

EXISTING PROVISIONS FOR THE CORRECTION OF YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS

AUSTIN H. MACCORMICK*

The statistics summarized by Thorsten Sellin in the preceding article reveal how far the administration of criminal justice in this country falls short either of protecting the public against crime and criminals or of preventing young offenders from becoming habitual criminals. It is the assignment of this article to analyze some of the reasons for the poor results obtained. Why, in particular, do our correctional systems fail to correct so large a proportion of the young offenders entrusted to them?

There is no such thing, of course, as a correctional system in the United States: that is, one in which the whole process of correction from conviction on is coordinated and integrated in a single closely unified administrative structure under one head. The nearest thing to such a system is found in the United States Department of Justice, where probation, prisons, and parole are coordinated by the fact that they are all within the Department and that their respective heads are fully cooperative with each other. In actual practice, however, they are semi-independent services. In Michigan and New Jersey, where the correctional machinery is coordinated to an unusual extent, probation is still a function of the courts. Correctional procedures in every state differ from those in other states and frequently differ among smaller jurisdictions within the state. In their effectiveness and in their spirit, these procedures range from the bad to the good and it is only by a comparison of their results that we can determine which should be modified or done away with and which improved and extended.

For the country as a whole the over-all trend has been continuously, though unevenly, forward, and in few places any longer do we find the primitive and frankly brutal procedures that were standard in the last century and by no means uncommon even as late as the 20's. When all that is said, Dr. Sellin's figures face us with the fact that improvement in correctional procedures has not kept pace with the progress of our society or with social thinking in general. Moreover, in the last twenty years the total number of prisoners has grown out of all proportion to the increase in

* A.B., 1915, hon. Sc.D., 1934, Bowdoin College; A.M., 1916, Columbia University; hon. LL.D., 1937, St. Lawrence University. Executive Director, The Osborne Association, since 1940; Chairman, New York State Committee on the Youth Correction Authority Plan. Assistant Director, United States Bureau of Prisons, 1929-1933; Commissioner of Correction, New York City, 1934-1940. President, American Prison Association, 1939, National Prisoners' Aid Association, 1942. Author: HANDBOOK OF AMERICAN PRISONS (1926) (with P. W. Garrett); HANDBOOK OF AMERICAN PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES (1929) (with P. W. Garrett); THE EDUCATION OF ADULT PRISONERS (1931). Contributor to periodicals.

population. While this is not an accurate index of the crime rate, one of the measures of the rate of progress of a society from savagery to civilization is assuredly the number of men and women whom their fellow human beings deem it necessary to keep in cages. It need not be pointed out that this gives some indication of the state of civilization that has been reached not merely by those in the cages but also by those who put them there.

To find the major defects in correctional procedures, we have only to look at the major trend in progressive jurisdictions, which for some years has been toward individualization of treatment, particularly with young offenders. This trend is based on the delayed discovery that each youth who breaks the law and is caught differs from every other youth in the toils as well as from those who never see the inside of a police station, and that the major hope of returning him to society as a good citizen is to discover the particular combination of factors in him and in his environment and circumstances which combined to get him into trouble, and to fit his training and treatment to those particular facts. Though this fact is becoming almost universally recognized in correctional circles, the cumbersome system inherited from the era of mass punishment frustrates many of the attempts to give individual treatment. In analyzing the various steps in the correctional process, we shall find that the failure to treat the offender as an individual will go far to account for the high percentage of failures in the correctional system.

The young offender caught in the machinery of criminal justice goes through many procedures at the hands of many different agencies: arrest, detention and trial, sentencing, probation or institutional treatment, and parole. Every step contributes to helping him or to injuring him psychologically. The Youth Correction Authority is necessarily concerned only with procedures after conviction and these must be the major concern of this article, but everything that happens to an offender up to the point of conviction has an inescapable effect on the procedures that follow.

Arrest and Detention

In spite of the excellent police forces developed in cities as dissimilar as Berkeley, Cleveland, Milwaukee, New York and Wichita, the treatment that the young offender often receives from the police tends to make him bitter and suspicious of the law and all its agencies and allergic to "correction." Detention too often adds to the damage. Unquestionably, the worst aspect of pre-conviction handling in its demoralization of young offenders is enforced association in detention "bull pens" and jails with degenerates, drunks, vagrants, and hardened criminals. In our usually overcrowded jails, a young first offender may be locked in with a man with active venereal disease, a pervert, a clever Fagin, or whatever derelict or criminal an overworked officer happens to pull out of the latest batch of arrivals. Having nothing with which to occupy himself day after day and subjected hourly to destructive influences, many a boy in jail is destroyed by forces from within and from without.

Sentencing

Discussion of indeterminate control of youthful offenders under the Youth Correction Authority Act in accompanying articles of this symposium reveals the nature of current sentencing practices. Their influence is so far-reaching on all the rest of the correctional process as to necessitate a brief discussion here. A recent study of sentencing in federal district courts reveals shocking disparities. A judge in one district would give ten years for a certain offense, while a judge in an adjacent district would give one year. A committee of federal judges, reporting upon this matter to the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, has this to say:¹

Judges who have never studied or visited prisons or reformatories, who never met with parole boards or discussed problems with their members, who never engaged in social work of rehabilitation, and who in their experience have never come into contact with those of criminal tendency are seldom able to do better than guess at what may be a proper sentence.

Pre-sentence investigations by probation officers have for many courts helped to provide the information about a prisoner needed to make a discriminating decision but, by and large, probation staffs are overloaded and overworked and many of them are not of the quality necessary to do a good job in this field. Furthermore, bad sentencing and its demoralizing effect on the victim are by no means always the fault of the judge. In some states the penalty is set rigidly by the law so that the court must give a first offender an excessively long sentence, in some instances the same sentence he gives a hardened criminal for the same offense.

The unsatisfactory situation with regard to sentencing procedures is indicated by the manner in which the states have been groping for improvement. A study² included in the report of the federal judges cited above indicates that the states now fall into six groups on the basis of the types of discretion to sentence given the trial courts. In eleven states the courts have no discretion whatsoever in fixing the maximum term; in one state the courts have some but not final discretion; in seven states the courts can determine the length of sentence in some instances but not in others; in eight states, in which the law provides for a maximum and minimum sentence, the courts can fix the maximum term and in most of them the minimum also; in six states the courts have the choice to impose either a minimum and maximum or a definite sentence, and they can also fix the length of the maximum or the definite sentence; finally, in fifteen states only a definite sentence of imprisonment is permitted and the courts (or the jury) have power to fix its length.

Probation

Once a youth in the age group with which we are concerned (that is, above the juvenile court age and not yet a fully mature adult) is found guilty of a felony, the possibilities for disposition are usually limited: probation, jail, prison, or reformatory. Not all these alternatives are available to all courts, however, and in only a few states

¹ *Report of the Subcommittee on Sentencing of Adult Offenders*, REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUNISHMENT FOR CRIME (1942) 26.

² Beattie and Tolman, *State Sentencing Practices and Penal Systems*, REPORT, *supra* note 1, at 81.

are facilities in addition to the above becoming available. All but six states make legal provision for adult probation. The extent to which it is used and the quality of probation services vary widely. Reports received by the United States Census Bureau from 27 states for 1940 show that 33.6% of the total number of defendants sentenced in the criminal courts were disposed of by probation and suspended sentences. The reports do not reveal in how many cases this involved supervision. The percentages placed on probation varied sharply from 11.7% in North Dakota to 74.1% in Rhode Island. Of the 7500 youths 16 to 21 years old convicted annually in New York State, more than 3000 (about 39%) are placed on probation. The rest are imprisoned.

Probation is unquestionably a major tool for the reclamation of young offenders. Though marked progress has been made in recent years toward realization of its full possibilities with the adolescent group, probation often suffers from insufficient personnel, from great unevenness in quality of personnel, and from lack of discrimination in selecting offenders responsive to probation. To succeed, a probation officer must be well grounded in social case work technique, and must be inspired by warm human sympathy and understanding. Too many probation officers are political appointees of the courts. Too many are so overburdened with cases that they cannot give sufficient time to those who need special attention. The maximum case load for effective supervision in an urban community should be about 50 per officer; case loads in many jurisdictions rise to 100, 200, and even higher.

The rule-of-thumb operates in the granting of probation in too many courts. Too many youths who should be given probation are committed to an institution for punitive reasons, while youths who require institutional training are put on probation as an act of misguided leniency, with the result that they soon get into trouble again. The surest way to reduce the margin of error is by a thorough pre-sentence investigation. This should not only include complete information on the current offense and the offender's previous criminal record, but also his family history, his personal history and community background, pertinent data from medical, psychiatric and psychological examinations, and so forth. The judge should give careful consideration to all this material before passing sentence. Too often judges do not have it and too often also they disregard pertinent data.

Commitment to Jails

When giving a short sentence the court usually commits the youth to a local jail. This is often considered milder treatment than commitment to a training school or a reformatory. In point of fact, our jails are the worst institutions in our whole penal and correctional system, except for the even more abominable chain gangs still found in a few Southern states. One must not forget that, of the 3078 jails inspected by the United States Bureau of Prisons, 2111 were listed as entirely unfit for use and only 99 were given a rating of 60% or over.

Conditions which characterize the vast majority of county jails³ include the fol-

³ For further discussion of this subject and others treated in this article, see the author's article on *Adult Offenders* in the 1941 SOCIAL WORK YEAR BOOK, to appear in revised form in the 1943 volume.

lowing: an almost total lack of classification and segregation, even of those with contagious diseases from the well, the young from the old, and the beginner from the hardened offender; idleness; nonexistent or inadequate medical service; overcrowding and unsanitary conditions; long hours of confinement in cells and bull pens; insufficient and poorly prepared food for those who lack money, and better food for those who can afford to pay for it; and absence of any efforts toward the rehabilitation of the offender through education and vocational training, placement or guidance on release, or social case work of any type. The chain gangs, of which there are still 125 to 150 in the South, usually have all the bad features of the jails except idleness; they generally require road work "from sun-up to sun-down." North Carolina is among the states demonstrating that road camps can be operated successfully without the chain gang system.

The jails are usually administered by politically chosen sheriffs and deputies, who are constantly changing. Many jails are run on the fee system, which means that it is to the financial interest of the sheriff to operate the jail as cheaply as possible and to spend the minimum amount on food, clothing, and other necessities. Finally, because of the inadequacy of the staff and their ignorance of methods of administering institutions, the prisoners are very often permitted to organize "kangaroo courts" and to enforce rules of their own making. This practice not only results in the prisoners being allowed to run the jail to suit themselves but also in all sorts of illegal, corrupt, and brutal actions.

It is recognized that one of the most disastrous features of our present jail system is its effect on young adults, large numbers of whom are first offenders. While awaiting trial many are held in jail under the conditions cited above and in constant contact with experienced criminals, even though they may later be discharged or placed on probation. Thousands of youths pass through our jails yearly and many boys in their late 'teens go to chain gangs.

Commitment to Reformatories

Although 22 states operate reformatories for men, youths of the reformatory type are committed in considerable numbers to prisons and penitentiaries. This is true of all states to some extent. The resultant lumping of youths with adults hampers rehabilitative work for both. Major Rice Youell, superintendent of the Virginia State Penitentiary and newly appointed Commissioner of Corrections, has stated that his penitentiary receives every year from 300 to 400 adolescents who should never have been sent there and who would be more likely to respond favorably to other types of treatment. Major Youell undoubtedly expresses the attitude of progressive wardens everywhere.

In the 28 reformatories for men, designed to serve particularly the adolescent and young adult group, the usual age range is from 16 to 25 or 30 years. The Federal Government operates four of these reformatories and the remaining 24 are in 22 states. The New York Reformatory at Elmira set the early style for this type of institution when it was established in 1876. With the best of intentions from the first, the re-

formatories gradually became little better than junior prisons characterized by unselective and monotonous training routines and unnecessarily severe discipline. The last two decades, however, have seen a definite advance toward programs fitted to the capabilities and interests of young adults. There has been a particular improvement in education and vocational training, in medical, classification, and other technical services, and in organized recreation as an aid to health and morale. The New Jersey Reformatory at Annandale, the Federal Reformatory at Chillicothe, and a rejuvenated Elmira have been leaders in the progress of recent years, and have done an especially good job in the field of vocational training.

Mass Treatment in Reformatories

In spite of these improvements many of the reformatories, particularly those in the states, leave much to be desired. In the first place, they are generally too large. Until recently, the Ohio Reformatory at Mansfield had about 2000 inmates, Elmira 1700, Chillicothe 1400, Ionia, Michigan, 1300 and Preston, California, nearly 800. Annandale, with about 450, is one of the smallest and this is one of the reasons for its success in rehabilitating youths.

No matter how thoroughly the staff may be inspired by the will to give individual treatment, the necessity of maintaining discipline in an overlarge population of young, reckless prisoners of badly mixed types leads to the use of stereotyped mass treatment procedures which impair, if not completely nullify, individualization. The difficulties are multiplied by the fact that nearly every one of our reformatories for adults has been crowded beyond capacity, although the war has now brought reductions in population. The New York State Vocational Institution at West Coxsackie, for boys 16 to 19 years old, has been compelled to house more than 700 in a plant designed for 504. Of this situation the superintendent wrote:

Due to this overcrowded condition it was necessary on two occasions to buy additional beds which are further supplemented by Army cots set up at night and taken down during the day. The overcrowded conditions introduce many problems, including those of discipline, health and sanitation, and the general inmate morale has suffered considerably in those sections of the institution where it has been necessary to house 70 inmates in a space provided for only 42.

Inadequate Classification and Segregation

A poison that infects most of our reformatories for adults is that resulting from inadequate classification and segregation. To a large extent the institutions must receive those whom the courts commit. Consequently, the steady stream that flows through their gates includes first offenders and hardened criminals, steady young fellows and hay-wire psychopaths, mentally superior and mental defectives, essentially normal youths and sex deviates, strong characters and weak characters. To prevent contamination institutions sometimes segregate either those with a very favorable prognosis or those with a very bad one. Unless one or the other group is restricted to the point where isolation becomes continuous and therefore something too near a

punishment status, the institution cannot prevent contacts outside the cell block. The process is as futile as mixing bad apples with good in a barrel. The United States Bureau of Prisons is so alive to the necessity of classification that it does not allow even the heavy transportation costs involved to prevent the transfer of prisoners to the appropriate institution among the thirty that make up its far-flung system.

It is not a pleasant truth, but one that must be faced, that homosexuality is an ever-present problem in our penal institutions and is encouraged by the lumping of all types together in mass treatment plants. As Leonard Harrison says:⁴

The inducements to reform, offered by the state, appear of little value when measured against the blighting effect of sex-tragedies that are risked by the practice of locking two young men within a single cell. A boy who is degraded as a result of the state's control over him can never get enough of shop training or of psychiatric ministrations to make up for the injury sustained. It is deterioration, not reformation, that the correctional system induces under such circumstances.

Enforced Idleness

Enforced idleness and inadequate outlets for our physical energies and emotional urges would tend to demoralize the best of us. Perhaps nothing has been more harmful and shameful in our recent penal history than the idleness in our prisons for all age groups, now mercifully relieved in some institutions by war industries. For mental and physical health the young prisoner, particularly, needs to have his day full to the brim with work and training, balanced by recreation and a variety of character-building activities that use up his energies to the limit. Most institutions for youths, as for older prisoners, have had to fall back on made work and have had to rely on unrealistic vocational training routines instead of training supplemented by productive work. The courses for aviation mechanics at Chillicothe and for shipyard workers at Chino are samples of real training inspired by the war.

For many years the greatest obstacle to rehabilitation has been the widespread idleness in prisons. Beginning with the Hawes-Cooper Act (1929)⁵ and the Ashurst-Sumners Act (1935),⁶ federal statutes made it possible for states to pass legislation restricting the sale of prison-made goods. This legislation sounded the death knell of the contract system, which had led to many abuses, and of sale on the open market in general. The iniquitous lease system had already disappeared. The general trend is now toward the state-use system, under which prisons manufacture goods for sale to governmental units. The federal prison industries operate with conspicuous success under this system, which has been in effect for many years with limited success in California, Illinois, New York, and Ohio, among the larger states, and with greater success in Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey and Virginia, among others. The state-use system is generally considered the one most fair to all concerned so long as the industries are varied. Prison industries in normal times must still struggle for survival, however, and must often produce at a slow pace for restricted markets, paying only the most meager wages to the prisoners.

⁴ HARRISON, PREVENTING CRIMINAL CAREERS (Community Service Society of N. Y., 1941) 11.

⁵ 45 STAT. 1084 (1929), 49 U. S. C. §60.

⁶ 49 STAT. 494 (1935), 49 U. S. C. §§61-64.

The war has opened tremendous possibilities for prison industries. The federal institutions, which encountered no legal obstacles, went on a war production basis prior to our entry into the war, and by 1942 were producing a great variety of war goods and materials with an estimated value of \$12,000,000 a year. Virginia, among other states, has been producing materials for the State Guard and other state agencies. The legal bars to production by the states for government use, including Lend-Lease, during the war were removed by an opinion of the Attorney General on May 6, 1942. The War Production Board has established in the Bureau of Government Requirements a Prison Industries Section to serve as a clearing house and an Institutional Supplies Committee to facilitate contact between state institutions and procurement offices. Many states are not in a position to produce needed goods at once, but the program is gradually developing.

Forestry Camps

It is because of the vicious effect of idleness in many of our penal and correctional institutions that the development of forestry-type camps for youths in California, Washington, and Michigan, of state prison farms in New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, and Tennessee, among others, and of excellent work camps by the Federal Bureau of Prisons is so encouraging.

These new developments focus attention upon a major weakness in the institutional facilities for youths: the lack of diversity in type, function, and degree of custody. No one institution can meet the needs of the endless variety of adolescents and young adults who break the laws. The Federal Bureau of Prisons, New Jersey and New York have made considerable progress in this matter of diversification. The thirty federal institutions range from a mountain road camp in Idaho to Alcatraz, but the country as a whole has scarcely made a beginning to meet the problem. "It is impossible," says the English Prison Commission, "to train men for freedom in a condition of captivity." Half of our state reformatories for men are walled institutions with a large part of the inmates quartered in cells. They have the physical attributes of prisons to a marked degree. By contrast, the federal reformatories and those of a dozen states are of the medium security type. The number of minimum security units is very small. The new California Institution for Men at Chino and the honor forestry camp just established as an annex to the Washington State Reformatory for Men deserve especial note.

The Importance of Institutional Personnel

No correctional system is better than the personnel that administers it, but the right kind of personnel can do wonders to overcome the physical and organizational handicaps to effective rehabilitation. There was a time when the public could easily be fooled by a showy plant and formally laid-out grounds into thinking the state had a successful reformatory. We have since learned better, although some state institutions have been built in recent years with the aid of federal funds which now stand as reminders of how futile it is to set up a beautiful plant and staff it with inadequate

or incompetent personnel. Although the proportion of professionally trained persons in reformatory staffs is much greater than in prison staffs, few states have as yet been able to attract personnel with the high quality of human sympathy, intelligence, and training essential to help boys find themselves. The old custodial tradition still lingers and it is a constant battle to keep staffs from falling back on easy routines in which, for instance, inmates are forbidden to talk or act naturally because natural behavior demands increased alertness of the staff.

A few winters ago the writer visited the men's reformatory in a Northern state. There was no outdoor recreation because of the cold and the inmates were not even allowed to get the physical release of shoveling snow. Indoor recreation was virtually nonexistent. The place had the explosive threat of a ticking bomb. There was a cowed, desperate look on the faces of the men, most of them young, that promised trouble. Fortunately, the operation of institutions for the convenience of the staff and unwillingness to take any extra risk of trouble are becoming increasingly rare, but if we are to reclaim more young offenders, we must have more high quality staff members.

Parole

The final step in the correctional process, if it is to be successful, is reestablishment of the offender in society. Good parole is an effective means of continuing supervision after a youth leaves a correctional institution until reestablishment is achieved. This vital part of the correctional process is as yet far from adequately developed. In the first place, it should be keyed in with all the treatment that has gone before. Parole should be granted the moment the youth is really ready for it. There comes a moment in the lives of many prisoners when the institutional treatment has done all that it can for them and they are ready and eager to regain their places in society and go straight. For many such men fixed sentences render parole impossible at the crucial moment. Often their psychological disintegration takes place before the eyes of wardens and superintendents whose hands are tied by the law. Keeping a man imprisoned beyond the critical psychological moment is often as harmful as extending fever treatment for syphilis too long.

Parole laws present a bewildering variety of provisions and restrictions. Only 13 states and the Federal Government have full-time parole boards. Supervision as a whole is inadequate. Only a dozen states and the Federal Government provide constant official supervision; one half of all the state parole officers are in five states. The trend is upward, however, and it is estimated that there has been a 100% increase in the number of parole officers in the past decade. During 1941-42 Florida and Virginia passed parole laws, so that all states now make some legal provision for parole.

The parole systems of the Federal Government and a few states have been brought to a comparatively high standard and their record of successes on parole is such as to demonstrate clearly the effectiveness of well-administered and adequately staffed parole. That various administrative set-ups are effective has been demonstrated in four of the outstanding systems of the country: the federal system and those of

Michigan, New Jersey and New York. In each there is close coordination of parole with the institutional programs; in Michigan and New Jersey parole is part of a centralized correctional administration under one head.

Community Cooperation

An indispensable factor in successful parole is community cooperation in helping the parolee to get a job and to return successfully to free life. Too often, as soon as the public discovers that a man has a prison record, it takes away his job and brands him as an outcast. That is a certain method of defeating the correctional effort. The war is serving to break down the old prejudices, although the change is based on the need of manpower rather than on a fundamental change of heart. Today ex-prisoners, young and old, can get jobs in a variety of war industries as well as in ordinary jobs that have been vacated by men going into the armed forces or into war industries. With some exceptions, probationers and parolees may be accepted for induction into the Army. In New York State alone about a thousand parolees have been accepted. It may well be that this will lead to a change of attitude toward offenders in general when the war is over. As a Kentucky official has said, "When they come back, these men will be thought of as ex-soldiers, not ex-convicts." Every man who makes a good record will assuredly help hasten the day when the public is ready to give the probationer or parolee a real chance to stand on his own feet and make his own way on his merits.

The Importance of Individualization and Integration

We began this analysis of the defects in the existing correctional process with the statement that most of the defects could be traced to failure to apply the principle of individual treatment. Unless all elements in the correctional system think in terms of individuals, those that do not will largely defeat those that do. To combine the punishment and custodial motive with the individual treatment and rehabilitation motive is to mix water in your gasoline. What good, for example, is it for experts in medicine, education, psychology and social case work to make a thorough study of a boy and determine the training and treatment to which he is most likely to respond if the court lumps him with all other kinds of delinquents in a mass treatment institution?

Correctional treatment, moreover, must be a continuous and integrated process to succeed. In the segmented structure of the penal and correctional system, we put our finger on a second reason for its failure and for the steady growth of prison populations. As Leonard Harrison has recently written,⁷ "No other governmental service engaged in a single enterprise is so poorly integrated, so divided among independent agencies, so inadequately equipped with facilities for carrying out an approved policy as is the criminal justice system." The courts function in their own splendid isolation; the institutions in theirs; the parole services in theirs. The hapless delinquent is passed from one to another like lumber through various processing

⁷ HARRISON, *op. cit. supra* note 4, at 4.

plants. Almost inevitably the mass-produced end result proves a perverse failure, for unfortunately the delinquent boy is not lumber.

Correctional Treatment for Women

The preceding discussion has been concerned chiefly with correctional systems for males. This is due, first, to the vastly greater magnitude of the problem of male offenders and, second, to the general superiority of correctional institutions for women.

There are 27 special institutions for women prisoners in the country, two federal and 25 state. (This figure does not include such larger city institutions as the New York City House of Detention, which cares for trial prisoners and sentenced misdemeanants, but includes the Detroit House of Correction, which serves as the state prison and reformatory for women for Michigan.) These institutions are variously designated as prisons, reformatories, state farms, or as combinations of two types, but in most of them the aim and method are essentially those of the adult reformatory. In the remaining states women prisoners occupy a section of the men's prison, often in very limited quarters.

As a whole, the institutions for women are the most encouraging of our penal and correctional institutions, chiefly because of their commonsense and socially minded approach. The oldest of these institutions date back to the 1870's but most of them have been established during the present century. The more recent ones are planned on the cottage basis, and their buildings and grounds have little of the prison atmosphere. There is a reasonably large proportion of professionally trained persons on their staffs, although the institutions for women have seldom been given the appropriations they need and their staffs are notoriously underpaid.

Academic education is not stressed, but excellent vocational training is given in the work of the institution for domestic and other occupations the women can enter on release. The Massachusetts Reformatory at Framingham places women in domestic employment while they are still serving sentence, thus modernizing an old indenture law. Productive industries are generally small, usually being limited to the manufacture of clothing for state use. Women prisoners also engage in outdoor work of all types, even heavy farm work, and appear to enjoy it and profit by it.

Emphasis is placed on medical service and health programs. Women with infant children are instructed in child care by trained nurses. Health and morale are promoted by a variety of indoor and outdoor recreational activities. Classification, case work, and individualized treatment are stressed. The Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, West Virginia, and several state institutions seek to develop cooperative social attitudes through some form of "student government." The humane and intelligently sympathetic attitude displayed by staff members in women's institutions contrasts vividly with the customary attitudes in institutions for men. The New Jersey Reformatory at Clinton Farms has developed individualized treatment to a particularly high level.

A very large proportion of the women's reformatories can be given a high rating. There is no part of the country in which one or more excellent institutions for women are not to be found. They often have to accept the older, chronic offenders whose rehabilitation is difficult, together with the younger and more hopeful cases. They are small in size and are sometimes neglected. They have difficulty securing funds for professional services and for other vital needs. But they are manifestly motivated, in the main, by a high ideal of social service and, with all their limitations, serve as models in aim and method for the institutions for men.

While it is true that a girl in her late 'teens or early twenties, if sent to one of the special institutions for women, will be one of a population having a very wide age range, this is not as serious a matter as it would be in an institution for men. She is much more likely to have her youth taken into account and to be safeguarded against the bad influence which some of the older prisoners might exercise. Under the type of leadership the staff of the better institutions give, the older women are often effectively utilized as a steadying influence on the younger.

In too many states still a young woman or older girl is confined in a county jail or in an institution designed primarily for men. Too many older girls, moreover, are sent to training schools for delinquent girls or, being sent there as children, are held until they are in their late 'teens. They are frequently a disturbing influence, or worse, and throw programs which should be planned for younger children out of balance. The inadequate provisions which have been made for those who are too old for children's institutions and too young for women's institutions are in part due to the comparatively small number involved. The war has brought a new problem, with its marked increase in the number of convicted women, many of whom are not women, as a matter of fact, but girls. In the South, where the problem has been most pressing, state farms for women and training schools for girls alike are receiving those convicted of prostitution and related offenses.

Future Prospects

In conclusion, our penal and correctional institutions reveal three current trends that are gratifying to those who are concerned primarily with the youthful offender. These trends are toward greater diversification of institutional facilities, toward more effective individualization of treatment, and toward closer integration and unification in the administration of the whole correctional process. Special institutions for young men and institutions where young women will receive special training and treatment have been established, but there are not enough of them, they are not sufficiently varied in type, and their efforts at individualized treatment are handicapped by many factors. The need of administrative integration is clearly recognized by leaders in the field, but many hide-bound traditions and the desire to protect precious prerogatives delay its accomplishment. The record of the past decade or two and the prospects for the future are encouraging, however, especially since it appears probable that the war will act as a catalyzer in the slow chemistry of correctional reform.