



# WHO ARE DELINQUENT?

CHILDREN . . PARENTS . . SOCIETY



**ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1946**

Hon. HARRY L. EASTMAN

Hon. WILLIAM J. McDERMOTT

JUDGES OF THE

CUYAHOGA COUNTY  
JUVENILE COURT

CLEVELAND, OHIO

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page		Page
WHO ARE DELINQUENT ? .....	3	Dilemma of the Court .....	15
Are parents delinquent? .....	3	Methods in other places .....	16
Schools for Parents .....	3	Contrast with another county .....	16
National Probation Association Report ..	3	No dependents in Detention .....	16
Legislation against parents .....	3	Children's shelter needed .....	16
Parents have problems .....	4	PROBATION DEPARTMENT .....	17
Basic causes of delinquency .....	4	Investigations .....	17
Real program of prevention .....	4	Referral to Social Agencies .....	17
Prevention programs applied .....	5	Cases under supervision .....	18
TEN-YEAR DELINQUENCY		Community Relations .....	18
TRENDS .....	6	DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT .....	18
What is delinquency? .....	6	Purpose and services .....	18
Who is a juvenile? .....	6	Volume of cases .....	19
Juvenile "crime" .....	6	Problems of the Division .....	19
How serious are delinquencies? .....	7	Adjustment of payments .....	19
Offenses limited to children .....	7	Correction Farm .....	19
Offenses against morals .....	7	Family relations .....	20
Property offenses .....	7	JUVENILE DETENTION HOME .....	20
Acts of violence .....	7	Children served .....	20
Breaking ordinances .....	8	Days care .....	20
Serious delinquencies .....	8	Overcrowding .....	21
Repeating delinquents .....	8	Quarantines .....	21
SUMMARY OF THE YEAR .....	9	Friends of the Home .....	21
Services and Statistics .....	9	Service to agencies .....	22
Protective services .....	9	THE COURT CLINIC .....	22
Adults before the Court .....	10	Medical examinations .....	22
Assigned Common Pleas Judge .....	10	Most frequent defects .....	22
Additional Judge authorized .....	10	Diagnostic tests .....	23
Judges elected in 1946 .....	10	Dispensary and bed patients .....	23
Veterans' training .....	11	Special and surgical service .....	23
In-service training .....	11	Psychiatrist appointed .....	24
1946 COMPLAINTS AND PREVIOUS		Number of cases studied .....	24
YEARS .....	12	Findings .....	24
Numbers before the Court .....	12	Psychopathic personality .....	24
Official and Unofficial cases .....	12	Service of other psychiatrists .....	25
DELINQUENCY COMPLAINTS .....	12	Psychometric tests .....	25
Number and kind .....	12	Purpose and use .....	25
Traffic Complaints .....	13	Number of tests reported .....	26
— effect on totals .....	13	AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN .....	26
Other delinquencies .....	13	Services of the Division .....	26
Disposition of delinquents .....	14	Intake .....	28
Correctional commitments .....	14	Standards of assistance .....	28
Adult contributors .....	14	Loss and gain .....	29
NEGLECT AND DEPENDENCY .....	15	CONTINUITY OF COURT	
Neglected children .....	15	EMPLOYEES .....	29
Dependent children .....	15	Retirements .....	30

### STATISTICAL TABLES

Total Complaints for six years .....	30
Delinquency complaints, 1946 .....	31
Children under care in Detention Home .....	31
Delinquency dispositions .....	32
Probation Department Supervision .....	32
Official dependency and neglect .....	33
Collections for support of children .....	33
Adults in Neglect and Non-Support .....	34
Child Support cases under supervision .....	34
Adults committed to Correction Farm .....	34
Aid to Dependent Children, applications and grants .....	35
DIRECTORY OF JUVENILE COURT PERSONNEL .....	36

**Honorable John F. Curry, Joseph F. Gorman, John J. Pekarek,**  
Commissioners of Cuyahoga County

**Honorable Charles L. Sherwood, Director,**  
State Department of Public Welfare

Sirs:

In compliance with Section 1639-13 of the General Code we submit herewith the Annual Report of the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court for the calendar year 1946, showing the number and kind of cases that have come before it, the dispositions thereof ordered by the Court, and other data pertaining to the work of the Court of interest to you and to the general public.

Respectfully submitted,  
Judge Harry L. Eastman  
Judge William J. McDermott  
The Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County

Cleveland, Ohio  
May 14, 1947



## MAX S. LAIRD

### PIONEER IN JUVENILE COURT

#### RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

Max S. Laird, Director of the Division of Research and Statistics, is rounding out his thirty-third year of service with the Juvenile Court. Prior to being Director, he had served as a probation officer and assistant chief probation officer. Twenty years ago when we were engaged in reorganizing the Court we realized that if the Juvenile Court was to know what it was accomplishing it was essential to have a division of research and statistics. In choosing a person to direct this department, it was desirable to have someone familiar with social work and especially trained in juvenile court work. We selected Mr. Laird as the one meeting these qualifications. When the Division was established in 1929 it was, as far as we know, the first one of its kind.

Mr. Laird, after fully qualifying himself by taking courses in research and statistics, rapidly developed the Division into perhaps the most outstanding juvenile court research department in the country. He has gathered what is probably the most complete information in the United States on delinquency and juvenile court work, consisting of newspaper and magazine articles, speeches, pamphlets, books, reports, and charts. Because of his deep interest in and devotion to his work, his prolific reading and research, and knowledge gained through experience, he perhaps knows as much about causes and treatment of delinquency as any person in this field.

Mr. Laird's reports are widely known and respected throughout social work and juvenile court fields and are eagerly sought by courts and social agencies in England, France, Russia, British South Africa, Australia, India, Canada, China, Japan, Brazil, and Chile. He served as a member of the Statistics Committees of the Federal Children's Bureau, the Ohio Juvenile Court Judges' Association, and the State Department of Public Welfare. His reports have been used as texts in colleges and high schools and as source material in libraries. He helped organize the Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges and the National Association of Juvenile Court Judges and served as their Executive Secretary for many years.

Mr. Laird's avocational interests are chiefly in the field of child welfare as a volunteer with the Y.M.C.A. boys' camps and boys' clubs.

Because of Mr. Laird's pioneering he has made a singular contribution in the field of research and statistics to the community and the nation.

Judge Harry L. Eastman



## WHO ARE DELINQUENT? CHILDREN — PARENTS — SOCIETY?

### PARENTS AND DELINQUENCY

**The Causes of Delinquency** During the past twenty years there has been much discussion and a vast amount of literature produced on the causes of delinquency. Much of this has got us nowhere except into profitless argument. On the one hand, the problem has been over-simplified by too broad generalizations such as poverty, poor housing, broken homes, and lack of recreational facilities. On the other, it has been narrowed to individual causes such as parental neglect, the school system, the radio, and movies. Out of this have come few reasonable and practical formulas for combating delinquency as a whole.

**Are Parents Delinquent?** The latest proposal to win popularity has been to blame the parents. This has led to the establishment of several "Schools for Delinquent Parents" that parents have been ordered to attend by judges of juvenile courts. Typical of these is the San Francisco School for Parents which received write-ups in several national magazines during the past year. The National Probation Association, after a careful investigation of this school, reported adversely on its use, giving the following reasons.

**Opinion of National Probation Association** "The parents of delinquent or neglected children may, or may not, be themselves delinquent, inadequate, or ignorant. Whether to punish, to aid, or to educate them is a grave question frequently involving complex situations and obscure personality factors. Hence, any course of action, any form of treatment should be based on a knowledge of individual needs. There was too little evidence that this was the case in San Francisco . . . Referral of parents on the basis that they have delinquent children, or are themselves delinquent . . . is not considered a sufficiently selective method . . . The extravagant claims which so commonly attach to novel and popular undertakings can be misleading and ultimately disillusioning; urgently needed professional services, such as intensive family case work, can be impaired or even omitted in favor of a superficial program . . . It is common practice for skillful probation officers to induce parental cooperation for the welfare of their child, without invoking court authority."

**Legislation Against Parents** The 1945 California Legislature enacted a law providing that whenever a minor is brought before the juvenile court, his parent, guardian, or custodian must show cause why a criminal complaint should not be filed against him for contributing to the delinquency or dependency of his

child. A bill before the 1947 session of the Ohio Legislature would compel the juvenile court to place the parent on probation along with the child. These bills are considered by court authorities and social workers to be impractical and ineffectual.

**Parents Have Problems** These short-sighted measures ignore the obvious fact that relatively few parents of delinquents are intentionally neglectful. It is true that sometimes they are, but generally this neglect is because of their own ignorance or inability to properly control their children. The child who becomes a problem in the court has usually long been a problem in his home that his parents have been unable to solve. What parents need is a great deal more practical advice and help than the community is now either equipped or willing to give them.

**Public Reaction** This generalized attack against parents has set up a reaction that may lead to the kind of improvement desired without legislation or punitive action. Articles in defense of parents have begun to appear in newspapers, magazines, and specialized publications. Competent authorities among educators, child psychologists, and social workers have analyzed the difficulties of parents in fulfilling their traditional responsibilities under changed economic and social conditions and pointed out the duty of the community to afford them the help and counsel they need to successfully solve the conduct problems of their children. Behavior clinics have been set up in various parts of the country to diagnose and treat conduct difficulties from the kindergarten to the high school level.

**Basic Causes of Delinquency** It is generally recognized that the real causes of delinquency are social and personality maladjustments within and particular to the individual. The usually alleged causes are incidental and may or may not be contributory factors to the central problem. Anti-social and delinquent acts are attempts by the individual to overcome or compensate for his own maladjustment. Only a close study of the offender and his personality and environment will uncover the real causes underlying his particular misbehavior. It follows that successful treatment must also be individualized to fit each delinquent.

**A Real Program of Prevention** Any effective program for prevention must start with the non-delinquent and plan to preserve him in that condition. Methods must be similar to those employed in preventing disease. Since it is impossible to foresee which child may contract delinquency, the program must apply to all children in the community.

It is often possible to discover the child who is in danger of becoming delinquent and to take special measures to build up his

resistance and overcome this susceptibility. There are successful forms of preventive treatment in character defects as well as in physical disorders. These require early recognition and the means for applying the proper treatment.

A character and behavior clinic is as necessary for the preservation of social health and delinquency prevention as are health clinics in the field of physical illness. This truth is gaining recognition throughout the country, but as yet has made little progress among the citizens of Cuyahoga County. It is time we took stock of what is being accomplished in other communities.

**Where Prevention is Being Applied** The successful use of various forms of the pre-delinquency clinic approach has been demonstrated in many localities. It has been applied in relatively small communities and in certain areas in large metropolitan cities. The States of New York, Michigan, and Illinois have created commissions to formulate programs and to encourage their local use. The New York State Department of Education has established a program for delinquency prevention that has been widely accepted by the schools of that State, and reports indicate it is showing satisfactory results.

**A Public Affairs Page** The Ladies' Home Journal for May, 1947, under the caption "The Role of the Community in Preventing Juvenile Neglect" (copyright 1947, The Curtis Publishing Co.) evaluates programs set up in several sections of the country. By special permission we quote the following regarding a plan directed at once to parents and the community and sponsored by the New York State Youth Commission.

**Prevention in Action** "Their program 'Prevention in Action', focuses attention upon the needs of 'vulnerable children'. They have worked through the schools first, where tests have been given by school personnel to over 5000 children from the third to the eighth grades, inclusive, in ten communities. Special consideration is given the child who is either markedly above or below average in intelligence, or handicapped by some physical or health defect."

**The Youth Bureau** "The keystone of the plan is the Youth Bureau, set up in individual communities and locally sponsored by the several agencies of home, school, church, welfare, health, and recreation. Juvenile delinquency thus assumes a major role in the municipality rather than a minor one handled by welfare or law-enforcement agencies. To the Youth Bureau come disturbed parents, school authorities, interested citizens. Recreation is often used as a pleasant foil for the necessary educational and psychological counseling youth needs. Each center has a full-time staff and a representative advisory committee of citizens."

“Strengthen the home, correct early tendencies toward delinquency and create a healthy community environment, advises the commission. Like the old proverb, a stitch in time in the character-building of a child may save nine in the future.”

**Community Responsibility** “Is the behavior of your neighbor’s child your business? It may very well be. You and I create the sort of community our neighbor’s children live and grow in. The bad child of today is the delinquent parent of tomorrow. Let’s inoculate our communities against the disease before it becomes epidemic.”

### TEN-YEAR DELINQUENCY TRENDS

Public concern about juvenile delinquency, its control and treatment, is highly desirable. But to be productive of constructive results the public must be correctly informed. Much of the discussion during the war years has been highly sensational and even hysterical statements of only partial truths, and has given a distorted picture of the actual trends in delinquency. A few definitions and basic facts should help to clarify public thought and future discussion.

**What is Juvenile Delinquency?** The word “delinquency” as applied to juvenile misbehavior is a general and collective term. Like the word “illness” it covers a wide variety of conditions from the trivial and minor through the serious and chronic. It includes extremes ranging from disobedience to acts resulting in death. By statutory enactment it is intended to make it possible for courts to deal with child misbehavior resulting from faulty training, lax discipline, and other causes and save the children from delinquent or criminal careers.

**Who is a Juvenile?** In Ohio and a majority of the other states the legal use of the term “juvenile” is limited to children under eighteen years of age. In some states the limit is as low as sixteen and in several may include the entire period of legal minority. Comparisons between states are useless unless this factor is known and allowance is made for it.

**What of Juvenile Crime?** It follows then that “juvenile crime” is an inaccurate term in all too common use. It is the result of loose generalization and careless thinking. Most frequently it is used by those who group all minors together, regardless of age, and classify in terms of statutory offenses. Actually the greater number of criminal offenses are committed by older youths and their inclusion among juveniles is not only inaccurate but it creates the false impression that juveniles commit a far greater number of serious offenses than they actually do.

**How Serious are Delinquent Acts?** What kinds of misconduct are included under the term "juvenile delinquency?" What is the proportion of trivial, minor, and serious offenses in the total of juvenile delinquency? To answer these questions a tabulation of the official complaints filed against delinquent boys and girls in the Court during the past ten years was compiled. These totaled 14,398 against boys and 4641 against girls. These were divided into separate classifications for boys and girls with the following results.

**Offenses Limited to Children** Certain forms of misbehavior by children are defined as delinquencies, but adults cannot be charged as offenders for the same or similar acts. These constituted 27 per cent of all complaints against boys and 70 per cent of those against girls. Included in this group are: beyond parental control, boys 10 per cent, girls 35 per cent; runaway from home, boys 10 per cent, girls 26 per cent; and truant from school, boys 7 per cent, girls 9 per cent. From 10 to 13 per cent of the runaways each year are non-residents of Cuyahoga County and are detained here till returned to their own homes or turned over to their local authorities.

**Offenses Against Morals** Less than 4 per cent of all complaints against boys and only 17 per cent of those against girls were concerned with immoral acts. Among boys these include the possession of obscene literature, indecent exposure, indecent acts with other boys or men, and liberties taken with the persons of small girls. Sexual intercourse by boys of juvenile age is infrequent. When indulged in it is usually at the solicitation of adult women or prostitutes. Among girls such complaints are nearly always the result of intercourse with boys above eighteen years or adult men. Many of these complaints are brought to court only in order to prosecute the adults as contributors to delinquency.

**Offenses Against Property** Among boys 52 per cent of complaints concern the violation of property rights, ranging from simple trespassing through destruction of property (breaking school windows, street lights, etc.) shop-lifting, forgery, petty stealing, up to auto stealing, burglary and larceny, and arson. Among girls this group only constitutes about 8 per cent.

Probably more than half of these complaints could only be classed as misdemeanors if committed by adults. Even the grand larcenies, which are felonies when committed by adults, might well be considered as only misdemeanors among many delinquents if consideration is given to absence of "criminal intent".

**Acts of Violence** Offenses against the person, those which involve violence, the use of physical force, the show of weapons, and other means of "putting in fear", were charged in complaints

against 7 per cent of the boys and less than 2 per cent of the girls. These include assaults and assault and battery (often fights between individuals or gangs), armed assault, highway robbery (including purse-snatching), sexual assault and attempts, and acts resulting in death.

**Breaking Ordinances** Complaints were lodged against 3 per cent of the girls and slightly less than 10 per cent of the boys because of the violation of city ordinances and other regulations imposed by law. These include traffic ordinances and state driving regulations; unlawful employment; playing in prohibited places; failure to return or defacement of library books; disorderly conduct and similar misbehavior. These would all be classed as misdemeanors if committed by adults.

**Serious Delinquent Acts** Delinquent acts of a violent or spectacular nature are given front page publicity and decried as evidence that delinquency is rampant. Such acts do occur but their numerical frequency does not justify the inference that they typify the misbehavior of the total group of delinquents. Summarizing the analysis of the delinquency complaints over a ten-year period, we find that only 37 per cent of the acts committed by boys and 23 per cent of those by girls could be classed as crimes or felonies if committed by adults.

The misbehavior charged against juveniles in the greater number of complaints is non-criminal when committed by adults. Nearly 36 per cent of the complaints lodged against boys and 7 per cent of those against girls would be only misdemeanors and an additional 27 per cent of those against boys and 70 per cent of those against girls would not be considered legally punishable among adults.

**Repeating Delinquents** In the ten-year period, 70 per cent of the boys and 85 per cent of the girls were appearing officially before the Court for the first time. Some of these had previous unofficial appearances on minor complaints. It follows that only 30 per cent of the boys and 15 per cent of the girls were repeaters in cases considered serious enough to be made official.

Many of these were under probationary supervision at the time of their reappearance and some of them reappeared more than once. Delinquency habits, like chronic diseases, cannot be instantly cured by any magic spell pronounced by a judge or physician. Treatment must often be extended over a considerable period of time, during which relapses may be expected. These do not necessarily discourage either the probation officer or the physician. Frequently they indicate the need of changes in treatment that are both desirable and helpful. Only when the symptoms resist all treatment is there reason to admit failure.



**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**OF THE**  
**CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT**

**SUMMARY OF THE YEAR**

The year 1946, the first full year since the close of the war, has been one of the most active in the forty-four years of the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court. While there was a slight decrease in the total number of complaints filed as compared with 1945, the work performed by the Court actually showed a considerable increase.

**Services and Statistics** Case counts, the number of children and adults dealt with, or any other statistics cannot give a true picture of the services of the Court or of the time and labor involved, nor the quality of the services and their social value to individuals and to the community. Readers interested in statistics will find them in the tables at the end of this report. It is the purpose of this section to describe and interpret the services that the Court has had to perform during the past year in terms of human welfare and their importance to the community.

**Protective Services** The Court is being called upon to give protective services to children and parents in an increasing number of cases. Recent legislation has conferred additional jurisdictions on the Court. It has been organized to perform certain services more promptly and efficiently than they can be obtained elsewhere. Much of the labor involved is administrative rather than judicial. This is illustrated by the following. Non-support of minor children may be prosecuted in several courts but the Juvenile Court gets a very large majority of them. This is because the Division of Child Support is able to enforce its orders and does so consistently.

In 1946 the Division collected and distributed to parents, relatives, and public and private child caring agencies almost one million dollars, an increase of nearly \$320,000 over the previous year. Consequently agencies prefer to file their actions in this Court and recommend similar action to their clients. In fairness to courts with concurrent jurisdiction it must be stated that the Juvenile Court has somewhat better powers to enforce its orders for the support of children. Because of this transfers of jurisdiction from Common Pleas to Juvenile Court are frequently requested for custody and support of minor children in divorce actions. The number of these transfers, already high before the war, increased by nearly forty-five per cent over the previous year.

**Adults in Court** Paternity cases, including support of the child, may be decided in either the Common Pleas or the Juvenile Courts. In 1938 only 30 of these complaints were filed here. They have been continuously increasing ever since, reaching a peak of nearly four hundred cases in 1946.

Many complaints against adults, including non-support, paternity, and contributing, must be heard under rules of formal procedure. These include a trial by jury unless waived by the defendant. Single cases sometimes require a half-day to a day and a half of the judge's time.

The increase in recent years of adult cases of this kind has necessitated the assignment of Common Pleas Judges to assist the Court hear and dispose of them. Their nature will not permit delays which might cause hardships to either party.

**Common Pleas Judge Assigned** Judge James C. Connell of the Common Pleas bench was assigned to assist in this Court for the January term. At his own request he was reassigned for for both the May and September terms. During the year he had over 2400 hearings assigned to him, including the greater part of the complaints against adults. His services were greatly appreciated by the Court and should be by the community. His desire and willingness to be helpful were shown by his voluntarily coming to the Court during his vacation to preside over continued and additional hearings of cases that originally had come before him.

**New Judge Authorized** These conditions led the Cleveland Bar Association to sponsor a bill to add a second judge to this Court. The Cuyahoga County Bar Association joined in supporting this bill, as did numerous other local groups, and it was passed on June 12, 1945. The first term of the new judge was set at four years. Succeeding terms will run six years. This will stagger future elections and avoid both judges standing for election in the same year. It will also provide smoother continuity in administration of the Court.

**Judge McDermott Elected** At the November, 1946, election Judge William J. McDermott was elected to fill the new judgeship and take office January 1, 1947. Judge McDermott came to the Juvenile Court from the Municipal Court of Cleveland where he had served since July, 1939. A graduate of Western Reserve Law School, he was admitted to the bar in 1924 and since then has practiced law or held various public offices. He served as Assistant United States District Attorney, Special Assistant to the Attorney General of Ohio, and Moral Claims Commissioner, City of Cleveland.

Judge McDermott brings to the Juvenile Court a wide background of civic and social experience. A professional football and basketball player during his early years, he also coached and officiated and served as a municipal playground instructor.

In the social work field he is a member of the Welfare Federation, Chairman of its Child Labor Law Committee, and member of the Group Work Council. He is a director of the Society for Crippled Children, Merrick House, and the Cleveland Safety Council, and president of the Shaker Heights Community Council.

**Judge Eastman Re-elected** Judge Harry L. Eastman was re-elected in November and is now serving his twenty-first consecutive year as Judge and Administrator of this Court. Upon the invitation of United States Attorney General Tom Clark, Judge Eastman participated in the National Conference for the Prevention and Control of Delinquency held in Washington, D. C., November 20, 21 and 22, 1946. The complete report of this Conference is now being prepared and will be available later in 1947.

**Veterans' Training** Beginning October 1, 1946, the Court entered into an agreement with the Veterans' Administration to accept six qualified veterans for on-the-job training under the provisions of Public Law 679. The veterans were selected by the Court from among applicants recommended by the Veterans' Administration. The Court undertook this project largely because of the scarcity of trained social workers. It has the approval of the State Department of Education, and veterans who are taking the training have adapted themselves well to their duties.

**In-Service Staff Training** The social workers in the Probation and Aid to Dependent Children Divisions and the supervisors and attendants in the Detention Home are encouraged to improve their training by taking advanced college courses and attending seminars and professional conferences. In addition, a continuous course of in-service training is conducted by the Court directed by members of the staff.

**Psychiatric Lectures** Outstanding during the past year was the series of six weekly lectures, supplemented by reading assignments, on psychiatry for social workers given by Dr. Oscar B. Markey. The purpose of the course was to aid the Court workers in the selection of cases in which psychiatric studies seemed desirable, and to enable them to cooperate with the psychiatrist. Ways of making the best possible use of psychiatric reports and of carrying out the recommendations they contain were discussed. The content of the lectures was adapted to the kind of problems encountered by the workers.

## 1946 COMPLAINTS COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS

**Complaints Before the Court** The total complaints brought before the Court in 1946 were two and one-half per cent less than in the previous year, but still considerably higher than in the first four years of the six-year period beginning in 1941. This total includes all complaints, official and unofficial, adults and children, paternity, custody, non-support, neglect, dependency, delinquency, and several minor categories. An inspection of the Table of Complaints in the Statistics Section of this report will make clear how decreases in some of these classifications have been offset by increases in others.

**Official and Unofficial Complaints** Official complaints (brought by the filing of sworn petitions) which include the more serious problems before the Court, or require court orders or commitments, have declined over eight and a half per cent under 1945, and are only slightly in excess of the totals for the other years of the six-year period. The factors preventing a greater decline have been the marked increases in the protective complaints including consents to marry, paternity, and custody and support certifications from the divorce division of the Common Pleas Court. Neglect complaints, including non-support, were higher than in any year during the past six except 1941. Official delinquency complaints were the lowest for the same period.

The decline in official complaints has been offset by an increase of over five and a half per cent in the number of unofficial complaints filed. These have shown an almost constant increase during the past six years, with the exception of slight recessions in 1944 and 1945. These increases have been in non-support complaints and in minor delinquency not serious enough to require official hearing and disposition.

### DELINQUENCY COMPLAINTS

**Delinquency Totals** Total delinquency complaints show noteworthy decreases under the previous year. Official complaints against boys were 468 less; those against girls declined by 115. Altogether there was a decrease of 583 official delinquency complaints or slightly over 25 per cent.

The total unofficial delinquency complaints show a slight increase of 108 over 1945. This increase is due to a new policy of the Cleveland Police Department in dealing with traffic violations by juveniles.

Previously the only complaints of this nature brought to Court were those which involved accidents or damage.

**Juvenile Traffic Complaints** Early in 1946 the Cleveland Police Department began issuing traffic tickets to juvenile violators similar to those which have long been issued to adults. Juveniles, however, are required to appear in court for an unofficial hearing, unless it is an aggravated case. The dispositions included admonitions, restriction of license to absolutely necessary driving, and temporary or permanent suspension of the driver's license. Restrictions are usually for longer periods than temporary suspension. Some juvenile drivers have been found without licenses and others violating the conditions of learner's temporary licenses. Authorities feel that the results of this new policy have been uniformly good and a positive contribution to safe driving.

**Effect on Delinquency Totals** This new policy increased the number of traffic complaints from 187 in 1945 to 619 in 1946, or over 230 per cent. Other unofficial delinquency complaints actually decreased by over 18 per cent. The inclusion of traffic complaints results in an increase of slightly less than 6 per cent in the unofficial total.

A table showing in detail both the official and unofficial delinquency complaints filed during the year will be found in the Statistical Section.

**Other Delinquencies** Aside from traffic complaints, and a few other exceptions, the various forms of delinquency have shown gratifying decreases. Among boys, complaints regarding property are the most numerous officially and occupy second place among the unofficial complaints. Yet these have decreased from the 1945 totals by 200 officially and 60 unofficially. Auto stealing, as usual, leads among official cases, but there were 54 fewer complaints than in 1945. If owners would stop inviting this offense by leaving their cars unlocked and the ignition keys in place, as happened in 75 per cent of these cases, complaints of this nature would be reduced to a very small number. Burglary and larceny have decreased but there have been about the usual number of complaints of stealing and destruction of property. While the more serious official complaints of property offenses have decreased among boys, they have increased by 16 among girls, or 47 per cent. These increases are mainly in stealing and destruction.

Complaints of sexual immorality among boys have increased noticeably, but among girls there has been a marked decrease. Complaints of beyond parental control have declined by over 200, and violations of ordinances, other than traffic, have decreased by over 170.

Truancy has shown a marked decline of over 100 complaints. Run-aways from home among Cuyahoga County children have remained about the same, but out-of-town runaways held by the Court for return to their home jurisdictions have dropped from 257 in 1945 to 154 in the past year. These have been about equally divided between boys and girls, whereas in 1945 the boys slightly exceeded the girls.

**Dispositions of Delinquents** The Court found it advisable to place only 912 delinquents under supervision of probation officers in 1946, whereas the number in the previous year was 1484. This was only 24 per cent of the total in 1946; those for the previous year represented over 31 per cent. A relatively larger per cent was released to the supervision of their own parents. This reflects the improved stability of the average home as well as the less serious nature of the predominating complaints.

**Commitments to Correctional Institutions** The total of institutional commitments of delinquents declined from 399 in 1945 to 222 in 1946. Commitments are made only in official cases, of which they represented over 17 per cent in 1945 and less than 13 per cent in 1946. Only half as many commitments were made to the State Industrial Schools at Lancaster and Delaware as in the preceding year. Commitments to the Boys' Farm at Hudson were little more than half as many as in 1945. Because in the past boys committed to this School had to remain in the Detention Home for long periods, sometimes months, before the School found room for them, the Court reduced the number of commitments to approximate the acceptance rate. There is urgent need for the expansion of this School so that the many minor delinquents who can be benefited by its services may be accommodated. The same is true of the Blossom Hill School for Girls, but in a lesser degree. Training at these schools, if available, would prevent many serious delinquent careers that later necessitate commitment to the State Industrial Schools or the Reformatory.

**Adult Contributors** Seventy-four adults were charged with contributing to juvenile delinquency, the same number as in the preceding year. Two-thirds of these were in connection with girls' cases, principally sexual offenses. In boys' cases most of the contributors were charged in connection with traffic violations. Others were in connection with truancy, illegal employment of minors, illegal sales to juveniles of firearms, ammunition, or alcoholic liquors, and receiving stolen property.

Forty-seven adults were sentenced to correctional institutions, 12 were given suspended sentences and assessed fines and costs, and only one escaped with a fine. Two adults were dismissed, 11 continued conditionally, and one was not apprehended.



## NEGLECT AND DEPENDENCY

The Juvenile Court is concerned not only with the delinquent child but also with neglected and dependent children. Continuous interpretation has gradually created public awareness of the fact that juvenile courts are not just "criminal courts for children" — a popular misconception — but are agencies for the enforcement of responsibilities of adults toward children. This function is clearly illustrated in the Court's work on behalf of dependent and neglected children.

Neglected children are those whose parents refuse or fail to provide a suitable home for them; dependent children are those whose parents are unable to provide such a home. In the former case the parent is at fault; in the case of dependents, the parent has some excuse for failure. In either case, the actual circumstances of the child may be very similar.

**Neglected Children** Neglect complaints, most of which charged non-support, increased by 84 official and 50 unofficial cases over 1945. This is the second year in which such cases have increased.

These increases are the normal result of the release of war-employed mothers, the return of fathers from military service, during which allotments for family support were compulsory, and improved employment conditions. The success of the Court in dealing with cases of this type is shown later under the Division of Child Support.

**Dependent Children** One of the saddest evidences of the social failure of our urban civilization is the plight of those unfortunate children who are classified as dependent. These are increasing and are the direct result of our social and moral disorganization. Some are the products of hasty and ill-considered war marriages, or of passing romances that avoided marriage. Some are the result of an influx to the city during the war of families of low cultural patterns and lax moral standards. Others are the unwanted and rejected offspring of parents who, while physically adult, are still emotionally and intellectually immature. Only a few of this group are actually orphaned or the children of physically disabled parents.

**The Dilemma of the Court** Many of these cases are brought to Court and the children placed in the Detention Home because no social agency in Cleveland is prepared or willing to give them the temporary care and shelter they need. The Court must attempt to find satisfactory homes for them either among relatives, in institutions, or through the public and private child caring agencies. In Cuyahoga County it is the general practice (with some notable exceptions) for child caring agencies to accept such children and assume responsibility for their care only by commitment from the Juvenile Court.

**Better Methods of Other Communities** The acceptance practices of Cuyahoga County child caring agencies, both private and public, are in sharp contrast with those employed by similar agencies elsewhere in Ohio and throughout the country. Elsewhere the general practice is to accept children by voluntary agreement with parents and relatives. Cases are taken to court only when parents oppose placement and legal authority is required in the interest of the child. This is in agreement with the recommendation of the 1940 White House Conference (page 372) that: "Public and private welfare agencies should cooperate in a program which will assure the proper service to every child in need . . . without court commitment, unless change of legal custody or guardianship is involved, or legal action is needed because of the circumstances of the parents' neglect or the child's delinquency."

**Contrast with Another County** One Ohio county, which has only a population about half as large as Cuyahoga's, furnishes a startling contrast to conditions here. During the last six months of 1946, according to figures published by the State Welfare Department, the public and private child-caring agencies of that county accepted 1564 children, only 155 of which were committed by the Juvenile Court. In Cuyahoga County during the same period, of 1611 children accepted by similar agencies, 1166 were committed by the Juvenile Court. In other words, 7 out of every 10 dependent and neglected children accepted by child welfare agencies in Cuyahoga County were brought into Juvenile Court, while in another county the proportion was only 1 out of 10.

**No Dependents in Other Detention Homes** The Detention Home in the county referred to does not care for dependent or neglected children. These are all housed by child caring institutions and agencies as are the children of evicted families. This is the general practice throughout the State and nation. The Cuyahoga County Detention Home is one of the very few obliged to provide such service and the only one that is required to care for children after a commitment has been made to a child caring agency or institution. It is also the only one compelled to care for infants and small children. During 1946 our Detention Home cared for 65 infants under 18 months old and an additional 231 children under 6 years of age. There were also 125 children from evicted families.

**Children's Shelter Needed** This situation is not to the credit of Cuyahoga County. It can and should be remedied immediately. Two possibilities may be considered. Either local institutions should undertake to furnish this service, or a children's shelter and training home should be opened. All local children's institutions are

operating as private or sectarian agencies and are within their legal rights in declining to furnish this service, although the social wisdom of this attitude may be questioned. Cuyahoga County never has had a general children's home. Neither the private nor the public agencies are willing to construct and operate such a shelter. The problem has been surveyed and discussed by the social agencies and the Welfare Federation for over four years. Meanwhile, large numbers of children have been the victims of community neglect and have had to remain in the confined quarters in the overcrowded Detention Home for periods ranging from six months to a year. Perhaps an indignant public opinion is needed to remedy this condition which is a reproach to the social services in this county.

#### PROBATION DEPARTMENT

**Probation Investigations** The probation officer has diverse functions and responsibilities in relation to persons brought before the Court and to the community. Almost all cases referred to the Court are assigned to the probation staff for a social investigation preceding the hearing. From interviews with the persons concerned, parents, relatives, school or employer, church, social agencies, etc., pertinent information is secured for an understanding of the whole personality of all persons involved and the role of each in the problem before the Court. The complex social and psychological factors are evaluated to determine the individual's capacity for adjustment and acceptance of recognized responsibilities. To gain such understanding, the probation officer must be friendly and objective.

The probation staff during 1946 investigated a total of 3156 cases, of which 1324 were delinquent boys, 385 were delinquent girls, and 1447 were non-delinquent cases.

The social information thus obtained is assembled in a report designated by law as confidential. It is presented at the time of the hearing and is of value to the judge or referee in determining what social treatment seems advisable or necessary.

**Referrals to Social Agencies** Many of the dispositions of the Court require the attention of the probation officer to assure that the orders of the Court are carried out. Decisions to place a delinquent, dependent, or neglected child necessitate conferences with public or private child welfare agencies. Children, parents, and adults in need of special services for behavior and personality problems are brought in contact with social agencies or clinics giving such services.

The probation staff reported 478 referrals for placement and case-work service. Many of these were accepted by the agencies, relieving the Court of providing supervision and further planning. In addition, the referees made a referral of 61 unofficial cases heard by them.

**Cases Under Supervision** Whenever it appears possible to effect a solution of the problem by adjustment within the home, this is attempted and the case placed under supervision of a probation officer. Probation is an individualized method of treatment. Efforts are made to correct poor environmental conditions. Parents are given an understanding of their responsibilities in caring for children and providing home conditions necessary for wholesome growth and development. The delinquent child is aided in securing some insight into his problem. At such times as the probation officer sees the need of advice, the child or adult is referred to a psychiatrist for an interview.

It is encouraging that less than one-fourth of the delinquent children and about one-sixth of the neglect cases under supervision during the year, have had to appear again before the Court for further action. Less than 6.5 per cent of the delinquent children, and only 3 adults contributing to neglect, reappeared because of a new complaint being filed.

The total number of delinquent, dependent, and neglect cases under the supervision of the Probation Department during the year was 2436. The Court referred 1029 new cases for supervision, while 1518 cases were removed or discharged from probation. This turn-over resulted in a reduction of case loads from war-time levels to generally recognized standards.

**Community Relations** To achieve the best possible results, the probation officer must have a thorough knowledge of the services of the social agencies and the schools in the community, and he must be ready to interpret to others the work of the Court. The Court, being an important cog in the community welfare program, must have its functions clearly understood by other agencies. Following changes in the policies and functions of the various social agencies to meet community needs, the Court must re-coordinate its work with that of the agencies.

To facilitate the exchange of information and ideas, the Court had representation on many of the committees and boards of public and private agencies, and staff members have participated in local community councils and social workers groups. Staff members constantly meet with and speak to groups at schools, churches, and civic organizations to bring to the community information about the work of the Court.

#### DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT

**Purpose of Division** The primary function of the Division of Child Support is to supervise collections for the support of children. An appreciable increase in the number of cases placed under

supervision in the past year was the result of demobilization. Many cases, inactive during the war, when allotments were paid directly to families, were re-opened after the father's return to civilian life. The accelerated divorce trend has also caused material increases in cases certified to the Juvenile Court for orders concerning the care, custody, and support of children.

**Volume of Cases** The total number of cases at the present time supervised by the Division is 3513 which includes approximately 5700 children. Of this number, there are 2854 cases for which the money goes direct to the mother or to a relative with whom the children are placed, and 659 cases supervised for collection for public and private child placing agencies. The total collected during 1946 was \$979,772.32, an increase of \$319,986.05 over 1945. Of this amount mothers and relatives received \$822,798.82, public agencies \$63,358.33, and private agencies \$93,615.17.

During 1946, there were 22,571 office interviews, the majority of which were in response to notices sent to the payer. This Division maintains an automatic checkup whereby all persons under order to pay are notified when they fall behind. This prevents the individual from accumulating a large arrearage and obviates further Court action.

**Problems of Division** Many problems arise that the Division attempts to adjust just without the necessity of a further Court hearing.

Often complaints are filed against fathers who live in the home but do not adequately support. In many instances, after the matter has been heard by the Court, it is referred to this Division and plans are worked out to assure adequate support. Sometimes the father's entire earnings are paid into Court and expenditures supervised; or arrangements are made for the mother to collect the wages from the employer. Such satisfactory financial arrangements have often avoided a broken home. Where payments have not been made regularly, arrangements are made with employers whereby an amount ordered is deducted from the man's earnings and sent directly to the Court.

**Adjustment of Payments** During the past year, it has been the object of the Division to review all orders with the purpose of increasing them wherever practical to meet the increased cost of care. In families receiving financial assistance from public agencies orders for support are reviewed from time to time and, wherever possible, increases are made, thereby relieving that agency from full financial aid when the father is able to assume all or part of the responsibility.

**Correction Farm** The Division supervises the parole from the Correction Farm of all adults committed by this Court. Where there are releases under conditional parole and supervision, it

is often necessary to contact employers and arrange for re-employment. When earnings have been determined, the release can be arranged and an order for future support made by the Court. The Division cooperates with representatives of Alcoholics Anonymous who sponsor individuals, work out programs for conditional releases, secure employment, and follow through on rehabilitation.

**Family Relations** When the parents are separated, the question of visiting must usually be settled and because of friction between parents objections are often raised by both parties as to arrangements for visitations. The Division endeavors to work out satisfactory arrangements, trying to select a place in neutral surroundings. It has been found that the parent who is not living with the children can be kept more interested in their welfare if he is allowed frequent visits with them. From time to time the Division has been helpful in bringing families together again, especially where the separation has existed for only a short time and either parent has expressed the desire for a reconciliation.

Tables showing the movement of cases in this Division, of prisoners at the Correction Farm committed by the Juvenile Court, and detailed distribution of the money collected for child support will be found in the Statistical Section.

#### THE JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

**Number of Children Served** Fewer children were received for care in the Detention Home during 1946 than in either of the two preceding years. The total numbered 2904, a decrease of 690 under that of 1945. Delinquent boys and girls totaled 2154, while the dependent and neglected, including 125 children of evicted families, totaled 750. There were about two delinquent boys to each delinquent girl. Among the dependent children, boys exceeded girls by only a slight margin.

**Number of Days' Care Given Children** The Home furnished 85,428 days' care to these children. The average length of stay of delinquents was 17 days, for a total of 34,408 days. The stays of most delinquents were only 7 to 10 days, the higher average being caused by longer stays of a small number awaiting admission to correctional schools or other institutions, or runaways from other communities held pending arrangement for their return to their homes or local authorities.

Dependent and neglected children received 51,020 days' care and remained for an average of 70 days each. Again this average is not a true picture, for the individual stays range from several weeks to well over a year. Agencies to which some of these children are com-



mitted have had difficulty in finding foster home placements and a considerable number were returned because foster home placements were not successful. Institutions have also been slow in removing children, especially those who are feeble-minded, maladjusted, or otherwise handicapped.

**Overcrowding** Facilities at the Detention Home provide for the care of 60 dependent and 100 delinquent children. At one time there were 171 dependent children in the home and 65 delinquents. This was nearly one-half again above the normal capacity of the Home and nearly two and a half times the capacity of the dependents' section. Ordinarily dependent and neglected children are housed in separate buildings. This overcrowding necessitated housing a considerable number of the dependent children in the delinquents' building.

**Quarantines** Congestion was further increased by incidence of children's contagious diseases. These are much more frequent among the dependents than among the delinquents who generally are older and already have had these diseases. These diseases cause strict quarantine of the entire unit of 18 to 20 children. As many as three or four units have been under quarantine at the same time and have caused the closing of units for a total of 755 unit days as compared with 431 days in 1945.

**Activities of the Children** In addition to their regular activities such as school, playground, and gymnasium, the children in each unit put on special projects of their own often under outside volunteer leaders. Because of their longer stays the more ambitious projects are developed by children in dependent units.

Holidays are always celebrated at Detention Home with appropriate ceremonies. Once a month each unit holds a birthday party in honor of all the children whose birthdays fell in that month. Parents are permitted to contribute in the way of gifts, favors, candy, and cake.

**Friends of the Detention Home** We are fortunate to have the sustained interest of many kindly citizens. These include civic, women's, church, and children's clubs; parent-teacher associations, and individuals. Adult groups have made clothing which it has been difficult to buy. Children's groups have contributed candy and favors for special holidays and both groups have sent gifts at Christmas time. The University Circle Kiwanis Club each year has given the children a Big Christmas party with a Santa Claus, individual gifts, and a delightful entertainment. The Detention Home also benefited from funds raised by the Cleveland News and the Cleveland Press, which were distributed by the Christmas Committee of the Welfare Federation.

The Library continues to be skillfully serviced by members of

the Women's Board of Hiram House. Access to good books is appreciated by the children and has created new interests and opened up new horizons. The Boy Scouts have been invited to set up groups within the Home to stimulate interest in their program and from which boys can be referred to Troops in the area in which they are placed.

**Service to Children's Agencies** The Home has continued to furnish the workers in children's agencies with reports on the adjustment of children in whom they are interested. During 1946 written reports of this nature totaled 324 and telephoned reports numbered 432. The usual tabular reports on the Home will be found in the Statistical Section.

## THE COURT CLINIC

### MEDICAL SECTION — Dr. R. F. Golubski, Physician-in-Charge

**Examinations Made** Of the 2670 children placed in the Detention Home during the year, 2478 received thorough medical and physical examinations. Those not examined, about 7 per cent, had been released in the morning before the physician came on duty. An additional 186, who had not been detained here, were sent in for examination so that the total numbered 2664 children. This included 1845 boys and 819 girls.

It is significant that only 501 of these children were found to be physically normal. This includes 432 delinquents and 69 dependents. This term applies only to those children who showed no evidence of illness or physical defect, either minor or major. It excludes all children having burns, scars, bruises, abrasions, or superficial cuts.

The large number of children (82 per cent) showing physical abnormalities tended to fall into definite groupings of common but remediable defects which were either overlooked or ignored prior to the child's detention. Attention is here called to only those defects which were most frequently found.

**Most Frequent Defects** Among the delinquents 17.5 per cent had various degrees of defective vision. In addition, 39 delinquents and 13 dependents were cross-eyed. Decayed teeth were observed among 32 per cent of the delinquents, and 25 per cent of the dependents. Head lice were found on 177 children (115 dependents and 62 delinquents). Ringworm of the foot was observed on 100 delinquents and 8 dependents and 12 additional cases of ringworm of the scalp were detected. Vigorous and intensive treatment was applied to prevent infection of other children in the Home.

Another significant finding was 735 cases of acne in the delinquent and 16 in the dependent group. Since the delinquents are made up principally of adolescents we would expect to find this condition with greater frequency there than in the younger group. In several in-

stances more severe cases created a psychological problem that was definitely a partial cause of the child's feeling of inferiority and rejection by his companions.

There were 66 cases of nutritional imbalance ranging from borderline conditions to malnutrition, 30 among the dependents and 36 among the delinquents. In addition, there were 78 cases of physical retardation and 66 cases of obesity.

Many children otherwise free of defects were admitted with upper respiratory infections (head colds, bronchitis, and similar diseases); scabies (skin diseases resulting from uncleanliness); and contacts with contagious diseases. Obviously we cannot be aware of the latter condition until the child "breaks out" with typical symptoms.

The physical defects mentioned above comprise the significant groups for which remedial care and treatment is of immediate importance. These, especially in their more severe forms, are likely to contribute to alterations in the child's behavior patterns and tendencies to anti-social conduct.

Many children, despite sound bodies, show definite neurotic and psychotic tendencies and varying degrees of mental retardation. The medical department keeps no record of these cases as they are referred to the psychologist and psychiatrist for study and observation.

**Diagnostic Tests** Employing diagnostic tests on admission has proved to be a valuable procedure. Gonorrhoea was discovered in 10 instances and in 17 a positive blood Wasserman was

found. Tuberculin tests of 256 children gave positive reactions in 28 cases. Of these, two were referred for X-ray examination and found to have active childhood tuberculosis for which they were promptly hospitalized. Out of 183 Schick tests done, 128 children were found to be susceptible to diphtheria and promptly immunized to this easily preventable disease. In addition, 129 smallpox vaccinations were done.

**Bed Patients and Quarantine** There were 958 bed patients for a total of 3410 bed days during the year. As would be expected in a children's group, acute infections of the nose, ear,

throat, and respiratory tract were responsible for the largest number of ill children. The contagious diseases common to children—measles, chicken pox, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and mumps—were responsible for unit quarantines totaling 755 days.

**Dispensary Treatments** Our nursing staff, in addition to excellent routine and, in many instances, specialized care of our bed patients, gave a total of 4248 dispensary treatments.

**Operations and Specialized Care** Finally, many children especially among the dependent group, received further specialized service, such as tonsilectomies, eye refractions, dental and other care in the out-patient departments of our

large city hospitals.

**Acknowledgments** A word of acknowledgment would not be amiss at this point for the whole-hearted cooperation the Medical Department has received from administrative heads of the Court and Detention Home, from probation officers, Detention Home personnel, and the visitors of the Child Welfare Board and other agencies, in carrying out its recommendations and suggestions, assuring each and every child in the Detention Home the most, the best, and the latest in medical care.

**PSYCHIATRIC DEPARTMENT** — Dr. Oscar B. Markey, Psychiatrist

Dr. Oscar B. Markey took charge of the Psychiatric section of the Court Clinic on March 15, 1946. Consequently this section of the report covers only the last nine and one-half months of 1946 under Dr. Markey's supervision.

**Number and Types Studied** About 118 children, two-thirds of them boys, were studied during the period covered by this report. Generally referred because of baffling mental components of their problems, they were selected by probation officers and their supervisors because they were considered potentially or actually mentally ill.

The average age probably fits the general statistics; the boys were slightly over fourteen and a half, and the girls fifteen and a half years old. The nature of their delinquencies ran the usual pattern of those coming to the attention of the Court, though it may be said that these children were usually more disturbing than disturbed.

**Findings** The findings emphasize the fact that environmental influences outside the home were not to be considered as too serious. Neighborhood recreational or church facilities, even had they been more readily available, could not have prevented the delinquencies of many of these children.

Actual psychoses were not present in any of the children studied, nor were there many malignant mental conditions. Less than five per cent were thought to be pre-psychotic and none were ill enough to require care in a mental hospital. Nevertheless, several could have benefited from a period of observation in a children's receiving ward, had such service been available. In some instances the facilities of open institutions, such as the Children's Aid Society or the Bureau of Juvenile Research, were considered inadequate. This was especially true of children whose behavior was characterized by lack of inhibition, overactivity, and failure to profit from simple experience.

**Psychopathic Personalities** Less than ten per cent of the children studied were considered to be developing psychopathic personalities. In children this diagnosis is made with hesitation because there is still a reasonable possibility that the character of the devel-

oping child is not finally settled. Thus, children who show the nominal signs of psychopathic personality may still resolve them if a satisfactory social and educational program can be established for them. The adult psychopath, on the other hand, requires custodial limitation and rarely, if ever, develops sufficient ego control to manage himself successfully in society.

It may be added that only two children in this group were diagnosed as feeble-minded and only twelve were borderline cases. The problem of mental defect was not found to be a major one in this group.

**Conclusions** The outstanding finding lay in the poor family integration of practically all of these children. Over-restriction or ineffectual discipline, parental discord, multiple marriages and broken homes, examples of major or minor delinquencies in other members of the family, and general evidence of child rejection predominated in most of the cases studied. Far less than ten per cent of the children came from families that could be recognized as adequate.

**Studies by Other** In addition to the 118 cases reported by Dr. Markey, 63 studies were made by other psychiatrists including

**Psychiatrists** Doctors M. D. Friedman, Wilfried M. Gill, Reuben R. Gould, Harry A. Lipson, and Wilmot F. Schneider.

These bring the total psychiatric studies to 181 cases.

#### PSYCHOMETRIC TESTING — Edith Dombey, Psychologist

**Purpose of Tests** To understand specific behavior it is necessary to understand the whole individual. To do this general intelligence, specific abilities and proficiencies must be measured. This appraisal of the child's intellectual level, his emotional development, his achievements, attitudes, and motives, is the psychologist's contribution to the over-all picture.

For this purpose a method of standardized interview is used including tests which are highly interesting to the child and call forth his responses to an extraordinary variety of situations. In this way we learn a great deal about the child's mental ability; whether he is average for his age, retarded, or advanced; whether his school placement is correct; and whether emotional factors are preventing him from working up to capacity. His facility in using words and symbols is measured as is his adeptness in handling concrete objects; in short, we learn what are his assets and liabilities.

Aside from the standardized rating, many valuable things can be learned about the child during the interview, such as his attitudes and behavior; his degree of responsiveness; whether he is alert or listless; whether he reacts spontaneously or needs urging and encouragement; whether he is attentive or easily distracted, composed or uncomfortable, at ease or tense, quick or slow, hesitant or embarrassed

and unusually shy; whether he is persistent in his efforts or gives up easily; whether he is serious or playful. Just observing the child reveals to the psychologist a multitude of significant things which will be helpful in handling him and his problems.

**Use of Test Results** The emotional factors are of great importance because they may cause oppressive feelings from which relief is sought through anti-social activity. It is essential to know the degree of the child's emotional maturity; his attitudes relating to his home, family, school, and associates; and the manner in which he has adjusted or failed to adjust in these situations.

Out of this body of knowledge comes an understanding of the causes of behavior difficulties and a recognition of the way in which the intellectual, emotional, social, and physical factors have operated to shape the behavior pattern of the child. This recognition facilitates planning with and for the child so that the underlying difficulties may be remedied or minimized, or his attitudes so modified that a repetition of the antisocial behavior will be unlikely.

**Number of Tests Given** Psychometric tests are given to all children who remain in the Detention Home one day or longer. During the year 23 per cent of the children received were released before tests could be arranged. Tests were given to 1038 children. In addition to these, recent tests were found in the psychometric clearing house for 229 children, and our own records furnished results of tests administered to 789 on previous stays in the Detention Home. Test results were furnished the Court, Probation Department, and children's agencies for a total of 2478 children.

#### DIVISION OF AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

**Services of the Division** Aid to Dependent Children is a nation-wide program providing financial aid and social services in their own homes to children who are dependent because the wage earner has died, or is physically or mentally ill and cannot work, or is continuously absent from the home. In Ohio the State Department of Public Welfare is responsible for developing uniform standards throughout the State and for supervising the county administrations. In Cuyahoga County the program is administered by the Juvenile Court Judge. Financial aid is provided jointly from county, state, and federal funds.

Effective October, 1946, new legislation changed the financial formula for state and federal funds. The federal formula now provides the local community with more money. Federal funds are determined solely by the number of eligible children and the money is distributed on the basis of a maximum of \$13.50 for the first child in a family and \$9.00 for each additional child. This represents an increase of 50 per cent over the former federal formula. The Federal Govern-



ment does not contribute to any amount over \$24.00 for the first and \$15.00 for each additional child. The State now gives 25 per cent of the total amount spent for assistance. For the year 1946 the Division spent \$1,474,554. This was received from the following sources: Federal Government, \$369,364.50; State Government, \$410,274.37; County Government, \$694,915.13.

**How Assistance is Given** Application for assistance is made to the office of the Division, located in the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court Building, where a statement of the conditions of eligibility will be provided upon request.

Before assistance may be given a Division worker is required to obtain proof that the applicant meets all of the requirements for aid. These include verification of age, residence, cause of dependency, and resources. There must be a complete physical examination of each parent who claims inability to support his children because of illness or physical disability. This examination is reviewed by a Medical Committee appointed by the Cleveland Academy of Medicine. Present members are Dr. Neil McDermott, Dr. Mortimer Siegel, and Dr. John Tomasch. Medical problems of active cases are also presented to this Committee for recommendation.

**Lay Advisory Board** An Advisory Board of lay people, appointed on the basis of their interest and knowledge of family and child welfare, studies all cases in which a grant is contemplated, and then makes a recommendation. These then go to the Administrator for action. The Board brings to the Division expert lay opinion and serves to interpret the work of the Division to other agencies and the community. Mrs. Edwin Alexander is Chairman of the Board and represents the Division on the Case Work Council of the Cleveland Welfare Federation. Mrs. Louis Bing represents the Division on the Children's Council.

The following are the other members of the Board. Mrs. L. O. Baumgardner, Mrs. Jules Eshner, Miss Dolcie Gallagher, Mrs. Margaret H. Hawkins, Mrs. C. M. Lemperly, Mrs. C. R. Metcalf, Mrs. H. P. Mishler, Miss Helen Phelan, Mrs. Arthur Reinthal, and Mrs. Louis B. Seltzer.

Since Aid to Dependent Children grants are given on the basis of actual need, no assistance can be given if the resources are sufficient to take care of the necessities of life. Where a grant is made, the amount will depend upon the living requirements of the applicant, on the resources of the individual or family, and upon the funds available in the county for public assistance. The law provides a fine and imprisonment for any person who obtains or attempts to obtain aid to which the child is not entitled.

While receiving assistance the recipients must continue to meet

all the requirements of the program and are responsible for notifying the county administration of any change in their circumstances which might affect the grant and must provide good care for their children.

The Division worker makes regular calls in the home and is available at other times when the recipient wishes some service. The worker may be able to help directly with many problems, or may be able to refer the recipient to other agencies in the community. This will include help in planning meals, suggestions of recreational opportunities, or aid in securing medical care, home instruction, or employment.

Assistance is given in the form of a warrant on the County Auditor's office. Payments are made only once a month and for this reason the Division is not able to handle emergency situations. Families that need immediate financial aid should be referred to an appropriate public or private relief agency.

**Intake Department** During the year 1946 the work of the Intake Department increased and there were several reasons for this. Many women and older children who had been employed in war industries were laid off after V-J Day, and following demobilization such people subsequently applied for and received unemployment compensation. These benefits began to terminate for many in February, 1946, and it was in this month that the Department noticed a rather sharp increase in applications. The Emergency Day Care Centers were very unsettled and eventually closed in the middle of the year. Some foster-home day care was available but the rates were prohibitive to the mothers who sought aid from this Division. A large percentage of mothers were advised by the courts and other agencies to remain at home and supervise their children.

During the year a total of 1384 applicants were interviewed by the Intake Department. Of these, 582 were referred by other social agencies in the community. A total of 743 applied on their own initiative and 59 were referred by individuals. We interpret this as an indication that the Aid to Dependent Children program is well known in the community. Of the total number seen by the Intake Department, 589 applications were accepted for investigation. There were 694 rejected chiefly because of adequate resources, according to the standards used by the Agency. An additional 101 cases not eligible for this program were referred to an appropriate agency for the services they requested. The 589 applications accepted for investigation were taken for the following reasons: separation and desertion, 181; death, 118; divorce, 91; incapacity, 91; illegitimacy, 70; imprisonment, 36; military service, 2.

**Standards of Assistance** New standards of assistance were adopted by the Division on October 1, 1946. Increases were chiefly for food and clothing. Following June 30, when the

Office of Price Administration was terminated, there was a period in which prices rose and fell. As a result of new standards of assistance the payroll increased from \$119,910 in September to \$137,769 in October.

The Division uses an adequate minimum diet based upon Publication 78 of the Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. The Division has a Home Economist who is available to families and to the Division's social workers for consultation on budget problems, planning meals and home-maker's service. She also takes care of the children's camp program during the summer and the Christmas program.

**Loss and** On January 1, 1946, there were 78 applications pending.

**Gain** To this were added the 589 applications accepted during the year, so that a total of 667 were considered. They were disposed of as follows: 425 approved for aid; 118 found to be ineligible after investigation; 124 pending on December 31, 1946.

On January 1, 1946, there were 1369 families receiving aid in which there were 3752 minor children. During the year 425 new cases were added so that a total of 1794 families with 5261 children received aid from the Division. The average number of children per family was 2.9. The average grant per year per family was \$821. During the year a total of 320 cases were discontinued chiefly because of family earnings due to direct employment and to the remarriage of mothers receiving aid. There were 1474 families carried forward to January 1, 1947.

In conclusion we wish to point out that the high divorce rate and the tendency of families to separate by reason of desertion, the lack of adequate facilities for day care of children and the bad housing situation have presented major problems both to the community and to the Agency. As long as this situation continues it seems likely that the Aid to Dependent Children rolls will increase.

#### LONG CONTINUITY OF SERVICE BY COURT EMPLOYEES

The Court has always taken pride and satisfaction in the number of its staff who have remained in its employ over an extended number of years, and who have made it their life work. To their loyalty, accumulated experience, and devotion to duty the Court owes much of the improvement in organization and service that it has been able to achieve. Operating strictly within Civil Service regulations, it has sought to give its employees a sense of security that would enable them to put forth their best efforts. By a policy of promotions within the service it has encouraged them to continued study and has benefited from the practical experience they have acquired.

Nineteen employees of the Court in 1946 were members of the

staff when the present administration took office in 1926. Many of them have served from twenty-five to thirty years. Many more who were employees in 1926 and who have since been lost by death or compulsory retirement had long records of continuous employment.

### RETIREMENTS

**Director of A.D.C. Retires** Miss Nell Collopy came to the Court in May, 1918, as a case worker in the Mothers' Pension Division. She was appointed Director in 1921. She retired on June 30, 1946, having reached the compulsory retirement age set by the laws governing the Ohio Public Employees' Retirement System.

**Retirement of Chief Clerk** Guy L. Spencer, Chief Deputy Clerk and Legal Advisor to the Court, became a member of the staff in December, 1926. He retired as of December 31, 1946, having served twenty years and, by special dispensation, beyond the customary compulsory retirement age.

## STATISTICAL TABLES

### Total Complaints — Official and Unofficial Six-Year Period — 1941 through 1946

Type of Complaint	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Total Complaints — Official and Unofficial . . .	5753	5901	6536	6007	6865	6687
Official Complaints — Total . . . . .	3482	3463	3620	3433	3996	3651
Delinquency — Total . . . . .	1790	1814	2244	2036	2323	1740
Boys . . . . .	1368	1304	1623	1486	1787	1319
Girls . . . . .	422	510	621	550	536	421
Adults tending to cause delinquency . . . . .	12	10	18	15	16	12
Dependency . . . . .	276	251	207	256	230	216
Neglect . . . . .	1061	898	759	722	895	979
Consents to marry . . . . .	88	141	129	128	149	144
Paternity . . . . .	157	266	206	162	227	393
Certified from Common Pleas Court . . . . .	98	83	57	71	90	130
Certified from Probate Court . . . . .	.....	.....	.....	43	66	4
Unofficial Complaints — Total . . . . .	2271	2438	2916	2574	2869	3036
Delinquency — Totals . . . . .	1376	1428	2032	1685	1945	2053
Boys . . . . .	1163	1116	1654	1306	1541	1685
Girls . . . . .	213	312	378	379	404	368
Dependency . . . . .	17	8	6	4	4	4
Neglect and non-support . . . . .	869	1000	878	885	920	979
Other . . . . .	9	2	.....	1	.....	.....

**Delinquency Complaints — By Sex and Type — Official and Unofficial**

Complaints	3004 Boys		789 Girls		Grand Total
	Offic.	Unoffic.	Offic.	Unoffic.	
Total — Delinquency .....	1319	1685	421	368	3793
Against the Person — Total.....	85	102	13	43	243
Assault (and) battery.....	63	102	8	43	216
Assault with weapons.....	5	.....	4	.....	9
Sexual assault and attempts .....	3	.....	.....	.....	3
Robbery and attempts .....	14	.....	1	.....	15
Against Property — Total.....	708	497	50	41	1296
Auto stealing and tampering.....	243	5	.....	.....	248
Breaking and entering.....	210	71	.....	4	285
Other stealing.....	155	152	41	32	380
Destruction of property.....	53	269	5	5	332
Other property offenses.....	47	.....	4	.....	51
Sex Complaints — Total.....	77	11	53	4	145
Serious Mischief — Total.....	219	984	146	226	1575
Beyond parental control.....	101	112	112	88	413
Traffic violations .....	33	619	.....	8	660
Other misdemeanors .....	85	253	34	130	502
Runaway from Home — Total.....	133	13	122	11	279
Cuyahoga County residents.....	55	13	46	11	125
Out-of-County residents.....	78	.....	76	.....	154
Truant from school — Total.....	97	78	37	43	255

**Children Under Care in the Detention Home — 1946**

Movement of Population	Delinquent		Dependent		Grand Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Under care January 1.....	77	30	74	53	234
Admitted during year.....	1485*	562*	357	266	2670
TOTAL under care.....	1562	592	431	319	2904
Released during year.....	1502	563	341	266	2672
Under care December 31 .....	60	29	90	53	232
Total days care furnished .....	22,817	11,591	30,232	20,788	85,428
Average daily population.....	62	32	83	57	234
Average length of stay in days .....	14	20	70	65	43

\* Includes 106 boys and 105 girls, not resident in Cuyahoga County, who were picked up as runaways and held for return to their own homes or to authorities in their home jurisdictions. These out-of-town runaways made up over 8 per cent of the boys and 25 per cent of the girls officially charged as delinquents.

### Dispositions in Official Delinquency Cases

Disposition of Juveniles	Boys	Girls	Total
Total Delinquency Complaints Filed.....	1319	421	1740
Committed to parents, relatives, individuals.....	59	5	64
Committed to Agencies for supervision.....	41	69	110
Placed under Supervision of Probation Officers — Total....	732	154	886
Supervision only.....	453	119	572
Supervision and payment of costs, fines, damages ...	222	8	230
For placement.....	50	20	70
Referral to Probate Court.....	7	7	14
Committed or Returned to Institutions — Total.....	184	38	222
Ohio State Reformatory — Mansfield.....	14	...	14
State Industrial Schools.....	100	10	110
City Farm Schools.....	70	22	92
Convent of the Good Shepherd.....	...	6	6
Dismissed.....	31	6	37
Not apprehended.....	3	2	5
Entered the armed services.....	26	...	26
Returned to other jurisdictions.....	98	92	190
Continued or other disposition.....	144	54	198
Held for the Grand Jury.....	1	1	2

### Disposition of Adult Contributors

Total Adult Contributors.....	24	50	74
Dismissed.....	1	1	2
Not apprehended.....	1	...	1
Committed to Correctional Institutions.....	9	38	47
Suspended sentence with fine or costs.....	6	6	12
Assessed fine or costs only.....	1	...	1
Continued conditionally.....	6	5	11

### Probation Cases Under Supervision

Movement of Cases	Total Cases	Boys	Girls	Neglect and Dependency	Total Children
Brought forward January 1, 1946 ..	1407	1044	173	355	1572
Received on probation.....	1029	746	173	210	1129
Total under supervision.....	2436	1790	346	565	2701
Removed from supervision.....	1518	1164	205	270	1639
Carried forward December 31, 1946	918	626	141	295	1062

**Dispositions of Children in 979 Neglect and 216 Dependency Cases  
Official Complaints Only**

<b>Disposition of Children</b>	<b>Neglect</b>	<b>Dependency</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Children Shown in Dispositions.....	1905	398	2303
Children Committed to:			
Parents, Relatives, Guardians.....	944	94	1038
Probation Officers.....	105	18	123
Institutional Placements.....	1	0	1
Child Caring and Placing Agencies — Total.....	249	233	482
County Child Welfare Board, Temporary Care..	119	133	252
County Child Welfare Board, Permanent Care..	.....	3	3
Children's Services, Temporary Care.....	47	39	86
Children's Services, Permanent Care.....	.....	3	3
Catholic Charities, Temporary Care.....	23	37	60
Catholic Charities, Permanent Care.....	2	.....	2
Family Service Association.....	39	.....	39
Jewish Children's Bureau, Temporary Care.....	1	4	5
Jewish Children's Bureau, Permanent Care.....	.....	1	1
State Welfare Department.....	.....	1	1
Other Agencies.....	18	12	30
Continued pending arrest of adult contributor.....	240	.....	240
Continued conditionally pending further order.....	183	48	231
Disposition of child made in previous case.....	102	.....	102
Case dismissed.....	81	3	84
Referred to other Court.....	.....	2	2

**Handicapped Children:** Applications for Orthopedic Care were filed for 33 children. All were approved and the children committed to the County Child Welfare Board for temporary care and treatment. Handicapped children whose parents are financially unable to provide prescribed orthopedic care can be granted such care upon application to the Court and it is not required that a dependency affidavit be filed.

**Support Money Collected and Distributed by the Court**

<b>Disbursed to:</b>	<b>Amounts</b>
<b>Parents and Relatives — Total.....</b>	<b>\$822,798.82</b>
<b>Public Agencies — Total.....</b>	<b>63,358.33</b>
County Child Welfare Board.....	48,311.32
Other tax-supported agencies.....	15,047.01
<b>Private Agencies — Total.....</b>	<b>93,615.17</b>
Children's Services.....	47,250.53
Other non-sectarian agencies.....	3,688.50
Jewish agencies.....	2,394.95
Catholic agencies.....	28,216.76
Protestant agencies.....	12,064.43
<b>Grand Total Collected and Distributed.....</b>	<b>\$979,772.32</b>



## Adults Dealt with in Official Neglect Cases

Complaints	Number
Total Complaints Filed.....	979
Adult Contributors * .....	940
Cases without Adult Contributors .....	65
<hr/>	
Causes of Complaints — Total.....	979
Abandoned by one or both parents.....	71
Faults or habits of parents.....	109
Non-support of minor children .....	753
Faulty parental control.....	24
Other causes.....	22
<hr/>	
<b>Disposition of Adults — Total.....</b>	<b>940</b>
<hr/>	
Committed to Correction Farm.....	124
Committed to Ohio Reformatory for Women.....	1
Committed to Jail.....	6
<hr/>	
Sentence Suspended:	
On condition of proper behavior.....	144
Support payments through Court.....	360
On other conditions.....	15
<hr/>	
Continued conditionally pending further order .....	135
Adult not arrested.....	119
Dismissed.....	35
Referred to other Court.....	1

\* In some cases more than one adult was charged as contributing to the neglect of minor children.

### Movement of Prisoners at the Correction Farm Under Juvenile Court Commitment

Movement of Prisoners	Sentenced for Non-Support	Contributing to Neglect or Delinquency	Totals
Brought forward January 1, 1946.....	38	29	67
Committed or returned during year.....	284	92	376
Total prisoners during year.....	322	121	443
Released or escaped during year.....	252	77	329
Carried forward January 1, 1947.....	70	44	114

### Cases Under Supervision by the Division of Child Support

Movement of Cases Under Supervision	Non-Support	Paternity	Delinquency Dependency Other Neglect	Total
Brought forward January 1, 1946 .....	2477	276	299	3052
Placed under supervision during the year.....	1395	264	295	1954
Total under supervision in 1946 .....	3872	540	594	5006
Lost from supervision during the year.....	1218	127	148	1493
Carried forward January 1, 1947.....	2654	413	446	3513

**Aid to Dependent Children  
Applications and Grants in Aid**

Applications	Families	Children
Total Applications Considered .....	667	1804
Pending January 1.....	78	192
Received during the year.....	589	1612
Total Applications Disposed of.....	543 *	1496
Grants in aid approved.....	425	1225
Disapproved, withdrawn, etc.....	118	258
Total Pending December 31.....	124	308
<b>Grants in Aid</b>		
Total grants active during year.....	1794	5261
Brought forward January 1.....	1369	3752
New grants during year* .....	425	1509
Discontinued during year.....	320	1211
Total grants active December 31 .....	1474	4050
Total Amount Administered in Grants.....		\$1,474,554.00
Average Grant per Family per Year.....		821.00

\* The number of children is greater here than in the corresponding item above because it includes births, children returning to school or to the home from institutional or other placements in families already receiving grants.

**CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT**  
**2163 East 22nd Street — Telephone PProspect 8400**  
**DIRECTORY OF PERSONNEL**  
**Corrected to June 1, 1947**

Only names of heads of departments and persons most frequently contacted by the public are listed.

HON. HARRY L. EASTMAN, *Judge*  
HON. WILLIAM J. McDERMOTT, *Judge*

**JUDICIAL ASSISTANTS**

JOHN B. SHELLER..... *Assistant to the Court*  
S. A. MANDALFINO..... *Administrative Assistant to the Court*  
ANTHONY E. PATTON..... *Chief Bailiff*  
EDWARD DI LEONE..... *Bailiff*  
LOTTIE BIALOSKY..... *Girls' Referee*  
JOHN J. MAYAR..... *Boys' Referee*

**CLERICAL DEPARTMENT**

WALTER G. WHITLATCH..... *Chief Clerk and Legal Advisor*  
CHARLES T. BAXTER..... *Chief Deputy Clerk*  
GEORGE G. STURGISS..... *Chief Cashier*  
ARTHUR W. DUDLEY..... *Assistant Cashier*  
CARL W. FISHER..... *Affidavit Clerk*  
MARGUERITE DE ROSSET..... *Information Clerk, Main Lobby*  
EMILY ROZELLE..... *Chief Telephone Operator*

**RECEIVING SECRETARY**

ALMA M. LUCHT

**PROBATION DEPARTMENT**

WILLIAM H. SHERIDAN..... *Chief Probation Officer*

**PROBATION SUPERVISORS**

MARIE G. BIGHOUSE  
JOHN S. BECKA, Assignments

MILTON F. HAY  
RUTH B. MELCHER

**PROBATION OFFICERS**

LOUISE AMICO  
EDWARD J. BLAKEMORE  
ROBERT A. DAMBACH  
EDWARD H. DEEGAN  
LILLIAN HARE  
JOSEPHUS HICKS  
GEORGIA HILL  
WILLIAM T. HUGHES  
LUCILLE JACKSON

BEN KAHN  
DOROTHEA LAUBSCHER  
MARGARET B. MARTIN  
RALPH B. MITCHELL  
LEOTA STEEVER  
FRANCIS P. STRAUB  
CECILIA U. TUROWSKI  
FRANCES FREEMAN,  
Student-in-Training

**VETERAN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING FOR PROBATION OFFICERS**

ARNE E. AHONEN  
LLOYD O. ALLEN

DONALD M. DEMUTH  
WALTER M. HAAS, JR.

JAMES EUGENE WOOD

**PROBATION INFORMATION CLERKS**

STELLA JURJEWICZ..... *Boys' Department*  
MARY TERRY..... *Girls' Department*

**DIVISION OF CHILD SUPPORT**

MYRON T. MOSES..... *Director*

**ASSISTANTS**

RAY C. BAESEL  
S. J. BERMAN  
LEO G. CHIMO

## DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS

M. S. LAIRD ..... *Director*  
JACOB A. HOEK ..... *Assistant Director*

## STENOGRAPHIC AND CLERICAL DIVISION

LUCILE N. BECK ..... *Chief, Stenographic Service*  
MARION MACAULAY ..... *Chief, Record Room*

## DIVISION OF AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

CLARENCE J. YAEGER ..... *Director*  
JOHN J. ALDEN ..... *Supervisor and Asst. Director*  
KAYE WEISS ..... *Intake Secretary*  
DOROTHY G. KIMMEL ..... *Home Economist*  
BLANCHE BOOSINGER ..... *Information Clerk*

## CASE WORK SUPERVISORS

MILDRED M. CARSON, *Chief*

MARY MYRTLE LEACH

MILDRED E. OSBORN

## CASE WORKERS

MARY JANE ANDERSON  
LOUISE BONCHEK  
BETTY E. BURLESON  
ELLA MAE CHEEKS  
MARY S. CRAWFORD  
RUTH E. DAVIS  
LUCILLE T. EDWARDS  
ROSE C. ESTRIN  
ANN M. FAY  
FRANCES M. FERAN  
HELEN G. FROST  
HAZEL E. GEISLER  
ALICE V. GRAY  
CECELIA M. HARTMAN  
CLEMENTINE M. HEDGES  
ELAINE W. HEWITT

URSULLA W. JEFFERSON  
EDITH M. JOYCE  
HELEN W. KELLER  
ANNE L. KELLEY  
HELEN LAUGHLIN  
ANNE K. MASTERSON  
WENONA D. REYNOLDS  
ELIZABETH RUDER  
MABEL H. SHEPHERD  
BETTY N. SIMMONS  
CHRISTINA E. SMITH  
DORA A. SMITH  
BESSIE C. STEIN  
EDNA M. TYLER  
MARJORIE N. WHITTLE

## STUDENTS- IN-TRAINING

JOSEPHINE S. BAUMAN

MARIO MILAZZO

## STENOGRAPHIC AND CLERICAL DEPARTMENT

MARIE D. GEDEON ..... *Chief Stenographer-Bookkeeper*  
LUCILLE E. STIMPERT ..... *Record Room Clerk*

## DIAGNOSTIC CLINIC

DR. REGIS F. GOLUBSKI ..... *Pediatrician*  
DR. OSCAR B. MARKEY ..... *Psychiatrist*  
EDITH H. DOMBEY ..... *Psychologist*  
MARGARET DARBES ..... *Asst. Psychologist*

## CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

2209 Central Avenue

—

Telephone PRespect 8400

MARY A. NEARY ..... *Superintendent*  
FLOY Y. RUSSELL ..... *Assistant Superintendent*  
DOROTHEA MONZELL ..... *Office Manager*  
MILTON BAUER ..... *Night Superintendent*

## BAIL BOND ARRANGEMENTS

During office hours, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., bail bonds may be arranged at the Clerk's Office in the Court Building. Between 4:00 p.m. and midnight, bail may be arranged with Mr. Milton Bauer at the Detention Home.