the streets."

Norma was a constant source of irritation to her father. Whether his fits of temper encouraged her to run away from home on any and every occasion or whether her habit of running away caused his outbursts of temper is difficult to say. Her mother believed the former to have been true and attributed the girl's tendency to run off and look for jobs to a desire to be completely independent of her abusive father. At the same time Mrs. P. realized that Norma was playing truant, staying out at indiscreet hours with undesirable companions and having a bad influence on her older but more

timid sister, and she began to fear lest both girls would come to harm. So, early in the winter of 1926-27, she arranged to send Norma to a private institution in another State.

In January, 1927, Norma attempted to escape from that institution. Her story to her mother was that she had been working on a power machine, sewing rayon underwear all day and she had been cruelly treated. After fainting from exhaustion, she had been taken to the bathroom to be revived and on being left alone had decided to escape by jumping out of the third-story window.⁸⁵ Although she broke a leg in the fall, she managed to drag herself nearly a mile without being discovered. She was then picked up by the police and taken to the city hospital, where she was under treatment for several months both for her broken leg and for what the neurological department diagnosed as "hysteria."

Meantime, in spite of Norma's absence, Pearl was growing less and less dependable. She was given to running away and although her employers consented to take her back again at first, they could not keep her long. Presently her mother learned she had spent several nights away from home, and although she could not bring herself to question the girl, she suspected that Pearl had been with men and that something would have to be done. So, in March, 1927, Pearl was sent to the same private institution that had received Norma.

In September of the same year, after the girls had complained of being very unhappy there, Mrs. P. sent for them, and, with the consent of the head of the institution they both came home. The stories are not quite clear as to what they did during September and October; apparently they divided their time between their home and the hotel at which their mother was employed. In November they both disappeared, but were promptly found in a neighboring town and returned home. There is no further information about Pearl at this time. Norma (either at this time or earlier) through her mother found work as a private maid in one of the hotel light-housekeeping suites; her duties consisted of dusting, making the bed, washing dishes, and occasionally acting as waitress when her mistress entertained. She liked the job, but the hotel management soon learned of the arrangement and objected to the employment of an "outsider." Norma then found employment as a chambermaid in a smaller hotel, without her mother's knowledge, and while she was working there a man promised her a better job in the neighboring town and presently she disappeared.

Ernest seems to have been much more dependable and ambitious than his sisters. In his after-school hours he had worked at the usual jobs of carrying newspapers and shoveling snow. Later he found a job for the summer months working on a truck farm, where he earned \$1 a day and his meals, and during the school year he worked as delivery and stock boy in grocery stores in after-school hours and on Saturday. At first he gave all his earnings to his mother; later he began to use them to purchase his own clothes. He was a member of the boys' choir in his church and a leader of a troop of Boy Scouts.

Ernest considered it one of his chief duties in life to look after his younger brother Edward who frequently ran away from home. The latter wanted to be a soldier, and he believed that by running away from home and hanging around an Army post his ambition would be realized more quickly. Whenever Edward ran away Ernest went in search of him, usually locating him at the nearest Army post. On one occasion Edward, at his father's request, was detained all night in the guardhouse with a view to curing this runaway habit. In March, 1927, however, both he and Ernest left home; it is not clear whether Ernest went merely to follow and protect his younger brother or whether both boys were running away to escape the continued abusiveness of their father. They arrived in Boston and were picked up by the police, who notified Mr. P. to come after them.

Both boys had been charged with petty larcenies. Ernest was accused of having gone through the pockets of the choir boys during a church service, but his guilt could not be definitely established and his case was dismissed without formal court action. Edward, although actually guilty of a small larceny, was not taken to court. According to his mother, he came home from school one night looking very pale and feeling quite unable to eat his supper; in the course of the evening he gave her 30 cents, confessing that he and

⁸⁵ A letter from the institution reported, however, that Norma and another girl had jumped from a first-floor window on their way from chapel.

another boy had taken 60 cents belonging to the school milk fund. He was made to return the money and, at least to his mother's knowledge, never repeated the offense.

At the end of March, 1927, Edward was brought before the municipal court on a charge of truancy, and, in view of the general family situation, and on recommendation of the school-attendance officer, he was committed to the State school for boys. (The school-attendance officer was also eager to have Ernest committed to the State school on charges of truancy and larceny, but there is no record of complaint against Ernest or of the basis for such possible charges.)

Apparently Victor was the only member of the family not presenting any problems, and even he was a source of difficulty, as Ernest was obliged to stay home from school frequently to look after him whenever he was unable to go to school. In December, 1927, Mr. P. went West to a sanatorium, leaving the two boys without even his querulous supervision.

The family was meanwhile becoming well known to the community. The school principal considered the children a "hard lot"; the school-attendance officer felt that he had exhausted every means at his disposal for keeping the youngsters in school; the police officers and police matron had had numerous occasions to look for the children when they had run away or to warn them when they had conducted themselves improperly; the local children's agency heard of them through a letter complaining of mischief done by the children and a letter from the Boston juvenile court reporting its experience with Ernest and Edward, who had seemed "bright and attractive" but had "complained of beatings and an unhappy home life"; their clergyman had tried to keep a friendly eye on the children; and the family-welfare society was constantly receiving pleas from Mrs. P. for advice and help in keeping the children out of the "reform school." When Mrs. P. finally appealed for a boarding home for the boys, the various agencies and individuals concerned in the welfare of the family conferred in the judge's office. They concluded that as Mr. P. was already away from home and not likely to return for some time and Mrs. P. had demonstrated her incapacity to care for her children properly and was, moreover, a woman of questionable moral standards, the home had best be broken up completely. According to their plan Pearl was to be committed to the State school for girls on a charge of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality," sentence to be suspended during a 2-year period of probation; Ernest was to be committed to the State school for boys on a charge of larceny,³³ sentence to be suspended during a 2-year period of probation; Norma was to be committed to the State school for girls on a charge of "being found in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality," as soon as she could be found; and Victor was to be placed in a boarding home, his mother to pay his board. The entire family was to be examined for venereal disease at the clinic.

These plans were duly carried out. The results of the examinations for venereal disease were all negative. Pearl was intrusted to the supervision of the family clergyman (who has since moved away and, as far as Pearl's supervision is concerned, has not been replaced) during the period of her probation. She works as a tray girl in a hospital and spends some of her nights with a friend near the hospital and some with her mother, whose single room on the outskirts of the city is all that is left of the family home. Mrs. P. feels confident that Pearl's conduct is blameless at present, but she worries over the girl's health. Pearl is restless at night and talks in her sleep, and she has a troublesome suppurating growth on her neck.

Victor, who was committed temporarily to the custody of the municipal board of children's guardians, has been placed in a rural boarding home, where he seems to be doing nicely. His mother is well pleased with the arrangement.

While the various members of the family were thus being disposed of, Norma was in the neighboring town working as a night waitress in a restaurant, using her earnings to pay her hotel room rent and her tips to buy silk stockings. One day she made a saucy remark to a man who had spoken to her

³³ The complainant in this case was the school-attendance officer, but as Ernest's school absences lacked one session of the number necessary to constitute habitual truancy he used the charge of larceny of a tobacco pipe and a pen from the church, a charge which had previously been made informally against Ernest and two other boys but of which he had not been proved guilty.

on the street, and a policeman, having observed her, warned her to go home. Her return was promptly noted by the authorities, and on March 1 she was brought before the municipal court and committed to the State school for girls for breaking the conditions of her probation.

Norma, at the age of 15, is a handsome, well-developed girl with an appearance of abundant health and vitality. She was interviewed at the State school and seemed quite willing to discuss her experiences. Without attempting to lay the blame for her delinquency on her mother, she said that if her mother had been able to remain at home to look after the children their troubles might have been prevented.

Of her experiences with men she spoke with more bitterness than shame. Apparently she had consented to go for automobile rides with any man who asked her, although the very first ride had taught her that she could not trust so casual an acquaintance. She sometimes worried over the risk she took. She used to cry herself to sleep at night; but, although she sometimes confided in her sister, she could not bear to have her mother know of her experiences.

She is doing well at the State school, both in her class work and in the cottage. She likes the kitchen work less than the work on rayon underwear at the private institution which had previously cared for her, but she appreciates her present educational opportunities. Part of her maintenance work has been to polish floors on her hands and knees. She enjoys this, but the strained position always aggravates her hernia. She told the school doctor, who tried to relieve the condition with a bandage, but the bandage chafed her and so she removed it. As she fears a surgical operation she no longer complains.

Norma likes to take care of pretty things—dishes and silver and silk underwear. She thinks she would like to be a maid in a private home and evidently feels no resentment toward her father as she would like to go West to work near him.

Ernest was at first placed in the boarding home with Victor. After he had been there two weeks the boarding mother complained that he was conducting himself so outrageously that she would not keep him and so she sent him back to his mother. His return, in view of the attending circumstances, was considered a violation of probation, for which he was committed to the State school for boys.

Ernest, at the age of 14, is a tall, healthy-looking boy with a fresh pink complexion and attractive brown eyes like his mother's. He is perhaps the only member of the family who considers himself to have been "badly used," and his mother is decidedly of the same opinion. He resents his truancy record because his absences, he says, were all due to his duty toward his family—hunting for Edward when he ran off to be a soldier; looking for Norma when she stayed out late or disappeared for a night or a week; taking care of Victor when no one else was at home to care for him, and in general trying to make up for the deficiencies of his father and mother. He was not aware of the efforts of the school-attendance officer to help the family, as the latter had never spoken to him. He also resents his experience with the court in connection with the church larceny; he insists he was innocent and the offense was committed by a little negro boy, who has since been committed to the State school for boys on similar charges.

He feels that his boarding experience was a failure because his boarding parents feared his popularity with and influence over the younger children in the home. As Ernest resented being asked to saw one and one-half cords of wet wood with a dull saw and to clean out a chicken coop, his popularity and influence probably threatened the morale of the home. So he was given his car fare and told to return to the city.

According to Ernest's story, the judge talked the matter over with him, saying that as Ernest was homeless and still of school age, he would be better off in the State school for boys, where he would have his brother near him, than in another boarding home. The judge asked his consent to the plan before making this disposition and promised him that it would not be a regular commitment but merely a temporary arrangement. Ernest told the Children's Bureau agent with some bitterness that thus far he had been treated exactly like the rest of the boys in the institution. He especially resented the fact that his clothes had been taken from him. Moreover, he considered the judge's statement that he would be near his brother rather a fraud, as he had been assigned to a different cottage and had seen Edward only when they were both assigned to kitchen duty and the kitchen matron allowed them to work together.

Ernest's attitude toward the court's method of dealing with him and of breaking up and disposing of the various members of the family is one of protest, therefore. His attitude toward the police, who on one occasion summoned a patrol wagon to meet him half way in order to complete his arrest in good form, in spite of his promises to walk along without giving any trouble, is no less resentful.

Ernest is giving no trouble at the State school. He is in the eighth grade, and except for his worry over the other members of the family—particularly over Norma, of whose disposition he has not been told—he is not very unhappy. His former summer employer came to visit him and tried to arrange to have the boy live on his farm, but as this plan would have interfered with Ernest's school attendance it did not receive the consent of the superintendent.

Ernest's ambition is to become a doctor. He seems to be a thoroughly intelligent boy, but whether, in view of his past handicaps and his present circumstances, he will ever be in a position to prepare for entering a medical school seems extremely doubtful.

Reformatories and jails.

Boys and girls who are considered unfit subjects for commitment to the State schools because of their age or the seriousness of their offenses are committed to the reformatories or jails. Maine has no law prohibiting commitment of children to jails; in fact, the alternative sentences provided for in all commitments to the State school for boys are usually commitments to jail or to a house of correction. Any "male over the age of 16 years" if convicted of or having pleaded guilty to a crime may be committed to the State reformatory for men⁸⁷ and any "woman over the age of 16 years" convicted before any court having jurisdiction of her offense may be sent to the State reformatory for women.⁸⁸

During the 6-month period studied 16 boys under 18 years of age were committed to these institutions—8 to county jails and 8 to the reformatory for men. Six of these commitments were made by higher courts. Seven of the boys were under 17 years of age at the time of commitment and thus were eligible for admission to the State schools. No girls were committed to the reformatory for women during this period, although 7 had been committed there during the preceding six months.⁸⁹ These commitments to institutions intended for adults constituted 24 per cent of the total commitments of children to correctional institutions.

The various States differ greatly in the extent to which children under 18 years of age are committed to institutions for adult offenders. The percentage of juvenile delinquents who were committed to institutions for adults, especially to jails and workhouses, was much lower throughout the United States in 1923 than in 1910.⁴⁰ In all the New England States this tendency was noticeable, but least so in Maine.

The most serious objections to these commitments are the contacts with adult offenders, the lack of facilities for organized instruction in academic and vocational work in these institutions, and, for the children in jails, the long period of idleness. (For description of jails see p. 22.) In order to give to all delinquent children under

⁸⁷ Laws of 1919, ch. 182, sec. 1, as amended by Laws of 1923, ch. 58.

⁸⁸ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 142, sec. 61, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 106.

⁸⁹ Four of these girls were 16 years of age and three were 17 years of age at the time of commitment.

⁴⁰ Children under Institutional Care, 1923, pp. 296-297. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, 1927.

18 years of age the greatest protection, it would seem desirable to prohibit the commitment or detention of boys and girls under 18 in any jail,⁴¹ and to raise the maximum age limit for admission to the State schools to 17 years.

The State reformatory for women is fairly well equipped to meet its problems. The plant consists of a main building which houses most of the inmates, an honor cottage accommodating about 14, and a large cottage for girls and women who have babies. Each cottage has a recreation room, and in the main building this is large enough to accommodate the entire group for entertainments and religious services. Although no educational work is provided, some training is given in connection with maintenance work. Every woman is taught to sew. No attempt is made to separate the young girls from the older women, but each person has her own room.

The provision for the care of pregnant girls and later of their babies is so much more adequate at the reformatory than at the State school for girls that a few of the younger girls have been sent there for such care. Girls or women receive confinement care in the institution and they may keep their babies with them for two years. Although there is some question as to the desirability of keeping children who are over 9 months of age in a penal institution, and also of delaying the early placement of children who are to be adopted, the plan followed by the reformatory at least prevents the undesirable early separation of the babies from their mothers that occurs at the State school for girls.

The State reformatory for men is housed in a new building of the congregate type. The entire third floor is a dormitory, accommodating all the inmates. A schoolroom has been provided in this building, but was not in use at the time of the visit. A chapel is available for general assemblies, and a large bench-lined room is provided in the basement for use during leisure hours. The boys and men are employed in maintenance work, on the farm, and in a brickyard. No trade activities are provided. No walls have been built around the building, and outdoor activities are reduced to outdoor work and to baseball games.

The parole supervision by both these institutions is limited by inadequate funds for travel. Each institution has one parole officer who undertakes some supervision of persons paroled throughout the State. The parole officer from the men's reformatory tries to see persons paroled once a month and receives reports from them every two weeks. No definite policy as to seeing women paroled at regular periods has been established at the women's reformatory, but they are supposed to make a monthly written report, for which a printed form is provided.

Private institutions.

During the period of the study 13 delinquent children were placed in private institutions, 9 being sent to institutions within the State

⁴¹ For the child of 16 years of age or over whose habits or conduct would constitute a menace to other children, a special provision for detention in a jail or other place of detention for adults, but in quarters separate from those of adults, seems desirable. See A Standard Juvenile Court Law, prepared by the committee on standard juvenile court laws of the National Probation Association, pp. 28 and 29. National Probation Association, New York, 1928.

and 4 being sent outside. All but 1 of these were girls. Most of the placements were made unofficially by various persons, only 2 children having been committed to private institutions by the courts.⁴²

Case histories illustrating commitment to the State reformatory

The only two case stories illustrating commitment to institutions for adults are the stories of Roger S. and Napier D., who were both committed to the reformatory for men. These stories contain an account of the boys' reactions to the unprofitable leisure time and the contact with older men in the reformatory. The effect of jail commitments is brought out in Napier's story in the description of the disposition made of the remaining members of the gang.

These two boys were members of a community gang to which apparently no one paid any attention until a number of serious offenses had been committed. As Napier had already spent two years in the State school for boys, and Roger's older brother was on parole from the reformatory for men, an interested parole officer might have followed up his contacts with these two families by stimulating the organization of wholesome recreational activities in the community and helping to provide these growing boys with an outlet for their restless desire for adventure. The dispositions made of the cases of the various members of this gang (see also pp. 75, 76) seem to show, however, that no one recognized the various factors in this gang situation and that Roger and Napier were committed to an institution for adults not because they were especially vicious or desperate, but simply because they were over 16 years of age and therefore considered too old for commitment to the State school for boys.

ROGER S.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 16.

Municipal court, March 14, 1928: Stealing; bound over for prosecution in superior court.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; brothers 18, 12, 11, 8, 7; sisters 16, 14, 6, 4, 2 at home.

Roger is a medium-sized boy with fair hair, good color, and a clear complexion. He is neat in appearance, and alert, responsive, and pleasant in manner.

His family live in the country in a small farmhouse which, together with a little apple orchard, they rent for \$8 a month. The house has a kitchen, sitting room, and one bedroom downstairs, and two bedrooms upstairs. The crowding is somewhat relieved by the fact that Mr. S. and the oldest boy are in camp most of the winter, and the boys sleep in a tent in the apple orchard during the summer.

Mr. S. is a cook, working in lumber camps in the winter, on ships in the summer, and digging potatoes, sawing wood, and picking up odd jobs between seasons.

Mrs. S. is a young but worn-looking woman. Her many family cares and her trying deafness have given her an anxious and apprehensive manner. In the summer she sometimes goes with the children to pick blueberries in an effort to increase the family income, and the year of the study she raised a hog which she hoped would "help out a little."

Martin, the oldest brother, has a reformatory record. In November, 1926, he was committed to the State reformatory for men on a charge of "breaking, entering, and larceny." Through breaking rules and attempting to escape

⁴²This type of commitment is not illustrated by the case histories. The story of Bertha N., p. 19, although an example of care in a private institution, shows commitment by a police matron at the request of the child's mother.

he was kept in the institution until he had served 14 months (January, 1928). Since his parole his conduct has been highly satisfactory, and he has been discharged recently. His mother finds him reluctant to speak of the experience but thinks he has "learned his lesson." He has been working with his father the past few months.

Janet, the 16-year-old girl, has been doing office work since she graduated from grammar school two years ago. In lieu of wages she receives her clothes and the office experience. She is planning to attend business college next year and her employers have promised to help her.

The remaining children seem to be normal in school achievement and look healthy and happy in spite of the family poverty.

Roger seems fond of his family. When interviewed at the reformatory he inquired eagerly about his young sisters and brothers and wanted to know what impression they had made on the agent. His mother also spoke of his interest in the little ones and said that, although he had "teased and plagued" them, he had not been a bad boy.

Of his school work Mrs. S. merely said that Roger seemed unable to learn as well as the rest of her children and never went beyond the sixth grade. During January and February of last year Roger worked as a woodcutter in a village about 7 miles from his home. He walked to and from work and gave his wages of \$5 a week to his mother. Practically his only recreation was playing ball with his brothers in the yard.

Late last winter Roger began spending his evenings in a neighboring village, where, under the leadership of a young man named Higgins, he and six other boys formed a group which, although not called a gang, was one in fact. The boys would hang around the post office in a sociable way until the evening mail had been distributed. About 9 o'clock, when the village had pretty well quieted down, they would divide up and make forced entries into various places to take whatever they could. The "gang" spirit of the group is illustrated by the fact that each of the boys felt it necessary to make a successful haul in order to maintain his self-respect in the group, and by the understanding that when the booty was large and taken by more than one boy, it was to be divided among all seven. After a series of these robberies the sheriff arrested one boy, who then revealed the names of his confederates, whereupon all were arraigned before the municipal court judge.

Roger had made several entries into stores, but his chief offense had been committed in the lumber office in which his sister Janet was employed. He took more than \$100 in cash, hiding the money in the woods with the intention of spending a little at a time on candy, motion pictures, and similar expenditures; but before he had spent very much he found himself in court. He decided to confess his guilt to clear his sister Janet, who was under suspicion for the theft of the money. The municipal court found probable cause and bound him over to the supreme court for trial. His bail was fixed at \$800.

Roger thinks that his father could have borrowed sufficient money to furnish bail had he not been convinced that detention in jail pending the supreme court hearing would reduce the boy's ultimate sentence. His mother said, however, that the family had been afraid to borrow the money lest Roger should run away and thus forfeit the security. Whatever the reason, he spent two months in the county jail awaiting trial. When tried in the supreme judicial court he was found guilty of "breaking, entering, and larceny" and committed to the State reformatory for men.

Roger did not complain of reformatory life. He admitted that he had spent two periods in "solitary confinement"—one for 10 and one for 11 days for talking and giggling in the dormitory after the lights had been turned out—which seemed to grieve him considerably. As he had been unable to write to his mother during this time and was afraid to refer to the experience later, he worried lest she think that he had been deprived of the privilege of writing home because he had committed a serious offense, such as attempting to escape.

Having spent two months in the close confinement of the county jail, he appreciates the greater freedom of the reformatory, the opportunity for work out of doors, the weekly motion pictures, and the church services. But he still has considerable leisure time which must be spent in the basement recreation room where the men do bead work, play cards, read magazines, and tell stories, and his experiences down there have convinced him that a boy can not derive much benefit from living with "a bunch of hardboiled fellows"

who fill his head with ideas that, in spite of his court record, he has not had before. He is interested in the fact that his brother Martin is "making good," and he hopes to follow his example.

NAPIER D.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 17.

Municipal court, March 14, 1928: Stealing; bound over for prosecution in superior court.

Family at time of disposition: Parents married and living together; sisters 27, 21 (divorced and having custody of her infant), 19 (with husband and one child), 16, 10, brother 20, at home; brother, 25, sister 23, away.

Napier is rather tall and thin, and, although he does not look sickly, he seems to be lacking in vitality. He breathes through his mouth most of the time and walks with a slight slouch.

The family live in a small five-room house, lighted with kerosene lamps and approached by a cinder path and two or three rickety board steps. They are about one block from the center of the town, directly opposite a river.

Mr. D. is a lumberman and said to be a steady worker. Mrs. D. appears to be a hard-working woman and supplements the family income by doing washing and housecleaning.

The oldest daughter is a school-teacher. She is the most pathetic member of the family, for, although she has a keen mind, she has always worked so hard that she has never had time to learn to play. She is conscious of the community's lack of opportunities for wholesome recreation. Although she herself finds a little recreation in connection with the social activities of the school, she realizes that most of the community have only the "movies."

The oldest brother works in a neighboring town and contributes irregularly to the family. The second brother lives at home, works seasonally, and contributes "some."

The marital status of the various sisters was not quite clear. Of the two who were living at home, one was said to be divorced and the other to be married. The 23-year-old sister was doing housework in another town. According to a local social worker, one of the girls had a child of illegitimate birth.

Of the remaining children, the 16-year-old girl is attending high school, and the other two are in the seventh and sixth grades. Of their conduct nothing special was noted.

The family gave the following brief history of Napier: When he was 10 years of age he was sent to the State school for boys, where he remained for two years on a charge of breaking, entering, and larceny. There is little evidence that Napier received any constructive parole supervision on being released from the State school. At any rate, when he was 15 years of age he was again brought before the municipal court and charged with breaking, entering, and larceny (this time with a boy accomplice). His case was bound over for prosecution in the higher court, and in default of \$500 bail, he was committed to the county jail for some 30 odd days pending the next session of the supreme court. In November, 1926, he was placed on probation by this court. He had attended high school for one year before his second delinquency, but after the jail commitment he never returned to school and it would seem as if the probation officer made no effort to urge him to do so. According to several reports the probation officer at this time was a man whose intemperance eventually lost him his position.

Mrs. D. was never correctly notified of Napier's hearing and was thus unable to attend. In view of Mr. D.'s attitude that the court could do whatever it considered right for his son, however, she felt that she could not plead successfully in her son's behalf. At the time of the interview with the Children's Bureau agent the entire family seemed almost indifferent to his situation.

Napier was never dissatisfied with his home, but he seems to have had no close bonds of affection or interest with the various members of his family. He was conscious of the fact that his oldest sister was displeased with him when he did not do well in school or was in a scrape.

His work history is vague and irregular. He worked in a fish cannery one summer, in the woods part of one winter, and in the potato fields for a season, giving his earnings to his mother.

His love of adventure was apparently the chief motive in his burglaries. He liked to break into tourist camps and steal cameras and other equipment, Roger S. he joined Higgins gang (see p. 74) and on March 14, 1928, was and he enjoyed the excitement of hiding the loot in the woods. Together with

Roger S. he joined Higgins's gang (see p. 74) and on March 14, 1928, was brought before the municipal court on a charge of breaking, entering, and larceny and bound over for prosecution in the higher court. In default of \$800 bail he was again committed to the county jail pending the next session of the supreme court. His jail detention lasted nearly two months, at the end of which he was committed to the State reformatory for men.

Napier likes the reformatory better than the State school for boys because he has more freedom in the reformatory. He has heard that a clergyman is planning to come to the institution to give several hours of tutoring a week, and he has been looking forward to this. He spends his spare time in reading books and magazines and playing baseball and cards.

He bears no resentment against anyone and realizes tearfully that he is in the reformatory through his own fault. While he was on probation he reported regularly that he was "making good," but once excused from reporting he ceased to feel the necessary restraint to prevent his getting into trouble. He makes the impression of being a rather weak character, easily led and quick to repent.

The remaining members of this gang were disposed of as follows:

Carter, aged 16, having helped the sheriff locate the rest of the gang, was placed on probation for one year.

The two B. boys, one under and one over 18 years, were placed on probation. They are a pair of shiftless young men who, because their mother is dead and their father an unreliable, neglectful, and more or less disreputable citizen, appeal to the sympathy of the community. In less than a month after the hearing they, together with Carter, were again brought before the municipal court and sentenced to 60 days in jail plus a joint fine of \$30 and court costs, or, in default of payment, 30 additional days in jail. Carter served 60 days, the other two served 90. They had a pleasant, lazy time, gained weight on the jail food, and when interviewed neither the boys nor Carter's family expressed regret concerning the experience.

The leader's young brother pleaded not guilty and was placed on probation for one year. He was digging potatoes in Aroostook County at the time of the interview and thus not reporting to his probation officer, who, however, was under the impression that the boy was doing well.

Higgins, the leader, was over 18 years of age and was committed to the State penitentiary for two to three years. He is now serving out his sentence.

PLACEMENT IN FAMILY HOMES

Within the last 10 years institutional commitment as a method of caring for the delinquent child has been to some extent supplemented in various parts of the country by placement in family homes. The theory is that corrective treatment should train the child to live a well-adjusted and socially acceptable life in a normal family group in the normal community and that this can not be accomplished satisfactorily and happily in the artificial atmosphere of a disciplinary institution.

The probation departments of some of the juvenile courts have extended their services from the supervision of children in their own homes to include the supervision of children in homes other than their own, and thus probation service has grown to cover also a limited amount of placement service. Other courts, fearing to overburden their probation departments and thus adversely affect their standards of probation service, use the various existing private agencies to do their placement work for them.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ For a discussion of this method and its results in Boston see *Reconstructing Behavior in Youth*, by William Healy, Augusta F. Bronner, Edith M. H. Baylor, and J. Prentice Murphy, p. 228 ff. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1929), and for a general discussion of placement in family homes see *The Child in America*, by William I. Thomas and Dorothy Swaine Thomas, ch. 2, *The Treatment of Delinquency*, and in particular p. 124 ff. (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1928).

In a few States the placement of children either in a family home or in an institution according to the needs of the particular child is undertaken by a State department which assumes the guardianship of children needing care. Possibly the most comprehensive authority is that given to the State department in Virginia, the law providing that "all delinquent children intended to be placed in a State institution shall be committed to the State board of public welfare, it being the purpose of this chapter to make said board the sole agency for the guardianship of delinquent children committed to the State."⁴⁴ The State board studies each child and decides upon the care that he needs.

In Maine family-home placement has been utilized chiefly as a means of caring for dependent and neglected children—the department of public welfare receiving such children into custody from the various committing courts and placing them in foster, boarding, or wage homes. The department appreciates that this same service should be provided for some of the delinquent children and has offered its services in this respect to the various courts. At the time of the survey, however, very little work of this kind was being done. The courts seem reluctant to commit delinquent children to the department of public welfare for home placement. The department field workers, with case loads of 100 or more dependency cases and 50 "mothers' aid" cases and with the duty of inspecting and licensing boarding homes, could scarcely give even the minimum supervision essential to successful placement of delinquent children. If the Maine courts were to make more extended use of placement service as a means of caring for juvenile delinquents, therefore, the State would be obliged, in the absence of either adequate probation service or private placement agencies, to increase the personnel and develop the facilities of the State department of public welfare in order to avoid crippling its service to the children already in State custody.

Case histories illustrating placement in family homes

The following three case histories show how satisfactorily family-home placement may answer the needs of the delinquent child. Ger-vaise B., Randolph L., and Norman F. were all three under 12 years of age and all came from broken homes. Their commitment to the State department of public welfare for placement in boarding homes is not particularly surprising, therefore, as they might have been committed equally well on grounds of dependency or neglect. These cases, however, are suggestive of a method of treatment that might be developed for handling some of the older children who are not properly committable to institutions and yet require a complete change of environment. As Healy and Bronner show in the Boston experiment,⁴⁵ placement of older delinquents, aged 13 to 18 years, in some cases meets with but little less success than placement of the younger groups; and as the older children can usually earn

⁴⁴ Va., Code 1919, sec. 1910, as revised by Laws of 1922, ch. 481.

⁴⁵ *Reconstructing Behavior in Youth*, Table 14, p. 308.

part or all of their cost of maintenance by after-school or full-time work either in the home or elsewhere, this method is feasible from a financial standpoint as well.

GERVAISE B.

Child of illegitimate birth; nativity not reported.

Age at time of offense, 10.

Municipal court, May 22, 1928: Stealing; committed to State department of public welfare for placement in boarding home.

Family at time of disposition: Mother (known as aunt) married and living with her husband in neighboring town; child living with grandmother and aunt.

Gervaise has very round red cheeks and very large brown eyes with long, dark lashes. He is a lively and responsive child and has an affectionate nature. His accent and inflections are still decidedly French.

Gervaise's mother lives in a neighboring town with her husband who represents himself as "in the garage business." They pretend to be Gervaise's aunt and uncle and appear to take a warm and protective interest in their young "nephew." According to the police inspector, they are a pair of "hard-boiled bootleggers"; but, although the woman has been arrested for drunkenness while driving and the man has been involved in disputed cases of chicken stealing, neither has been arrested thus far for bootlegging.

Except for a short time, when he lived in an orphanage, Gervaise has always been with his grandmother. She has four neat little rooms in a foreign-looking tenement house on a narrow street. She has tried to keep Gervaise out of mischief, but with her age and her inability to speak English she has been unable to give him the necessary supervision.

Gervaise went to a parochial school, where all the instruction except English reading was given in French. He said that he did not like school because the sisters scolded him, and he played truant whenever any of the other boys did so.

He was brought to the police station in July, 1927, on a charge of larceny and apparently was dismissed with a warning. His grandmother took him to the police matron (date not recorded), asking the latter to send him to the State school as she did not know how to keep him from stealing, but the police matron tried instead to dispose of the case by talking to the boy. In May, 1928, he was again brought to the police, this time on a charge of breaking, entering, and larceny, and his case was referred to the municipal court for action. The police matron recommended that he be sent to the orphanage that had cared for him previously, but that institution refused to accept him on the ground that he had been a bad influence among the boys when he was there before. It was finally decided to commit him to the custody of the State department of public welfare for placement in a boarding home. Accordingly the State field agent visited his home and arranged for placement in another city.

Gervaise was first placed in a temporary boarding home in which there were usually from four to eight children. He was quite content there; but as the home was Protestant and he was French Catholic, the State field worker transferred him to a Catholic home. Gervaise, however, had liked the children and the dog in the temporary boarding home; he got into the habit of wandering back, until finally he was allowed to remain there.

Gervaise's friendliness and lack of restraint when interviewed in the boarding home indicated that he was very much at ease there. He talked happily about playing in the yard with the other children, and was very eager to bring in Bimba, a roguish little mulatto child, and have her sing a little solo to her teddy bear. He has grown to like school; he is in the fourth grade now and attends regularly. His teacher has taken a special interest in him and is helping him to catch up in his English. On Sundays, instead of going to Sunday school with the rest of the family, he goes to mass, so that although he is in a Protestant home, his church affiliation is being maintained.

Gervaise's aunt and uncle sometimes drive over to see him, and they seem satisfied with the care he is receiving. Altogether he seems to be leading a normal child life with regular hours for sleep and school attendance, plenty of wholesome out-of-door play under the supervision of his boarding parents, and the constant companionship of other children.

RANDOLPH L.

Native white; parents Canadian.

Age at time of offense, 8.

Municipal court, March 8, 1928: Stealing. April 10, 1928: Stealing; twice continued for sentence. Committed to custody of State department of public welfare.

Family at time of disposition: Parents divorced; mother, brothers 18, 17 at home; father remarried and living elsewhere; sister 15 living with grandmother; brother 11 in foster home since 1922.

Randolph is a jolly, healthy-looking little lad. He seems bright and has a real talent for dancing.

His parents were divorced in 1920. Mrs. L. and the boys live in the poorest and probably most disreputable section of one of Maine's largest cities. They occupy four first-floor rooms in the rear of a store. At the time of the interview the dilapidated porch entrance to their part of the house was cluttered with empty cans and refuse, which had apparently been accumulating for several weeks. The scantily furnished rooms, although less dirty than the porch, were also untidy. (Mrs. L. had been ill several days preceding the interview, however, and the messy kitchen and general untidiness may be accounted for in part by this fact.) It was learned subsequently from the family-welfare society that Mrs. L. had disappeared.

The two oldest boys are employed as laborers, and Mrs. L. takes in occasional washings. The entire family have been known to social agencies and to the court over a considerable period of years. In 1916 they had their first contact with the family-welfare society; in 1918 they received aid from the overseers of the poor. In 1919 the mother brought a complaint of assault and battery against the father, the case being continued for sentence; in 1920 the parents were divorced, the mother receiving the custody of the children. In the same year the father was fined \$5 and costs on a charge of drunkenness. In 1921 the mother was arrested for maintaining a house of common nuisance wherein liquor was sold and gambling permitted; she pleaded guilty, and the case was continued for sentence under \$1,000 bond. The next record of her was in 1926, when she was again applying to the family-welfare society, this time for fuel.

In 1922 and 1923 the oldest boy was arrested four times on charges of entering, breaking, and larceny. For the third offense he was sentenced to the State school for boys, but appealed his case and while out on appeal committed his fourth offense, for which he served three days in jail. According to agency records, he must have been placed on probation by the superior court and ultimately referred to a nonsectarian child-placing agency for placement. But after two months in a foster home he returned to his mother, without the consent of the agency, and no further action seems to have been taken.

In 1927 the young brother was arrested on a charge of larceny and truancy and placed on probation for five months. While on probation he reported regularly to his officer and improved his school attendance to some extent.

Randolph was not quite 5 years of age when the family-welfare society began to receive reports of his successful begging.

As Mrs. L. was frequently away from home, Randolph was sent to school with his older brother before he had reached school age, and under this arrangement he felt free to go and come as he chose. Later, when he was of school age, he continued in his irregular attendance. When he was 7 the family-welfare society received the following report of his school conduct: "Very bad; playing truant, smoking cigarettes, and stealing." His irregular school attendance had another aspect. Randolph was spending many of his evenings entertaining people with his dancing. He danced well and, with his winning personality, became a popular entertainer at lodge parties, local theaters, commercial dance halls, and midnight revues, sometimes earning as much as \$30 an evening. But on the day following such a performance he needed his sleep and naturally did not go to school.

The school-attendance officer was unsuccessful in his efforts to keep Randolph in school. The police also warned the boy on three different occasions, but with no greater success. The representative of the Travelers' Aid Society reported to the State department of public welfare that the child was being exploited, but no other action seems to have been taken by either the Travelers' Aid Society or the department of public welfare. No one tried to get at the essential cause of Randolph's truancy, and no one took any steps to protect the boy.

Last March Randolph became involved in two cases of larceny. In the first instance he managed by his dancing to hold the attention of a group of people in a hotel lobby while several other boys made away with a laundry case full of clothing valued at \$10. His case was twice continued for sentence in the municipal court, but in the meantime he became involved with a group of boys who stole lead pipe, valued at \$5, and was brought before the municipal court on a new charge of larceny. No special investigation was made, but the general family situation had long been known to the local agencies and officials and accordingly the municipal board of children's guardians entered a complaint, alleging that the child was kept in places injurious to his health and morals. With his mother's consent he was committed to the custody of the State department of public welfare.

Randolph was taken to another city and placed in a boarding home by the department of public welfare in April, 1928. In spite of the fact that he had previously been much spoiled and petted by older people who admired his dancing, he has adjusted himself rather well to his position as merely one of a family of children. He is well liked by the family and seems happy in the companionship of the children and their neighborhood playmates.

His school attendance has become quite regular, and he likes his school work and his teacher. He has been having difficulty with reading, but with the help of his boarding mother he has managed to improve this year.

The boarding home has a good yard for play, and the boarding mother encourages the neighborhood children to play here rather than elsewhere. Occasionally she allowed Randolph to go down town and to the "movies." On one such occasion he took a cake from a bakery and two rings and a box of rouge from the five and ten cent store. He was punished for this, and he promised never again to touch things that did not belong to him.

His experience in the boarding home has been too short to justify an opinion as to its success, and yet the indications are favorable.

NORMAN F.

Native white; parents native white.

Age at time of offense, 9.

Municipal court, April 6, 1928: Truancy; committed to State school for boys.

April 9, 1928: Order recalled and case dismissed. Probate court, May 1, 1928:

Parental neglect; committed to custody of State department of public welfare.

Family at time of disposition: Parents divorced; mother keeping house for widower with 16-year-old daughter; brothers 18, 5, sisters 14, 7, with mother; sister 15 in State school for girls.

Norman is a stockily built lad with light hair and blue eyes. Although a little nervous when first interviewed, he appeared normal in health and mental ability.

Mrs. F. was deserted by her husband about six years before the time of the interview. She obtained a divorce but was refused mothers' aid, and, therefore, made her home with her invalid mother, so that the latter could take care of the children while she worked. Unfortunately, her mother seemed unable to manage the children, who took advantage of her lameness and ran off to do as they pleased.

Meanwhile the family were known to the following social agencies: Salvation Army, 1923; baby-hygiene clinic, 1924; hospital dispensary, 1927; social-hygiene clinic, 1927; eye-and-ear clinic, date not reported; probation officer, 1924; overseers of the poor, November 17, 1924, to April 30, 1928. Through the last they received town aid—\$8 a week in groceries, their rent, and some clothing—until April 30, 1928. At that time the overseers of the poor learned that Mrs. F.'s boarder had died and left her his estate, whereupon they discontinued aid. Shortly thereafter they received notice from Mrs. F.'s grocer that the family had moved. Mrs. F. said that she had received nothing, as the will had not yet been probated, and that in any event she expected the estate to be completely absorbed by debts. So, after the death of her boarder, she found work as a housekeeper for a widower and his 16-year-old daughter and is now living on his farm with four of her children.

Douglas, her 18-year-old boy, is also working on the farm. He was before the municipal court in November, 1921, on a charge of truancy. He pleaded guilty and was committed to the State school for boys, but the sentence was suspended and he was placed on probation for two years. In February, 1922, he was brought before the municipal court on a charge of breaking the conditions of his probation and sent to the State school. He has recently been discharged from the school and has apparently been doing well on parole. Hilda, the 15-year-old sister, is at present in the State school for girls, to which she

was committed by the municipal court in February, 1927, on a charge of "being found in manifest danger of falling into habits of vice or immorality."

Early last spring the school-attendance officer visited the family (who were at that time still living in the city) in order to discover the reason for Norman's truancy. He concluded that Mrs. F. was not giving Norman the proper supervision and that the child would be better off in the State school for boys. With the cooperation of the municipal board of children's guardians he brought a charge of truancy against Norman in the municipal court and obtained his commitment to this institution.

No record appears of Norman's detention, but Mrs. F. reported that he was detained in the police station from Friday until Monday. She was under the impression that he was not locked up during the day but was allowed to go about with the janitor.

In the meantime the State school refused to accept Norman, on the ground that his truancy had not been of sufficient frequency to come within the definition of "habitual truancy" (see p. 83) required for commitment. The court recalled the mittimus but did not issue a mittimus for the alternate sentence, presumably because the boy was considered too young for jail commitment. His case, therefore, was dismissed by the municipal court, and he was temporarily placed in a boarding home by the agent of the municipal board of children's guardians.

On May 1, 1928, the agent of the municipal board brought Norman's case before the probate court, alleging that he was being neglected by his parents. The probate court committed him without further investigation to the custody of the State department of public welfare.

The agent of the State department of public welfare has not removed Norman from his first boarding home. She has concluded that, although the house itself is in need of repair and is almost inaccessible in bad weather, the boarding parents are doing so well with Norman that the disadvantages of the location are more than balanced by the good influence of the home. Norman is in the third grade. He attends school regularly, responds well to the boarding-home discipline, and seems cheerful and happy.

SITUATIONS AFFECTING THE DELINQUENCY PROBLEM

No attempt was made in this survey to study the causes of juvenile delinquency in Maine; yet the case histories indicated that defects in the school attendance and child labor laws or in their enforcement, inadequate prosecution of adults contributing to juvenile delinquency, and inadequate or insufficiently supervised facilities for recreation were not infrequently connected with specific delinquencies. These situations should be considered carefully, for no program for the care of juvenile delinquents would be complete without some attention to preventive measures.

ENFORCEMENT OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

School attendance in Maine is compulsory for "every child between the seventh and fifteenth anniversaries of his birth and every child between the fifteenth and seventeenth anniversaries who can not read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language and every child between the fifteenth and sixteenth anniversaries who has not completed the eighth grade of the elementary school."¹ To enforce this law the school committee of every city or town "shall annually elect one or more persons to act as attendance officers" to investigate all cases of nonattendance, the compensation of the officer to be fixed by the committee.² It is further provided that "the attendance officer has the same control over pupils of compulsory school age in private and parochial schools as over pupils in the public schools."³ The 17 communities visited by the agents of the Children's Bureau employed 4 full-time and 18 part-time officers; of the latter, 11 were school janitors, 3 were law-enforcing agents, and 4 were otherwise engaged.

The extent to which these officers enforce the compulsory education law can not be measured by their annual reports showing the number of truants returned to school. Some indication of the type of work done in some localities in the past may be derived from the statement of one attendance officer that before her appointment the school enrollment had never been checked against the school census, with the result that some children of 14 and 15 years of age had never attended school. Similarly, in another county, an attendance officer reported having found a community in which only 5 of the 34 children of school age were enrolled and attending school.

The methods of enforcing school attendance in the public schools vary in the different communities. In a few communities the attendance officer makes daily rounds of the schools to check up on all absences, following this with such home visits as he sees fit. In most communities, particularly those employing the services of janitors, it is customary for the teachers to inquire of a child's sisters, brothers, neighbors, and friends concerning his absence; if such reports are not satisfactory, or if the absence continues, or if the absentee is a subject for suspicion, the principal sends for the attendance officer, who

¹ Rev. Stat. 1916. ch. 16, sec. 66, as amended by Laws of 1927, ch. 37.

² *Ibid.*, sec. 68.

³ Extracts from the Maine School Laws in Relation to Compulsory Education, p. 8. Published by the State Department of Education, Augusta, Me.

scours the streets and calls at the home in an effort to find and return the child to school. In some communities the police are called upon to hunt for children. County probation officers may serve as school-attendance officers, but none of these officers seems to have undertaken any responsibility for school attendance.

Although attendance officers are responsible for children attending both the public and parochial schools, the latter usually do their own attendance work. The methods used in the parochial schools are very similar to those of the public schools. In one of the large French parochial schools, having an enrollment of 1,700 pupils, the principal from time to time gives a list of "truants" to a French-speaking police officer, who either investigates the cases himself or calls on the police matron or public-school attendance officer to do so.

The lack of cooperation between private and public schools is a serious factor in defeating good attendance enforcement. The law states clearly that children shall not be excused from attending public day school "until a certificate showing their names, residence, and attendance at such private school, signed by the person or persons having such child in charge, shall be filed with the school officials of the town in which said children reside." Nevertheless, local departments of education fail to keep an accurate file of all local children and merely assume that children not recorded in their files are attending parochial schools. As parochial schools have the same attitude, it becomes possible for children to fail to attend either public or parochial schools without being missed by either. Of course, if such children make public nuisances of themselves, they are soon picked up by the police. But if they stay quietly at home to keep house and enable their mothers to work, or if they themselves succeed in finding employment, their failure to attend school is likely to be overlooked. (See the case stories of Mildred E., p. 54, and Clarice W., p. 56.)

The difficulties arising from this lack of cooperation between public and parochial schools are augmented by the children's practice of transferring back and forth between the two. These constant transfers are in themselves conducive to truancy. Each change necessitates a complete readjustment to the school curriculum, and, as it often involves a demotion, the child is likely to lose interest in his class work and to think up ways of avoiding it. A transfer to give a pupil a new chance may be exceedingly beneficial to him, but these casual, undirected transfers, made whenever the spirit moves, are productive of nothing but restlessness and irresponsibility. (See the stories of Yvon S., p. 46, and Harold R., p. 61.)

Although the statutes define as a habitual truant any child who "without sufficient excuse shall be habitually and willfully absent from school or shall fail without such excuse to attend school for 5 day sessions or 10 half-day sessions within any period of six months,"⁴ the schools frequently make their own interpretation of what constitutes truancy. In several communities, for instance, school principals reported that they did not consider as truant boys whose indigent home conditions necessitated their remaining out of school for several weeks each fall to dig potatoes, or girls who stayed at home from time to time to supervise younger sisters and brothers.

⁴ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 16, sec. 69.

(See the case of Michael Y., p. 41.) Thus even when the school-attendance officer is performing his duty to the best of his ability, individual pupils may be seriously irregular in their attendance without coming to his attention.

REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT OF MINORS

The obvious intent of the Maine child labor law is to keep the child in school until he is 15 years of age or until he is 16 unless he has completed the eighth grade; to enter any occupation during school hours he must obtain a work permit showing that he has met these requirements.⁵ As school attendance was found in some places not to be rigidly enforced, however, some children under 16 obtained employment without work permits by claiming to be over 16 years of age. For work carried on outside school hours the law provides a minimum age of 14 and requires a permit for work in connection with manufacturing or mechanical establishments, bowling alleys, or pool rooms, but not for other work.

Like the child labor laws of many other States, the Maine law fails to cover "street trades"—selling or distributing newspapers, magazines, and handbills and bootblacking, junk collecting, and similar occupations in which a child works on his own account.⁶ The city of Portland, however, like a number of other cities interested in providing for their own needs, has an ordinance placing certain restrictions on the employment of children in street work. This ordinance was passed in June, 1906, and, as supplemented by rules for administration made in 1926, provides as follows:⁷

1. No license for the selling or offering for sale of newspapers in public street, square, or grounds, or in any public place, shall be issued to a child under 10 years of age without permission of parent.
2. Licensee must be of good moral character.
3. No newsboy of school age shall sell during school hours.
4. No newsboy under 15 shall sell after 9.15 p. m.
5. No newsboy shall sell papers on street cars or other public conveyance.

Even these limited provisions were not found to be strictly enforced.

So far as could be ascertained, no other Maine cities have ordinances relating to street trades, and children may carry on their little business enterprises without fear of being questioned as to age.

Some of the Maine case studies show that frequenting streets and alleys alone or with chance companions in the pursuit of business sometimes leads to the formation of irregular and irresponsible habits and even to actual delinquencies. The best specific example of this is the case history of Harold R., page 61.

⁵ The educational requirement for obtaining a work permit may be waived in case of children of subnormal mental capacity under a permit issued jointly by the commissioner of labor and the commissioner of education. For the text of the foregoing provisions see Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 49, secs. 20-21, as amended by Laws of 1927, chs. 137 and 171 (the latter of a later date); sec. 23, as amended by Laws of 1919, ch. 190; and secs. 24-31. By a law passed in 1917 (Laws of 1917, ch. 248) the words "attendance officer" were substituted for the term "truant officer" in all statutes.

⁶ For a discussion of laws relating to street trades see *Children in Street Work*, by Nettie P. McGill, p. 47 ff. (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 183, Washington, 1928). See also *State Laws and Local Ordinances Regulating the Street Work of Children*, a tabular summary of regulations in effect in the United States, by Ella Arvilla Merritt (U. S. Children's Bureau Chart No. 15, Washington, 1929).

⁷ *State Laws and Local Ordinances Regulating the Street Work of Children*, pp. 22 and 23.

PROSECUTION OF ADULTS CONTRIBUTING TO DELINQUENCY OF CHILDREN

Maine has no law providing for the prosecution of adults on the general charge of "contributing to delinquency" of children, and action against adults must be taken on specific charges, under a series of laws, covering "crimes against children," which apply only to offenses committed against children under 16 years of age, as follows: Mistreating a child by abuse, neglect, overwork, or extreme punishment;⁸ admitting or allowing a child to remain in a disorderly house, house of ill fame, gambling place, place where intoxicating liquors are sold, or other place injurious to health or morals; offering for sale, selling, or giving intoxicating liquors to children; selling or giving cigarettes, tobacco, liquor, or narcotic drugs to children; giving or furnishing children with firearms or dangerous weapons; and employing, exhibiting, or training children in begging or soliciting or receiving alms, or in illegal, indecent, or immoral exhibitions or practices. The law defining and punishing exposure of a child with intent to abandon him applies only to children under the age of 6. The law with regard to rape or assault with intent to commit rape applies to all females, with special penalties in case of girls under 14 years of age; and the law with regard to carnal knowledge, other than by rape, by a person over 18 applies to female children between the ages of 14 and 16.⁹

Laws relating to contributing to delinquency usually include omissions to perform duties toward children as well as acts promoting delinquency. Thus an adult may commit an offense against a minor; he may fail to fulfill a duty toward a minor; and he may cause, or tend to cause, juvenile delinquency or dependency.¹⁰ The court dealing with delinquent or dependent children is in the best position to know about the adult's relation to the child's delinquency and of his possible menace to other children. It is, therefore, the logical court to have original jurisdiction over all cases of parents or other persons causing or tending to cause delinquency of children, perhaps cooperating with other courts if it seems desirable to deal with the adult on a serious, specific charge.

The case studies show that in some localities little attempt has been made to prosecute parents or other persons committing offenses against children. In two cases criminal prosecution had been instituted against older men involving young girls, but in two similar cases no action had been taken, and in other cases no investigation had been made to determine whether any adult should have been prosecuted. The history of Annette Q. (p. 63) is an example of cases in which some steps were being taken toward prosecution of an adult; the story of Irma and Gladys I. (p. 37) is an example of neglect to prosecute the adult. One or two judges reported that they had taken action, with considerable success, against parents in truancy cases.

In a few communities school officials, recreation workers, and others in direct contact with children were considerably disturbed

⁸ Since this survey was made the State legislature has also passed a law providing for punishment of a parent found guilty of failure or neglect to support a child (Laws of 1929, ch. 267).

⁹ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 120, secs. 16, 22, 27, as amended by Laws of 1917, ch. 106, secs. 28-37.

¹⁰ See *The Legal Aspect of the Juvenile Court*, p. 19.

over the fact that many children were smoking on the streets and that no court action was being taken against merchants selling tobacco to young boys.

In one of the cases studied a pool-room proprietor was required to pay court costs for a 13-year-old boy for whose delinquency he was held to some extent responsible. (See the story of Louis F., p. 58.) The law provides that keepers of bowling alleys and billiard rooms shall not permit "any minor to play, shoot, or roll therein without the written consent of his parents, guardian, or master."¹¹ Some of the police officers reported that they had no difficulty in getting the owners to keep on file, subject to police inspection at all times, notes of consent from the parents of all minors playing; others reported that no attempt had been made to keep such a file. Some were confident that no minors were playing without consent; others were very dubious about the whole situation and expressed little confidence in the consent requirement. The law itself is obviously inadequate, however, as it fails to protect children whose parents give consent ignorantly or carelessly. Furthermore, it makes no provision for children who do not themselves play but who hang around to watch others play.

PROVISION FOR RECREATION

All the larger cities of Maine have playgrounds, usually on the public-school grounds. In one or two communities local factories have also provided athletic fields and gymnasiums for their employees and, to a limited extent, have made these available to other groups. In some communities the local departments of education have engaged school principals to act as playground supervisors during the summer vacation. Local Rotary and Kiwanis organizations have also helped in some communities by contributing certain sums of money for playground equipment. Smaller communities frequently have less consciousness of the need for special play facilities for children. Maine's natural resources—forests, rivers, lakes, mountains, and sea-coast—furnish such abundant opportunities for play and recreation at all seasons of the year that the equipment so essential to urban communities may seem superfluous. But opportunities for wholesome play should be near at hand so that the school child can take advantage of them even when his play time is brief; they should be safe so that mothers need not be afraid to let their children use them; and they should be interesting so that children will prefer them to organizing mischief or seeking less desirable forms of amusement elsewhere. Such opportunities are furnished by equipped and supervised playgrounds, and it therefore becomes a public responsibility to provide them.

Other opportunities for recreation are provided by the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Camp Fire Girls, and the 4-H Clubs, all of which are represented in Maine. The difficulty with the extension of the work of these organizations is that their activities demand a certain amount of service from paid executives. The counties that have a concentrated population, as Cumberland and Penobscot, can usually afford to support three or four such exec-

¹¹ Rev. Stat. 1916, ch. 32, sec. 5.

atives, whereas the counties that have a thinly distributed population, as Washington and Aroostook, can not support any. Of course some of this work can always be done by volunteers. Indeed, Maine has few communities in which a clergyman, clergyman's wife, school principal, school-teacher, or other individual has not made at least one attempt to organize a troop of Boy Scouts or some kind of club; but even a hardy volunteer, when stranded in the farthest limits of the State, needs the advice, encouragement, and appreciation of the professional recreation worker and the contact with other groups that this worker represents.

As far as the relation of these organizations to the delinquency situation is concerned, the number of children and the character of the groups served by these organizations are quite as important as the type of service rendered. Very few of the children whose cases were studied belonged to these organizations. Unless an organization consciously sets out to supply facilities for an underprivileged group it tends toward selective membership, and the "undesirable" children—whether their exclusion is based on nationality, creed, family standards, or personal conduct—have little opportunity to join. And it is among the excluded groups that delinquencies are likely to occur.

Portland has met this situation, to a certain extent, with a city boys' club. This club extends the privileges of its game room, reading room, gymnasium, shower baths, Saturday picnics, and other activities in a democratic spirit to as many as 1,000 boys. The organization is so large, however, that it is bound to be very loose, and many of the boys take advantage of it only on rainy days or on other occasions when their own pursuits fail them.

Some of the other communities have attempted group organizations in the form of city baseball teams and hiking clubs, and have thus offered to at least a few boys an opportunity for wholesome recreation. In one town several men have succeeded in organizing a boys' band, which not only gives its members a certain amount of pleasurable occupation but also confers on them an agreeable prestige, both in the town itself and in the neighboring towns in which they play. Its membership is necessarily restricted, but, nevertheless, it includes a relatively large number of the boys of the community.

Each community must face the problem not only of providing facilities for recreation but also of giving adequate supervision to the local commercial recreation facilities. They must guard and protect young boys and girls who seek amusement in pool rooms and bowling alleys, in theaters, in dance halls, and in roadhouses. This task has usually been assigned to the law-enforcing officers. In communities having police matrons or policewomen to visit such places, fairly good standards seem to be maintained; but in some of the other communities, the police officers themselves confess their inability to handle the situation, especially as regards young girls.

Each community must recognize its own recreation needs and resources. But no community can afford to be blind to the fact that young people who are not provided with attractive, safe, and suitable opportunities for play will entertain themselves as they see fit and that their own selection may not always be wise.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of this study the following recommendations are made for improving the methods of dealing with juvenile delinquency in Maine:

1. Special court organization for children's cases is greatly needed. Whether this should involve establishment of separate juvenile courts or centralizing juvenile jurisdiction in some existing court system is a question that needs consideration. Procedure in juvenile cases, however, should be chancery or equity and not criminal in nature.¹

2. The court hearing children's cases should have exclusive jurisdiction over delinquent and neglected children under 18 years of age² and such dependent children under 18 years of age as now come within the jurisdiction of the courts. The term "delinquent child" should be defined to include children who have violated laws or ordinances of the State or of any subdivision thereof and children whose conduct or associations have rendered them in need of the care and protection of the State. The court should also have jurisdiction over adults contributing to the delinquency or dependency of children.³

3. Any plan for providing a special court organization for children's cases should take into consideration the following factors: (1) Frequency of sessions of the court; (2) desirability of using the county or a district including several counties as the area of jurisdiction; (3) opportunity provided for obtaining qualified judges having understanding of children's problems.

Courts to hear children's cases might be organized in either of the following ways:

(a) Designation of special judges as juvenile court judges, the area served by these judges to be extensive enough to make such specialization possible. The judges chosen should be selected because of special qualifications for juvenile court work. This plan would involve the provision of a separate juvenile court or a separate division of the superior court.

(b) Vesting of jurisdiction in children's cases in one of the existing courts without providing special judges, special sessions of the court being held to hear children's cases. The courts in which such jurisdiction might be placed are the superior court, the municipal courts, or the probate courts. The newly created superior court,

¹ See Juvenile Court Standards, p. 1 (U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 121, Washington, 1923).

² Provision might be made for waiving jurisdiction over children between 16 and 18 years charged with serious offenses.

³ The juvenile court standards previously mentioned recommended that the juvenile court be given jurisdiction in addition to the cases referred to above as follows: Adoption cases; commitment of children suffering from mental defect or disorder; violations of school attendance laws beyond provisions for control by school administration; nonsupport or desertion of minor children; and determination of paternity and support of children born out of wedlock. These standards are to be considered as suggestive only and subject to adaptation to local needs.

although having original jurisdiction over all types of offenses, is not in continuous session in any locality. (See p. 2.) Municipal courts are in continuous session, but several may have concurrent jurisdiction in certain sections of a county. The designation of one municipal court as the juvenile court of the county, however, would overcome this difficulty. The probate courts, although having jurisdiction throughout the county, are not in continuous session.

4. In the development of a probation system consideration should be given to the following problems:

(a) A centralized system of supervision of all probation officers should be established.

(b) Only qualified persons should be appointed, and all appointments should be made on a merit basis.

(c) Probation officers should be responsible for making investigations of delinquency cases prior to hearing, supervising children placed on probation, acting as referees in the absence of judges, providing for detention, and performing other services needed for children.

(d) Special probation officers should be provided for work with children. Coordination of juvenile probation work with the services given to dependent and neglected children by the State department should be considered when it is not possible for a county to provide a full-time juvenile probation officer.

(e) In making the decision as to whether men or women probation officers should be appointed in different localities, the needs of girls as well as of boys should be taken into consideration. In a county of the size of Cumberland it is probable that two officers, a man and a woman, should be appointed.

The probation service provided for juvenile courts should be adapted to the form of organization of the court hearing children's cases. If a special juvenile court is provided, the probation officers should be an integral part of the court organization, the judge of the court being responsible for appointments. If an existing court is designated, the organization of the probation service would depend upon the number of children appearing before the court. Thus, if the court has county-wide jurisdiction and hears only a small number of children's cases, it would probably be necessary to combine the probation work and other work for children in the county. An alternative to this plan would be to provide a separate probation office serving several counties.

5. Children should not be detained in jails or police stations and bail should not be required. The creation of juvenile courts with exclusive jurisdiction over all children under 18 years of age would eliminate one cause of the present situation regarding jail detention—the binding over of children to the higher courts. The development of local resources, such as boarding homes for the care of the few children needing detention, should be one of the responsibilities of the juvenile probation officers in whose custody all children should be placed on arrest.

6. Itinerant mental-hygiene clinics that would assist the courts and other agencies throughout the State in studying children presenting conduct difficulties or mentally defective would be of great value

in Maine. (Several States, including Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, are providing such services.)

7. The upper age limits for admission to the State school for boys and the State school for girls should be raised so that any child under the age of 18 years needing the care that can be provided by these schools can be committed to them.

8. Adequate provision should be made for the supervision of children paroled from the State schools. Assistance in supervising children paroled throughout the State might be given by probation officers.

9. The development of foster homes equipped to deal with problem children which might be used as an alternative to institutional care would provide much-needed facilities for the care of delinquent children. If this work is undertaken by the State department of public welfare persons specially equipped to supervise such homes should be added to the staff of the department.

10. The development of a well-considered program of prevention of delinquency is needed in Maine. The schools are the most important agency in such a plan, as truancy enters as a major factor into the delinquency of children of school age. Throughout the State more emphasis should be placed on school attendance. In the cities well-trained, full-time attendance officers should be provided, and in the rural districts probation officers should be called upon to do constructive work with habitual truants. As part of the attendance program, a careful check of attendance with the school census should be made in all communities. Special classes for retarded children and visiting teachers to work with children exhibiting conduct difficulties should be provided in all the larger cities.

The need of greater development of organized recreation, especially in rural districts, was voiced by many of the persons interviewed. Club work especially for boys had been developed in some communities. Such work should be extended throughout the State for both boys and girls.



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05708 5274

