

The Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Quarterly

Contents: JANUARY, 1946

News---

Institute Attendance Pleases Association Leaders

Tibbetts Thanks Welfare Department, State Parole Board

Articles---

Juvenile Jails in State Analyzed

Leon T. Stern

Unite Communities to Curb Child Crime

Judge Paul W. Alexander

Toward a Better World

Dr. J. O. Reinemann

Should Parents Pay for Damages

William B. Harris

Washington County Blazes Trail

Jean L. Anderson

State Parole Studies returned Veteran

Major H. C. Hill

Juvenile Judges Urge Correctional School for Girls

VOLUME 3

NUMBER 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
President Tibbetts Lauds Welfare Department	1
Institute Attendance Pleases Association Leaders	3
National Congress On Juvenile Delinquency For United Approach To Child Problems	6
Two Thousand Soldier Parolees, "Reconverted to Civilian Life"	9
Should Parents Pay Damages When Children Destroy Property	10
Judge Carson Blazes Trail In Washington County Juvenile Court	12
Two Films For Juvenile And Racial Study Groups	16
Stern Analyzes Detention Home Problem In Pennsylvania	17
The Pennsylvania Council of Juvenile Court Judges	22
Toward A Better World	25
From The Institutes	28
New Books And Booklets	30

President Tibbetts Lauds Welfare Department,
State Board Of Parole For Splendid Cooperation

By Paul Tibbetts, President
The Pennsylvania Association On Probation and Parole

Editor's Note: After writing this message, Paul Tibbetts, energetic president of the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole, was stricken with pneumonia at his home in Berks County.

As this issue goes to the printers, Mr. Tibbetts is believed to be in a satisfactory condition but all of his many friends throughout the Commonwealth will be pulling for a quick and complete recovery for Mr. Tibbetts.

During his two-year term as president of the Association, Paul Tibbetts has traveled many hundreds of miles and given much of his time and strength to the Association. His efforts have been admired by those who have been privileged to work with him.

* * * * *

With our autumn meetings completed, we can stop and take inventory for a time upon the results attained. They were successful, we feel, in every detail.

Those, who compare the fall institutes with the spring meetings, should take into account the facts that our spring gatherings were two days in duration and, in two of the three sessions, in large centers of population, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. In October and November, smaller communities were chosen.

We have found that men and women, who live and work some distance from the state's two largest cities, appreciate an opportunity to meet and mingle with others in the same field, if only for a day.

Likewise, we have discovered that institute sessions bring before correctional workers the program of the state association and its objectives in an informal and pleasing way for the second time during the year. There is no long period in which to forget the state association once the convention is over. Hence the association ceases to be a two or three day organization which meets but once a year.

As president of the association, I want to thank the Department of Welfare for its splendid cooperation. This progressive branch of the state government, under the wise administration of Miss S. M. R. O'Hara, was co-sponsor of the institutes and did so much to make our meetings a success.

Credit must also be given to Major Hill, the Board of Parole, and Dr. Giardini and others in the state parole system who threw behind the institutes the full strength of the splendid state parole group. The assistance from this source has been an inspiration and very helpful.

We now begin to think about the 1946 convention. Whether it will be at a different city and time than the Welfare Conference is to be determined by the executive committee in its coming assembly at Harrisburg. If we unite again with

the Welfare Conference, the convention will be in Harrisburg in April. The executive committee will seek to decide what is best for the association and what step will insure the most successful convention.

More members, a common objective such as a union of community resources to combat juvenile delinquency, the exploration of volunteer group systems and a concerted campaign for more adequate detention homes are possible themes for 1946. All have merit and will receive our attention. Tenure of probation officers deserves constructive thought.

Plan now, if you can, to become an active member of the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole. Your assistance is needed and is solicited.

* * * * *

Three Articles, Omitted From Last
Issue, Carried In January Number

Yes, the paper shortage and printer delays have caused some trouble for the sturdy souls, who in the wisdom of the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole, are responsible for the appearance of The Quarterly.

Our shoulders sagged somewhat in October when a printer's delay made the magazine later than had been planned. Then it was found that limited space made necessary the postponement of publication of three articles, which appear in this issue of The Quarterly.

Each of the three articles are full of valuable information and inspiration. They are: "Should parents pay damages when children destroy property" by William B. Harris, "Toward a better world" by Dr. J. O. Reinemann, and "Judge Carson blazes trail in Washington County juvenile court" by Jean L. Anderson.

We hope that those who were so gracious and cooperative in preparing the articles for The Quarterly will understand.

Institute Attendance Pleases Association Leaders;
More Than 350 at Meetings; Largest Group at Reading

Attendance at the three regional institutes during October and November passed the 350 mark, survey of the registration shows, and all who planned the unique series of meetings were pleased with the response from workers throughout the state. It was agreed that efforts of the Department of Welfare and the Pennsylvania Board of Parole to further the programs added much to their success.

At Williamsport, where lesser-populated counties were included in a bloc for Central Pennsylvania, a fine group was present throughout the day. Uniontown's gathering was dampened by weather which made travel undesirable but representatives were present from Beaver, Butler, Armstrong, Westmoreland, Washington, Allegheny, Mercer, and Fayette counties.

Reading's meeting, which attracted a large group from Philadelphia, was the largest of the three.

Theme of all three meetings was the problems of the peace and reconversion. Industrial representatives spoke at Williamsport, Uniontown and Reading, and such firms as Aviation Corporation, Westinghouse Electric and Vanity Fair hosiery detailed their plans for the future and the employment of thousands.

DPA workers, school teachers, civic clubs, chamber of commerce heads, members of the bars in various counties and judges joined with probation and parole workers, especially in the attendance of the luncheon. In each of the three cities, judges of the courts in those cities presided at various portions of the programs.

New techniques of probation and parole were told in a different way as a debate was introduced with the satirical subject, "Resolved That New-Fangled Methods In Parole and Probation Should Be Abolished." As a direct benefit, Dr. G. I. Giardini, superintendent, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, brought to his various staff members the reasons why many of the reports and routines of the parole system were in use.

More important than the actual programs was the testing of the institute method of reaching all sections of the state. Now that the autumn institutes have been conducted and represent a study in methods to be added to the results secured from the spring programs, those in the leadership of the Association feel that an effective system has been devised to bring the Association and its objectives into all counties of the Commonwealth.

All agreed that the institutes were too late in the year, coming in late October or early November when there were many holidays and distractions. In addition, weather complications could be expected in such a period of the calendar and it is likely that September will be the month for the autumn sessions in 1946.

Reading Meeting

Excerpts from the Reading meeting are reported by Dr. J. O. Reinemann as follows:

Immediately following the welcoming remarks by Paul W. Tibbetts, president of the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole, the British motion picture, "Children of the City," described on another page in this issue, was shown.

Dr. E. Preston Sharp, director of the Bureau of Community Work, Department of Welfare, brought greetings from Miss Sophia M. R. O'Hara, Secretary of Welfare. Speaking on the subject, "Prevention vs. Detention," and referring to the motion picture just shown, Dr. Sharp stressed the need of correlation of services for children such as juvenile court, school, probation department, community activities. He mentioned that the Department of Welfare will help and advise local authorities and agencies; it will compile statistics on juvenile delinquency so that an adequate picture of the needs will be gained. He asked for cooperation of local juvenile courts and their probation officers with the work of the Department of Welfare. "To keep three children out of institutions," he said, "would more than pay the yearly salary of a probation officer."

Hon. Paul N. Schaeffer, president judge, Court of Common Pleas, Berks County, while introducing the main speaker of the morning session, referred to the basic philosophy of the Juvenile Court as expressed in the famous Supreme Court decision of Commonwealth vs. Fisher in 1905. Judge Schaeffer stated that out of 829 boys, who over the years were placed in the Boys' Home in Reading, only 15 were failures and they were feeble minded. "We don't know of any case where a child of these boys who are now married ever was brought into juvenile court," he continued.

Thomas K. Leinbech, personnel manager, Vanity Fair Mills, Inc., Reading, spoke on "The Place of Parolees in the Reconversion Program." In his address, he stressed the fact that reconversion is more than re-employment. "We have arrived at the cross roads and we are too forgetful of the sacrifices which were brought," he declared. "We need more practical application of spiritual values."

Continuing, the speaker declared that it is the decision of the people of America to decide whether atom energy shall be used to destroy life or to aid mankind.

In the field of re-employment, the speaker sees three groups constituting special problems for the correctional worker. They are the returned veteran, the war worker, and special groups such as the parolee.

Mr. Leinbech, who is re-employment man of the Selective Service board in Reading, said that his experience has shown that it is not true that 40 percent of the returned service men act "peculiar." Many had expected this large a figure but only a few, he declared, will "drift away and get into trouble." He expected some trouble from older men who found employment during wartime but who now are out of jobs and are finding it tough to again locate work and hence may become desperate.

For the purpose of securing jobs for parolees, Mr. Leinbech proposed vocational testing of parolees, the representation of courts and parole agencies at all meetings dealing with reconversion, and an educational campaign to make the public aware of its obligations towards the parolees, most of whom have made good in the war either as members of the armed forces or on the production line. The job of the parole officer is that of reclamation, and that also means "reclamation of souls," the speaker concluded.

* * * * *

Members Vote On State Convention Of Parole

Members of the Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Association voted at the three regional institutes during October and November regarding the continued scheduling of the state convention coincidental with the State Welfare Conference.

Heretofore, annual meetings of the state association have been held in the same hotel and city as the State Welfare Conference and have featured the first two days of the weekly program of the Welfare group.

President Tibbetts did not announce the results of the balloting, which was by secret ballot in Uniontown and Reading and by the raising of the hand in Williamsport. The 1946 convention will be a subject of discussion for the meeting of the executive committee to be held in Harrisburg before the middle of February.

National Congress On Juvenile Delinquency For United Approach
To Child Problems, Jurist Plea

Editor's Note: At the Congress of Correction in New York in November, Judge Paul W. Alexander of Toledo, Ohio gave a ringing challenge to the communities of America to unite their agencies and resources in a coordinated and understanding approach to the juvenile problems of their community, to the problems of the individual children and to the national aspects of the problem.

Judge Alexander is the judge of Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts of Lucas County, Ohio (Toledo); organizer of one of the few nationally recognized child guidance clinics operated by a court; member, American Prison Association; member, National Association of Training Schools; immediate past president, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges; president, National Conference of Juvenile Agencies.

By Judge Paul W. Alexander

Joe's a high school sophomore. He's in trouble again -- playing hockey, stealing, defying rules. School authorities (dean, principal, pupil personnel department) work on him. Forbid him athletics, social brawls; kick him off the band; ostracize him generally. Joe gets mad, sneaks back, smashes school property. Police are called.

Police work on him, give him the bawling out he deserves. Question him about other offenses. Point out he may land in training school. Joe gets scared and won't talk. Officer brings him to juvenile court. Probation officer investigates. Joe is misunderstood. Releases him pending final hearing. Joe shows up at school. School not ready to let him in -- too dangerous, bad influence. Joe goes down town. Policeman sees him during school hours, eyeing swell automobile. Arrests him. Joe is referred to guidance clinic.

Psychologist goes to work on him. Gives him tests. Uncovers complexes hard to do anything about. Recommends changed environment. Final hearing comes up. Judge hears parents plead for another chance; school expounds Joe's evil-doing and its effects; police tell all the trouble he's caused; probation officer optimistically offers to keep Joe straight; psychologist recommends treatment that can't be had. Judge has heart-to-heart talk with Joe. Releases him on probation. Joe resents supervision. Steals car and runs away. Police catch him again. Joe goes to institution.

Training school regiments Joe. Teaches him rudiments of a trade. Punishes him for occasional infractions; in due course sends him back to the home whence he came.

Saga Of Joe Ends

Thus endeth the saga of Joe, the juvenile delinquent, and this may begin the history of Joe's future criminal career. This is a composite picture of thousands of cases. Not a single feature of it is atypical.

Do you see what has happened here? Six different agencies, with six divergent approaches have each had a crack at Joe, have each left a separate trademark on him. Never mind who was right or who was wrong. Each was right from his own point of view. None was wholly right from the others' points of view. And from Joe's point of view -- ugh.

They worked at cross purposes because none fully comprehended the others' peculiar problems. The schools couldn't have the rest of the pupils demoralized by Joe. The police couldn't spend all their time rounding up Joe. The probation officer couldn't have anything interfere with the working out of Joe's personality problems.

The psychologist had to turn in a good professional job whether the community resources were adequate. The judge wanted to do what was best for Joe, but do it in a way that would satisfy parents, schools, police, press and public. The training school couldn't keep Joe till he was "cured" or his home was fit to take him back -- it had to make room for more Joes.

Of course they worked at cross purposes, too seldom carried forward a course of handling started by one of the others, too often undid what others had labored hard to do. Yet, they were all trying to do the same thing; make a good kid out of a bad kid -- the same kid, remember?

Six agencies with six disjointed, desperate approaches. No coordinated tactics, no integrated strategy. And Joe is the victim. It is Joe who calls for the integration.

First Step In Integration

What is the first step in integration? Obviously, congregating. We, who handle the delinquent at different stages in his career, pretty much go our own separate ways. We have our own organizations, publications, conventions. We fraternize with those working on our respective levels. The truant officers meet with the school organizations; the police juvenile squads meet with the police organizations and so on. Such contacts on a horizontal plane are, of course, useful; why not equally useful on a vertical plane?

If this be a consummation devoutly to be wished, perhaps it could be accomplished through a national congress on juvenile delinquency, a congress of all who make a specialty of handling delinquent children, e.g., truant officers, pupil personnel men, visiting teachers, counsellors, deans, etc., police juvenile squads, crime prevention bureaus, women's bureaus, etc., probation officers in the juvenile field, psychologists, psychiatrists and others from the child guidance clinics, juvenile court judges, training and correctional school workers, public and private, including parole or placement officers.

To keep from becoming too large and heterogeneous, the meeting could be limited to those who specialize in juvenile delinquency; to avoid being overpowered or disconcerted, it could be held at a time and place by itself instead of in conjunction with some of the large established national conventions; to keep it from being just another convention, the program could be arranged to intrigue everybody all the time, e.g., first day, morning program, put on by school people; afternoon by judges, evening by correctional schools, all without any sideshows or counter attractions, with plenty of time for questions, discussion and the interchange of ideas and ideologies plus features to encourage free social intercourse

among members in various fields. Certainly there is no occasion for any existing organization to lose its autonomy or surrender any of its sovereignty.

Potential constituents of such a congress would appear to include such organizations and individuals as the Association of School Social Workers; National League to Promote School Attendance; Tri-State Conference of Pupil Personnel (Ohio, Michigan and Indiana) or any other organization of counsellors or other school people who handle truancy and disciplinary problems; the juvenile squads of the metropolitan police and any other officers and sheriffs who specialize in the juvenile field; the National Probation Association; the Central States Probation Association; all the state and area probation associations; the Orthopsychiatric Association and the various psychological organizations or the departments thereof that operate in the juvenile field; the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges; the National Conference of Juvenile Agencies; the National Association of Training Schools; the Association of Institution Superintendents, Male; the Association of Institution Superintendents, Female, etc.

There need be nothing to prevent each one from continuing with its present name, constitution, officers, dues, publications, etc., just as its fancy dictates. On the other hand, to save time and travel, they could hold their annual meetings separately in the same city, following the joint sessions of the congress.

Of course, it would take people and money to promote and operate such a congress. Where would they come from? That is a fair question but it need not be answered yet. The first question is: Does the benefit to be derived appear to outweigh the probable cost? In other words, shall we continue to go our separate ways, despite the effect on Joe, or shall we take that first step and get together to try to find ways of giving Joe the benefit of a united approach?

Where there's a will, there's a way. Let's not worry about the way until we determine whether there's a will. Is there?

Two Thousand Soldier Parolees, "Reconverted To Civilian Life,"
Get Board Study

By Major H. C. Hill

Editor's Note: In recent months, Major H. C. Hill, chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole and an outstanding authority in penal and correctional affairs, has frankly discussed the returned veteran and the problem he represents to parole in event the soldier was on parole when inducted.

We asked Major Hill to state briefly the viewpoint of the State Parole Board on the status of returned soldier parolees. His remarks follow.

* * * * *

The Pennsylvania Board of Parole has been giving serious thought to the "reconversion" of its more than two thousand soldier-parolees to civilian status. Under the laws of this Commonwealth, parolees who were inducted into the armed forces were not discharged from parole, but were simply relieved of active supervision by this Board for the duration of their military service. Their necessary return to supervision is a matter demanding immediate attention, for many of these men have served their Country with valor and distinction and resent being returned to the status of an ex-convict or parolee, feeling that they have earned the right to be regarded as respected citizens as well as veterans.

Reams have been written about the problem of the readjustment of the returning veteran to civilian life; and while in most cases perhaps the problem is chiefly in the minds of those who talk and write about it, there can be no question that many veterans who have felt the direct impact and shock of the war will appreciate assistance in getting back to civilian standards and pursuits. There can certainly be no question, therefore, that the readjustment problem will be intensified for those men who passed from the strict discipline of prison, either directly or after a very brief period on parole, into the rigid discipline of military regimentation. There will undoubtedly be some among them who might well be relieved of parole supervision; but to throw all of them indiscriminately on their own as a "reward" for military service would be a concession to sentimentality that would be unfair to those who need assistance and guidance, as well as to the community, and would defeat the general purpose of parole.

This Board does not deem it wise, therefore, to recognize an honorable discharge in itself as evidence that parole supervision is no longer needed or desirable, but is working out a program with the Board of Pardons whereby each case will be considered on its individual merits. Where the combination of the soldier-parolee's past history, military service record, emotional and mental balance, and opportunities present a good prognosis for future stability and success, the Board of Parole will consider recommending to the Board of Pardons that the maximum sentence be commuted in order that a final discharge from parole may be granted. Where the prognosis is less favorable, the individual will be continued under parole guidance until such time as his proper adjustment in civilian life seems assured.

Should Parents Pay Damages When Children Destroy Property?

Juvenile Probation Officer Advances Interesting Opinion On Parental Liability; Cites Criteria To Determine Responsibility Of Parents In Delinquency Of Children

Editor's Note: The writer of this article, William B. Harris, is a probation officer in the Juvenile Division of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia. He is also enrolled as a graduate student in the Temple University School of Law.

By William B. Harris

It is an oft expressed maxim that law is no better than the public opinion behind it. Public opinion demands that law grow and keep abreast of the times. However, there are times when there is a "lag" on the part of public opinion as well as on the part of the lawmakers. For example, there is an aroused public today because of the alleged prevalence of juvenile delinquents -- there are many solutions offered; there is praise and there is condemnation. Perhaps there is a necessity for public opinion to catch up with the law; to lift some of the legal shackles that are technically on the juvenile court in Pennsylvania.

Many of the boys who come before the juvenile court have caused personal or property damage. The prosecutors in most instances seem to see only one side of the question -- they want to be reimbursed -- they have or their property has been damaged -- the culprit has been apprehended and he or his parents should be made to pay.

The cases are legion where parents have willingly asked and been granted permission to pay restitution. Perhaps through this procedure the idea has reached the public that the juvenile court can get repayment for damage done. Possibly because of this public opinion many parents ask to pay restitution. However, the powers of the juvenile court along this line are limited. The Superior Court of Pennsylvania in Trignani's Case (148 Pa. Super. 142, 1942) stated that, "It is not a function of a juvenile court or within its jurisdiction to determine civil liability and to execute its finding." Further, the case mentioned above points out that "Attachment for contempt is not among the powers of the juvenile court." The court did say, "In placing a juvenile on probation, a court may impose such terms as will bring home to the minor a realization of the seriousness of his delinquency, but the terms imposed must be wholly in the interest of the child, looking toward his reformation, and not to make good the damages flowing from an illegal act."

Nevertheless, the writer is of the opinion that it may be wholly in the interest of the child to require the parent, by statute, to make good the damages flowing from the child's illegal act. Harper in his "Law of Torts" points out, "Unless made so by statute, there is no liability on the part of a parent as such, for the tort of a child. The child is, in general, liable for his own tort." But, in the Trignani Case, where the juvenile court placed the minor on probation to pay \$1040 at the rate of \$10 per week for a period of two years, the Pennsylvania Superior Court in reversing the lower court said that the order by its terms "Bound the boy to servitude and compelled him to surrender all that he could possibly earn for the period of two years. By its severity, it invited further

delinquency and revolt against the authority of the court." If the responsibility could be placed on the parent, there may be a revolt against the authority of the court too, but it may, on the other hand, help to meet what the Pennsylvania Superior Court in Commonwealth versus Jordan (136 Pa. Super. 242, 1939) called the broad purpose of the Juvenile Court Act "----to stamp out juvenile delinquency at its roots." The terms imposed would be wholly in the interest of the child, because it might cause the parent to decide to tackle the problem in the home. For the best interest of all concerned it may be advisable to place the parent on probation along with the child.

Use Its Present Power

Of course, the juvenile court can still use its present power granted under the Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Act which brings into its purview all adults who contribute to the delinquency of children under the age of 18 years. As was said in Commonwealth vs. Lash (151 Penna. Superior 601, 1943), "We are of opinion the legislature never intended the juvenile court to have any jurisdiction over indictable offenses except that if one is noticed in the course of the exercise of its appropriate functions, the case shall be returned by the Judge of the court to the proper court for trial (i.e., the Court of Quarter Sessions)."

The questions will probably arise-- What constitutes contributing to the delinquency of a minor? What criteria shall be used to determine liability? In answering these questions it may be helpful to again utilize the law of torts. Harper points out these situations in which the parents may be held liable.

1. Where the relationship of master and servant exists and the child is acting within the scope of his authority accorded by the parent.

2. Where a parent is negligent in entrusting to the child an instrument which, because of its nature and purpose, is so dangerous as to constitute, in the hands of the child an unreasonable risk to others.

3. Where a parent is negligent in entrusting to the child an instrumentality which, though not necessarily a dangerous thing of itself, is likely to be put to a dangerous use because of the known propensities of the child.

4. Where the parents' negligence consists of his failure reasonably to restrain the child from vicious conduct imperiling others, when the parent has knowledge of the child; propensity towards such conduct.

5. Where the parent participates in the child; tortious act by consenting to it or ratifying it later and accepting the fruits.

The writer suggests another criterion, that which seems so helpful today and which probably is as much responsible for the splendid progress of the juvenile court as any law; the discretion of the judge.

Judge Carson Blazes Trail In Washington County Juvenile Court;
New Procedure Told By Worker

By Jean L. Anderson
Assistant Probation Officer
Washington County

Editor's Note: We live in adjoining Washington County and for months we have watched things happen there. An interesting article by Mrs. Jean Anderson, formerly with the Pennsylvania Training School at Morgantown, but now on Judge Carson's staff of probation officers, reviews the program of the Juvenile Court.

This is another in the series of interesting procedure in the counties of the Commonwealth. We have printed stories from Beaver, Lawrence, Blair, Delaware and other counties, and hope to continue this series from time to time. Many counties have interesting stories to tell in the attack upon juvenile and adult delinquency.

In the article Mrs. Anderson mentions the death of Miss Francis, a veteran probation officer, who was well known to many correctional workers in the state and whose death will be read with sorrow by those who knew her.

* * * * *

The upswing in juvenile delinquency is expected to continue for sometime as an aftermath of the war. This condition constitutes a new challenge and greater effort if our courts for the youth are to meet the situation just around the corner.

It is gratifying to note that courts for children all over the Commonwealth are giving new thought and serious consideration to that which lies just ahead.

The trend is to do something for the youth before he gets into court, but if, or when, he gets there, to be able to handle his problem with sympathy and understanding. That the courts are making a study of the problems in their respective counties and endeavoring to do something about the situations before they develop, gives rise to the hope that the juvenile, who is a pre-delinquent, may be able to adjust himself in a satisfactory manner without having to become a real delinquent and then be faced with an appearance before the juvenile court judge and become a probationer.

Such forward steps, as are being taken in Washington County by the Juvenile Court Judge, Roy I. Carson, indicate that he has an awareness of the situation and is endeavoring to do something about it.

Became Judge In January

Judge Carson was elected to the Court of Common Pleas and took office in January, 1944. At that time he was appointed to handle all juvenile cases. In the past year he has visited many county courts and has made a careful study with consultations with veteran leaders to familiarize himself with the important service assigned to him. He is keenly aware of the juvenile situation and believes

that with an adequately staffed probation bureau he can prevent many of the first offenders from again appearing in his court.

When a complaint is made to the Juvenile Court, a thorough investigation of the child, his home and his background follows and this is discussed in the court by the probation officer before the child is brought in for his hearing. At the pre-hearing conference the court discusses all of the possibilities for the child and is made fully aware of all the angles of the difficulty. At this time a recommendation is made so that the court may have some working plan along which he may direct his hearing.

Each case is reviewed carefully before the hearing and at the time of the appearance in court. The probation officer sits in on the hearing and is fully aware of all that the court wishes to imply and all the suggestions and orders that are directed to those interested in the juvenile. The hearings are never hurried and although the schedule is very full, the court takes all the time necessary to bring out each point and to give the child as well as those interested every opportunity to express themselves fully. The court listens to much that is irrelevant but never hurries and manifests great patience in giving the child as well as the family aid in expressing himself. Many times rapport is difficult to establish but Judge Carson has acquired a distinct technique in putting persons who appear before him at ease and a friendly relationship is established.

New Probation Staff

At the time Judge Carson entered the juvenile court field he had an almost completely new probation staff with which to start to work. To help carry out his program, he called to his aid a venerable citizen, church man and broad minded individual, who is keenly interested in the problems of the youth, in the person of John L. Post, as his chief probation officer. Mr. Post has surrounded himself with a staff in perfect harmony with his and the court's ideas, all of whom are contributing in their way honestly and with a peculiar sympathy attuned to the feelings of the court. The staff includes the chief probation officer, an assistant to the chief probation officer and three other probation officers, along with a competent clerical staff.

Miss Francis Dies

On August 13 the probation department suffered a severe loss in the death of Miss Nellie Francis at her home in North Charleroi. Her death broke the circle of a well coordinated staff and her keen insight and understanding, as assistant to the chief probation officer, will be sorely missed.

Washington County Juvenile Court has the very distinct quality of functioning as one unit, with complete coordination of ideas and with each individual of the unit aware of his or her responsibility and discharging his or her duties to the best of his or her ability. Judge Carson is constantly on the alert for ideas and suggestions as to how to improve his juvenile court system and make it a better court for the correction and solution of problems that come before him.

It is the belief of Judge Carson that an adequate probation system is much more to be desired than to have a large number of children come before him and, because of an inadequate probation system, be faced with the necessity of committing the child to an institution for custodial care.

It is his belief that more and more children who find themselves before the court for the first time should be placed on probation under the direct supervision of a skilled probation officer. The directives that are made at the time of the child's appearance in court make fully aware of his responsibility to the court and to the probation officer who is to supervise him.

There are some children who are recidivists but in the great majority of cases of first offenders if the child is made to understand his responsibility, and here, Judge Carson, takes all the time necessary to fully acquaint the offender with what is expected of him insofar as he is mentally capable of accepting such responsibility so as to prevent his re-appearance in court.

The probation officer must be prepared to carry through with the child in whatever has been the order of the court. This may be by assisting the child to adjust in an entirely new situation in a foster home. It may be in the work situation or with some relative who has been approved by the court. The probation officer frequently finds it necessary to have the order changed by the court when the program in which the court concurred originally fails or for some reason is inadequate. The new plan is discussed with the court and he accepts the recommendation made by the officer and directs that a supplementing order be made. This is continued until the child finds himself satisfactorily adjusted or until it is necessary for the child to again appear in court.

The present juvenile court setup in Washington County indicates an attitude that is prevalent in many courts in this state as well as in other states. Looking at the picture as a taxpayer, it is a good business venture as it is much cheaper to maintain an adequate probation staff where the recidivists are kept at the lowest possible number than to have a large number of cases that require more supervision and a heavy load of commitments to institutions. It is believed that once it has become necessary to commit a child to an institution, an irreparable harm has been done and somehow somewhere along the line an officer of the state has failed. The institution is used only as a last resort.

Parents Instructed

When it becomes necessary for a juvenile to be placed away from his home, thereby involving financial support, Judge Carson endeavors to impress upon the parents their responsibility in conforming to the court's ideas. Here is a dual responsibility insofar as the child is concerned with both the parent and the child participating in a plan designed for the benefit of the child. It is the belief of the court that if the parent has a financial obligation he will be more keenly aware of his responsibility and be more cooperative in carrying through the plan. Whenever possible the court directs that the parents assist the court in financing the plan, thereby impressing upon the parent in a material way his or her responsibility to the court and to the child. The child's needs are the first consideration and whenever it is possible for the parent to enter into the plan by assisting in financing such a plan a happier adjustment follows. Occasionally, it becomes necessary to enforce an order that the court makes but the plan is still believed to be desirable.

Bringing to the Washington County Juvenile Court the general principle that the law has its obligation to humanity as well as to the state, Judge Carson is blazing a trail into the none-too-well explored wilderness for the handling and treatment of juvenile responsibility.

Holding that it is both humanitarian and less costly to reclaim or rehabilitate a child into a normal and decent citizenship than to clear the record by sending the child to an institution, Judge Carson is following in the footsteps of the immortal Judge Ben Lindsay in an effort to get at the cause rather than to the end of the record.

The progress that has been made under the direction of Judge Carson has attracted the attention of many counties. Others are becoming more aware of the need of a more adequate juvenile program. It is most gratifying to know that in this matter of a re-awakening of adults the children are profiting to the end that they are given a chance to adjust themselves either in a natural or a created situation without the ogre of an institution hanging over their heads.

The Washington County jurist is not yet satisfied with his procedure and is constantly infiltrating new ideas as they develop. It is the general opinion of those who have become aware of his system that he is establishing a closer relationship between the court, the child and the parent that augurs well for the maladjusted children who may come before the juvenile courts of the future.

* * * * *

Pennsylvanians at New York Congress of Correction

Headed by Paul Tibbetts, president of the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole, members of the organization were in attendance at the Congress of Correction beginning November 14 in the Pennsylvania Hotel, Philadelphia.

Among the state parole officials present were F. H. Reiber, member of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, and Dr. G. I. Giardini, superintendent. Dr. E. Preston Sharp, Department of Welfare, and S. M. R. O'Hara, Secretary of Welfare, were in attendance as well as Warden Stanley Ashe of the Western Penitentiary and other distinguished figures in the penal and correctional fields.

Two Films For Juvenile and Racial Study Groups

By Dr. J. O. Reinemann

The Regional Institute for Probation and Parole Officers in Reading which was held under the joint auspices of the Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Association and the State Department of Welfare on November 26, 1945, was fittingly opened by the showing of a film, entitled "Children of the City." This motion picture made a deep impression on the audience and was referred to by several speakers during the course of the meetings.

This 16 mm., 3-reel, 30-minute sound film was produced for the Scottish Education Department and the Scottish Home Office and released in the United States by the British Information Services. Its sub-title calls it "A Study of Child Delinquency in Scotland."

It is pointed out that though the actual scene is Scotland, the picture may be taken as representative of British practice generally, as governed by a recent act known in Britain as "The Children's Charter."

The occasion chosen for the central episode is crime committed by three boys whose escapade begins as mere mischief and ends in theft. The whole story is unfolded -- the background of the boys' lives, the occurrence of the incident, the arrest, the hearing before the Juvenile Court, and the treatment given to each. The youngest boy is given sympathetic guidance on the advice of the psychiatrists at a Child Guidance Clinic. The second boy is kept under surveillance for a time by a probation officer. The oldest boy, whose unfortunate social environment has already hardened him somewhat in an anti-social attitude, is sent to a training school where he can learn a trade, and where discipline relaxes gradually into freedom as the boy adjusts himself to an honest social life. Finally, the causes of juvenile delinquency are traced to their social origins in overcrowding and slums, which the film does not shrink from exposing. The remedies advocated -- the provision of play-centers and youth clubs, and the organization of all such activities as give a healthy outlet to childhood's energies -- end the film on a constructive note.

The film "Children of the City" may be loaned for a nominal charge of one dollar from the British Consulate General, 12 South 12th St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

- - - - -

Also on a constructive note ends another film dealing with a certain dangerous and un-American aspect of juvenile delinquency, namely religious and racial hatred and prejudice. Currently shown in our motion-picture theatres is an 11-minute short, called "The House I Live In."

In it, Frank Sinatra encounters a bunch of ten youngsters who are about to beat up a kid because of his religion. He talks to them in an informal, unpreachy fashion on the subject of tolerance and seals the lecture effectively with his singing of the ballad, "The House I Live In." Incidentally, all proceeds from this short film will go to agencies devoted to the care of underprivileged children and juvenile delinquents.

Stern Analyzes Detention Home Problem In Pennsylvania;
Jails House Children, Many Communities Without Proper Plans

By Leon Thomas Stern
Secretary, Penal Affairs Committee
Public Charities Association

Editor's Note: At the Congress of Correction in New York in November, Leon Thomas Stern, Pennsylvania's most assiduous student of probation and parole methods and crime prevention, arose to speak, at the invitation of the meeting chairman, upon the all important subject of juvenile detention homes.

There was none in that large meeting who failed to get much worthwhile information and inspiration from the remarks of Mr. Stern and we asked him to prepare a study on detention homes in Pennsylvania, which we present in this issue.

* * * * *

Brutal treatment of children and young boys in some of our nation's county jails has profoundly disturbed the country and sharply focused the attention of a horror-struck and indignant public on the way in which we have sometimes dealt with children awaiting court action.

Pennsylvania has its share of poor jails, many of which do not meet approved standards laid down by "practical jail men." But children are seldom held in Pennsylvania jails in association with adults and criminals. However, the problem of the care or detention of children awaiting court hearing has been the constant subject of study and inquiry by juvenile court judges, probation officers, and citizen groups. In this postwar era when juvenile delinquency again threatens to rise, it may be helpful to analyze our program and facilities for the care of juveniles awaiting disposition by judges.

How an individual charged with an offense is controlled or cared for while he awaits the judge's action is closely bound up with the court processes themselves as they are laid down by law. There is a sharp distinction made in Pennsylvania between the type of custodial care prior to trial prescribed under the criminal court system and the pre-hearing care which obtains under the auspices of our juvenile courts. When an adult accused of crime is formally committed for trial in criminal court, it usually means "jail or bail" for him. He furnishes a bond or goes to prison. The kind of offense which a child or youth commits and his age determine whether he shall be dealt with by the juvenile court or the criminal court and therefore whether he shall be held in custody in an adult prison or in a juvenile house of detention or private home.

Few Juveniles In Criminal Courts

In Pennsylvania comparatively few juveniles appear in criminal court for trial. Under our law, however, any boy or girl charged with murder must go to criminal court and a youth between the ages of sixteen and eighteen if charged with a serious crime may be sent by the Juvenile Court judge to criminal court for trial. Juveniles sent to criminal court are held in jail unless they or their parents are permitted or able to furnish bail. However, children under sixteen may not be held in jail.

As soon as a delinquent juvenile is brought to Juvenile Court whether on arrest, petition of a relative, friend, concerned person, or agency, or on "information" made out before a justice of the peace or alderman, he immediately becomes the responsibility of the children's court, its judges, and probation staff. As Judge Fuller of Luzerne County put it a generation ago, the Juvenile Court has the authority of a parent in respect to delinquent children. "Like a father, its judge needs no formal process to bring the child before him." He also has full authority to designate the care given a child awaiting hearing and disposition in his court.

Juvenile Court Law

The Juvenile Court Law of 1939 provides that: "Pending the final disposition of any case, the child shall be subject to the order of the court, and may be permitted by the court to remain in the control of his or her parents or the person having him or her in charge, or in charge of a probation officer, or the child may be placed by the court in the custody of any association or society having for one of its objects the care of dependent, delinquent or neglected children, or may be ordered by the court to be kept and maintained in some place provided by the county for such purposes. No child under sixteen years of age, pending or after hearing before the juvenile court, shall be confined in any county jail, workhouse, police station, lockup, or other institution in which adults are confined.

"The county commissioners in each county shall provide, furnish, and heat a separate room or rooms, or a suitable building, to be used exclusively for the confinement of all children under sixteen years of age who may be in custody awaiting hearing in the juvenile court of the county, and shall provide for the maintenance and care of such children while in custody."

A juvenile may remain at home in care of a probation officer or may be sent to a regular detention home or house, or to a special boarding home, subsidized by the county, or he may be placed in a foster home during this period. Among the juveniles who need such care are those who have no homes or have homes with very poor environment, those who are not likely to appear at hearing, and children who are difficult and require observation.

The period pending court hearing is an important one in the child or youth's life and experience with the juvenile court. It is usually a new and tremendous event for him. It may mold his whole attitude towards the court, his family, the community, or society. It is very important then for him to receive the kind of control and care which he needs and which would help him most.

Children Need Study

In modern juvenile court practice, this time before court hearing is used for social investigation of the child or youth's home, family life, social and economic environment; school and work records; his use of leisure time, etc. Physical and mental examinations, and personality and clinical studies are usually made during this time. If the delinquent child is held in a detention place with facilities for medical and psychiatric studies, the study is made there. If he is in a private or foster home or such facilities are lacking in the detention place, the probation officer takes the child or youth to the clinic for study or examination. Such preliminary investigation and study should be made part of the supervision and oversight given children and youths awaiting hearing.

The investigation and supervision of these children pending hearing and their admission and discharge from foster homes, temporary boarding homes, or a place of detention should be completely under the control of the juvenile court, its judges, and probation officers.

Suggested Facilities and Service for Children Awaiting Court Hearing

Pre-hearing facilities should be provided by the county commissioners for juveniles and youths held for juvenile court and who cannot stay at home. It is recommended that the county commissioners either establish a small house of detention under public auspices, or follow the subsidized boarding home plan, or establish a foster home and child placing agency which has a suitably developed foster home service and skilled staff. The kind of facilities established or plan used must depend upon the needs of the court and the local resources. If the first plan is to be used, the county commissioners could either erect a suitable building or rent (or purchase) an old house of sufficient capacity and adapt it for the purpose of detention. If the county subsidizes a special boarding home, it should provide heat, light, rent and other overhead; maintenance should be paid for each child during his stay in detention. The expense to the county is thus reduced to a minimum since only children who actually require care are paid by the county. The subsidized boarding home works very well when it is properly conducted and administered.

Elaborate Home Not Answer

One of our Pennsylvania counties erected a rather elaborate detention house for the care of children pending hearing. However, they found so large an institution was not necessary; children were dumped indiscriminately into it simply because it was there. As a result, expenses for upkeep mounted. The county commissioners then changed their plan and provided a subsidized boarding home. A youth or child awaiting hearing in juvenile court and needing care is taken home.

In a detention home or a subsidized boarding home it is important that the care given juveniles should approximate as nearly as possible that of a normal home, with play space within the house and a recreation yard. There should be good food, bathing facilities and schooling in the home or at a nearby school. A doctor should be available for medical care and for study of the child's physical and mental problems. Children who remain in detention for more than a few days should receive religious instruction according to the parent's belief. The probation officer should regularly visit the home and see the children in care. The stay there should only be for the time required for the court to make disposition of the case. Although the court should control all admissions and releases, the county commissioners should control the fiscal policy.

By some authorities placing children in foster homes pending court hearing is considered a preferable method of care. Its proponents consider it a more natural way of dealing with children since it more nearly approximates the care a child would have in a good family home of his own. It is also easier for the child to make the transition from his home to a foster home than to a congregate detention home. Only a few children are kept in each foster home; therefore, there is no undesirable mingling with other children.

National Recognition Gained

Such a foster home program in operation in Buffalo for a number of years has gained national recognition because of its success. At times the Buffalo court has used ten or more foster homes, making it possible to place children in homes which meet their individual needs. However, such a program must be carefully worked out as has been the case in Buffalo. It requires the cooperation of a children's agency which has developed child placing on a casework basis. Otherwise, it is likely to fail. Many years ago the Luzerne County court of our state tried the foster home plan without success, largely due to the absence of a home-finding service in the county. The Juvenile Court of York County, which at present uses a subsidized boarding home for children awaiting hearing, is working towards a foster home plan.

With the raising of the juvenile court age to eighteen, new problems of detention and pre-court care have arisen as far as older youths are concerned. In this older group are found some of the most difficult problems.

The law provides that "If a juvenile is sixteen years of age or over and less than eighteen years of age, he or she may be confined in any place of detention maintained and provided for the custody of adults awaiting trial." This does not mean that a youth between sixteen and eighteen must await hearing in jail, although the judge may send him there. The holding of youngsters in jail should be determined by the juvenile court and its probation officers and not by the police authorities. Only youths who have familiarity with the ways of delinquency, and who, therefore, may be said to have acquired patterns of undesirable behavior, should be kept in a jail or lockup.

There are indeed youths in this age group who should not be sent to jail to await hearing in juvenile court, even though they cannot be kept with their families during this period. Provision should be made for them other than in a jail or lockup, where they are likely to associate with older and experienced offenders.

Juvenile court judges have construed the act liberally. Sometimes such a youth is kept in a juvenile place of detention because it would be against his best interests to keep him in jail pending hearing. The law needs amendment or restatement because it now specifically restricts the use of the juvenile detention home to children under sixteen.

Should A Detention Home Be Used For Short-Term Punishment?

There is a feeling on the part of some juvenile court judges and probation officers that it may sometimes be helpful to put delinquent children in the detention home for a brief stay instead of placing them on probation. It is pointed out that occasionally a youngster needs to come up against an authority greater than that exercised by his parents or the probation officer, but does not necessarily require institutional training for a period of time. For such a lad it is suggested that holding him in the detention house with the accompanying deprivation of freedom would serve as a sharp lesson and clarify for him the fact that there are certain limits of behavior to which he must conform. This conception rests primarily on the constructive use of authority and may have value if used cautiously and with conscious direction.

Not For Punishment

Generally speaking, a place of detention should not be used for short term punishment, or as a place of commitment or incarceration of children. Otherwise, the house of detention may soon turn into a juvenile jail.

It has been pointed out by authorities that in the United States there is a serious lack of facilities for the care of children awaiting hearing. There are neither detention homes, subsidized boarding homes, nor foster homes for the use of the juvenile court in many sections of the country as pointed out by Dr. George Lott in 1942. It has stirred national agencies to action.

Recently it was reported to the National Probation Association that institutions used for detention are often jail-like in atmosphere, are lacking in suitable equipment for child care and are without the trained and understanding personnel required for this responsible and challenging task. Although we have places of detention in Pennsylvania with high standards of care, we also have similar problems in some of our counties. While we do not place boys and girls in association with adult offenders in jail, we have detention places in the shadow of the jail. We keep children in segregated sections of it — in the sheriff's or warden's quarters, in separate rooms in the women's section of the prison, in special quarters in police stations and lockups. While such arrangements are found in a few counties where juvenile intake is considerable, they are for the most part in areas where children needing care are small in number and where social and financial resources are limited. The difficulty of obtaining suitable care in such circumstances is most understandable and should have our sympathetic interest. Judges and probation officers and socially-minded citizens have been very much alive to conditions and are constantly working for their amelioration and elimination.

Leaders in child welfare and work with delinquent children agree with judges and probation officers that detention care in a congregate type of house is often essential and approve highly of the modern institutions set up for that purpose in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. It might be more appropriate to call it the Juvenile Court Reception Home or Center. This would carry less stigma and better convey its broader purpose. But for some delinquents they see another solution in which more extensive use is made of subsidized boarding homes and foster homes for such temporary care as may be required.

Pennsylvania has under its excellent juvenile court law authority to set up in all counties all or any of these types of service. It is a challenge to us to see that our courts get the kind of facilities and service they require, operated under the highest standards and with the best personnel obtainable.

THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF JUVENILE COURT JUDGES

By Nochem S. Winnet

Judge of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia
Secretary-Treasurer of the Council

Purpose of Council of Juvenile Court Judges: To act as clearing house for the discussion of problems of Judges doing juvenile court work with the aim in view of facilitating and improving the work of the courts, including Probation and Parole methods.

Fifty years ago an organization such as The Pennsylvania Council of Juvenile Court Judges would have been unthinkable. Judges traditionally were all wise and all knowing! It would have been difficult to get any considerable number of them together for the specific purpose of improving their work.

And yet, this is just what happened in 1941. A group of judges were called together by that pioneer in juvenile court work in this country, the Honorable Charles L. Brown, President Judge of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia.

There were about fifteen judges present. They decided to attempt an informal organization. There was not too much optimism about the number of members it could attract. But in five years that number has grown to fifty-nine, which includes representatives of the courts of almost every county in the Commonwealth.

The purpose of the Council, as stated at the first meeting, was "to act as a clearing house for the discussion of problems of judges doing juvenile court work with the aim in view of facilitating and improving the work of the courts, including probation and parole methods." The hope was also expressed that the Council might "supply a needed voice in legislation affecting the youth of the Commonwealth."

Has the Council been of benefit to its members? I would say, "yes". From the very beginning the members have searched for an understanding of the principles which lie at the base of the work of the Juvenile Courts and have also made a conscious effort to understand the techniques and the instrumentalities of the court, such as social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists.

We did discover that in certain quarters the revolutionary nature of this court was not realized. Instead of a traditional contentious criminal tribunal, here is one that is administrative. It affords no opportunity for forensic skill and technical pleas. It concerns itself, it is true, with criminal acts, but they are treated as symptomatic of some underlying personality disturbance, and the whole purpose of the proceeding is to seek a method to rid the offender of this personality defect. By no means does this technique eliminate strict disciplinary measures against an offender.

The meeting of the judges, with an exchange of experiences, has been a source of education to every member. It must be borne in mind that in juvenile court work there are very few reported cases to which an individual judge may turn

for guidance. There is no reported body of experience, such as is contained in reports of the usual civil and criminal cases, to which a judge might turn. It becomes all the more important, therefore, that there be the facilities for the exchange of information, experiences and decisions. The Council has afforded this opportunity.

The Council has attempted to hold meetings at the various institutions to which juvenile commitments might be made, in order that the judges might become acquainted with these institutions. This has been difficult during the war years, but visits were made to institutions such as White Hill, Morganza, Pennhurst, Sleighton Farms, and Glen Mills. And with the easing of transportation it is hoped that more institutions will be visited in the future. There is great value, not only to the judges, but to the institutions in this practice.

During the past legislative sessions there was an opportunity by the members to oppose legislation which the Council felt was inimical to the best interest of juveniles. For example, the members of the Council protested a reduction in the juvenile court age. The Executive Committee of the Council met with a committee of the Police Chiefs' Association of Pennsylvania, one of the proponents of such legislation. Misunderstandings and existing confusions were cleared up. The ground work was laid for further cooperation between the Chiefs of Police and the Courts-cooperation which can only result in better juvenile court work.

Perhaps I could best indicate the work of the Council and its interests by the agenda of the last annual meeting held in Harrisburg, a meeting which was honored by an informal visit from Governor Martin.

1. Correspondence with Glen Mills was considered in which that institution stated the reasons why it was not prepared to receive boys of low mentality. The judges were asked to confine commitments to boys who had an I.Q. of 70 or over.
2. The recommendation from the Joint State Government Commission to the Council to consider whether any strengthening is necessary of the law as it relates to adults contributing to the delinquency of a minor, particularly as to the advisability of compulsory schools for parents of delinquent minors. After full discussion there was unanimous agreement that there was no necessity for any change in the present law.
3. There was consideration of the experiences of the judges with certification of juveniles to Quarter Sessions Court for trial where the offense was a serious one and when there has been a denial of its commission by the juvenile.
4. A resolution was adopted opposing the acquisition by the Commonwealth, through the Department of Welfare, of Kis-Lyn as an institution for delinquent boys. It was felt that the purchase would not materially increase the facilities which are so necessary at this time.
5. A resolution was adopted urging that the money allocated for the purchase of Kis-Lyn be used for acquisition of an institution for delinquent girls of all types, which is urgently needed at this time.
6. A Committee was appointed to consider the type of classification or reception centre needed for juveniles committed by the Commonwealth.

7. There was a discussion of new institutions being planned by the Commonwealth for delinquents and a resolution was adopted expressing the sense of the meeting that if at all possible a cottage type of institution be erected.

8. A resolution was adopted urging the continuation of the In-Service Training Program for correctional workers.

9. A discussion took place on the necessity of changes in the adoption laws. The discussion was deferred to a later meeting, after a further study could be made of the subject.

The meeting in December concluded with a dinner at the Penn Harris Hotel. The following officers and executive committee were elected:

Hon. Charles L. Brown	Chairman
" Robert E. Woodside	Vice Chairman
" Nochem S. Winnet	Secretary-Treasurer
" Hiram H. Keller	Executive Committee
" Gustav L. Schramm	" "
" W. Clarence Sheely	" "
" George W. Griffith	" "
" Roy I. Carson	" "

One thing further might be said about the Council, and this without apology. Its work has not been exclusively educational. The sociability of the meetings, the opportunity of the judges throughout the State to know each other, has been one of the Council's greatest values.

Toward A Better World

By Dr. J. O. Reinemann
Municipal Court, Philadelphia

Peace has brought along and will continue to bring to the fore many problems which will require the brain power and the warmth of heart of men of good will everywhere. The special postwar problems which we, as correctional workers, face in our particular field of endeavor were described in the preceding issue of this magazine. But since we do not want to be isolationists in our professional work, we must -- on a wider plane -- be interested in the social improvement of peoples all over the globe.

Therefore, to give realistic expression to our deep gratitude for the victorious end of the second World War, to cherish and honor the loving memory of those who have given their lives in this struggle, nothing seems to be more fitting than to print a few sections from the document which has brought hope to millions of people and which, we trust, will safeguard peace and security for all mankind. From the Charter of the United Nations, as signed in San Francisco on June 26, 1945, by the representatives of 50 nations, and made effective after ratification by the United States of America and many other countries, we quote those parts which deal particularly with the social advancement of all peoples:

PREAMBLE

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, and for these ends to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Article 1

The purposes of the United Nations are:

.....

(3) To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 13

The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of:

.....

(b) promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 55

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

- (a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic, and social progress and development;
- (b) Solutions of international, economic, social, health and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and
- (c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all

Article 62

- (1) The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations to the General Assembly, to the Members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.
- (2) It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.
- (3) It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.
- (4) It may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence.

Article 71

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence.....

Readers of the Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Quarterly will be interested to know that the Pennsylvania Committee on Penal Affairs of the Public Charities Association sent the following letter to Hon. Edward Stettinius, the Chief Delegate of the USA in the United Nations Organization. This letter will also serve as basis for a similar communication to Mr. Stettinius by the Congress of Correction according to action taken at the Annual Meeting in New York in November, 1945.

"May we respectfully urge that the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations Organization undertake as part of its program the setting up of standards of care and supervision of persons in prison or detained and segregated from society.

"It will be recalled that the League of Nations drew up with the assistance of the International Penal and Penitentiaries Commission a set of Standard Minimum Rules for the treatment of prisoners and also concerned itself with such questions as the traffic in drugs and that in children and women (the so-called 'white slave traffic').

"We trust that the United Nations Organization will set up a penal service and implement it in some way in order that it be even more effective than the service established by the League of Nations. Although this service created a

climate of public opinion, we urge that a more permanent and fuller program be set up by the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations Organization. We deem such action essential both in peace and wartime. The setting up of concentration camps and the extraordinarily barbarous and inhuman treatment given prisoners of war and civil populations which had been characteristic of Axis countries points out the great need for such action.

"We hope most sincerely that the United Nations Organization will take cognizance of these related problems in the penal field as a matter of international organization.

"It seems to us that this is an area for the promotion of international goodwill, both in the treatment of those who have rebelled against society in the commission of ordinary crimes against the property and the person, and who are incarcerated as political or enemy prisoners.

"We respectfully submit our suggestions for your consideration with the thought that you may draw it to the attention of the proper officials or persons for study and action by the Social and Economic Council."

(Quotations of United Nations Charter
from: Publication 2353 -- Conference
Series 74 -- of the Department of State)

From The Institutes

Little Items From The Three Regional Meetings Which May Interest You

Dr. E. Preston Sharp's film on juvenile procedure in Scotland, entitled "Children of the City," proved one of the highlights of the three institutes. Included in the picture was the new British juvenile procedure which, everyone agreed, resembled American juvenile programs.

* * * * *

Two portions of the film brought comment from the audience. One was the narrator's solemn announcement that the three British lads, who were the subjects of the picture, had to face punishment for their offenses, which included the burglary of a shop.

Judge Schaeffer of Berks County, chairman of that portion of the Reading program which included the showing of the film, pointed out that in Pennsylvania there can be no thought of punishment and that it is not the province of the juvenile court to impose punishment.

More than one of the viewers of the picture passed judgment upon the "approved school" and the lack of happy smiles upon the faces of the students as the narrator told about the school life and they went about their school routine.

* * * * *

Weather was unusual for two of the three institutes. Williamsport, on October 29, was a bright and lovely town for the assembled correctional workers as was expected.

But in Uniontown, on November 19, came the unusual weather of fog and rain and cold. The chamber of commerce forced us to use the word "unusual." And Reading's meeting was the occasion for Old Sol to beam down upon the Berkshire Hotel and the happy gathering in a way that is not customary for November 26 in that part of the state.

* * * * *

Of all the talks heard during the three institutes, the most controversial was that of Florence Fisher Parry, Pittsburgh newspaper woman, who exploded an atomic bomb in the faces of the assembled probation workers by deploring the GI vocational training program. Mrs. Parry especially assailed the idea of training returned soldiers in the field of photography.

* * * * *

Possessing a droll wit which enabled him to challenge certain procedure of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole with increasing effectiveness during the debates in the three institutes, Ira Mills was a star performer. Mr. Mills, vocational instructor of the Eastern Penitentiary, Philadelphia, appeared in all three institute cities.

* * * * *

Congratulations are in order for Mrs. Leola F. Curtin of Williamsport and her fine committee for the hospitality and instructive institute in that city, and to Mr. H. L. Sparks and his committee for the program in Uniontown. President Tibbetts and his staff and committee made the Reading meeting an outstanding one.

* * * * *

National Probation Association, in its publication, "Newslet," observed that the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole was holding frequent meetings and recited the three institute dates and the cities visited.

* * * * *

Among the Philadelphia delegation was Dr. J. O. Reinemann, Municipal Court, who shares the editorial prerogatives of The Quarterly and who has contributed so much to this publication.

* * * * *

Accommodations at the Lycoming Hotel, Williamsport, were superb for out-of-towners and as usual the room of President Tibbetts was the unofficial headquarters. Many mighty questions of public and private interest were discussed during the "off-the-record" hours.

* * * * *

In Uniontown two-day rooms were given by the White Swan hotel for institute attenders from other communities. In the interlude between the afternoon program and the evening dinner for Major Hill, most of those in attendance were in these rooms engaging experiences and meeting members from other sections.

* * * * *

Lt. William Hanna, in charge of the Butler troop of the State Police, and Lieutenant Augustine, head of the Washington, Pa. troop, were in attendance at the Uniontown gathering and guests at the dinner for Major Hill.

* * * * *

New Books and Booklets

Hester B. Crutcher, FOSTER HOME CARE FOR MENTAL PATIENTS; The Commonwealth Fund, New York 1944, 199 pp.

Foster family care -- the care under hospital supervision of mentally ill individuals or mental defectives in families other than their own -- is, in America, a recent development in the continuing search for better methods. Many patients do not adapt well to the regimentation in large institutions, but flourish in the warmth of family life. Some who have responded well to intensive hospital treatment can be placed in homes to speed recovery and rehabilitation. Foster family care is not mere custody, but therapeutic care under the supervision of the mental hospital. The author of this book, Miss Crutcher, has had rich experience over many years in the home care of mental patients in New York; she discusses the meaning and objectives of family care, its development in this and foreign countries, some of the results achieved, financial as well as therapeutic advantages, various procedures including selection and supervision, and forms for keeping necessary records. Case histories illustrate procedures and results.

Alice C. Weitz, YOUTH AND YOUR COMMUNITY; Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 108, Public Affairs Committee, Inc., New York 1945, 31 pp.

This readable pamphlet starts out with a discussion of the wartime increase in juvenile delinquency; its thesis is that "whether or not the child develops into a useful citizen depends upon many complex factors that are chiefly to be found, not in himself, but in society." The author then outlines a broad program for youth and with youth, giving practical examples of community efforts in various parts of this country. She describes what organizations such as the YMCA, the YWCA, the American Association of University Women, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and other groups have done on the national and local level. A "Ten Point Program for Developing a Community Recreation Program for Young People" which may be adapted to local needs is given. Pictorial aids and graphs enliven and underscore the text. Probation officers in juvenile courts who want to promote community action for youngsters will receive valuable information from this publication. (Price: \$0.10; address: 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20.)

Leon Thomas Stern, SIXTY-FIVE AND OVER; Social Service Committee, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1515 Cherry St., Philadelphia, Pa.; 1945, 35 pp.

This study was written particularly for members of the Society of Friends, but in its general description it is of great value for everybody in the field of welfare, education, recreation, etc., who realizes that care of the aged is a new and challenging task which has heretofore been neglected. The extension of the average life-span in this country has changed and will even more change the age structure of our population, with the older people growing in numbers. Mr. Stern, known to our readers as Secretary of the Penal Affairs Committee of Penna. (Public Charities Association) describes in this booklet "Care and Services for the Aged Today," such as Old Age Assistance, Old Age and Survivors' Insurance, The County Home, Private Homes, etc.; other chapter headings are: "When Older People Are Ill," "Importance of Old Age Today," "A Changing World," and "Community Service."

PENNSYLVANIA PROBATION AND PAROLE QUARTERLY

Official Publication
of the Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole

The Pennsylvania Probation and Parole Quarterly is published and distributed jointly by The Pennsylvania Association on Probation and Parole and the Institute of Local Government of The Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania. Members are urged to send articles and news notes for the Quarterly to Mr. William Gladden, Juvenile Probation Officer, Court House, Uniontown, Pennsylvania.

QUARTERLY COMMITTEE

Mr. William Gladden, Chairman, Uniontown; Mr. Jacob W. Zang, Glen Mills; Mr. Frederick Johnson, Harrisburg; Miss D. P. Warrington, West Chester; Mr. Harry J. Cancelmi, Pittsburgh; Mr. Guy B. Wheeler, Philadelphia; Miss Lucy Davis, Scranton; Mr. W. J. Rhoades, Beaver; Miss E. Jean Martin, Stroudsburg; Miss Mary G. Davis, Hollidaysburg.

The Pennsylvania State College
Institute of Local Government
H. F. Alderfer, Executive Secretary

THE PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION ON PROBATION AND PAROLE

Officers and Committees for the Year 1946

President: Mr. Paul W. Tibbetts, Chief Probation and Parole Officer, Reading, Pa.

First Vice-President: Mrs. Leola F. Curtin, Parole Officer, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Muncy, Pa.

Second Vice-President: Mr. Howard L. Sparks, Chief Probation Officer, Uniontown, Pa.

Secretary-Treasurer: Mr. Lee C. Beier, U. S. Probation Officer, Philadelphia, Pa.

Executive Committee

Miss Hilda Jolly, Laurelton (one year); Mrs. Lena B. Watson, Probation Officer, Juvenile Court, West Chester (three years); Dr. I. W. Swinehart (three years).

Special Advisory Committee

Dr. E. Preston Sharp, chairman, Department of Welfare, Harrisburg; Dr. G. I. Giardini, Superintendent Parole Supervision, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Harrisburg; Dr. J. O. Reinemann, Municipal Court, Philadelphia.

Membership Committee

Mr. Edgar R. Barnes, chairman, Probation Officer, Lancaster; Miss Hazel G. Kenny, Juvenile Probation Department, Beaver; Mr. J. M. Des Rochers, District Supervisor, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Allentown; Miss Grace Woodrow, Parole Agent, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Pittsburgh; Miss Erma Evans, Woman Parole and Probation Officer, Waynesburg.

Nominating Committee

Miss Mary H. Rinsland, chairman, Juvenile Probation Officer, Scranton; Miss Helen Easterwood, Probation Officer, Meadville; Mr. George J. Weaver, Sr., Agent, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Harrisburg.

Publicity Committee

Mr. Paul J. Gernert, chairman, Berks Co. Prison, Reading; Mr. H. C. Spessard, Parole Officer, Glen Mills, Philadelphia; Miss Deborah P. Werrington, Chief Probation Officer, Chester Juvenile Court, West Chester; Mr. Charles W. Toebe, Philadelphia; Miss Virginia E. Davis, Sr. Statistician, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Harrisburg.

Legislative Committee

Mr. Edgar R. Barnes, chairman, Probation Officer, Lancaster; Mr. Henry Lenz, Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Court, York; Mr. Claud E. Thomas, Chief Probation Officer, Scranton; Mr. Walter Rome, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, Pittsburgh; Mr. George J. Weaver, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Harrisburg.