



1939

A Study of the Dispositons of the Cases of 882 Children Admitted to the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home in the Months of March, June, and September, 1937

Francis M. McCarthy
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Recommended Citation

McCarthy, Francis M., "A Study of the Dispositons of the Cases of 882 Children Admitted to the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home in the Months of March, June, and September, 1937" (1939). *Master's Theses*. 648.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/648

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1939 Francis M. McCarthy

A STUDY OF THE DISPOSITIONS OF THE CASES OF 882 CHILDREN
ADMITTED TO THE COOK COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME
IN THE MONTHS OF MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937.

BY

FRANCIS M. MCCARTHY

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in
Loyola University

1939

VITA

Born in Chicago, Illinois, August 2, 1912.
Graduated from the Roosevelt High School,
Chicago, Illinois, June 1930. Ph.B. from
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin,
June, 1934.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.	
Chapter I. A Brief History of the Juvenile Detention Home, of Cook County, Illinois.....	1
Chapter II. Analysis of the cases of 201 children admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home in March, June, and September, 1937, who were released without judicial determination.....	13
Chapter III. Analysis of the cases of 669 children admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home in March, June, and September, 1937 who were released with judicial determination.....	25
Chapter IV. Summary and Conclusions.....	39
Appendix. Selected Case Studies.....	46
Bibliography 	53

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

PAGE

I.	Disposition at Time of Release of the Cases of 201 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released Without Judicial Determination.....	14
II.	Disposition at Time of Release and Length of Detention of the Cases of 201 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released Without Judicial Determination.....	16
III.	Reason for Referral, Sex and Age of the Cases of 201 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released Without Judicial Determination.....	18
IV.	Reason for Referral and Length of Detention of the Cases of 201 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released Without Judicial Determination.....	20
V.	Length of Detention, Sex and Number of Previous Admissions to the Juvenile Detention Home of the Cases of 201 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released Without Judicial Determination.....	22
VI.	Source of Referral, Sex and Previous Court Record of the Cases of 201 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released Without Judicial Determination.....	24
VII.	Disposition at Time of Release of the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	26

TABLEPAGE

VIII.	Disposition at Time of Release and Length of Detention of the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	28
IX.	Reason for Referral, Sex and Age of the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	30
X.	Reason for Referral and Length of Detention of the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	32
XI.	Length of Detention, Sex and Number of Previous Admissions to the Juvenile Detention Home of the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	33
XII.	Source of Referral, Sex and Previous Court Record of the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	35
XIII.	Court Order in the Cases of 669 Children Admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home During March, June and September, 1937, Who Were Released With Judicial Determination.....	37

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF STUDY.

It is the purpose of this thesis to study the cases of children who are not released from the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home proper, after the Intake Department and the referring agency have decided that the child cannot be released without endangering the welfare of the child or community, or that no substitute plan for detention can be provided. The study includes the cases of the children admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home in March, June, and September, 1937. The cases of these children are studied to determine the number of children who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home with or without judicial determination by the Juvenile Court of Cook County and to analyze the disposition of the cases of these children at the time of their release from the Juvenile Detention Home.

SELECTION OF CASES.

The months of March, June, and September were selected because these months take into account several factors which would have a bearing on this study. First, these months cover the various periods of the school year, the middle of a school semester, the vacation period and the preparation for entrance following the vacation period. These factors are important from the viewpoint of truancy, opportunity for delinquent acts, and the attitude of the children. The second reason for selecting

these months was based on the fact that they take into consideration the vacation periods of the Juvenile Court Probation Officers and tend to equalize the Juvenile Court Calendar.

NUMBER OF CASES.

In March, June, and September, 1937, 862 children passed through the Intake Department and were admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home proper. In this study the identifying information such as case number, birthdate, sex, date of entrance to the Juvenile Detention Home, source of referral, reason for referral, and the number of times the child was previously admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home and Intake Department, was secured from the records of the Intake Department. Information regarding the date and method of release from the Juvenile Detention Home of the 862 cases was obtained from the files of the Juvenile Home. The records of the Juvenile Court were checked in order to ascertain whether or not the child appeared in court and whether or not the court had decided upon the child's release from the Juvenile Detention Home. In 12 of the 862 cases it was impossible to secure sufficient information regarding court appearances. These children may or may not have appeared before the courts. Some of these cases were those of children who had entered the Juvenile Detention Home under aliases and apparently their cases had not been crossed indexed.

METHODOLOGY.

When the above information of 870 cases was secured from the files of the Intake Department, Juvenile Detention Home and Juvenile Court, it was tabulated. Two hundred and one children were released from the Juvenile Detention Home without a formal appearance before the Juvenile

Court on the charge for which they had been referred to the Juvenile Home. However, as will be shown in a later chapter, many of these children had appeared in the Juvenile Court at a time prior to their referral to the Juvenile Home. Six hundred and sixty nine children appeared in the Juvenile Court either on the day of their referral to the Juvenile Detention Home or on a date within a reasonable length of time of their referral to the Juvenile Detention Home which would justify considering the charge for which they were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home as being the same as the charge for which they appeared in the Juvenile Court.

Tables showing the disposition from the Juvenile Detention Home; the age, sex and charges; charge and length of detention; length of detention and disposition from the Juvenile Home; sex, length of detention and number of previous detentions and source of referral, sex and whether or not the case had a court hearing prior to the date of admission to the Juvenile Home, were made of the 201 cases of children who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home without judicial determination and of the 669 cases of children who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home with judicial determination.

A number of cases were reviewed in detail and a selection of eight (8) case histories was made indicating some of the typical dispositions and the procedure of release for these selected cases. These case histories are contained in the Appendix.

CHAPTER I

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COOK COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME.

The Juvenile Court of Cook County was created by an act of the Illinois State Legislature in April, 1899. The Statute was entitled, "An Act to regulate the treatment and control of dependent, neglected and delinquent children," and it provided that, "No court or magistrate shall commit a child under (12) years of age to a jail or police station but if such child is unable to give bail it may be committed to the care of the sheriff, police officer or probation officer, who shall keep such a child in some suitable place provided by the city or county outside the inclosure of any jail or police station."⁽¹⁾

Early detention of children in Cook County, after the passage of the Act of 1899, is best described by Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, President of the Juvenile Court Committee of the Chicago Women's Club, in 1900:

I have said that we had no place to confine children pending their hearing. They could not be kept in the jails or the police stations so we took an old house on West Adams Street which had been fitted up as a Detention Home and run by the Illinois Industrial Association. They could not support it so it was taken over by the Juvenile Court Committee. The girls and the dependent children were kept in the house, which was a very simple homelike place. Behind it was a large, two story building which had been used as a stable. We fitted this up, using the first floor as a kitchen and sitting room and the second floor as sleeping quarters. It contained fifty beds for the boys who were confined

(1) Illinois Revised Statutes, 1951, Chapter 23, Sec. 205.

there. We maintained this house for seven years in cooperation with the city and county, from twenty-six to twenty-eight hundred children passing through it yearly. The city allowed us eleven cents a day for food for each child and the county gave us certain things, among others the services of the county physician, transportation to and from the court, etc. (1)

From 1899 until 1907, Cook County and the City of Chicago had merely supplemented the funds of the Illinois Industrial Association and the Juvenile Court Committee, which organization in 1909 became known as the Juvenile Protective Association. The actual care and detention of the children had been the function of the above mentioned private organizations.

The Illinois State Legislature enacted a statute on May 13, 1907 which provided, "That the Board of County Commissioners, or the Board of Supervisors, as the case may be, in any county in the State, shall have the power and authority to locate, purchase, erect, lease or otherwise provide and establish, and also to support and maintain a Detention Home for the temporary care and custody of dependent, delinquent or truant children." (2)

The Board of Commissioners of Cook County had erected a new building at 771 Gilpin Place, Chicago. This building was operated by persons appointed by the Board of Commissioners and was known as the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home. This Home was maintained entirely by public funds and from this time on Cook County assumed complete responsibility for the administration of the Juvenile Court law and the detention of Juvenile Court wards.

(1) Bowen, Mrs. Joseph T., "The Early Days of the Juvenile Court"
The Child, the Clinic and the Court. p. 300. 1925.

(2) Illinois Revised Statutes, 1931, Chapter 23, Sec. 304.

The Act of 1907 had provided that, "Such detention home shall be so arranged, furnished and conducted, that, as near as practicable for their safe custody, the inmates thereof shall be cared for as in a family home and public school." (1) The institution on Gilpin Place attempted to provide the family home type of care but it encountered much difficulty keeping the children in safe custody. Teachers from the Board of Education were provided at the institution to care for the child's education. In 1909, Dr. William Healy established the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute at the Juvenile Detention Home. The purpose of the Institute was to study the child prior to his appearance in Court and in the case of recidivists to assist the Court in determining what plan should be pursued for the child's future welfare. (2)

As a result of the demands of several public spirited organizations which were interested in developing better child care facilities in Cook County, particularly the facilities for the detention of children, the Honorable Peter Reinburg, then President of the Board of Commissioners, appointed a special committee in 1917, to study conditions affecting the detention of children at the Juvenile Detention Home. The findings of this committee resulted in many recommendations of which the following appear to have the most important bearing upon this study:

That instead of bringing children to the Juvenile Home, the uniformed police should secure the names and addresses for the police probation officers to investigate

(1) Illinois Revised Statutes, 1931, Chapter 23, Sec. 305.

(2) Report of the Superintendent of the Juvenile Detention Home. Charity Service Reports, 1913, p. 234.

before the children are brought to the Home.

That children sentenced to a corrective institution be taken there directly from the court-- (1)

In December, 1917, the Cook County Civil Service Commission on Investigation of the Juvenile Detention Home recommended that, "A man should be appointed to regulate admittance to the Detention Home and to release to their homes all children possible to be so released, to classify the delinquents admitted, to direct for immediate investigation those children so needful, to give an immediate investigation to every child apprehended and to recommend to the Court an immediate disposition of all cases possible." (2)

As early as 1917 the problems of overcrowding and long time detention had been presented in the picture of the Juvenile Detention Home. The Reinburg Committee and the Civil Service Commission on investigation of the Juvenile Detention Home made many recommendations which they believed would be for the betterment of juvenile detention facilities in Cook County. The history of the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home illustrates that the conditions that were so widely criticized in 1917 are still existent in 1937. Although a new Juvenile Detention building was constructed in 1923, the changes which were recommended by the Reinburg Committee and Civil Service Commission of 1917 were not for the most part physical but were concerned primarily with the complex questions as to what children were to

(1) The Juvenile Detention Home, Report of the Investigation of the Special Committee appointed by the Honorable Peter Reinburg, Feb. 20, 1917. p. 7.

(2) Report of the Cook County Civil Service Commission on Investigation of the Juvenile Detention Home, submitted December 1917, pp. 4-5

be detained, for what period of time and what treatment was to be provided for children who were detained.

The physical limitations of the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home and Juvenile Court were alleviated when on November 2, 1923, the buildings housing the present Juvenile Court and Juvenile Detention Home were opened for use. These buildings were constructed at a cost of \$1,000,000 but as early as 1927 persons expressed a criticism that has been so frequently expressed in recent years:

It may be noted in passing that the Detention Home stands directly behind the large Juvenile Court building and that they together occupy one of the noisiest and busiest corners in the City of Chicago- a location which adds much to the seriousness of administrative problems. (1)

This quotation describes the present Juvenile Detention Home as to its appearance from the outside. Mrs. Joseph T. Bowen, former President of the Chicago Juvenile Court Committee, on the occasion of the joint commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first Juvenile Court and of the fifteenth anniversary of the first Psychopathic Hospital, in 1925, described the new Juvenile Detention Home as follows:

The present Detention Home has every appearance of being a jail, with its barred windows and locked doors. Its attendants do not understand the psychology of childhood; they know very little about dependents and delinquents; their idea seems to be that every child in the institution is there for punishment and that they are all potential criminals. The whole atmosphere of the place is wrong. The children have fewer comforts than do criminals confined in the county jail. They are not kept sufficiently occupied and have very little fresh air. (2)

(1) Report of the Superintendent of the Juvenile Detention Home.
Charity Service Reports, 1927, p. 440.

(2) Bowen, Mrs. Joseph T., "The Early Days of the Juvenile Court."
The Child, the Clinic and the Court. p. 309. 1925

There was an alarming increase in the number of children admitted to the new Juvenile Detention Home in 1924. The cause of the surprising increase in population, which was 45.9 per cent (1) during the first year of operation over the preceding year, during which the children were kept in the detention home on Gilpin Place, can probably be explained in part by a statement made by Phyllis Osborn in 1930, "With such a convenient and available depository at hand, it is not surprising that so large a number of children are having the experience of detention." (2)

In 1924 a fact finding study was conducted by Savilla Millis which was based on the factors associated with the admission and release of children referred to the Juvenile Detention Home. This study was published in 1927, under the title of, "The Juvenile Detention Home in Relation to Juvenile Court Policy." The findings that will have a most significant bearing on this study are the following:

There were, furthermore, a considerable number of instances where the child was detained five or six weeks and even longer.

The agency of release tended to be the same as the agency of admission.

The responsibility for bringing this large group of children into the detention home was found to be chiefly with the police. (3)

-
- (1) Annual Message of Clayton F. Smith, President, Board of Commissioners of Cook County, Illinois - 1935, p. 54.
 - (2) Warner, Florence M., Juvenile Detention in the United States. p. 176
 - (3) Millis, Savilla. The Juvenile Detention Home in Relation to Juvenile Court Policy. pp. 88-90

The Savilla Millis study did not make any recommendations but presented several important facts. However, as in the cases of the Reinburg Committee and The Civil Service Commission on the Investigation of the Juvenile Detention Home, little, if any, action was taken to remedy what these three studies showed to be very grave problems existing in the Juvenile Detention Home.

Phyllis Osborn, in a study of the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home entitled, "A Cross-sectional Study of Population in the Chicago Detention Home" made the following statements regarding the effect of detention on a child:

Association with children of all degrees of delinquency exposes the child to a contagion as real as that of infectious disease and stimulates delinquent interests if nothing more.

If an easily available detention home were not ready and waiting many children might escape the experience of being detained behind bars as well as the dangers of a stay in an institution of this sort. (1)

Despite the various studies which were made during the history of the Juvenile Detention Home with few, if any, recommendations acted upon, the Board of Commissioners of Cook County appointed a group of five social workers to constitute a "Child Care Study Staff", in November, 1935. The purpose of the study "was to ascertain whether or not the present facilities for child care are adequate and to determine the responsibility of the Board of Commissioners for making future plans and recommending appropriations for the care of the children of Cook County

(1) Warner, Florence M., Juvenile Detention in the United States.
pp. 152-157.

who are the legal responsibilities of the Board of Commissioners of Cook County." (1) A part of the work of this staff consisted in a study of the Juvenile Detention Home. The Child Care Study Staff included the following statement in their preliminary report to best explain the purpose of detention:

The primary purpose of detention is safekeeping pending disposition of the case, and both for the child's sake and for the sake of the community which bears the expense of detention, it should be limited to those children for whom it is absolutely necessary. Such children include: Runaways and homeless children; those whose home conditions are so bad that immediate removal is necessary; those beyond control of their parents; those whose parents cannot be relied upon to produce them in court; those who have committed offenses so serious that their releases pending the disposition of their cases would endanger public safety; those who must be held as witnesses. Detention for the purpose of observation is thought by some to be justified in cases in which detention for the purpose of safe-keeping would not be warranted. (2)

The Board of Commissioners of Cook County acting upon one of the recommendations of the Child Care Study Staff, established an Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home on January 13, 1937. The Intake Department began functioning on February 11, 1937. "It's underlying operating principle is to provide a substitute for detention for those children received in the Intake Department for whom a satisfactory plan

(1) Preliminary Report of the Child Care Study Conducted Under The Auspices of the Board of Commissioners of Cook County, November 30, 1936, p. 1.

(2) Lenroot and Lundberg. Juvenile Courts at Work. United States Children's Bureau Publication, No. 141, pp. 67-68.

can be made without endangering either the welfare of the child or the community." (1) With the establishment of the Intake Department some authority was vested in the Juvenile Detention Home by which admission could be controlled.

"During the first 12 calendar months of operation, namely, from February 11, 1937, to January 31, 1938, there were 5,926 children received by the Intake Department, of this number 2,304 children or approximately 39 percent, were released from the department while the remaining 3,622 children, or approximately 61 percent, were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home proper." (2) In March 1937, 252 children were referred to the Juvenile Home, in June 1937, 291 children were referred to the Juvenile Home and in September 1937, 341 children were referred to the Juvenile Home. This study will attempt to ascertain the method of disposition used for releasing these children from the Juvenile Home and some of the problems that caused long time detention.

Arthur J. Audy, Director of the Intake Department, in writing of the 3622 children referred to the Juvenile Home says, "Generally speaking, about 1,200 of these children, in the opinion of the Intake Department, were not in need of custodial care in the Juvenile Detention Home." Due to the policy and procedure of the Juvenile Court, however, no alternative existed. These 1,200 children referred to the Detention Home proper can be divided into three general classifications:

(1) Annual Message of Clayton F. Smith, President, Board of Commissioners of Cook County, Illinois, 1937. p. 82.

(2) Ibid p. 82.

The first group consisted of dependent children for whom the Juvenile Court staff believed that foster care, either in a home or institution, was advisable but when the pre-placement examination was given these children by the court physician it was found that their physical condition prevented such a placement----

A second group consisted of those children, most of whom were delinquent but a few dependent, who were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home for an examination by the Institute for Juvenile Research----

The third and last group of the 1,200 children was composed of those delinquent children referred to the Detention Home for one of the following reasons: Because the juvenile police officer or Juvenile Court officer believed that the child's testimony as a witness in a criminal case might be altered if the child were not kept in custody and thus free of any contact with a person or persons who might attempt to influence the child's testimony; because the juvenile police officer or Juvenile Court officer believed that a few days or a week in the Detention Home might make the child realize that he cannot violate the law and go unpunished and also that this detention might act as a deterrent if the child is tempted at some future date to violate the law; or because the child refused to cooperate with the juvenile police officer or Juvenile Court officer in the matter of reciting the details of the delinquent act or in the identification of accomplices. (1)

At the present time the Board of Commissioners of Cook County have made a forward step in the field of juvenile detention by establishing the Intake Department. The Juvenile Court Act empowers the Judge of the Juvenile Court to refer children to the Juvenile Detention Home. The Judge has delegated this authority to the officers of his court, who are probation officers and juvenile police officers. In general the plans

(1) Andy, Arthur J., "Is There a Place for the Juvenile Detention Home." The Catholic Charities Review, Vol. XXII, pp. 310-311.

and investigations of the cases of children are the responsibility of the Juvenile Court Probation officers and juvenile police officers. Because of these circumstances the authority of the Intake Department is limited and it is necessary for this Department to function only with the cooperation of the Juvenile Court officers and juvenile police officers. In brief, the decision for admission of a child to the Juvenile Detention Home does not rest with the Intake Department. The worker of the Intake Department makes an investigation of the child's previous contacts with other agencies in an effort to secure a complete understanding of the child's situation, reviews the case with the responsible person in the agency of referral and presents the results of this investigation, plus the information obtained in an interview with the child. On the basis of this information the disposition of the case is decided upon by the person making the referral or a designated court officer and the Intake Department worker. In this manner a child is either referred to his own home, a substitute plan such as a temporary foster home or institutional placement is made, or the child is referred to the Juvenile Detention Home.

The procedure for the release of children from the Juvenile Detention Home differs from the procedure of the Intake Department. The authority to release children from the Juvenile Detention Home is assumed by the Judge of the Juvenile Court, the Assistant Judge, the Chief Probation Officer of the Court, the Deputy Chief Probation Officer, the respective heads of the Delinquent Boys Division, the Investigation Division, and Family Supervision Division of the Juvenile Court and in some cases the police officer in charge of the juvenile police officers of the Juvenile

Court. Children may be released from the Detention Home by the proper released blank signed by one of the persons authorized to sign such blanks.

Dependent children are not permitted to remain in the Detention Home pending their appearance in court, or during the investigation of the case unless for any reason the Temporary Care Division of the Court or institutions providing temporary care cannot accept them.

In the case of children who are taken into custody on serious charges such as sex offenses, delinquencies in which a gun was involved, serious robberies and "all boys who are appearing in court for the second time are referred to the Institute for Juvenile Research for examination during which time they are held in detention." (1) Cases of this type are not released until they appear before the Judge of the Juvenile Court.

(1) Annual Message of Clayton F. Smith, President, Board of Commissioners of Cook County, Illinois, 1935. p. 68.

CHAPTER IIRELEASES WITHOUT JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

In order to make an analysis of the 201 cases of children released from the Cook County Juvenile Detention Home during the months of March, June and September, 1937, several factors must be considered. One of the most important factors to be noted is that 64 of these children had been known to the Juvenile Court prior to their admission to the Juvenile Detention Home. The cases of children, who were placed in the Juvenile Detention Home on the date of their court hearing, and who were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home by the Judge of the Juvenile Court, are not included in this number. The 201 children were considered as being released from the Juvenile Detention Home without having judicial determination of their cases because either they did not appear in the Juvenile Court within four weeks after the date of their release from the Juvenile Detention Home, or no record of a court hearing was found.

The various dispositions listed for these cases were obtained from the records of the Juvenile Detention Home. Referring to types of dispositions listed, Dr. Barry, Superintendent of the Juvenile Detention Home, stated, in effect, that in some cases different clerks record different types of dispositions. For example, in the case of a child being released to a private child placing agency, one worker might record the child as being released to the child placing agency, whereas another worker would record the disposition as "placed by the court".

TABLE I

DISPOSITION AT TIME OF RELEASE OF THE CASES OF 201 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITHOUT JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

DISPOSITION AT RELEASE	NUMBER	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION
Released to go home.	129	64.18
Placed by Court.	18	7.97
Returned to institutions for feeble-minded.	13	6.47
County Jail.	7	3.48
Returned to home out of town.	7	3.48
Police.	6	2.99
Chicago Parental School.	5	2.48
Criminal Court or States Attorney's Office.	5	2.48
St. Charles School for Boys or Geneva School for Girls.	3	1.49
Other	10*	4.98
	201	100.00

*Other:

Psychopathic Hospital - 1.
 Mary A Club - 1.
 Convalescent home - 1.
 Cook County Hospital - 1.
 Chicago orphanage - 1.
 St. Joseph's Orphanage - 3.
 Catholic Home Bureau - 1.
 C.Y.O. Hotel - 1.

DISPOSITION AT TIME OF RELEASE.

With reference to Table I, it should be noted that "Placed by Court" refers in some cases to children who were former wards of the Juvenile Court and were placed in foster homes without a subsequent court hearing. This disposition also includes cases of children released to private child placing agencies. The children listed as being released to "Police", were, for the most part, those children who were found to be over the juvenile age and were returned to the police districts from which they had come. Some cases were released for transfer to the "County Jail". Apparently these were children who were placed under the jurisdiction of the Criminal Court and in most cases were over the Juvenile Court age limit. Some children were released from the Juvenile Detention Home to appear as defendants or witnesses in the "Criminal Court". In some cases they were detained at the County Jail by order of the Judge of the Criminal Court and in others they were permitted to go home after their services as a witness were no longer required. Although the Superintendent of the Juvenile Detention Home does not look with approval upon the practice, some children who were taken from the Juvenile Detention Home for an interview at the "States Attorney's office", were released at that office without returning to the Juvenile Detention Home.

It may be noted in Table I that of the 201 children released without judicial determination there were 129 children who were "released to go home".

DISPOSITION AND LENGTH OF DETENTION.

Table II shows the disposition and the length of detention

TABLE II

DISPOSITION AT TIME OF RELEASE AND LENGTH OF DETENTION OF THE CASES OF 201 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITHOUT JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

DISPOSITION AT RELEASE.	LENGTH OF DETENTION (DAYS)																Total
	Under 3	3- 7	8- 12	13- 17	18- 22	23- 27	28- 32	33- 37	38- 42	43- 47	48- 52	53- 57	58- 62	63- 67	68- 72	Over 72	
Released to go home.	23	43	21	14	4	3	5	6		3	1		3	1		2	129
Placed by Court.		6	1	1	2				1	1	3					1	16
Returned to institutions for feeble-minded.	5	3	1	1			1		1					1			13
County Jail.		1	3	1	1	1											7
Returned to home out of town.		2	1	1			1						1			1	7
Police	3	1	2														6
Chicago Parental School.	1	1			3												5
Criminal Court or States Attorney's Office.	4	1															5
St. Charles School for Boys and Genova School for Girls.		3															3
Other	2	4		3							1						10*
	38	65	29	21	10	4	7	6	2	4	5	0	4	2	0	4**	201

* Psychopathic Hospital - 1; Mary A Club - 1; Convalescent home - 1; Cook County Hospital - 1; Chicago Orphanage - 1; St. Joseph's Orphanage - 3; Catholic Home Bureau - 1; C.Y.O. Hotel - 1.

** 4 cases detained over 72 days averaged 107.3 days.

of these 201 cases. It is interesting to note that 66 children "released to go home" were detained less than eight days. Of the 201 children released without judicial determination of their cases, over 50 percent or 103 children were released from the Juvenile Detention Home in less than eight days. Forty-eight or over 23 percent of these 201 children were detained for periods of time ranging from 18 days to 181 days. The 13 children returned to "institutions for the feebleminded" were detained from one to 65 days.

REASON FOR REFERRAL, SEX AND AGE.

Classification was made on the basis of reason for referral, sex and age, in Table III. The age of the children was determined by their nearest birthday. This explains why 60 boys are listed as being at the age of 16 and 17 years, although the Juvenile Court Act defines the age limit for boys as under the age of 17 years.

The "reason for referral", in some instances, constituted only the suspected offense, yet sufficient evidence was present at the time to warrant the detention of the child. Although many of the reasons for referral are self-explanatory, it seems necessary to clarify some of them. Sex offense - includes all immoral sex acts, except those acts in which the child was presumed to be an innocent victim. Children who ran away were classified according to the place from which they ran away. The children listed under Runaway from home (outside of city) are those children who resided outside of the boundaries of Cook County. Pending transfer to institution - implies detention awaiting an institutional placement which was arranged by the Juvenile Court or a private agency. At request of Probation Officer - applies to children who were brought to the Intake De-

TABLE III

REASON FOR REFERRAL, SEX AND AGE OF THE CASES OF 201 CHILDREN
ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND
SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITHOUT JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

REASON FOR REFERRAL.	MALES							FEMALES							Total		
	A																
	G E	Under 10	10- 11	12- 13	14- 15	16- 17	18- 19	Total	Under 10	10- 11	12- 13	14- 15	16- 17	18- 19		Total	
Runaway from home (local).			4	5	6	4		19				1	3	6	2	12	31
Sex offense.						2	3	5				2	4	11	1	18	23
Larceny.					3	5	10	18							2	2	20
Burglary.			2	1	3	12		18								-	18
Incorrigibility.			1	3	3	3		10				1	3	3		7	17
Witness			2	2		1		5	1			2	4	4	1	12	17
Runaway from home (out of city).					1	3	7	11					1	4		5	16
Larceny of auto.						1	7	8						1		1	9
Runaway from institution.					3	1	2	6						1		1	7
Dependency only.		2						2	4							4	6
Pending transfer to institution.				1	2			3						2		2	5
Robbery.						1	3	4								-	4
Shoplifting.						2	1	3					1			1	4
Riding in stolen car.						3		3								-	3
Malicious mischief.						1	2	3								-	3
Feeble-mindedness.			1			1		2								-	2
At request of Probation Officer.						1	1	2								-	2
Returned after temporary release.			1			1		2								-	2
Tampering with mail.								-					1			1	1
Purse snatching.						1		1								-	1
Truancy.								-					1			1	1
Drunkenness.						1		1								-	1
Other.				1			4	5						3		3	8
		2	11	20	38	60	-	131	5	-	6	18	37	4		70	201

partment of the Juvenile Detention Home by Probation Officers of the Juvenile Court.

Ninety-eight or 74.8 percent of the total 131 boys were 14 years of age and over, while 59 or 84.3 percent of the total 70 girls were 14 years of age and over.

Of the 23 reasons for referral listed, the first seven reasons include a total of 142 children, or over 70 percent of the 201 children. It can be noted that 18 girls, as compared to 6 boys, were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home because of sex offenses. On the other hand only 4 girls were involved in delinquencies which pertained to theft, as compared to 54 boys.

REASON FOR REFERRAL AND LENGTH OF DETENTION.

The reason for referral and length of detention is shown in Table IV. It may be observed that of the 142 children included in the first seven reasons for referral, 74 children, or 52.1 percent, were released from the Juvenile Detention Home within 7 days. This percentage compares favorably with the percentage (50.4%) of the total number of children released within 7 days.

LENGTH OF DETENTION, SEX AND NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS.

The length of detention, sex, and the number of previous admissions, is shown in Table V.

When a child was admitted to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home and released from that Department without being admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home proper, (for the purpose of this study), he was considered as having been previously admitted to the

TABLE IV

REASON FOR REFERRAL AND LENGTH OF DETENTION OF THE CASES OF 201 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITHOUT JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

REASON FOR REFERRAL.	LENGTH OF DETENTION (DAYS).																TOTAL	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION
	Under 3	3- 7	8- 12	13- 17	18- 22	23- 27	28- 32	33- 37	38- 42	43- 47	48- 52	53- 57	58- 62	63- 67	68- 72	Over 72		
Runaway from home (local).	7	10	3	2	3	2			1	1	1		1				31	15.42
Sex offense.	3	6	3	4			1	1		1	3					1	23	11.44
Larceny.	6	6	2	2	1		1	1					1				20	9.95
Burglary.	5	6	3	1	1	1				1							18	8.96
Incorrigibility.	1	6	1	2	2			2		1			1			1	17	8.46
Witness.	2	5	2	1	2		3	1								1	17	8.46
Runaway from home (out of city).	3	8	3	1	1												16	7.96
Larceny of auto.	1	6	1	1													9	4.48
Runaway from institution.	1	1	4										1				7	3.48
Dependency only.	1	1		3										1			6	2.99
Pending transfer to institution.	1	3		1													5	2.49
Robbery.		2	1	1													4	1.99
Shoplifting.	2		1	1													4	1.99
Riding in stolen car.	2	1															3	1.49
Malicious mischief.		1	2														3	1.49
Feeble-mindedness.			1				1										2	.99
At request of Probation Officer.	1	1															2	.99
Returned after temporary release.									1							1	2	.99
Tampering with mail.						1											1	.50
Purse snatching.	1																1	.50
Truancy.														1			1	.50
Drunkenness.	1																1	.50
Other.		2	2	1			1	1			1						8	3.98
	38	65	29	21	10	4	7	6	2	4	5	0	4	2	0	4*	201	100.00

*4 cases detained over 72 days averaged 107.3 days.

Juvenile Detention Home.

Eighty-three boys and 60 girls were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home for the first time. Forty-eight boys, or over 56 percent of the 131 boys were recidivists, while only 10 girls, or 14.3 percent of the 70 girls were recidivists.

Of the 83 boys who were in the Juvenile Detention Home for the first time, 52, or 62.6 percent, were released within 7 days. Of the 60 girls who were in the Juvenile Detention Home for the first time, 19, or 31.6 percent, were released within 7 days.

Only 5 of the 48 boys who were recidivists were detained over 33 days, while 10 of the boys admitted for the first time were detained over 33 days. Two of the 10 girls who were recidivists were detained over 33 days, while 10 of the girls admitted for the first time were detained over 33 days.

SOURCE OF REFERRAL, SEX AND PREVIOUS COURT RECORD.

The source of referral is classified according to sex, and previous Court record in Table VI. It is interesting to note that 160 or 79.6 percent of the 201 children were referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home by the Chicago Police Department.

As has been stated in the preceding pages of this study, 64 children of this group had been known to the Juvenile Court prior to their referral to the Juvenile Detention Home during the period covered by this study. However, they were considered as being released from the Juvenile Detention Home without judicial determination of their cases because they did not appear before the Juvenile Court between the date of

TABLE V

LENGTH OF DETENTION, SEX AND NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME OF THE CASES OF 201 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITHOUT JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

LENGTH OF DETENTION.	<u>MALES</u>									<u>FEMALES</u>									TOTAL
	NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS									NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	OVER 6	TOTAL	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	OVER 6	TOTAL	
Under 3	17	7	2	1					27	9		2						11	38
3-7	35	7	5	1		1		2	51	10	2		2					14	65
8-12	9	3	3			2		1	18	10		1						11	29
13-17	9				1				10	10	1							11	21
18-22	1	2			1			1	5	5								5	10
23-27	2		1						3	1								1	4
28-32				1			1		2	5								5	7
33-37	4								4	2								2	6
38-42		2							2									-	2
43-47	3								3	1								1	4
48-52	1	1							2	2		1						3	5
53-57									-									-	-
58-62	1								1	2	1							3	4
63-67									-	2								2	2
68-72									-									-	-
Over 72	1	1						1	3	1								1	4*
	83	23	11	3	2	3	1	5	131	60	4	4	2	-	-	-	-	70	201

*Average length of detention of the 4 cases detained over 72 days was 107.3 days.

their admission to the Juvenile Detention Home and the date of their release from the institution, or, within a reasonable length of time after the date of their release from the institution.

Table VI shows that a larger proportion of girls had previous Court Hearings than had been recidivists as shown by Table V.

The child referred by the Cook County Hospital had been placed in that institution from the Juvenile Detention Home and was returned to the Juvenile Detention Home when he no longer needed hospitalisation.

TABLE VI

SOURCE OF REFERRAL, SEX AND PREVIOUS COURT RECORD OF THE CASES
OF 201 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING
MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITHOUT JU-
DICIAL DETERMINATION.

SOURCE OF REFERRAL	MALES			FEMALES			TOTAL
	NO PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	TOTAL	NO PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	TOTAL	
Police (local).	65	41	106	46	8	54	160
Juvenile Court:							
Investigation Division.	3	1	4	4	1	5	9
Family Supervision Division.	2	2	4	1	2	3	7
Child Placing Division.	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
Police (suburbs).	4	2	6	2	-	2	8
Traveller's Aid.	6	-	6	-	-	-	6
Parent.	-	2	2	-	2	2	4
Cook County Hospital.	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
Other.*	2	-	2	1	1	2	4
	83	48	131	54	16	70	201

*States Attorney - 2.
State Parole Office - 1.
U. S. Marshall - 1.

CHAPTER III

RELEASES WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

The tables presented in this chapter were constructed from information contained in the cases of 669 children admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home in March, June and September, 1937, who were released from that institution with judicial determination of their cases. For the purposes of this study, the children were considered as having had judicial determination of their cases if they appeared in the Juvenile Court, either on the day of their referral to the Juvenile Detention Home, or, on a date within a reasonable length of time of their referral to the Juvenile Detention Home, which would justify the charge for which they were referred to the Juvenile Detention home as being the same as the charge for which they appeared in the Juvenile Court.

The various dispositions listed for these cases also were secured from the records of the Juvenile Detention Home, as were the dispositions listed in the tables in Chapter II.

DISPOSITION AT TIME OF RELEASE.

The disposition at the time of release for the cases of 669 children who were released with judicial determination of their cases is shown in Table VII. "Released at Court" refers to the children who were released on the day of their Court Hearings and by order of the Court. "Released to go home" includes cases of children who were released to their parents or to Probation Officers, for the purpose of returning to their own

TABLE VII

DISPOSITION AT TIME OF RELEASE OF THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

DISPOSITION AT RELEASE	NUMBER	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION
Released at Court.	267	39.91
Released to go home.	121	18.09
Chicago Parental School.	69	10.31
St. Charles School for Boys.	69	8.82
Placed by Court.	49	7.32
Released to institutions for feebleminded.	19	2.84
Cook County Hospital.	18*	2.69
House of Good Shepherd.	16	2.39
Geneva School for Girls.	16	2.39
Child placing agencies.	8	1.20
Chicago Home for Girls.	7	1.05
Institutions for dependent children.	5**	.75
Police.	4	.60
Other.	11***	1.64
	669	100.00

* Psychopathic Hospital - 2.

** St. Hedwig's Orphanage - 2; St. Mary's M.T.S. - 2; Glenwood M.T.S. - 1.

*** County Jail - 4; Mary A Club - 3; Out of town - 2; Escape - 1; Gibault School - 1.

homes. In some cases children are released from the Juvenile Detention Home to go home awaiting a Court Hearing. "Placed by the Court" refers to the cases of children who were released for placement in foster homes. This may have been for temporary or long time care in foster homes. As was already explained in Chapter II, "Placed by Court" refers in some cases to children accepted by private child placing agencies. Cases listed as released to "Polios" are usually cases of children who are over age for the Juvenile Court. Cases listed as being released to the Cook County Hospital are those of children, who while detained in the Juvenile Detention Home, were in need of hospital care and were sent to the Cook County Hospital. Those children were eventually returned to the Juvenile Detention Home to await their Court Hearings. The other dispositions listed in Table VII are self-explanatory.

It may be noted in Table VII that of the 669 children released with judicial determination, 388 or 58 percent, of the children were "released at Court" or "released to go home".

DISPOSITION AND LENGTH OF DETENTION.

The disposition and length of detention are shown in Table VIII. Eighty-one children or 20.9 percent of the 388 children "released at Court" or "released to go home" were detained less than 8 days. The total number of children released in less than 8 days was 106 or 15.7 percent of the 669 children who were released with judicial determination. Three hundred and seventy-two or 55.6 percent of these 669 children were detained for a period of time ranging from 18 days to 224 days.

It is interesting to note that 12 of the 19 children

TABLE VIII

DISPOSITION AT TIME OF RELEASE AND LENGTH OF DETENTION OF
THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETEN-
TION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE
RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION

DISPOSITION AT RELEASE.	LENGTH OF DETENTION (DAYS).																	Total
	Under 3	3-7	8-12	13-17	18-22	23-27	28-32	33-37	38-42	43-47	48-52	53-57	58-62	63-67	68-72	Over 72		
Released by Court.	4	12	37	60	45	28	21	16	14	10	7	3	1	2	3	4	267	
Released to go home.	33	32	15	12	7	1	3	5	2		1	7	1	1	1		121	
Chicago Parental School.	2	3	5	17	13	9	6	6	4	2	1					1	69	
St. Charles School for Boys.		2		13	11	7	5	3	8	3		4	1	1		1	59	
Placed by Court.		3	6	5	5	7	5	4	2	2		4			1	5	49	
Released to institutions for feebleminded.			1	1				2			2	1				12	19	
Cook County Hospital.	1	1	3	2	1	3	4	1	1						1		18**	
House of Good Shepherd.			2		4	3	2	2	2							1	16	
Geneva School for Girls.	2	2	1		1	3	1	3		1	1			1			16	
Child placing agencies.		1	3				1		1				1		1		8	
Chicago Home for Girls.		1	2		2	1					1						7	
Institutions for dependent children.			2	2					1								5***	
Police.		1	1		2												4	
Other.		2	2	3		1		1	2								11****	
	42	63	80	112	91	63	48	43	37	18	13	19	4	5	7	24*	669	

* 24 cases detained over 72 days averaged 108.4 days.

** Psychopathic Hospital - 2.

*** St. Hedwig's Orphanage - 2; St. Mary's M.T.S. - 2; Glenwood M.T.S. - 1.

**** County Jail - 4; Mary A Club - 3; Out of town - 2; Escape - 1; Gibault - 1.

"released to institutions for the feebleminded" were detained over 72 days. One boy of this group was detained 224 days.

REASON FOR REFERRAL, SEX AND AGE.

Table IX shows the reason for referral, sex, and age of the 669 children who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home with judicial determination of their cases. "Institute for Juvenile Research Examination", as a reason for referral, applies to those children who were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home either by the Judge of the Juvenile Court, or the head of one of the Divisions of the Court, for an examination by the Institute for Juvenile Research while the child was detained. However, this figure of 51 children listed as being referred for "Institute for Juvenile Research Examination" does not illustrate the number of examinations performed by Institute for Juvenile Research at the Juvenile Detention Home. Many children were admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home for some other reason and a subsequent request for an examination was made after the child had been detained in the institution. "Returned after temporary release" applies to children who had been in the Juvenile Detention Home but who for some reason were taken from the institution and kept out over 24 hours.

It will be observed that 381 or 76.2 percent of the total 513 boys were 14 years of age and over, while 67.6 percent of the girls were 14 years of age and over.

Of the 22 reasons for referral listed, the first seven reasons include a total of 469 children or over 70 percent of the 669 children released with judicial determination. Thirty-two boys were

TABLE IX

REASON FOR REFERRAL, SEX AND AGE OF THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN
 ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND
 SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

REASON FOR REFERRAL.	MALES														Total	
	A															
	Under 10	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	Total	Under 10	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	Total		
Burglary.	4	2	17	45	43		111				1				1	112
Larceny.		7	26	37	30		100			1	1	4			6	106
Sex offense.			5	15	12		32			3	8	10	4		25	57
Runaway from home (local).	1	2	6	6	4		19		1	2	14	19	1		37	56
Institute for Juvenile Research Examination.	1	1	10	17	8		37				9	5			14	51
Larceny of auto.			5	16	25		46								-	46
Incorrigibility.	1		3	10	5		19			3	11	8			22	41
Dependency only.	7	2	1	1			11	4	1	1	2	1	1		10	21
Returned after temporary release.	3	1	1	1	5		11			2	3	3			8	19
Shoplifting.		1	7	6	3		17								-	17
Riding in stolen car.				5	12		17								-	17
Robbery.			1	8	3		12								-	12
Purse snatching.			3	1	6		10				1	1			2	12
Malicious mischief.			2	6	3		11								-	11
Pending transfer to institution.	1	1		4	2		8				1	2			3	11
At request of Probation Officer.		1		4	2		7					3			3	10
Witness.				1			1			1	3	3	1		8	9
Runaway from institution.		2	3	1	1		7				1	1			2	9
Truancy.				3	1		4				1	3			4	8
Tampering with mail.					1		1					1			1	2
Runaway.							-				1				1	1
Other.			4	15	13		32				5	4			9	41
	18	20	94	202	179	-	513	4	2	13	62	68	7		156	669

admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home because of sex offenses as compared to 25 girls who were admitted for the same reason. It is also interesting to note that only 7 girls were involved in delinquencies which pertained to theft, as compared to 303 boys.

REASON FOR REFERRAL AND LENGTH OF DETENTION.

The reason for referral and length of detention is shown in Table X. Of the 218 children referred to the Juvenile Detention Home because of "larceny" and "burglary", 163 or 75 percent of the children were detained 13 or more days. Forty-four or 86.3 percent of the 51 children referred to the Juvenile Detention Home for examination by the Institute for Juvenile Research were detained 13 or more days.

LENGTH OF DETENTION, SEX AND NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS.

The length of detention, sex, and number of previous admissions to the Juvenile Detention Home for the 669 children released from the institution with judicial determination of their cases, is shown in Table XI.

It is interesting to note that 272, or 50.3 percent, of the 513 boys were recidivists and exactly 50 percent of the girls were recidivists. In other words, the percentage of recidivists for this group of 669 children is practically the same for boys and girls.

Of the 241 boys who were in the Juvenile Detention Home for the first time only 94 boys, or 39 percent, were released in less than 13 days. Of the 272 boys who were recidivists, 20.6 percent were released in less than 13 days. Whereas, of the 78 girls who were in the Juvenile Detention Home for the first time, 18 girls, or 23 percent, were detained

TABLE I

REASON FOR REFERRAL AND LENGTH OF DETENTION OF THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN
ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER,
1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

REASON FOR REFERRAL.	LENGTH OF DETENTION (DAYS)																TOTAL	PER CENT DISTRIBU- TION
	Under 3	3- 7	8- 12	13- 17	18- 22	23- 27	28- 32	33- 37	38- 42	43- 47	48- 52	53- 57	58- 62	63- 67	68- 72	Over 72		
Burglary.	14	9	5	16	19	7	11	7	12	1	4	6		1			112	16.73
Larceny	8	6	13	8	19	12	11	6	6	4	3		1		2	7	106	15.84
Sex offense.	1	5	10	6	8	6	4	3	2	3	1	2	3	1		2	57	8.52
Runaway from home (local).	1	1	5	8	8	9	3	3	3	2	1	2		2	3	5	56	8.37
Institute for Juvenile Research Examination.	1	2	4	18	8	5	3	2	4			1			1	2	51	7.62
Larceny of auto.	4	6	7	11	6	3	3	1		3						2	46	6.87
Incorrigibility.	2	1	4	11	5	5	1	5	2			3		1			41	6.13
Dependency only.		2	6	6			3					4					21	3.14
Returned after temporary release.	1	4	4	2	3			1	1		2					1	19	2.84
Shoplifting.		1	3	2	2	1	3	2	2							1	17	2.54
Riding in stolen car.	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	1		2							17	2.54
Robbery.	1	4	2	1		3		1									12	1.79
Purse snatching.	1	1	4	2		1			1						1	1	12	1.79
Pending transfer to institution.	3	3						1			1	1				2	11	1.65
Malicious mischief.		1	2	4	2			1			1						11	1.65
At request of Probation Officer.		3	1	1	2	2			1								10	1.50
Witness.		3			1		1	2		1						1	9	1.35
Runaway from institution.		1	1	1	2	1		2	1								9	1.35
Truancy.	4	1	2				1										8	1.20
Tampering with mail.					1			1									2	.30
Runaway.					1												1	.15
Other.		8	5	12	1	5	2	4	2	2							41	6.13
	42	63	80	112	91	63	48	43	37	18	13	19	4	5	7	24*	669	100.00

*Average length of detention of 24 cases detained over 72 days was 108.4 days.

TABLE XI

LENGTH OF DETENTION, SEX AND NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS TO THE
JUVENILE DETENTION HOME OF THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO
THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937
WHO WERE RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

LENGTH OF DETENTION.	<u>MALES</u>									<u>FEMALES</u>										TOTAL
	NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS									NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADMISSIONS										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	OVER 6	TOTAL	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	OVER 6	TOTAL		
Under 3	28	4	3	1					36	4			2					6	42	
3-7	25	11	6	4	3	2		1	52	6	3	2						11	63	
8-12	41	18	1		1	1			62	8	5	2	1		1	1		18	80	
13-17	48	20	12	5		5		3	93	9	6	2	2					19	112	
18-22	38	13	6	5	2	2	1	2	67	16	5	2		1				24	91	
23-27	11	14	9	4	1	4	1	2	46	5	6	3				1	2	17	63	
28-32	14	8	8	3	4	1	1		39	6	3							9	48	
33-37	10	4	4	6	2		1	1	28	7	3	2			1		2	15	43	
38-42	13	3	4	3		2	1	3	29	2	3	1	2					8	37	
43-47	1	3	3	2	3				12	6								6	18	
48-52		1	4	1			1	2	9	1	2						1	4	13	
53-57	5	3		6	1				15	1			3					4	19	
58-62	2								2	1		1						2	4	
63-67	1			1					2	2	1							3	5	
68-72	4	2							6		1							1	7	
Over 72	2	7	4	1	1				15	4	5							9	24*	
	241	111	64	42	18	17	6	14	513	78	43	15	10	1	2	2	5	156	669	

*Average length of detention of the 24 cases detained over 72 days was 108.4 days.

less than 13 days, and of the 78 girls who were recidivists, 21.8 percent were released in less than 13 days.

SOURCE OF REFERRAL, SEX AND PREVIOUS COURT RECORD.

This table shows the source of referral, sex, and previous court record for the 669 children. Four hundred and thirty, or 64.3 percent, of the 669 children were referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home by the Chicago Police Department. It may be observed that a smaller percentage of girls had previous court hearings than had been "previously admitted" to the Juvenile Detention Home as shown in Table XI.

More than 53 percent, or 273 boys, had previous court hearings as compared to 46.1 percent of the girls who had previous court hearings.

COURT ORDERS.

The Court orders in the cases of the 669 children who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home with judicial determination of their cases are listed in Table XIII. The Court orders were placed in this study to show how many children were eventually released to go home under "special supervision", or on "probation" and how many children were committed to agencies and institutions after they had been detained in the Juvenile Detention Home for a period of time ranging from one to 224 days.

"Special supervision" was considered to be a definite Court order for the purposes of this study. However, "special supervision" is practically always followed by an order for "Probation". The Court may continue a case for 60 days or 90 days under special supervision and after two continuances of from 60 to 90 days an order for "Probation" is

TABLE XII

SOURCE OF REFERRAL, SEX AND PREVIOUS COURT RECORD OF THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

SOURCE OF REFERRAL	MALES			FEMALES			TOTAL
	NO PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	TOTAL	NO PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	PREVIOUS COURT HEARING	TOTAL	
Police (local).	178	198	376	37	17	54	430
Juvenile Court Court:	28	24	52	4	10	14	66
Investigation Division.	8	4	12	20	12	32	44
Delinquent Boys' Division.	3	14	17	-	-	-	17
Family Supervision Division.	3	10	13	5	14	19	32
Child Placing Division.	-	-	-	-	9	9	9
Police (suburbs).	15	8	23	7	2	9	32
Cook County Hospital.	2	6	8	6	2	8	16
Child placing agencies.	-	2	2	-	4	4	6
Alone.	1	3	4	1	-	1	5
Board of Education.	2	-	2	2	-	2	4
Other.*	-	4	4	2	2	4	8
	240	273	513	84	72	156	669

*Chicago Parental School - 2; Chicago Home for Girls - 1; Sheriff - 1; States Attorney - 1; Postal Inspector - 1; Parent - 1; Traveller's Aid - 1.

usually made, providing, that the child has made a successful adjustment during the periods of special court supervision. Although a written order of "special supervision" was not entered in the records of each case listed as such, the author upon the advice of the Assistant Judge of the Juvenile Court, Ralph Riley, considered an order as "special supervision" when the following conditions were present: (1) Two continuances of approximately 60 days or more followed by an order of "Probation". (2) When a continuance of several weeks was heard on Thursday (Court day for special supervision cases). (3) When "special supervision" was written in the records. In the cases of girls there is not always two continuances for "special supervision" prior to probation. In many cases only one "special supervision" continuance is made.

In some cases the Court orders "Probation" on the day of the child's first appearance in the Juvenile Court. However, the proportion of children placed on "Probation" on the date of their first Court appearance is small. "Continued generally" means that "the Court did find, on hearing the case, that a situation of delinquency, dependency or neglect, or feeble-mindedness, existed; but that it was not serious enough to warrant entering an order which would in any way disturb the family relation ----- by this order the Court retains jurisdiction over the child to the extent that if a like situation again arises the child can be brought into Court again without a new petition being filed". (1)

Although Table VII shows that 368 or 53 percent of the 689 children were "released at Court" or "released to go home", there

(1) Annual Report of the Chief Probation Officer of the Juvenile Court - Charity Service Reports - 1924 - page 15.

TABLE XIII

COURT ORDER IN THE CASES OF 669 CHILDREN ADMITTED TO THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME DURING MARCH, JUNE AND SEPTEMBER, 1937, WHO WERE RELEASED WITH JUDICIAL DETERMINATION.

COURT ORDER	NUMBER	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION
Special supervision.	341	50.97
Chicago Parental School.	82	12.25
St. Charles School for Boys.	63	9.43
Probation.	17	2.54
Geneva School for Girls.	17	2.54
Institutions for feebleminded.	17	2.54
Committed to child placing agencies:		
Catholic Home Bureau.	16	2.39
Children's & Minors' Service.	13	1.94
Joint Service Bureau.	4	.60
Illinois Children's Home & Aid.	3	.45
House of Good Shepherd.	15	2.24
Continued generally.	14	2.09
Committed to institutions for dependents.	13	1.94
Dismissed.	10	1.49
Chicago Home for Girls.	8	1.20
Chief Probation Officer guardian.	8	1.20
Continued	5	.75
Supervision - Mary A Club.	4	.60
Deputy Probation Officer guardian.	3	.45
Other.	16*	2.39
	669	100.00

*Writ of attachment - 3; Feebleminded petition order - 3; No change of order - 2; Transferred to Boy's Court - 1; Transferred to Illinois Security Hospital - 1; Order on father to pay - 1; Release denied - 1; Mother's pension - 1; Held to Criminal Court - 1; Bond \$500 - 1; Open - 1.

were only 372, or 53.5 percent, of the children placed under "special supervision", placed on "probation" or had their cases "continued generally" as shown in Table XIII. This is explained by the fact that some children are released from the Juvenile Detention Home to await their Court hearings. In some of these cases, circumstances may arise prior to the hearing that would result in a child's commitment to an institution or child placing agency on the date of the Court hearing.

It will be noted that over 57 percent of the children, who were detained in the Juvenile Detention Home and had judicial determination of their cases, were eventually permitted to return to their homes after their cases had been "dismissed", "continued generally", or they had been placed on "probation" or under "special supervision.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.

In the preceding chapters the cases of 870 children admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home in March, June, and September, 1937, were studied. Of the 870 children, 23.1 percent were released from the Juvenile Detention Home without having judicial determination of their cases and 76.9 percent were released with judicial determination of their cases.

It was apparent that of the 870 children detained, 74.0-percent were boys and 25.9-percent were girls. The number of boys was almost three times the number of girls admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home.

A larger percentage of the children released from the Juvenile Detention Home without judicial determination of their cases were released to go home (64.18 percent) than the children who had judicial determination of their cases (57 percent). The large percentage of children released to go home raises the question as to whether or not it was necessary to detain many of the children who were subsequently returned to their homes without a formal Court hearing.

A larger percentage of the children released without judicial determination were detained for a short period of time (less than eight days) than the percentage of children who had Court hearings. Over 55 percent of the children who had Court hearings were detained over 33 days as compared to 23 percent of the children who did not have judicial deter-

mination of their cases. It is to be expected that children who are released from the Juvenile Detention Home without a Court hearing should be detained for shorter periods of time than children who appear in Court. This does not explain why so many children are detained from one to 7 days and then are released without having Court hearings. This would seem to indicate that some children are referred to the Juvenile Detention Home primarily for investigation of their cases.

Children who are admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home for return to institutions for the feeble-minded are detained for shorter periods of time than are those children who are admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home on other charges and later committed to an institution for the feeble-minded. More than 63 percent of the children who were released to institutions for the feeble-minded were detained for periods of time over 72 days. Whether or not children who are committable to institutions for the feeble-minded should be detained with normal children has been questioned. An answer to the question could probably be found in a study of the degree of mental incapacity of these children and what adjustment they made during their stay at the Juvenile Detention Home. This, however, would not explain the effect that the feeble-minded children had upon the normal children with whom they associated.

Of the boys released without judicial determination, 74.8 percent were 14 years of age and over, and of the girls, 84.3 percent were 14 years of age and over. Practically the same ratio of percentages applied to boys and girls who were released with judicial action. At first glance the impression is received that a high percentage of girls above the age of 14 years was admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home.

This is true, but it must be borne in mind that the Juvenile Court Act defines the age level of a male juvenile as "under the age of 17 years", whereas, the age level for female juveniles as defined by the Juvenile Court Act is "under the age of 18 years".

Over seven-tenths of the children who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home without judicial determination of their cases were referred to the institution for one of the following reasons: runaway from home (local), sex offense, larceny, burglary, incorrigibility, held as witness, and runaway from home (outside the city). Of the children who appeared before the Juvenile Court, the majority (70 percent) were referred for the following reasons: burglary, larceny, sex offense, runaway from home (local), Institute for Juvenile Research examination, larceny of auto and incorrigibility. With the exception of those children held as witnesses and for Institute for Juvenile Research examination, the greater percentage of both classes of children were admitted for practically the same reasons.

This study indicates that the percentage of boys admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home because of sex offenses and later released without judicial action, was much smaller (3.6 percent) than the percentage of girls (25.7 percent) admitted for the same charge. On the other hand, among the children that appeared in the Juvenile Court, the difference in percentage of boys (6.2 percent) and girls (16 percent), charged with sex offenses was not nearly as great.

A much larger percentage of boys than girls in both groups of cases were referred to the Juvenile Detention Home because of delinquencies which pertained to theft. It is to be expected that more boys would

be involved in delinquencies of this type.

In the cases of children detained because of larceny and burglary, 26 percent of those released without judicial determination were detained over 13 days, while of the children who appeared in Court 75 percent were detained over 13 days. This indicates that children appearing in Court are detained for longer periods of time than are children admitted because of the same charges but who are released without appearing in Court. The question arises as to whether or not adequate investigations are made before a child is referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention home because of larceny and burglary. Practically all children referred to the Juvenile Detention Home for larceny and burglary come from the Chicago Police Department and the preliminary investigations are the responsibility of that Department.

The study shows that a number of the children admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home had been detained in the institution on previous occasions. The percentage of recidivism for boys (36.6 percent) who were released without judicial determination was much larger than for girls (14.3 percent) in the same group. However, the percentage of recidivism among the boys and the girls who were released with judicial determination was practically equal (50 percent).

Children who were released without appearing in the Juvenile Court and who had not been previously detained in the Juvenile Detention Home were detained for shorter periods of time than were children who had not been previously detained in the Juvenile Detention Home but who appeared in the Juvenile Court. It would seem that a larger percentage of girls, whether recidivists or non-recidivists, are detained for longer periods of

time than the boys are detained. This is brought out by the fact that only 31.6 percent of the girls who were non-recidivists were released within 7 days, while 62.6 percent of the boys who were non-recidivists were released within the same period of time.

The majority of children in both groups were referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home by the Chicago Police Department. An interesting point to note is that of the children who did not have judicial determination of their cases, 79.6 percent were referred by the police, while of the children who appeared in the Juvenile Court, only 64.3 percent of the children were referred by the police. This would seem to indicate that the Police Department frequently refers children for detention, who are eventually released without judicial action on their cases.

Over one-half of the boys who were released from the Juvenile Detention Home with judicial action had Court hearings prior to the date of their referral to the Juvenile Detention Home. The percentage of girls in the same group who had previous Court hearings was 46.1 percent. A study of the reasons for recidivism would be interesting.

Over one-half of the children who appeared before the Juvenile Court after being detained in the Juvenile Home were permitted to return to their own homes under some form of supervision. The necessity of detaining these children in the Juvenile Detention Home and after a period of detention returning them to their own homes under supervision, brings up the question of whether or not some of these children could not have been allowed to remain in their homes awaiting a hearing in the Juvenile Court. This question can only be answered by a thorough study of each individual case. There are a multiplicity of factors which affect each

case and only by the case-study method could these factors be shown.

During the past several years the public and private agencies in Cook County have given serious study to the function of the Juvenile Detention Home and the place it holds in the Child Welfare Program of Cook County. The community and the social agencies in the community should be concerned not only about Juvenile Delinquency and its resulting problem of detention but also about the causes for Juvenile Delinquency. More emphasis must be placed on the causes for delinquency and the existing resources of the community must be improved in order to reduce, if not prevent, delinquency. The community should realize that the same factors and resources that are used for the rehabilitation of delinquents existed before the boy or girl became a delinquent. The need for a preventive program may be recognized by the community because of the ever mounting monetary cost of Juvenile Detention, but the community also must realize the unnecessary cost in the forms of thwarted lives. The welfare of the children can be best safeguarded by a program of treatment prior to acts which require detention, rather than a program designed for treatment after detention.

APPENDIXSELECTED CASE STUDIES.RELEASED TO AN INSTITUTION FOR THE FEEBLEMINDED.

Dorothy B----, a 4 year old negro girl was brought to the Investigation Division of the Juvenile Court by her natural father, Mr. A----, on September 14, 1937. He asked that the Juvenile Court make arrangements for over-night care for Dorothy as he expected to be able to locate the child's mother in several hours. He stated that he and the child's mother, Mrs. B----, had lived together for some time as common-law husband and wife but had separated. Two days prior to Mr. A----'s appearance at the Juvenile Court, Mrs. B---- had come to him with Dorothy and asked him to care for the child for a short time. Mrs. B---- did not return for the child and as Mr. A---- was unable to keep the child he came to the Juvenile Court. Dorothy was referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home but "because the child was feeble-minded the Intake Department was unable to keep her" and she was placed in the Juvenile Detention Home.

Six days later on September 20, 1937, Mr. A---- came to the Juvenile Court, Investigation Division, with Mrs. B----. Mrs. B---- stated that she was unable to care for Dorothy, because at this time Mrs. B---- was living with her sister and the sister refused to care for Dorothy because of the care the child required. Mrs. B---- returned to the home of her sister and the child remained in the Juvenile Detention Home.

A Probation Officer from the Investigation Division studied the case the next day, September 21, 1937. The County Court record disclosed that Dorothy had been committed to a State institution for the feeble-minded on February 19, 1936. On September 28, 1937, 14 days after the child's admission to the Juvenile Home, a letter was sent to the State institution for the feeble-minded by the Chief Probation Officer of the Juvenile Court, stating that the child had been committed to the institution and that "both parents now refuse to care for the child as they feel as though they are not able to give her adequate care. ---- The child is not placeable in a foster home and we would appreciate the case being handled as an emergency". The following day a letter was received from the institution for the feeble-minded which stated, "We regret the fact that our Receiving Wards are in extremely overcrowded conditions and there are no available vacancies for your County at the present time. However, the name of Dorothy B---- already appears upon our Extensive Waiting List. You will be notified when we are in a position to receive her".

Dorothy B----- was released to the Sheriff of Cook County to be transferred to the State institution for the feeble-minded on November 18, 1937, 65 days after her admission to the Juvenile Detention Home.

Although the child's case did not appear before the Juvenile Court, she had been committed to the State institution for the feeble-minded by the Cook County Court February 19, 1936. She was admitted to the institution for the feeble-minded 650 days after her commitment to the institution.

RELEASED TO GO HOME.

Gertrude W-----, a 16 year old negro girl was referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home by the Chicago Police on September 6, 1937. The girl was arrested when she was found in a disorderly house in the company of five men and an 18 year old girl. Gertrude told the police that she did not know that she was in a disorderly house. However, the girl admitted drinking wine with the men. The adults also were taken into custody.

Gertrude lived with her mother, stepfather, a brother and a half-brother. Little information was available regarding the economic status and the living conditions of the family. When a Probation Officer from the Juvenile Court interviewed the neighbors of the W----- family, she received several contradictory statements regarding Mr. and Mrs. W-----. However, most of the neighbors reported that Mr. and Mrs. W----- were well respected people and that the W----- children were well mannered and did not cause any trouble in the neighborhood.

On September 7, 1937, a Juvenile Police Officer made a complaint to the Investigation Division of the Juvenile Court, stating the reasons for Gertrude's referral to the Intake Department. The same day Mrs. W----- was interviewed at the Investigation Division office. Mrs. W----- requested that her daughter be released, because the adults involved in the case had been discharged in the Municipal Court that morning. The court worker in the Investigation Division believed that there was more to the case than had been stated and decided that Gertrude should be placed in the Juvenile Detention Home pending an investigation of the case. Mrs. W----- returned to the Investigation Division on September 10, 1937. Gertrude was interviewed in the Juvenile Detention Home and the girl admitted having sex relations with a man some time prior to her arrest. Despite the girl's story, Mrs. W----- insisted that she wanted to take Gertrude home. Mrs. W----- promised that she would take very good care of her daughter and that she would closely supervise the girl. The court worker accepted the case for follow-up investigation and granted permission to Mrs. W----- to take the girl home.

On September 10, 1937, 3 days after she had been placed in the Juvenile Detention Home, Gertrude was released from the institution to go

home with her mother. A delinquent petition was not filed on the case.

RETURNED HOME OUT OF TOWN.

George H---, a 15 year old white boy was referred to the Intake Department by the Police on March 15, 1937. George had approached a policeman and requested some food. When questioned the boy stated he had been chased from the home of a 61 year old man with whom he had been living for the past month. This man had been taking indecent liberties with the boy. George was admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home. Investigation disclosed that George had been living with an aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. H--- in Minneapolis, Minnesota. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. G--- also live in Minneapolis, Minnesota. When George was one year old he went to live in the home of his maternal grandmother and remained with her until he was ten years old. At that time the grandmother died and George returned to the home of his parents. Due to the fact that the relationship between the boy and his mother was very strained, George went to live with his aunt and uncle. He lived with them up until a few months prior to his trip to Chicago to look for employment in February, 1937.

On March 18, 1937, a letter was sent to the Juvenile Court of Hennepin County, Minneapolis, Minnesota, requesting the court to authorize the boy's return to Minneapolis and to investigate the parent's home to determine whether or not they would be able to make arrangements for boy's return fare. These arrangements were to be made when the boy was no longer needed as a witness in the Criminal Court of Cook County. A reply was received on April 2, 1937, to the effect that George had been known to the Hennepin County Juvenile Court since April, 1933. He had been considered a habitual runaway and incorrigible. He also stole a bicycle. The boy was examined by the Child Guardian Clinic. The results of the examination disclosed that there was "no mental derangement". George was placed by an agency specializing in boarding home placement and treatment for the problem child. He made a fairly successful adjustment in the boarding home. However at the time of George's last appearance in the Hennepin County Juvenile Court because he had "absented himself from home", it was believed the basis of the complaint was the mother's attitude toward the boy. "Mrs. G--- is a frail, nervous, physically ill woman who has no strength nor patience to work with George". The boy admitted sexual misconduct with an older man. According to the Hennepin County, Juvenile Court, "neither parents nor aunt and uncle could provide fare for the boy's return". On April 5, 1937, a letter was sent to the Transportation Service of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare by the Chief Probation Officer of the Cook County Juvenile Court requesting arrangement for transportation so that George could be returned to Minneapolis as he would no longer be needed as a witness in the Criminal Court. On April 8, 1937, the Transportation Service granted permission for arrangements to be made for the boy's return to Minneapolis. The Board of Education of Minneapolis wrote to the Juvenile Court of Cook County on April 23, 1937 asking for information

regarding George as the boy was under the compulsory school age in the State of Minneapolis. The Juvenile Court of Cook County replied that "it will probably be at least another month before George would no longer be needed as a witness in the Criminal Court". On June 3, 1937 a letter to the Inter-City Department of the United Charities of Chicago from the Juvenile Court of Cook County requested that they purchase a ticket for George's return to his home.

On June 4, 1937, George was released from the Juvenile Detention Home to be returned to his home in Minneapolis. He had been detained 81 days in the Juvenile Detention Home.

RELEASED AT COURT.

Louis P----, a 16 year old white boy was brought to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home by the police on September 26, 1937. Two days prior to the boy's referral to the Intake Department, Louis and a 16 year old companion stole a quantity of sheet lead from the roof of a government building. The boys sold the lead to a junk-dealer. Louis had been detained at the Juvenile Detention Home on two previous occasions because of incorrigibility and breaking windows. The Intake Department admitted the boy to the Juvenile Detention Home proper.

Louis lived with his mother, father, sister and brother. Mr. P----'s position necessitated his absence from home for long periods of time. The family was in excellent financial circumstances. The family occupied an old house in a neighborhood which was known for its large amount of juvenile delinquency and adult crime. Louis was a large, strong boy for his age. He was interested in outdoor sports. The school authorities reported that Louis was an undesirable pupil, and a habitual truant. Mrs. P----, Louis' mother, placed the entire responsibility for the boy's misbehavior on the undesirable neighborhood in which the family lived and the fact that Louis was influenced by bad companions. A court worker, assigned to the boy's case, believed that Louis' delinquent action could be attributed to the fact that the boy enjoyed little, if any, success in school and that he had few constructive recreationally outlets. On the occasion of Louis' previous release from the Juvenile Detention Home, the family sent Louis to live with relatives in a rural community. However, the boy became lonesome and refused to remain with the relatives.

Because the boy had been in trouble on two previous occasions and the theft of the lead was considered a serious offense, the police filed a delinquent petition on the boy. Louis appeared in the Juvenile Court on October 11, 1937. His case was continued and the boy was placed under special court supervision. On October 11, 1937, 16 days after he had been placed in the Juvenile Detention Home, Louis was released from the institution.

RELEASED AT COURT.

James Z-----, a 12 year old white boy, was taken into custody by the police on the complaint of a proprietor of a grocery store.

It was alleged that on February 24, 1937, James entered a grocery store and asked the owner for some food. In return for the food given him, James offered to sweep the floor. It was alleged that James took \$32.00 from the store. When arrested, James at first denied the theft but later admitted it. The police permitted James to remain in his own home under the supervision of his mother pending a Juvenile Court hearing on a delinquent petition. On March 12, 1937, James appeared in the Juvenile Court and his case was continued until March 29, 1937. The Court ordered the boy placed in the Juvenile Detention Home for examination by the Institute for Juvenile Research.

A social investigation of James' family disclosed that the boy lived with his mother and three older siblings. His father had deserted the family nine years ago and was living in Chicago. Mr. Z----- was employed but did not contribute to the support of his family. The family was supported by James' oldest brother who was employed on a WPA project. The family lived in five rooms in a building that was in good repair. The house was moderately furnished and immaculately clean. James attended one of the public schools in the neighborhood. The school reported that the boy's scholarship was poor, his deportment was poor and listed the following behavior difficulties; stealing, truancy, lying, impertinence and defiance.

The Institute for Juvenile Research, as a result of their examination of James, reported "the boy has a dull and backward intelligence. Because of the poor conditions in the home as well as poor training we think the boy has had a desire for money for a long time. It is our impression that the boy should be returned home under special court supervision".

On March 29, 1937, 17 days after the boy had been admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home, he appeared in the Juvenile Court and the Court ordered that the boy be released from the Juvenile Detention Home.

RELEASED TO GO HOME.

Elmer B-----, a 13 year old white boy was referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home by the police of one of the towns in Cook County on June 2, 1937. He was charged with the larceny of an auto. Two other juvenile boys were also involved in the theft of the auto. Elmer and his companions were placed in the Juvenile Detention Home.

Investigation disclosed that Elmer lived with his mother, stepfather, a sister and two half-brothers and a half-sister. Mr. B-----,

the stepfather, earned \$40.00 per week as a bus driver. Mrs. B--- conducted a dress-making business in her home. The family lived in a sparsely populated area of Evanston. Mr. and Mrs. B--- were intelligent people, interested in their family.

Elmer did not have any previous record of delinquency. He was considered an average student in school.

A delinquent petition was filed on Elmer and the court hearing was set for June 21, 1937. On June 7, 1937, 5 days after his admission to the Juvenile Detention Home, Elmer was released from the Juvenile Detention Home by the officer in charge of the juvenile police officers at the Juvenile Court. No information was obtained regarding the reason for the boy's release.

When Elmer appeared at the Juvenile Court on June 21, 1937, he was placed "under special supervision".

RELEASED TO GO TO THE CHICAGO PARENTAL SCHOOL.

Oscar R---, a 14 year old negro boy was referred to the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home and subsequently admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home proper on March 31, 1937. The Judge of the Juvenile Court had ordered that the boy be held for examination by the Institute for Juvenile Research and that his case be continued until April 14, 1937. Oscar had been brought in to the Juvenile Court on a delinquent petition because he and two other boys had threatened an elderly man and woman with a knife. The boys admitted that they went to the home of the elderly couple with the intention of securing money from the people. However, they were frightened away from the house. Later they were arrested on the complaint of the old man and woman. The boys were not taken to the Juvenile Detention Home prior to their court hearing, but were permitted to remain at home with their parents.

Oscar lived with his mother and stepfather, Mr. and Mrs. M---, and an infant half-brother. The boy's father deserted the family when Oscar was quite young, and his mother remarried. The family was receiving assistance from the Chicago Relief Administration because Mr. M--- was unemployed. They lived in a neighborhood inhabited entirely by negro families of low economic status. Oscar did not adjust himself well to the regular schools and had been transferred to a special school for problem children. The Psychiatrist who examined Oscar while the boy was in the Juvenile Detention Home, classified the boy as being slightly below average intelligence. The Psychiatrist recommended that the boy be allowed to return to his mother and stepfather for a trial period under special court supervision.

When Oscar appeared in the Juvenile Court on April 14, 1937,

he was committed to the Chicago Parental School. On April 14, 1937, 14 days after he had been admitted to the Juvenile Detention Home, Oscar was released to the Chicago Parental School.

COMMITTED TO THE HOUSE OF GOOD SHEPHERD.

Dorothy H----, a 14 year old white girl was placed in the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home and subsequently in the Juvenile Detention Home proper by order of the Juvenile Court on March 24, 1937. The Court ordered an examination by the Institute for Juvenile Research.

Dorothy and four other girls had been frequenting a chinese laundry and engaging in sex practices with a Chinaman. They had also engaged in sex practices with a Filipino. The girls received money for these acts. Their activities had been disclosed by the police as a result of a complaint from the school authorities. The Chinaman and Filipino were taken into custody.

Dorothy lived with her mother, father and a sister. A married brother and sister were living outside of the home. Mr. H---- was regularly employed and had an income sufficient to maintain his family comfortably. The family lived in a fairly well furnished, clean and well cared for house. The family lived in a cosmopolitan neighborhood. Mr. and Mrs. H---- were not citizens of the United States, although they had been in the country for 15 years.

A report from the Principal of the grade school that D---- attended, stated that, "Dorothy had been a problem in their school from the first grade days to the present. Her work is fair but she is not working up to the measure of her ability. We have had a constant battle to secure a little parental supervision over her comings and goings".

The Institute for Juvenile Research reported that the girl had slightly below average intelligence and did not have the ability to successfully do high school work. The Psychiatrist believed that Dorothy's parents had been lax and indifferent in their methods of supervising the girl. He recommended that "her (Dorothy's) family should be urged to make a plan to move to an entirely new environment in an effort to separate her from her associates".

A complaint of Dorothy's delinquent sex activities was made to the Investigation Division of the Juvenile Court by the Chicago Police on January 27, 1937. At that time complaints were also made about Dorothy's four girl companions. The two men who had engaged in sex practices with the girls were taken before the Grand Jury on February 18, 1937. The girls appeared as witnesses against the men and they were indicted. On February 24, 1937, delinquent petitions were filed on Dorothy and her companions. The girls were not placed in the Juvenile Detention Home but were permitted

to remain with their parents awaiting a court hearing on February 24, 1937. On February 24, 1937 the Juvenile Court continued the hearing on Dorothy's case until March 22, 1937, so that Dorothy could appear as a witness at the trial of the two men in the Criminal Court. A continuance of two days from March 22, 1937 until March 24, 1937 was granted when Dorothy appeared the second time in the Juvenile Court, in order that the results of the case against the two adults in the Criminal Court could be determined.

On March 24, 1937 Dorothy appeared with her four companions before the Juvenile Court. The Filipino and Chinaman had both received long prison sentences from the Criminal Court. The Court ordered that Dorothy and her companions be examined by the Institute for Juvenile Research and that they be detained in the Juvenile Detention Home while the examinations were being made. Prior to March 24, 1937 all of the girls had remained in the homes of their respective parents.

On April 14, 1937, the Judge of the Juvenile Court committed Dorothy to the House of Good Shepherd. Twenty-one days after Dorothy had been placed in the Juvenile Detention Home, she was released to go to the House of Good Shepherd.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles.

- Abbott, Grace. "Case Work Responsibility of Juvenile Courts."
Year Book, National Probation Association, 1929.
- Addams, Jane. The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.
- Audy, Arthur J., "Is There a Place for the Juvenile Detention
Home." The Catholic Charities Review, Vol. XXII, No. 10.
- Bowen, Mrs. Joseph T., "The Early Days of the Juvenile Court."
The Child, the Clinic and the Court. New York,
New Republic, Inc., 1925.
- Bowler and Bloodgood. Institutional Treatment of Delinquent Boys.
Washington, D. C., United States Children's Bureau, No. 228.
- Burt, Cyril. The Young Delinquent. New York, D. Appleton and
Company, 1925.
- Cabot, Fredrick P., "The Detention of Children as Part of Treatment."
The Child, the Clinic and the Court. New York, New Republic,
Inc., 1925.
- Chute, Charles L., "Probation in a Community Social Welfare Program."
Year Book, National Probation Association, 1932-1933.
- Cooley, Edwin J., Probation and Delinquency. Catholic Charities
of the Archdiocese of New York, 1927.
- Cooper, John. Children's Institutions. Philadelphia, The Dolphin
Press, 1931.
- Flexner and Oppenheimer. The Legal Aspects of the Juvenile Court.
Washington, D. C., United States Children's Bureau
Publication, No. 99.
- Gabower, Genevieve. "The Juvenile Court - A Legal-Social Agency."
Catholic Charities Review, Vol. XXII, No. 10.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Halperin, Irving W., "Practical Problems in Administering Probation."
Year Book National Probation Association, 1931.

Healy, William. The Individual Delinquent. Boston: Little, Brown
and Company, 1915.

_____. Mental Conflicts and Misconduct. Boston: Little, Brown
and Company, 1928.

Healy and Bronner. New Light on Delinquency and its Treatment.
New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1936.

Healy, Bronner, Boyler and Murphy. Reconstructing Behavior in Youth.
New York: Judge Baker Foundation Publication No. 5, 1936.

Lenroot and Lundberg. Juvenile Courts at Work. Washington, D. C.,
United States Children's Bureau Publication, No. 141.

Lou, Herbert H., Juvenile Courts in the United States. Chapel Hills,
N. C.: North Carolina Press, 1927.

Millis, Savilla. The Juvenile Detention Home in Relation to Juvenile
Court Policy, 1927.

Riley, Ralph J., A Working Manual for Juvenile Court Officers.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.

Shaw, Clifford. Delinquency Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1929.

_____. The Jack Roller. Chicago: The University of Chicago
Press, 1930.

Stern, Leon. "Detention Homes for Children." Social Work Year Book,
1933. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Sullinger, Earl. Social Determinants in Juvenile Delinquency.
John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1936.

Sutherland, Edwin H., Principles of Criminology. New York:
J. B. Lippincott Company, 1934.

Thrasher, F. M., The Gang. Chicago: The University of Chicago
Press, 1927.

Van Waters, Miriam. Youth in Conflict. New York, Republic
Publishing Company, 1925.

Walker and Durost. Statistical Tables, Their Structure and Use.
New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College,
Columbia University, 1936.

Warner, Florence M., Juvenile Detention in the United States.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933.

Young, Pauline V., Social Treatment in Probation and Delinquency.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1937.

Zorbaugh, H., Gold Coast and the Slum. Chicago: The University
of Chicago Press, 1929.

Pamphlets and Reports.

Annual Message of Clayton F. Smith, President, Board of Commissioners
of Cook County, Illinois - 1935, 1936, 1937 and 1938.

Annual Report of the Juvenile Protective Association of Chicago - 1928.

Preliminary Report of the Child Care Study Conducted Under the
Auspsices of the Board of Commissioners of Cook County - November 1936.

Report of the Intake Department of the Juvenile Detention Home of
Cook County for the Period February 11, 1937 to April 30, 1937.

Report of the Cook County Civil Service Commission on Investigation
of the Juvenile Detention Home, December 1917.

Report of The Superintendent of The Juvenile Detention Home.
Charity Service Reports, 1913.

Report of The Chief Probation Officer of The Juvenile Court.
Charity Service Reports, 1924.

Report of The Superintendent of The Juvenile Detention Home.
Charity Service Reports, 1927.

Routine for the Investigation Department. A manual provided for
Juvenile Probation Officers of the Investigation Division of the
Juvenile Court of Cook County.

The Juvenile Detention Home, Report of The Investigation of The
Special Committee, appointed by the Honorable Peter Reinburg,
February 20, 1917.

White House Conference on Child Health and Protection: The Delinquent
Child, IV C-2, New York: The Century Company, 1932.