

# The Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Quarterly

OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE PENNSYLVANIA  
ASSOCIATION ON PROBATION AND PAROLE

•  
JULY, 1940  
•

Volume 1

Number 2

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE ASSOCIATION ON PROBATION AND PAROLE

Officers and Committees for the Year 1940

President: Edgar R. Barnes, Chief Probation Officer, Lancaster County,  
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

First Vice-President: Mrs. Helen K. Spencer, Probation Officer, Erie County,  
Erie, Pennsylvania

Second Vice-President: Harvey E. Huff, Senior Field Agent, Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Board of Pardons, Parole Supervision, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Secretary-Treasurer: Miss. Mary H. Rinsland, Probation Officer, Luzerne County,  
Scranton, Pennsylvania

Legislative Committee:

Mr. J. Harry Messersmith, Chairman, District Agent, The Glen Mills School, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Mr. David D. Swavely, Chief Probation Officer, Dauphin County, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; Mr. J. M. Dunlap, Chief Probation Officer, Lawrence County, New Castle, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Mary Buch, Chief Probation Officer, Franklin County, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania; Miss. Lucy D. Davis, Juvenile Probation Officer, Lackawanna County, Scranton, Pennsylvania; Miss. Gertrude Bright, Probation Officer, Bucks County, Doylestown, Pennsylvania; Mr. Walter I. Greth, Chief Probation Officer, Berks County, Reading, Pennsylvania.

Resolutions Committee:

Miss. Helen C. Easterwood, Juvenile Probation Officer, Crawford County, Meadville, Pennsylvania; Mr. Harold Dundon, Chief Probation Officer, Erie County, Erie, Pennsylvania; Mr. Robert C. Scott, Chief Probation Officer, Lackawanna County, Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Publicity Committee:

Mrs. Elizabeth O. Miller, Juvenile Probation Officer, Greene County, Waynesburg, Pennsylvania; Miss. Helen C. Easterwood, Juvenile Probation Officer, Crawford County, Meadville, Pennsylvania; Mr. Robert Tabor, Chief Probation Officer, Philadelphia County, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Appointed on Advisory Committee for Pennsylvania:

Mr. Robert C. Tabor, Chief Probation Officer, Municipal Court, Philadelphia County, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Quarterly Staff

"The Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Quarterly" is published and distributed in cooperation with the Publicity Committee of The Pennsylvania State Association On Probation and Parole by The Institute of Local Government of The Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania.

H. F. Alderfer, Executive Secretary of The Institute of Local Government is acting as Editor of the Quarterly. Joseph R. Miller is acting as Assistant Editor. Probation and Parole Officers and members of the Association are requested to make news contributions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Officers of the Association . . . . . 1

I. A Parole Program for Pennsylvania . . . . . 3

II. Probation and Parole News . . . . . 7

III. New Members . . . . . 11

IV. First Correctional Workers' School in Philadelphia . . . . . 12

V. Ode to a Probation Officer . . . . . 14

VI. Step-Children of the Community . . . . . 15

---

## I. A PAROLE PROGRAM FOR PENNSYLVANIA

By

Leon Thomas Stern

Secretary, Pennsylvania Committee on Penal Affairs of  
the Public Charities Association of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pa.

The parole system of the Commonwealth is outmoded. It is like an ancient blunderbuss which scatters shot over the landscape in different directions. Parole, as now operating in Pennsylvania, is a confusion of three systems; prisoners committed to the state penitentiaries are paroled by the Pardon Board; prisoners sentenced to county prisons are paroled by our 118 county judges; boys at the Pennsylvania Industrial School at Huntingdon and women at the State Industrial Home for Women at Muncy, are paroled by the institutions' trustees.

At the new institution for youths at White Hill there is not now provision for parole, because no board has been provided by law for the purpose. The various parole units are all unconnected and uncoordinated. Because they are concerned not with different types of prisoners but with the same potential groups of parolees shows great disparity and may at times cause grievous injustices. Persons committed for like crimes are treated in one way by one institution or authority, in another way by another institution or authority. The method of paroling does not depend on the crime an individual has committed but instead on the institution to which he was sentenced.

Proof of this is contained in an official study made by the Pennsylvania Committee on Penal Affairs. The findings cover conditions in Eastern Penitentiary and Philadelphia County Prison, comparison being made of parole in these two institutions over a period of ten years -- 1924 to 1933 inclusive. The two types of prisons were chosen because men committing penitentiary crimes may be committed either to the state prison, to Allegheny County Workhouse, or to one of the local jails in Berks, Chester, Delaware, Dauphin, Lancaster, Montgomery, Schuylkill or Philadelphia Counties. During the decade reviewed, the penitentiary and the Philadelphia county jail received each practically the same number of penitentiary offenders. But for a twist of fate, any prisoner might have been sent to Eastern Penitentiary instead of to Holmesburg prison in Philadelphia County, or vice versa. Severity in granting parole depended, not on the character and crime of the prisoner, but on the institution to which he happened to have been assigned.

The county prison was much more lenient than the Eastern Penitentiary was regarding the length of sentence served before granting parole. Approximately one-fourth paroled from the Eastern Penitentiary served less than half their maximum sentences, due to shortening of terms by commutation by the Pardon Board. But, more than three-fourths of those paroled from the Philadelphia County Prison did not serve even their minimum sentence.

Under the present complicated parole system, when a county judge sentences a man to a county jail, he himself has power to release the prisoner at any time before the minimum term is finished. In contrast, a man sentenced to the State Penitentiary cannot be released at all before his full minimum term has been reached, unless he goes through a complicated process. He must ask the state prison trustees

to recommend him to the Pardon Board for a shortened sentence; the recommendation is reviewed by the judge who sentenced him and the district attorney; the plea is then passed on to the State Pardon Board at Harrisburg which takes action. When all this has been done and the sentence has been shortened, the prisoner makes a second petition -- this time for his parole. The petition goes through the same process as before. In cases of persons sentenced to the State Industrial Home for Women at Muncy and the Pennsylvania Industrial School at Huntingdon, the other extreme is touched -- parole is not weighed but the boards of trustees are allowed to be a law unto themselves in parole matters.

A serious weakness in the present parole system of our state is in the fact that the various paroling authorities -- trustees and pardon boards -- decide on our parole cases only as a spare time activity. In this connection, it is significant to note that the members of the State Pardon Board are cabinet members without other interest in the administration of criminal justice. They act in an ex officio capacity and give attention to parole only when the Pardon Board meets.

One of the major evils is in the fact that at present a criminal of the worst and most dangerous type may be paroled as readily as the man who is deserving of a chance to take back his place as a responsible citizen in society. No wonder the average citizen feels that the present parole system is accountable for the crimes committed by released convicts.

Not only is the granting of parole complicated but the supervision of men paroled in the community is divided. When an individual is released from a state prison or the Pennsylvania Industrial School at Huntingdon, he comes under the supervision of the state parole officers. When a parolee is released from the State Industrial Home for Women at Muncy, the parolee is in charge of officers attached to the institution. When an individual is paroled from the county prison, he is placed under the care of probation officers and becomes an additional burden to officers who already have heavy case loads of adult and juvenile probationers.

The administrative problem is to unify the granting of parole, and to establish a single system to control the paroling of all offenders who have committed serious crimes, whether they are incarcerated in a state or local institution. It means the abolishing of the system by which both the judges and the Pardon Board have the power to parole long term prisoners. This can be done without interfering with the power of the judges to place men and women on probation or to release short term offenders from local institutions.

It means also that we must provide a better system for the supervision of parolees released by the paroling authority, placing under a single system of supervision all those who have been paroled following commitment and incarceration for state prison offenses.

The Pennsylvania Committee on Penal Affairs proposes the establishment of a state paroling authority to assume responsibility for granting parole of all long term offenders from state and local prisons, and the setting up of a Department of Corrections to supervise the prisons of the state and the parolees released from them by the State Board of Parole.

In place of the present cumbersome, confused and ineffective set-up, there should be established a State Parole Board consisting of qualified salaried members devoting full time to parole work. The Parole Board would grant all paroles from

state and county institutions alike, to persons who have committed serious offenses, regardless of the prison or correctional institution to which an individual happened to have been sent.

The Board would turn over all persons it released to a State Department of Corrections for supervision. The Department would be staffed with parole officers under civil service. Political activity by either Parole Board members or the employees of the Department of Corrections would be forbidden, under penalty.

A feature of the proposal is that the Parole Board may act only within the limits of the minimum, maximum sentence given by the judge.

A prospective parolee, in addition, must be seen in the institution in which he is incarcerated by at least one Parole Board member. Before a parole may be granted, the Board must notify the district attorney of the county from which the man was sentenced. The Board may arrest and bring back to prison a person who has violated parole. The Board is to have complete control over such violators. Out-right pardon, however, still remains the function of the Pardon Board as provided in the Constitution.

This plan will give Pennsylvania a unified and scientific system of granting paroles and controlling parolees, as substitute for our old-fashioned, blunderbuss method. It is a most necessary step if we are to prevent the tragic spread of crime perpetrated by criminals who are released without adequate consideration under our present hodge-podge.

To sum up, if the proposed system should be established the following program could be developed.

1. A prisoner in a state or county prison serving sentence for a penitentiary offense would make application to the parole board for parole.
2. A field staff would investigate the desirability of granting parole.
3. At least one member of the parole board would interview the prospective parolee in the institution where he is incarcerated.
4. The Department of Corrections would have in its charge the extra-mural care of all prisoners on parole or on conditional liberation as well as the supervision of the institutions in which prisoners are serving sentences.
5. A parolee released by the State Parole Board would be supervised by an officer in the State Department of Corrections who would be responsible for his behavior and return to prison through the Parole Board if he did not behave.
6. A misdemeanant serving a short term in a county prison or local penal institution would be in charge of the county court both as to release on parole and supervision by probation officers of the courts after such conditional release.

The probation service of the counties would remain, as now, in charge of the judges and their probation officers.

This program is recommended to judges, prison officials, parole and probation officers for their study and consideration. It is earnestly hoped that it will obtain their backing should it be presented in the State Assembly.

NOTE: Since the 1941 General Assembly will probably alter the parole and probation laws, members of the Association are urged to present their views through the medium of this Quarterly. - Editors.

## II. PROBATION AND PAROLE NEWS

### New Superintendent at The Pennsylvania Training School

The Board of Trustees at The Pennsylvania Training School, Morganza, Pennsylvania, elected Mr. Martin I. Fowler of Bridgeville, Pennsylvania, as the school's new Superintendent to succeed Mr. Kenneth Gordon who resigned July first.

Mr. Fowler is a graduate of the State Teachers College at Indiana, Pennsylvania, in the Class of 1918. After graduation, Mr. Fowler taught school in Clarion County and later accepted a similar position at Bridgeville, Pennsylvania where the past 12 years he has been principal of the Junior-Senior High School and professor of Sociology.

Majoring in Administration and Vocational Education and minoring in Sociology and Criminology, Mr. Fowler received his Master of Arts Degree from the University of Pittsburgh and lacks but 18 credits for his Doctorate at the same institution. He has also taken graduate work in Penology at The Pennsylvania State College where he studied under Dr. Willard W. Waller. He spent a summer at the University of Southern California where he made a study of "Commercial Amusements As A Contributing Factor To Delinquency."

For the past 17 years he has been the Director of a summer camp of over 200 boys. As a school principal Mr. Fowler was intensely interested in the prevention of delinquency in public schools and has made many studies of delinquency in Allegheny areas. He is a member of the Kappa Phi Kappa, honorary educational fraternity and Phi Delta Kappa. He is married and has a daughter and a son.

Mr. Fowler has a deep understanding of the problems confronting delinquent adolescents, a fine intellectual background, the executive ability and experience to carry on a modern program of constructive education and training.



### Correctional Workers Elect New Officers

At a meeting held in Pittsburgh during the latter part of June, the Correctional Case Workers Association elected Walter J. Rome, Chief Probation Officer in the Juvenile Court of Allegheny County as its new President. He succeeds Dr. W. R. Grove of the Allegheny County Behavior Clinic. Other officers elected were: Joseph Amshey of the Quarter Sessions Court as Vice-President; Miss. Mary Clancy of the Juvenile Court as Secretary-Treasurer.

Members of the Executive Committee for 1940-41 are: Dr. G. I. Giardini, Psychologist, Western State Penitentiary; Philip Judd, Social Worker, Allegheny County Jail; Maurice Snyder, Social Work Director, Allegheny County Workhouse and Dr. Grove.

### New Handbook and Directory Ready For Mailing

The new Handbook and Directory of the Court and Penal System of Pennsylvania, published by the Pennsylvania Committee on Penal Affairs is off the press and can be procured from this Committee by writing to them at 311 South Juniper Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The price postpaid is 35¢ a copy.

### Pittsburgh Class Graduates

Forty-seven students and their friends attended the graduation exercises of the Pittsburgh class of the course in PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF DEALING WITH OFFENDERS, conducted under the auspices of the Public Service Institute of The Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction. Thirty certificates of attainment were presented at this commencement banquet, held at Webster Hall. Principal speaker of the evening was the Honorable Gustav L. Schramm, Judge of the Juvenile Court of Allegheny County. His remarks stressed the value of training in every part of the correctional field by emphasizing the special value of this training course in bringing together workers from every division of the correctional field. The value of this interchange of views and philosophies was also stressed by the guests and

and selected students who made one-minute contributions to the ceremony. The presentation of certificates was made by Miss. Helen Pigeon, of the Public Service Institute, and author of the manual used by the students during the course. Thus our first year closed on June 3, 1940.

#### Probation Officer For Juvenile Cases Chosen

Recognizing the need for better handling of juvenile delinquency cases before the local court, Judges Ray P. Sherwood and Walter I. Anderson, Monday announced the appointment of Charles O. Yost, formerly of Cleveland, as juvenile probation officer. His appointment was the first order of business at the opening of the April session of criminal court. His salary will be \$2000 a year.

The appointment of such an officer has been the interest of service clubs and public service agencies for several years. A complete survey of juvenile delinquency was made at the suggestion of a committee composed of representatives of these clubs. Twenty applicants were submitted to the committee, which selected six for personal interviews on the basis of qualifications. From these six the committee recommended three to the court which made the final decision.

#### New State Parole Officer

Lee Tice of Howard, Centre County, Pennsylvania replaced William T. Lucas of Corsica, Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, as Junior Field Agent in the District #5 State Parole Office at Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. Mr. Tice was a former Deputy Sheriff of Centre County.

#### Be Prepared For The January Blitzkrieg

When the legislators convene in Harrisburg next January, Probation and Parole will probably be one of the phases of government that will be given particular attention. Our organization should be represented and those representatives should

have some definite ideas of just what laws if any should be passed. In the April issue of the Quarterly we published a proposed law drawn up by J. M. Dunlap. In this issue you will note an article by Mr. Stern discussing the question and offering a solution. The editors request that other members of the organization submit their views on the subject so that a sustaining interest will be on the problem.

The next annual meeting is tentatively scheduled for the second week in February, 1941. It might be well to anticipate this possible legislation and either move the meeting date ahead or plan regional meetings during the fall.

Contact members of the Legislative Committee, fellow Probation and Parole Officers, Senators, Legislators, etc., and get interested in this subject so that this organization will be prepared to protect its own interests.

#### Susan Dunmore

With the death on March 18, 1940, of Miss Susan Dunmore, Montgomery County has lost a loyal and valued employee.

As Chief Probation Officer of the Juvenile Court, she would have completed 18 years service this June. Her good judgment and common sense were evidenced time and again in handling the difficult cases which came before the Juvenile Court. Steering a middle course between social work theorists and old proven methods, she dealt with each case on its merits.

Preparation of her annual report for 1939, which is published herewith, was one of her last official duties. Despite ailing health, she continued her work until stricken a few days before her death.

The regard in which she was held and the efficiency with which she performed her duties were attested to time and again by Grand Juries in their reports to the Court.

Particularly applicable to Miss. Dunmore are the oft-quoted words: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

### III. NEW MEMBERS

The following is the list of new members who have paid for their membership in the organization since the April Quarterly was published. Those who have not paid their dues for 1940, kindly mail a check for \$2.00 to Miss. Mary H. Rinsland, Secretary-Treasurer, 313 Monroe Avenue, Scranton, Pennsylvania. Miss. Rinsland will mail you a receipt and you will be reimbursed by your County Commissioners under an Act of Assembly passed in 1923.

Robert C. Tabor, Chief Probation Officer, Municipal Court of Philadelphia.

Agnes McGovern, Probation Officer, Juvenile Court, Northampton County.

William M. Dunkelberger, Desertion Probation Officer, Desertion Court, Reading.

David M. Shendowich, Acting Senior Agent, Board of Pardons, Parole Supervision, Dept. of Justice, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Lenor C. Jordan, Girls Probation Officer, Warren County, Warren.

William H. Mitchell, Jr. Field Agent, Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bellefonte, Pa.

Henry C. Hill, Superintendent, State Industrial School for Boys, White Hall.

Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 311 S. Juniper St., Philadelphia.

S. R. Parsons, Probation and Parole Officer, Venango County, Franklin, Pa.

Gomer W. Jones, Parole and Probation Officer, Schuylkill County, Saint Clair, Pa.

Edward Cuff, Parole and Probation Officer, Schuylkill County, Shenandoah, Pa.

~~Mrs. Ruth Schilbe, Female Parole & Probation Officer, Schuylkill County, Tamaqua, Pa.~~

Angus E. Wood, Probation Officer & Investigator; Wayne County, Honesdale, Pa.

Mrs. Oscie Clark, Juvenile Probation Officer, Greene County, Waynesburg, Pa.

Mary G. Davis, Probation Officer, Hollidaysburg, Pa.

Walter I. Greth, Chief Probation-Parole Officer, Reading, Pa.

George W. Wilkins, Executive Director, 821-823 Vine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
(The Galilee Mission)

Mrs. Mary C. Parker, Probation Officer of Butler County, Butler, Pa.

William Henry Welsh, Board of Education, Philadelphia, Pa.

John M. Broomall, III, C.P. Judge, Delaware County, Media, Pa.

#### IV. FIRST CORRECTIONAL WORKERS' SCHOOL IN PHILADELPHIA

By Dr. John Otto Reinemann, District Supervisor,  
Probation Department, Juvenile Division, Municipal Court, Philadelphia

In the April issue of "The Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Quarterly," Miss Helen D. Pigeon outlined the idea and the scope of in-service training courses for correctional workers, sponsored by the Public Service Institute, a unit of the State Department of Public Instruction in Harrisburg. The first course of this kind to be given in Philadelphia has just been completed.

The classes held once a week for  $2\frac{1}{2}$  hours over a period of 23 weeks were attended by probation officers - men and women - in the U. S. District Court, the Quarter Sessions Court, the Juvenile and Men's Misdemeanants' Division of the Municipal Court, parole agents of the State Parole Service, custodial officers from the Eastern State Penitentiary and the County Prison. Institutional and non-institutional workers were equally divided. The first two sections of the program, "Criminal Justice Program of Pennsylvania," covering the following topics: Police, Detention pending Trial, the Courts, Probation, Correctional Institutions, Parole - and "The Behavior of the Delinquent" were spread over 14 weeks; they were followed by the third section, "The Treatment of the Individual Offender," lasting 8 weeks, during which the probation and parole group discussed typical problems of case work while the institutional group considered specific problems presented by the prison inmate. Both groups met again jointly for a final class discussion on "Crime Prevention."

The subject matter was presented by the course leader, assisted at a number of sessions by guest speakers who were experts in their respective fields. Sufficient time was always given for discussion and questions as the classes were based on the idea of full participation by the students. Presentations by the members of the class characterized particularly the two sessions which were devoted to the subjects of Probation and Parole. At least one officer from every agency which deals with probation or which is engaged in parole preparation and parole supervision described the scope and the problems of his work; some had prepared short papers which they read before the class. One of the liveliest discussions developed when the subject of parole was considered. Student participation was encouraged in every respect and manifested itself in various ways; clippings from newspapers dealing with some event in the correctional field, excerpt from a magazine, suggestions as to guest speakers, or to the use of charts and graphs, etc., were submitted to the course leader.

There was an oral quiz after the first half of the course was over; a written examination was given at the end of the course and successfully passed by all members of the class. On June 19, the final exercises took place in the Municipal Court Building, 1810 Race Street. Judge Gerald F. Flood, Common Pleas Court, was the main speaker; he stressed the necessity of such training courses for officers in probation, parole and prison administration from the viewpoint of the judge. For the judge, the knowledge that qualified officers will be in charge of the offender after the verdict is rendered is most important in meting out justice, he stated. Other speakers were Mr. Leon Stern, Executive Secretary of the Pennsylvania Penal Affairs Committee, who locally prepared the course; Dr. E. Preston Sharp, Director of Rehabilitation, Eastern State Penitentiary, who conducted the special

sessions of the institutional group; Mr. William G. Love, Probation Officer, Quarter Sessions Court, who spoke on behalf of the class; and the writer of this report as the course leader. Miss. Helen D. Pigeon, representing the Public Service Institute, awarded the certificates to the 41 graduates.

In my address I emphasized the following thought: The wholesome trend of developing public service into a profession has brought about a growing demand from state, city and county employees for "in-service training" courses. This spreading idea of In-Service Training is based upon a deeper understanding and a new appreciation of the meaning of "public service." As public servants in a democracy we are not just employees or hired hands of an isolated entity called "The State." The State, according to our philosophy of life, is not an over-lord, but the freely organized community of citizens. Therefore, serving the State, being officials of the state or its political subdivisions, means serving the citizens both as individuals and as established society. We as correctional workers are especially dependent on the citizenry as a whole, on public opinion which - to quote from the Uniform Crime Reports of the U. S. Department of Justice - "now positively is demanding constantly higher standards in law enforcement." In order to attain and maintain these standards in the correctional work which is anything but static, which is subject to steady changes, the probation officer, the parole agent, and the custodial officer have to keep themselves abreast of modern developments, be it in the fields of medical and social sciences, of education and vocational guidance, or be it in the general social, cultural, and economic trends of our complex life. In-Service Training serves this purpose.

V. ODE TO A PROBATION OFFICER

You are hours late for dinner and the wife is quite sore,  
And you faithfully promise, it will happen no more.  
To appease her anger and make her feel fine,  
We'll go to the movies at a quarter of nine.

It's exactly eight-thirty by the clock on the wall,  
The telephone rings and you answer the call.  
A deep Irish voice on the end of the wire  
Says, "We've one of your boys for stealing a tire."

You rush to the station, and sure as you're born,  
It's probationer Willie, ashamed and forlorn.  
The investigation finished, you get home by two,  
To a wife who's not happy, so explain things you do.

A late snack and coffee, in bed by three  
With thoughts not of Morpheus, but delinquent Willie,  
It's five in the morning, a loud rap on the door,  
You hurry to see who's there and what for.

It's Johnny Smith's mother, worked up to a fright,  
Excited she tells you, John stayed out all night.  
Dressing in haste and getting your car,  
You look high and low, near and far..

No, Johnny is found, and you feel quite upset  
And go to the office, but not with regret.  
You know very well there is plenty to do,  
The D.A. and Judge both want to see you.

Clients in the office, awaiting their turn,  
The sheriff calls about Alex and Verne,  
Pre-sentence investigations to make and report  
Of the home and environment at four to the Court.

Again late for dinner, the food you devour  
As you're due at a conference in less than hour.  
You struggle and strain, your eyes open to keep;  
It's been many a night since you've had enough sleep.

For this mad dashing you do every day,  
You'll be amply rewarded in Heaven, they say,  
Because you and I know, that down here on earth,  
It's only The Lord who appreciates your worth.

"Joe"

## VI. STEP-CHILDREN OF THE COMMUNITY

By Dr. J. O. Reinemann

District Supervisor, Probation Department, Juvenile Division, Municipal Court of Philadelphia

A brief of a paper on "The Juvenile Court At Work," read before the Five County Conference of the Pennsylvania League of Women Voters, in Philadelphia, on January 22, 1940.

.....I want to discuss with you some of the problems which the Juvenile Court of Philadelphia is encountering in its daily work. This seems to me the appropriate thing to do, as I speak before a group of women whose aim it is to support progressive legislation. In order to appreciate these problems it is necessary to bear this in mind; compared to other social agencies concerned with juvenile welfare, the Juvenile Court is a "court of last resort"; that means that its intake-department has no choice, can not select the cases it likes to accept. The Court has exclusive jurisdiction, and that includes all cases of Juvenile delinquency and dependency which warrant legal action. In my experience as District Supervisor, I have found the following problems the most pressing ones:

First, there is a decided lack of institutions for children, primarily for boys, showing - what I like to call - "medium delinquency." These are cases where probation has been tried out, possibly over a period of several months, but cannot lead to a successful conclusion; it must fail because these boys through home and street environment are exposed to detrimental influences which cannot be counteracted by a probation officer's necessarily limited supervision. In order to prevent recidivism, placement in an institution seems to be imperative. These boys in numerous cases present special behavior problems which need individual attention and treatment. In a large-sized training school which might be a good solution for another type of boys, such individual treatment possibilities do not exist, they cannot be expected to exist due to the whole set-up serving several hundreds of boys. Two small-sized schools, Elliott House and Shallcross School, both under the auspices of the Board of Education, fulfill this task to a certain extent; but their capacity is too small to accomodate all cases of this type. These "in-between cases", i.e., between probation and disciplinary institution, deserve special attention if the idea of genuine crime prevention shall find its way into reality, if the development of medium delinquency into serious delinquency shall be forstalled.

Second, a problem of utmost importance is indicated by this striking statistical figure regarding the distribution of juvenile delinquency in respect to color and race; while only 14.4 p.c. of the children of Juvenile Court age in Philadelphia were colored, 39 p.c. of the delinquent children in 1938\* belonged to the negro race; by counting the number of cases (instead of the number of children involved) we reach an even higher figure of 43 p.c. This does not indicate a biological problem, nor has it anything to do with the superiority or inferiority of one race or the other. The thought-provoking statistical result can solely be explained by the

---

\* The respective figures for 1939 which were compiled in the meantime, are almost the same as for 1938.



socio-economic situation in which the negro citizens find themselves. These findings should not only be analyzed, but should lead to constructive proposals for an efficient curb on juvenile delinquency in general and among the colored group in particular. Such proposals ought to include the demand for an increase of recreation facilities, playgrounds, boys' clubs, and settlement activities.

Third, in respect to cases of feeble-minded children we again find a most unfortunate, if not catastrophic lack of institutional facilities. Since Byberry was taken over by the State, no children were admitted to this institution; Pennhurst State School and Elwyn Training School are the only institutions available for mentally defective children (aside from Laurelton State Village for feeble-minded adolescent girls and women). Pennhurst and Elwyn have capacities of 2100 and 1075 respectively. They have no vacancies. There are now between 800 and 900 cases of feeble-minded children (including epileptic and so-called defective delinquent children) who during the last years were committed to an institution for the feeble-minded, in the big majority to Pennhurst, but cannot be admitted due to lack of vacancies. Their names are on the waiting lists, but their helpless bodies and feeble minds are at home with their parents, brothers and sisters; they are a terrible financial burden on their family, a constant source of sorrow, human misery, and mental pain for their parents, and often the reason for broken homes; they are potential - and in many instances actual criminal offenders, potential and actual fathers and mothers of illegitimate and potentially likewise feeble-minded babies. Some of them are placed in institutions for delinquent children where they most certainly do not belong. At present, the Court is preparing a very detailed study of these cases as to their medical and social history and especially to their court history subsequent to commitment. This study aims to assemble statistical material to be evaluated from the standpoint of the sociologist and the psychiatrist; it shall be used to create public interest in this problem for which society pays so dearly in the long run, and to spur legislative proposals which might remedy this situation by providing sufficient facilities. An interested group like yours will, I am sure, do its share in such a campaign.

Fourth, a problem which has presented itself lately due to the raising of the compulsory school age to 17, is that of truancy of the older boy and girl. The Juvenile Court not seldom has to deal with a child who considering his or her physical maturity and limited intellectual capacity should not be forced to attend school even if the age limit of 17 is not yet reached. Compulsion in such cases frequently leads to a harmful feeling of frustration in the boy or girl, and to the presence of a disturbing element in class detrimental to both the other pupils and the teacher's efforts. The law is rather strict and only allows a few exceptions to compulsory attendance; apart from those cases where a child is regularly engaged in any useful and lawful employment or service holding an employment certificate, a child can be excused from school attendance only if he "has been examined by an approved mental clinic or by a person certified as a public school psychologist or psychological examiner, and has been found to be unable to profit from further school attendance..." In Philadelphia, this is interpreted in such a way that a child of 16 years of age who has a mental age of 10 years, or an Intelligence Quotient of 67, can be excused. In cases of children under 16 years a comparatively

lower mental age is required, and the decision has to be approved by the authorities in Harrisburg. There are a goodly number of children who - although intellectually not as low as a middle or low-grade moron - cannot profit from further school attendance, but do possess mechanical skill. According to law, they would not fall under the group of children to be excused from school attendance. For these, either the law should be made less rigid, or some facilities for vocational training along mechanical lines ought to be established. The Philadelphia School System has several very excellent vocational schools, but admission to them requires a rather high academic standard which cannot be attained by the pupils who present this particular truancy problem. A way should be found providing vocational training for these youngsters, be it within the school system or in some form of supervised apprenticeship. Due to the limited time allotted to my talk, I can only touch this problem very casually; I feel that it will necessitate a very careful study from such viewpoints as the school, the government, the employer and the trade union; it will arouse the interest of the average man and woman voter who was told that one reason for raising the compulsory school age was to stop the influx on the labor market, and who then reads of surveys by the American Chamber of Commerce and of reports from the employment office of the Philadelphia Navy Yard which indicate a growing shortage of skilled labor.