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INTRODUCTION

The objectives of the writer in writing this monograph are two - first, to acquaint himself with the Juvenile And Relations Court of his own city - and second, to compile the records of the court so that they may be known to all interested people.

The work is divided into four sections - in the first the early fundamental history and principles of Juvenile Courts in which an attempt is made to show that the Juvenile Court can trace its origin back to the English Common Law Courts.

In the second section the writer discusses the bills passed by the General Assembly of Virginia that led to the establishment of juvenile and Domestic Relation Courts in Virginia.

In the third section the work and program of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of Richmond, Virginia is discussed. Reports are given in detail.

In the last section the writer gives his opinion of the value of the court and how it could be more beneficial to the Welfare of Richmond.
TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Fundamental History and Principles of Juvenile Courts

Laws Leading to The Establishment of Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts in Virginia

The Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts of Richmond

Opinion of Court
The juvenile court is a unique institution. It is, indeed, a court, but it is different from its parent, the criminal court, in several material respects. The most important and most striking difference is in its point of view. Under the criminal law system of Virginia, and indeed of most of the states, the sole question at issue in a trial is---is the accused guilty of the offense charged? Once this question is answered in the affirmative, the inexorable law takes its course, and to the offender is meted out that punishment which is deemed commensurate with his crime. Under this system scant consideration is given to the age of the offender---none if he is over the age of fourteen years. The question in the case of a child, as in that of an adult is---is he guilty? If so, what penalty must he pay? There is no thought of the prisoner's welfare. The controlling motive of the criminal law system is punishment, retribution, revenge!

The controlling purpose of the "juvenile court system" is this---to make of every child coming before it a self-supporting, self-respecting, law-abiding citizen. It deals with the offending juvenile just as a fond parent deals with his erring child. It looks at the child and his welfare---not at the offense and retribution to
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be exacted therefor. This is what we mean by the new point of view.

The idea of the Juvenile Court is to carry out the immortal saying of Frances Bacon, which is, "It is the business of the judge to consider, not only the offense, but also the offender."

The juvenile court is a response to the modern spirit of social justice. In it law and science, especially the science of medicine and those sciences that deal with human behavior, such as biology, sociology, and psychology, work side by side. It recognizes the fact that law and science must determine the treatment for delinquency and crime. It attempts to readjust social situations without the sentiment of prejudice. It approaches the problem which the child presents with an in a scientific, and dispassionate method.

In the place of trying the case to determine the guilt and inflicting punishment according to the laws governing that guilt, the juvenile court defines the relations of the child to his family or other adults and to the state or society to which he belongs, and adjusts them according to the scientific findings about the child and its surroundings. In the place of magistrates limited by laws of the realm to judge a case, we now have the socially minded judge to hear cases and adjust them to, what the interests of society and the child demands. In the place of juries,
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prosecutors, and lawyers, trained in the old conception of the law, staging legal battles, the juvenile court presents, probation officers, psychologists, and psychiatrists, who search for the social, physiological, psychological, and mental backgrounds of the child in order to arrive at a reasonable and just solution of and for individual cases. In other words in this new court, this juvenile court we tear down primitive prejudice, hatred, and hostility towards the law-breaker, and we attempt as far as possible to administer justice in the name of truth, love and understanding.

While the juvenile Court is of comparatively recent origin the fundamental principles underlying it may be traced back into Angle-American jurisprudence and legal history. While in most instances these principles have been modified and extended, their primary basis is the common law. The juvenile court is a growth in legal theory and not a departure from it. The first common law basis of the juvenile court legislation is the idea of chancery or equity. This is that the court, the agent of the state, is the ultimate parent of all such minors, as require its care and protection. This principle is very ancient in its origin. It goes back to feudal times, when in England, the crown through the "inquisitio post mortem," assumed supervision over the estates of minors in order to realize the fruits of tenure and livery to the over lord. This was succeeded by the court of wards and livery in the time of Henry VIII, which continued to exercise such jurisdiction until its abolition in 1660. The feudal system

having become passe and the common law having transferred the feudal duties of the overlord toward his vassals into the legal duties of the king toward his subjects, the jurisdiction of this court was transferred to the court of chancery, through which the king, assumed the general protection of all the infants in the kingdom, through the keeper of his conscience, the chancellor. The development of English law investing the crown as the protector of the rights of minors is fully set forth in the leading case of Eyre v. Shaftsbury, decided in 1772. In this case Lord Jekyll enunciated the general doctrine, which has been unanimously accepted by his successors. He said:

The care of all infants lodged in the king as parens patriae, and by the king this same is delegated to his Court of Chancery.

Idiots and lunatics, who are incapable to take care of themselves, are provided for by the king as parens patriae; and there is some reason to extend this care to infants.

This common law doctrine, repeatedly asserted by the court of chancery in exercising its equity jurisdiction from the earliest beginnings of English legal history, became thus a part of the British system of government and jurisprudence.

For many years the court failed to protect the minor unless property rights were involved. The English court of Chancery dealt entirely with children whom we designate as neglected, dependent, or destitute. The doctrine of the state as parens patriae was recognized

4 Ibid. P. 12-17
as applying to this class of children for many years in many of the states in the union. When juvenile court laws were enacted by the various states, the same doctrine was extended to delinquent children. The court applies the same procedure to the delinquent as it would to the neglected.

The juvenile court is founded upon the theory of the common law age of criminal responsibility. It was and is a fundamental maxim of the common law that no person can be guilty of a crime unless he did the act complained of with a mens rea, a guilty mind. A child under seven years of age has been treated as being incapable of felonious intent. Thus children under the age of seven years were not tried for crimes. As time passed the age limit below which there was no criminal responsibility has been modified and extended by the laws passed from time to time both in this country and in England. Both crime and delinquency as based upon intent for the juvenile court has retained that element in the distinction between delinquency, and dependency and neglect. The only difference seems to lie in the question whether or not the State desires to stigmatize those who offend against the law as being a criminal and to prescribe different methods of treatment in order to achieve the end in view.

5 Ibid p. 18
6 Ibid p. 19
7 Sutherland, E. H. **Criminology** J. B. Lippincott Company 1924 pp 19-20, 307-308.
Whereby no provision was made in the common law for those below the age of responsibility, provision was made in the various juvenile laws for all of these under the name "delinquents." Responsibility does not go with the punishment, for the juvenile-court law recognizes the responsibility, but the methods it uses are reformation, protection and education rather than punishment.

The modern movement with reference to the juvenile court began with the introduction in the Illinois legislature of a bill creating the juvenile court for the State of Illinois and the establishment of a court in Chicago in July 1899.

J. J. Kelso of Toronto, Canada in 1893 urged the establishment of such courts at a meeting in Chicago of the Waif-Saving Congress, and in the same year legislation towards the promotion of such a plan was passed in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

Colorado soon followed the general plan of the court set up in Chicago. During the intervening years the movement has grown with great rapidity. Today the State of Virginia has a juvenile court located in everyone of its one hundred and one counties and in 24 of its cities.

The court has been attacked by those who say it is an infringement upon the constitutional rights guaranteed by the

10 Bane, Frank. *State Department of Public Welfare of Virginia Report for 1933.*
constitution. They point out that one of the fundamental principles laid down by the constitution of the United States guarantees life liberty, and pursuit of happiness to every man, unless he is deprived of it through due process of law. In a juvenile court they point out -- a child is brought before a judge who hears its case and disposes of it without a jury. He may dismiss the child, place it on probation, or commit it to an institution, at his own discretion.

The first case cited and quoted in the numerous subsequent cases throughout the country is Commonwealth v. Fisher. It was decided in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in 1905. The decree read in part:

To save a child from becoming a criminal, or from continuing in a career of crime, to end in maturer years in public punishment and disgrace, the legislature surely may provide for the salvation of such a child, if its parents or guardian be unable or unwilling to do so, by bringing it into one of the courts of the state without any process at all, for the purpose of subjecting it to the state's guardianship and protection. When the child gets there and the court, with the power to save it, determines on its salvation and not its punishment, it is immaterial how it got there.

The law was also attacked on the ground that no jury trial was provided. On this point the opinion of the court recited;
The act is not for the trial of a child charged with crime, but is mercifully to save it from such an ordeal, with the prison or penitentiary in its wake,... if the child's own good and the best interests of the state justify such salvation. Whether the child deserves to be saved by the state is no more a question for a jury than whether the father, if able to save it, ought to save it.

The constitutionality of juvenile-courts acts has been upheld in the following leading cases embodying with greater or less fulness these various fundamental principles: Ex parte Loving, 178 Mo. 194 (1903); Commonwealth v. Fisher, 213 Pa. 48 (1905); Mill v. Brown 31 Utah 473 (1907); Robinson v. Wayne County Judges, 151 Mich. 315 (1908); Nicholl v Koster, 157 Cal. 416 (1910); Marlowe v Commonwealth, 142 Ky. 106 (1911); Ex parte Januzewski, 196 Fed. 123 (1911); People v. Freldrelich, 185 Pac. 657 (Colo. 1919); Lynn v. Bullock, 189 Ky. 604 (1920).

The spread of the juvenile court movement has been remarkable. The movement which had its inception in Chicago has been extended to most parts of the world. Great Britian established a juvenile court in 1908, Canada in 1908, Switzerland, 1910; France 1912; Belgium, 1912; Hungary 1913; Croatia, 1918; Argentine, 1919; Austria, 1919; Madras, India, 1920; The Netherlands, 1922; Madagascar, 1922; Bengal (India), 1922; Japan 1922; Germany, 1923; Brazil, 1923; Spain, 1924; Mexico, 1926. In Norway, Denmark, Finland, and Portugal there are no juvenile courts but children are dealt with under a special code administered usually 12 Ibid Page 10
by a guardian council or a child welfare commission, and not subject to punishment under a certain age. In Russia there was a juvenile court but since 1922 the whole question on juvenile delinquency has been made a branch of social education, and has been turned over to the education authorities who substitute for the courts.

The juvenile court is a curative and preventive agency. The court does not brand a child offender, as a criminal, but makes an attempt to cure the child of crimality and prevent it from being committed to acts contrary to the welfare of the state. It does this by means of reformation. The court attempts to reform all potential criminals before they mature. Some further characteristics of the juvenile court are:

1- Separate hearings for children's cases.
2- Informal or chancery procedure
3- Regular probation service, both for investigation and supervision
4- Detention separate from adults.
5- Special courts records and probation records, both legal and social
6- Provision for mental and physical examinations.

The juvenile court deals with delinquency and dependency. The following is a definition of delinquent as given in the Illinois law and which has been adopted by the majority of the states:

One who, (a) violates a law or local ordinance (except crimes punishable by death or life imprisonment), (b) is incorrigible,

12 Ibid Page 23.
14 Sutherland, E. H. op. cit Page 286
(c) associates with thieves, criminals, prostitutes, vagrants or vicious persons, (d) is growing up in idleness and crime, (e) knowingly visits a saloon, pool room, billiard room or gambling place, (f) knowingly visits a house of ill-fame, (g) wanders about the streets at night, (h) wanders about rail road yards, jumps on trains, or enters any car or engine without authority, (i) habitually uses or writes, vile, indecent or obscene language, (j) absents himself from home without just cause or without the consent of parent or guardian, (k) is immoral or indecent (l) is an habitual tenant.

The dependent is defined as one who is:

(a) destitute, (b) homeless, (c) abandoned, (d) dependent upon the public for support, (e) without proper parental care or guardianship, (f) found living in a house of ill-fame or with vicious or disreputable persons, (h) in a home unfit because of neglect, cruelty, or depravity on the part of the parents, (i) peddling or playing a musical instrument or singing in a public square, (j) in surroundings dangerous to morals, health, or general welfare or such as to warrant the state in assuming guardianship.

Many juvenile courts have jurisdiction over certain adults. Forty states have laws that make it possible for the court to deal with parents or other who contribute to the delinquency or dependency of children. In some states the court has jurisdiction over; adults deserting of failing to support juveniles, adults accused of crimes against children, adults violating the child-labor law, parents failing to comply with the compulsory school law or concealing the birth of a child, adults aiding a child to escape from an institution and adults furnishing children in institutions tobacco.

15. Ibid. Page 287
16. Ibid. Page 291
Virginia and Colorado give juvenile courts jurisdiction over offenses committed by adults upon children. In some cases, it includes any criminal case against an adult person for violation of any criminal law when the offense is against the person or involves the morals of a child.

The criminal court attempts to determine, if possible, whether the accused is guilty of the crime that he is charged with. It is a question of guilty or not guilty. There is no machinery or set up which investigates the character of the accused, and such evidence if presented is prohibited from the records of the trial. If the accused is convicted, punishment is meted out according to previous legislation. The legislature has already determined that persons found guilty of committing such and such a crime will receive such and such a punishment.

The Juvenile Court operates entirely differently. The question is not, is the child guilty or not guilty of a certain crime? The purpose of the hearing is to probe deeply into the character and general condition of the child. This includes his general environment as well as individual traits. The juvenile court has elaborate machinery to make this investigation, the result of which is the basis of the decision. Instead of punishing the offender, the state takes it as a ward for probation and guardianship. Each hearing is treated individually without appealing to treatment involving other delinquents, actual or potential.

17 Ibid; page 60
LAWS LEADING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATION
COURT IN VIRGINIA

In the state of Virginia, the judiciary department consists
of a Supreme Court of Appeals, circuit and corporation or hustings
18
courts, and various city court.

In addition to these courts, the constitution of the state
provides that the "General Assembly shall provide for the appointment
or election and for the jurisdiction of such justices of the peace as
public interest may require."

In Virginia we have the single court system. Under the con-
stitution there can be only one court of record in a county. In each
county, therefore, there is a circuit court, which is a court of record
and a court of general jurisdiction, civil and criminal. Each city of
the first class has a corporation or hustings court. A city of the first
class is a city containing more than ten thousand inhabitants. A
second class city which usually has a corporation court is one which
has less than ten-thousand of people. All incorporated communities not
cities are known as town.

Three cities of the first class, namely, Norfolk, Richmond,
and Roanoke, have other courts of record. Richmond has a Chancery
Court and a Law and Equity Court.

Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court are not Courts of
record. They were created by the General Assembly under the constitutional

18-Morrissett, C. H. "Legal Aspects of Virginia juvenile and Domestic
Relations Court" in State Board of Public Welfare Bulletin for
August 21-27, 1924.
19-ibid
20-ibid
provision previously quoted.

The General Assembly passed an act in March 10, 1914 which provided for a Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, in cities of a population of 50,000 inhabitants or more. It provided for the election of a special justice of the peace, to be known as the justice of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, and for his jurisdiction and duties.

This act provided also that the justice shall be appointed by the city council and be paid out of the treasury of the city, and that he hold office for four years, subject to re-election. He shall have jurisdiction over all offenses committed by children under the age of eighteen years against the laws of the state. Also, against all prosecutions of men charged with ill-treatment, abuse, abandonment or neglect of their wives or of their children. He further was given jurisdiction over all persons charged with offenses against children under the age of eighteen, or with causing, aiding in or contributing to the delinquency or dependency of such children. The act further provided that the cities should provide suitable court rooms and office for such special justices and furnish all necessary furniture, filing cabinets, dockets, books, stationary, et cetera. The Council of the city shall elect a clerk and a bailiff for the court and he shall be paid from out of the city treasury at a compensation fixed by the council. The act also had a clause which said that those cities finding it impracticable to create a special court and electing a special justice may as a substitute, by act of city council, provide for a special section in children's cases in accordance with the form of ordinance that was passed by the General Assembly in 1910 and amended in 1914.

The city Council passed the following ordinance December 22, 1911.

Be it ordained by the Council of the City of Richmond——

1. That the Judge of the Police Court, upon the recommendation of the Juvenile Protective Society of Virginia be, and he is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint one special probation officer to assist in performing and executing the duties and services contemplated by section three of an act approved March 16, 1910, entitled "An act providing for detention or commitment of minors under seventeen years of age for certain offenses not in jails or Penitentiaries; placing them in suitable homes and Institutions under certain circumstances; when they can and cannot be sent to jail; allowing them to be released on probation; the approval of the State Board of Charities and Corrections under certain contingencies; penalties for removing any child committed hereunder or violating any provision hereof; allowing jury trials and appeals; appointments of probation officers and outlining their duties; and declaring an emergency;" and shall receive for his services a salary of twelve hundred dollars per annum, payable as other salaries are now paid.

2. That the probation officers as provided for in section five of said act approved March 16, 1910, be selected and designated by the Judge of the Hustings Court in accordance with the provisions of said section.

3. In order that no child under seventeen years of age when arrested for any offense, shall be confined in jail previous to a trial for such offense, the Finance Committee, and it is authorized and instructed to make reasonable terms and financial arrangements for the detention of such children previous to such trials with any home of detention for children, or any charitable society, association or institution, having power under its charter to receive and detain any child arrested for any offense previous to or pending his or her trial for such offense.

4. The Police Justice of the City shall hold a session of his court every day at noon, when necessary, for the hearing of all cases and matters coming before his court, as provided for in said act approved March 16, 1910, and all cases coming before him under an Act approved March 17, 1910 entitled, "An act making it a misdemeanor for parents or guardians to refuse or neglect to support their children under fourteen years of age or to subject children under seventeen years of age to vicious or immoral influence encourage any child to commit a misdemeanor, or to send a child under seventeen years of age to certain places; punishment therefor, and declaring an emergency;" and if the hearing of such cases and matters shall be private.
THE JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC COURT OF RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

The first juvenile Court in Richmond thus was established by this bill. Judge Crutchfield was the then judge of the Police Court and thus served as Judge at the trials of those juvenile offenders under the Term of the act. The first session of the Police Court to be held for juvenile offenders was held April 12, 1912.

In the month of November, 1912, the Girls Auxiliary of the Instructive Visiting Nurse Association offered the court the services of Miss Sarah B. Roller, a young lady of liberal education and wide experience in social work, for a period of three months. She served in the capacity of a woman probation officer. She handled in two months seven probation cases and sixteen other cases were referred to her. In addition to these she responded to twenty-eight unofficial complaints, and took six children under her supervision, unofficially.

This first juvenile court thus handled in the nine months beginning April 12 and ending December 31, 1912 the following number of cases. The report in full is as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cases before the Court</th>
<th>410</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involving</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White boys</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White girls</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro boys</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro girls</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of offenses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct, including fighting, shooting, throwing crap, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault and battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felonious cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felonious shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying concealed weapon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selina C.
Offenses against Morality by Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Walking</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful cohabitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other charges</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incorrigible ................................................. 27
Vagrants, including begging on street .................. 18
Fugitives from parents and guardians .................. 31
Aiding prisoners to escape .............................. 2
Dependent and neglected children ...................... 16
Drunkenness .................................................. 9
Larceny ........................................................ 31
Violations of City Ordinances ......................... 21

Disposition of Cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationed</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Prison Association of Va ..........</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Negro Reformatory Association</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To State Board of Charities and Corrections (Negroes) ..</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Virginia Home and Industrial School for Girls ....</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Juvenile Protective Society</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fined</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposed of in Police Court</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whipped by Parents or guardian</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned over to or released in custody of guardian or parent</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission of Lunacy held</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharged with a warning</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed at request of complainant</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending, December 31, 1912 ..........</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the cases marked as "probationed" in the above table, the following summary gives a general classification:

Number of children released on probation—First offense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number released on probation, who have been released and re-arrested charged with other offenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above report was the first so written report ever issued in the state of Virginia from a court record that dealt with juveniles in such a manner. The report was presented to the city council, by the Protective Society of Virginia through whose efforts the court was established and was made to function in the smooth manner that the report indicates. The report was published in 1913 and covered the first nine months program and work of the court.

The report further when on to tell of the procedure that the court carries out in dealing with cases in which serious offences have been committed. Such cases are handled by probation officers who investigated the case, by visiting the home of the child, and when necessary, employers, teachers, family physicians, neighbors and others who have an acquaintance with the child interviewed. It is always the aim of the probation officers to learn the essential facts concerning the child's environment and previous history. From these facts he attempts to discover the underlying causes of his delinquency. A chronological history the report tells was kept of each child's probation record. Improvement and the tendency to overcome bad habits thus was noted and the probationer was thus watched over by the state. He must become a good citizen.

The Council provided the court with a Detention Home for white children. Before children that had to be confined were placed in jail. The Detention Home was established at the Ballard House which was occupied by the Associated Charities. In the report the Juvenile Protective Society of Virginia asked the council to make the equipment at the home more complete, and begged that they established a like home for the colored children.
The first court thus was as in the words of Miss Sarah B. Roller, a "pioneering effort." She in an interview told the author that everyone connected with the court at that time with the exception of the Judge and the Clerk were offering their services free.

The court grew and was moved from the Police court to 1112 Capitol Street. The Court had been hereto only a Juvenile Court, but now through an ordinance issued by the City Council it was made into a Domestic Relations as well as Juvenile Court. James Hodge Ricks, who had served as probation officer under Judge Crutchfield was appointed Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. J. J. Scherer, Jr. was appointed substitute justice of the court. Miss Eleanor McCarthy was appointed acting clerk, while the probation officers for juveniles were: Miss Sarah B. Roller, for the girls and Mr. A. S. MacFarlane for the boys. The probation for adults were: B. E. Poltiaux, J. W. Whealton, and L. C. Tanner. The Court was given a colored detention home which was located on 13th and Leigh streets which was next door to the African Church. The white detention home was on the second floor of the Ballard House located on 14th and Franklin Streets. This house has now been torn down.

The Court increased its functions in amount of work and the program of the Court was greatly enlarged so that the Second Annual
The report of the Juvenile And Domestic Relations Court of Richmond published in 1917 shows that the total number of children tried by the court were 1,761, and the total number of adults tried numbered 780, making a total of 2,541 cases handled by the Court during the year of 1917. The fines paid to the court amounted to the sum of $2,795.07. This amount was turned over to the Mayor, who was George Ainslie. The ordinance of the city Council required that the fines assessed by the court should be turned over in such a fashion. The Council Ordinance had been passed in 1915 and the work of the New Juvenile and Domestic court began as I have said on Capitol Street. The year was January 1, 1916.

Under the City Council Ordinance the Court was given jurisdiction over children under the age of eighteen years, and over adults who were accused of contributing to the delinquency, dependency, or neglect of children, and over adults involved in domestic relations cases within the city limits. It had concurrent jurisdiction within one mile of the corporate limits.

Further the first report of the new Juvenile And Domestic Relations court shows that:

Total Number of Probationers during the year were:

- White boys...257  Girls.....29
- Colored boys...177  Girls.....60

Total cases ..............523

23- The Juvenile And Domestic Relations Court, Report for 1917
24- An Ordinance of City Council, September 10, 1915.
The Report shows that Miss Roller had under her supervision 90 girls. Mr. Macfarlane's supervision list totaled 120 boys.

Further study of this report shows that the probation force investigated 384 cases officially and 125 cases unofficially. They made 1,289 number of visits to the homes of probationers, and 153 visits to schools, employers etc of probationers. They helped to secure employment for 92 children and reinstated 92 children in the public schools. The fines collected from probationers in installments amounted to $352.92 paid in small amounts. The restitution collected from probationers in installments amounted to $484.23. The bulk of these funds was paid by probationers sixteen and seventeen years of age—white boys brought into court on the charge of using automobiles without permission.

The probation work done by the Adult Probation officers was shown in the following report:

Number of probationers Jan. 1. White...Men...139...Colored..Men 82
Number placed on probation during year .....98.....colored..Men 89
Grand Total for year 1917......White..Men.....237.....Colored..Men 171

Number remaining on probation at the end of the year were 161 white men and 85 colored men. There were no women. Of the number released sixty per cent made good records.

I think that here I should say something about the meaning of the term Probation. Probation is a supervision of persons who have broken laws. It is the method by which the court disciplines and seeks to reform young or first offenders and others not hardened to vice and crime, without subjecting them to imprisonment and without incurring the expense of maintaining them in institutions. The offenders, after an investigation by the Probation officers, are released pending sentence or under the suspension of sentence and on their good behavior. They are placed under the authoritative and helpful oversight of a man or woman appointed by the court as a probation officer. Those on probation are required to obey certain conditions, as for instance, to report regularly, usually once a week, to the probation office; to abstain from evil associates and bad habits; to work regularly, and to pay certain amounts regularly to the probation officer for the support of family, fines, restitution, and other conditions. In case of failure to observe these conditions those on probation may be returned to court for the execution of sentence.

Probation was first authorized in Virginia by the General Assembly of 1904. It was to be used chiefly against adults who...
failed to support their children. Probation of children came later. It was granted by the act of the General Assembly in 1910, and this act was amended in 1914. In 1914, the General Assembly as we have seen passed an act for the establishment of juvenile and domestic Relations Courts in cities of 50,000 or over. Under the Provisions of this act such a court was, as we also have seen, was established in Richmond as a separate and distinct tribunal, and it is this court that we find that probation has gone farther and fared better than in any other court in the State, both in adult and juvenile cases. During 1917 this court probationed 317 juveniles and 187 adults, and collected $49,391.99. Of juvenile probationers, not less than 75 per cent, made good and of adult probationers, not less than 60 percent finished with good records.

Probation is not compulsory, it is optional with the offender. Although it is not customary to ask the offender whether he accepts, the court usually has some intimation that he would prefer probation to the execution of sentence. The length of Probation is within the discretion of the court. The term of probation is also set by the discretion of the court. They ordinarily include, aside, from specific order, general requirements as to the conduct, associates, and habits of the probationer. The form may be some what as follows:

The probationer shall
(1) Comply with such orders as the Court may make
(2) Report promptly to probation officer as required
(3) Work regularly
(4) Keep good company and indulge in no bad habits
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(5) Refrain from violating any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation the violation whereof is punishable.

(6) Pay to the probation officer before........191........ $........as fine and costs.

(7) Pay to the probation officer before........191........ $........as restitution and reparation.

(8) Pay to the probation officer $.............per week for...............weeks for the support of wife or child of family.30

Before recommending anyone for probation the probation officer should be satisfied that (1) the community will be protected, (2) that the past history and present disposition of the person investigated indicate that he may be expected to comply with the conditions of probation in such a manner and spirit that a reformation will be achieved. After a person is placed on probation, the probation officer should (1) keep informed of the conduct and surrounding of his probationer; (2) win his confidence if possible. Impress upon his probationer that it is not his purpose to spy upon him, but to watch over and to help him help himself; (3) he should see his probationer and encourage him by his friendly advice and admonition, and take an active interest in reclaiming him from evil courses.

To return to the work of the First Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court in Richmond, I again take from the report made at the end of 1916. Judge Ricks in this report wrote.

You will note that the number of children appearing before the court is considerably larger than during the previous year, there being an increase of 372. The largest increases are shown in the following offenses:
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We feel that this increase in serious offenses is largely due to the abnormal conditions existing at the time. In August and September of last year the increase in the number of white girls appearing before the court was alarming. At this time the soldiers were stationed in Richmond and quite a number of girls came to the city, apparently attracted here by offers of high wages. A number of these girls became involved in escapades with men in the uniform, and in consequence were brought into court.

It will be noted that there were 100 fewer adults appearing before the court this year than last. The most striking reduction was in the number of persons charged with wife beating. In 1916 the number was 331; last year, 176. Number of persons charged with non-support also shows a material reduction, the figures being 308 for 1916 and 231 for 1917.

In order to render our probation work more effective, it is absolutely essential that the court shall have at least one additional officer for children's cases.

The clerical work of the court is very heavy so heavy, indeed, that in the past two years the clerk has been unable to take so much as a week's vacation. She is charged with the keeping of two docket books, one for the Juvenile and one for Adult cases, and with indexing the same; with keeping a card index for each person tried, with keeping a record of all fines both state and city, and making monthly statements thereof; with preparing vouchers for salaries and for other items of expense of the court and both detention homes; with writing all correspondence in connection with the work of the court; with assisting in the preparation of probation officers' monthly and annual reports; with the pre-
paring of annual reports for the court; with answering the telephone and giving information when probation officers are not on duty, and with many other miscellaneous duties.

It will be noted from the statistical summary that the superintendent of the Colored Detention Home has been allowed a per diem of only twenty-five cents for feeding the inmates of that home. In view of the high cost of all article of food, it seems to me that this allowance should be materially increased. An increase of, say, 5 cents per day, or 20%, would necessitate an approximate increase in the appropriation of $280 for this item alone. We feel sure, however, that in the matter of feeding the wards of the court the city has no desire to be parsimonious.

Thus from the report and the words of the judge of the court we can understand and comprehend the manner in which the Court operated and the hardships that the affiliates of the Court had to work under during these early pioneering days.

The Court had then and has now a working agreement with the various number of institutions and charities of the city and state. In 1917 we see the following table showing the number and place of dispositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispositions</th>
<th>White Boys</th>
<th>White Girls</th>
<th>Colored Boys</th>
<th>Colored Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison Assoc. of Va..................</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph's Academy.................</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Charities............</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission held-sent to hospital.....</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Va Home and Industrial School for girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's Industrial Sch. (by parents)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial School Wayward colored girls.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1917 the report from the White Juvenile Detention home which at this time was located at 400 North Twelfth Street, and was under the direction of Mrs J. H. Tanner who served as matron.

The report shows that from January 1, 1917 and ending December 31, 1917, that 336 boys and 110 girls had been detained for a total of 2,225 days and had been served a total of 6,702 meals.

The average cost of the meals per day for inmates and employees was 12 cents.

The report of the Colored Detention Home which at this time was located at 408 East Leigh Street for the year beginning January 1, 1917 and ending December 31, 1917 shows...
that 497 boys and 188 girls were detained there for an average number of ten days each. The report further shows that the average amount paid to the detention home for meals was 8½ cents. The report was signed by William H. Tharps who was in charge of the detention home.

The Council appropriated money for the Court.

The Financial Statement and Budget of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court for the year 1917 follows:

**General Appropriation** $10,000

**Additional appropriation**
account necessary increase in expenses $1,000

**Special appropriation account**
increase in salaries $2,288.75 $11,288.75 1918

**Budget** $14,886

**Disbursements**

**Court Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1918</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary Justice</td>
<td>$1,852.50</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Sub-justice</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Probation Officer no 1</td>
<td>1,235.00</td>
<td>1,320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Probation officer no 2</td>
<td>1,029.17</td>
<td>1,320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary probation officer no 3</td>
<td>741.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Clerk</td>
<td>257.00</td>
<td>264.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary office Assistant</td>
<td>461.48</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>$9,024.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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White Juvenile Detention Home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary of matron</td>
<td>$494.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages of watchman</td>
<td>$247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary of sub-matron</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent (part 1916)</td>
<td>457.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1,189.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General expenses</td>
<td>454.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs and furnishings</td>
<td>212.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,268.22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colored Detention Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages caretaker</td>
<td>$247.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Wards and help</td>
<td>986.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages helpers</td>
<td>147.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent one quarter due</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs, improvements and furnishings</td>
<td>163.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,208.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount reserved for January salary increase | 50.84 |

**Grand total** | **$11,228.75**

And the court grew so that in the Third Annual Report of the Court for the year 1918 we find the following interesting trends. Lieut. Jas. C Pollard had succeeded Mr. A. S. Macfarlane and was named chief Probation Officer.

In 1918 the court tried a total of 1,836 juvenile cases. Of this number, 1,524 were delinquents and 159 dependent with 153 accused of city ordinance violations.

---

35 *The Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Report* for 1919, pp 1-3.
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The classes of cases showing the largest increase were those of larceny, assault and battery, incorrigible, fugitive from parents, vagrancy and offenses vs. morality.

The Judge of the Court wrote in 1918, "the number of cases handled in the Domestic Relations side of the court show that parents frequently quarrel, curse and fight each other in the presence of their little ones; that neither of them go to church, nor do they send their children to church or Sunday school. The product of such environment cannot be a wholesome clean-minded youth."

The Court asked the Council in this report to provide the city with more playgrounds. It pointed out that the playgrounds of the city were always crowded with children, and that there were only six playgrounds in all, for a city with a school population of 30,000. Furthermore, these playgrounds the court pointed out were operated only seven months a year. Of the six playgrounds, one was for colored children and the rest for white children. In the center of the colored population known as "Jackson Ward," there was no playground whatever. The Court said that this condition was the cause and the reason for the large number of cases that the Court was called upon to deal. The children in these cases were charged with "disorderly conduct." That crime was that they were accused of playing football on the public streets and had annoyed their neighbors and the passer-by. When asked in the court if they had any statement to make, the leader of the crowd said: "Judge, where are we to play?"
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Judge Ricks said that the number of cases of this kind handled in 1917 were 465. "These were unquestionably the victims of our civic neglect of their welfare," he wrote in his report.

In this report the Court began to fight for a substitute for the saloon, which had been abolished. The Court argued that something must be put in its place. If this was not done, the Court believed that they themselves would find a substitute. The past few years has proven that the court was not wrong in this reasoning, for the people did find a substitute for the saloon, the bootleg dens.

The General Assembly in 1918 passed an act permitting cities and counties to establish a pension fund for mothers. The Court pleaded that the City Council would find it cpracticable to do so, in the near future.

Another thing that the Court began to ask for was that a city farm be established. It was pointed out that the city held all prisoners in the City Jail in absolute idleness at a heavy cost to the city for their maintenance. If they were transferred and placed on a city farm, they could do some work which would be both to the profit of themselves and the city.
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Mr A.S. Macfarlane, who had served as Probation officer for juvenile cases in 1915 and 1916 resigned to accept the position of Chief Probation Officer for the city of Winston-Salem, N.C. In his place the Court secured Lieutenant James C. Pollard.

The total amount that the court collected in fines in 1918 was $3,673.28. This was $828.21 more than had been collected during the same period in 1917.

Through an arrangement made by the Mayor with the State Board of Charities and Corrections and other institutions, they are permitted to board their wards pending permanent placing, at the per capita per diem of 50 cents in either the White or the colored detention homes. The total sum collected by the court for this was $411.90.

The court records show that 5,727 adult cases were tried in the court, during 1918.

The probationers paid to the probation officers of the court for the support of their families, $58,260.42. This money gave support to families, which had become broken homes because of the desertion of the male member. The court returned these men and made them pay to the support of their families.
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Mrs J. H. Tanner, the Matron at the White Detention Home reported at the end of 1918 that she had detained during the year a total of 575 boys and girls. Of this number 411 were boys and 164 were girls. To them she had served a total of 8,468 meals, at an average cost of $.13 per meal. At the home the following diet was served:

**Breakfast:**
- Coffee with Milk and sugar.
- Batter bread and butter or sugar.
- Fish of some kind, or fish roe.

**Lunch:**
- Two wholesome vegetables.
- Wheat bread with syrup.
- Occasionally dried or fresh fruit.

**Dinner:**
- Tea with milk and sugar.
- Wheat bread with syrup.
- Sausage or beef hash.
- Potatoes or some wholesome vegetable.

**Dinner on Sunday:**
- Roast beef.
- Two vegetables.
- Pie.

**Supper:**
- Cold roast beef and gravy.
- Hot rolls and syrup.
- Hot tea with milk and sugar.

William H. Harps the Custodian of the Colored Detention home reported that he had detained a total of 470 boys and 194 girls in the home during the year. The average cost of each meal was 48 10 cents.
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Because of the plea of the court for better recreation centers, the Colored Playgrounds and Recreation Association was organized and established for the purpose of locating negro playgrounds, throughout the entire city. The Boy Scouts of America set up a number of troops among the negro youths of the city. The Community Recreation Association was established in 1919 and helped to establish recreation centers for the children of Richmond.

In 1919 the court created the office of First Deputy Clerk and Miss Agnes O'Brien was appointed to fill that office. She was to remove some of the clerical work from the hands of Miss McCarthy.

In 1920, W. Wheaton, one of the first probation officers died and was succeeded by S. F. Ernest.

In 1921 the office of a Chief Probation Officer was created and James C. Pollard was promoted to this office.

In 1922 The Children's Code Commission appointed by Governor Westmoreland Davis, for the purpose of revising laws relating to children and suggesting new laws, enacted 18 bills into new laws in the General Assembly. At this Assembly the following work on children's welfare was enacted; 49. Ibid Page 22.
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The State Board of Charities and Corrections was continued under the name of State Board of Welfare. The bill also provided for the composition and maintenance of the Board, and prescribed its powers, duties, and compensation. It further authorized the Board to create a children's bureau.

The Assembly also at this time passed a law governing the regulation of boarding-houses and nurseries for children.

The main enactment of the Assembly that affected the Juvenile Court was the act providing for the appointment of special justices of the peace in cities of less than 25,000 inhabitants and in counties, to be known as judges of juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts, and to prescribe for their jurisdiction, powers, duties, and compensation; and to provide for the maintenance of juvenile and domestic relations courts in such cities and counties.

The Richmond Juvenile and Domestic Court was deeply moved by the sudden death of James C. Pollard in 1922. He had served the court, well and earnestly ad his advice and


53. Ibid. Chapter 486.

54. Ibid Chapter 482.
ability was missed by the court, although Gordon B. Ambler was appointed to succeed him capably and carried on the work. The Report of the Juvenile and Domestic Court for 1922 and 1923 shows that:

Children in Court in 1922, 1,449; 1923, 1,619.

Amount of fines collected, total 1922, $96,316.99, while the total amount of fines collected in 1923 was $108,107.46.

The Court tried 708 adults in 1922 and 728 in 1923.

Also in 1923 it was necessary to appoint W. I. Stockton to succeed B. E. Politalux, probation officer from the earliest days of the court's history. Mr. Politalux died after a long illness in that year.

On May 16, 1924 the City Council passed the following bill:

1. That in accordance with the terms and provisions of Chapter 482 of the acts of the General Assembly of Va, March 27, 1922, entitled, "An Act to provide for the appointment of special justices of the peace in cities of less than 25,000 inhabitants and counties, to be known as judges of juvenile and domestic relations courts; to prescribe for their jurisdiction, powers, duties, and compensation; and to provide for the maintenance of juvenile and domestic relations courts in such cities and such counties," there shall be elected by the city council on the first Monday in December 1927 and every six years.
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thereafter, a special justice of the peace, who shall be the judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of Richmond, and whose term of office shall be for six years.

2- That the judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court shall hold a court daily except Sunday and legal holidays in said city. He shall hold his said court in the building 1112 Capitol Street, or in such other building or rooms as the City Council may hereafter provide and equip for the purpose.

3- That the Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court shall have jurisdiction as prescribed for such court in section 1950 of said act of the General Assembly.

4- That the Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court shall enter the discharge of his duties on Jan. 1, 1924 and hold office for six years, until his successor is elected and qualified. He shall during his term of office hold no other remunerative office or position, and shall receive for his services a salary of $4,500 a year.

5- That the substitute justice of the said Juvenile and Domestic Relation Court appointed shall perform his duties prescribed for him, and for his services shall receive the sum of $12.50 per day for each and every day he may be called upon to perform in the duties of the said judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, such compensation to be paid out of the city treasury.

6- The judge, upon the recommendation of the State Board of Public Welfare, and he is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint four special probation officers to perform and execute the duties and services contemplated by chapter 349 of the acts of General Assembly of Va. of 1918, and such other duties as the judge may require.

7- All fines and penalties imposed by the judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court for violations of the City Ordinances that may be paid to or received by him shall belong to the city. Said judge shall on an oath turn this amount over to the City Council at the first regular meeting thereof in each month and during the term for which he shall be elected.
8- Pending the purchase or erection of a suitable building or buildings for the purpose, under the direction of the City Council, the Mayor of the city of Richmond is hereby authorized and empowered to provide homes for the detention or safe keeping of delinquent, dependent, or neglected children, while awaiting trial, or previous to their reception by the society, institution, association, or reformatory to which they have been committed by the judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, t and to lease or purchase such land and buildings in the city of Richmond, such properties as he may consider adaptable for the purpose for a term not exceeding five years. To provide for the supervision and care of the children detained in such homes, the judge of said court is authorized and empowered to appoint a superintendent or matron and such other employees as may be necessary thereof and to prescribe their duties in accordance with the provisions of Ch. 481 of the acts of General Assembly of 1922, such superintendent or matron and other employees to receive for their services such salaries as may be provided for them in the annual appropriations made therefor in the budget ordinance.

In August, 1924 the Children's Memorial Clinic began to operate. It is maintained by a group of affiliated agencies, both of the State and City, and by private organizations. The State Board of Welfare is one of the contributing agencies. With the assistance of the State, the budget of $24,000 was raised, for the first year. There were two departments in the clinic, one of pediatrics and the other of psychiatry. The pediatric department is for diagnostic purposes only, while the psychiatric department assists in the treatment carried on in the affiliated agencies referring children. At the bureau, children are treated for mental and physical defects. In cases where the children have become problems, they are studied in the psychiatric department of this clinic.

The report of the Richmond Juvenile and Domestic Relations court shows for the year ending June 30, 1925 that the court tried 1,634 juveniles, and 2,092 adults. It collected $127,130.69 from adults for the support of dependents, and $2,263.52 from adults for Restitution, and a total of $7,224.80 from both adults and juveniles for State and city fines.

On June 9, 1925 in a joint resolution this bill was passed by the Board of Alderman, and the City Council:

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Richmond, the Board of Alderman Concurring:

(1) That the Director of Public Safety be and he is hereby authorized and directed, subject to the approval of the Judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, to secure plans and specifications and to advertise for bids and award contract for the construction of a juvenile court and juvenile detention homes upon the site recently acquired by the city of Richmond at the southwest corner of 12th and Clay Streets, the total cost of said building including architect's fees and other necessary charges for the complete erection of same, not to exceed the sum of $100,000.00, all of said works to be done under the supervision of the Director of the Public Safety.

The cornerstone of the new Juvenile and Domestic Court and detention homes building at 115 E. Clay street was laid in 1925, with appropriate ceremonies.
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Gordon B. Ambler resigned his position from the court in 1925 in order to devote his activities to the practice of law, and W. L. Stockdom, Jr. was promoted to the office of Chief Probation Officer. He has this office to day. When he first took over the duties of this office, he found that he lacked the needed knowledge of law, to advise people concerning their problems in the best way possible, so that, he entered the school of law of the University of Richmond, at the T. C. Williams Law School and devoted himself to the study of law at night. He succeeded in graduating from the law school, and proudly displays his notice from the School, signed by President Boatwright, to the effect that he had successfully passed the required work for law, but that the University was unable to give him a degree, because he had no previous college training.

In 1926 the Court was moved from Capitol Street to its new home and present location at Twelfth and Clay Streets. The Building was dedicated with befitting ceremonies.

The work of the court constantly increased so that it was necessary to obtain the services of a Colored Probation Officers. One was given to the by the Civico Club a negro civic organization for a term of six months. William Randolph Johnson was appointed to this position.

The first official Probation officer for colored boys was J. M. Hord and he was appointed to the office in 1930.

The office of Second deputy Clerk was created also in 1930.
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help take care of the increasing amount of clerical work that there was to be done in the Court. Miss Edith A. Williams was appointed to fill this position.

In 1932 the Court was able to appoint Miss Bertha May Miner as Special Instructor for the White Detention Home. Miss Virginia Lee Tanner who had served as matron of the White Juvenile Detention Home for a long period of years died in 1932 and was succeeded by Mrs Maude L Tanner. William T. Jones, who had retired from the Police Department offered his services to the court as volunteer bailiff and was accepted.

In 1932 there was a decrease of 110 in the number of children appearing before the court. The total number of children charged with delinquency in 1932 was 1,612, the lowest number appearing before the court on this charge since 1925. The Judge attributed this to the fine work that was done by the City Playground Bureau, by the Community Recreation Association and by the various Character Building agencies, such as the Y. M. C. A., the Boys Scouts, the Boys Club, the Settlement Houses etc.

Mr. H. C. Ganzert was noted for the great work he did in 1932. He was Crime Prevention Officer, assigned by the Department.
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of Public Safety to work with the Community Recreation Association. During the year he handled 609 children so wisely and so tactfully that not but 20 of them were brought into Court for Delinquency charges.

After twenty years of history the court in 1935 found that it had handled in the twenty years 36,006 children and 41,048 adults. Thenumber of children assigned to probation were 4,643 and the number of adults was 5,732. In the twenty years the Court found that it had collected $2,142,433.37 on support orders.

To day the Court has the following officers working and carrying on the work started in a one hour session of a Police Court.

James Hoge Ricks Judge
J. J. Scherer Jr. Substitute
Eleanor McCarthy, Clerk
Edna C. Sharpe, Deputy Clerk
Edith A. Williams, Deputy Clerk
Francée D. Moseley, Stenographer
William T. Jones Bailiff (Volunteer)
Probation Department
W. L. Stockdon Jr., Chief
L. C. Tanner
Sf. F. Ernest
J. H Lassiter
Sarah B. Roller
A. C. Sager
C. R. Minor

Salary
$5,000
$12,50 per diem worked
$3,600
$1,740
$1,200
$1,500
$2,700
$2,040
$2,040
$1,980
$1,920
$1,920
$240.00
Annie B. Crews, Typist $1,020

Detention Homes

White

Maude L. Tanner, Matron $1,080
Robert T. Millikin, Custodian $840.00
Mrs Newton E. Beaton Assistant $540.00
Dr Newton E. Beaton Assistant $540.00
Katherine M Roberts, Special Instructor $1,200

Colored

Maude Tharps, Matron $600.00
Fred Tharps, Custodian and Janitor $480.00
Gertrude Harris, Assistant $240.00

Play Leader

Annie L. Williams $600.00

The above are the salaries that the City Council provided for in the last ordinance.

68. An Ordinance of City Council, September 10, 1936.
To-day the court functions, with the right invested in it to promote the general welfare of the juveniles of the city of Richmond, and with the right to attempt to mend the domestic differences that cause a broken home to become into an existence.

The court has not changed in either its program or its personnel in the last three years. The Court's program and aim is the same to-day as it was in 1916. That aim can best be said in the words of Prentice Murphy:

Each day the world is made anew through its childhood; each day countless opportunities are offered us through our children.

Let us catch their love for the beautiful, their love of sport, of play, of art, of truth and justice, the delicate fineness of all their sensibilities and capabilities, the numerous creative resources they have within them.

Then let us use their talents for that newer, finer life which is the great objective of social work.
OPINION OF THE COURT

To me the Juvenile and Domestic Court of Richmond, Virginia stands as guardian over children, who lack one. Some parents beget children, that they themselves turn against because the child spoils them some outside pleasure, and they allow the child to manage his own affairs, so that the child comes to think that the only friend he has is his fist and his meanneas. To this child the Juvenile Court is a parent, for it learns his problem, after careful study of his actions and home life. It places the blame on the shoulders of those that are responsible, be they his parents or some one else. I talked with one of the boys that had been arrested for stealing a apple from a fruit stand, and he told me that after the judge had spoken with him, that he felt that he had acquired a new friend and that he would do right and not wrong again so that when he grew up he would be the same type of man that the judge was.

I found that the court in Richmond, has a capable and friendly personnel. It is made up of people that not only are qualified to do their work, but who are devoted and open minded to their jobs. The Judge of the Richmond Court is a man of great powers. He loves his work, as one can easily divine from a conversation with him.

The Probation force of the court is made up of men that are capable of interpreting what has happened, and
and understanding what lies ahead. With such judges and probation officers seeking to understand the deeper significance presented by the problems of Domestic relations and of juveniles, there can not be anything but success in dealing with such problems of our society.

I sat through seven cases in the chambers of the local juvenile court and I was struck by the atmosphere of Intimacy in the room between the delinquent and his parents and the judge. The boy or the girl would come into the room with his parent, both of whom looked strained and nervous. Then the judge would say a few words to them and the shocked look in their eyes would leave and they would seem at ease. In the room, Mother and child could speak freely to the understanding judge.

The court is very efficient, for I found that in a single day they handle many cases. Captain Stockdom interviews many people a day, listens to their problems and gives them the best advice, he means, and sends them about their way. They leave his office, knowing that they have spoken to a friend to a man that understood.

Records of the court are available to everyone, for they are well kept and are up to date. Everything about the court in my opinion suggests a welcoming atmosphere, and I found myself quite at ease there.

The Court records shows the amount of work, among
juveniles and domestics, that it has accomplished in its short existence.

The City of Richmond is better off, because of the splendid Juvenile and Domestic Court that it sponsors. All societies must provide in a civilized community for the welfare of children, and must provide some punishment for those that cause the delinquency of any child. Also any society that ignores the separation of families, which cause the unfortunate children and women to become subjects of despair and wards of charities is ignoring the basic laws of humanity, which call for kindness and understanding.

I support the program of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of Richmond, and am very proud that my city fosters such an efficient body.