CHAPTER X

ORGANIZATIONS FOR CHILD PROTECTION

In 1922 there were fifty-seven societies for the prevention of cruelty to children, and of the three hundred and seven humane societies combining child and animal work, a few, like the Ohio Humane Society, devoted themselves almost exclusively to child protection. In general, the distribution of child protective societies is the same as that of the animal protective organizations. Perhaps they are slightly more concentrated in proportion to their number in the Atlantic States where the greater density of population makes child problems more acute.

In New York State there has been a regional organization of child protective activities similar to that for animal protection. New York City is served by the New York S. P. C. C. together with the Brooklyn, Bronx County, Queens and Richmond S.P.C.C.s in their respective boroughs. The central part of New York State is covered in its child work by the Mohawk and Hudson River Humane Society with its branch organizations. A number of small independent S.P.C.C.s and humane societies fill in the interstices.

The New York S. P. C. C. was organized in December 1874, upon the initiative of Mr. Henry Bergh and his counsel Mr. Elbridge T. Gerry, after the “Mary Ellen case” had drawn their attention to the cruelties being practiced on children.1 At the organization meeting, the purposes of the Society were stated “to seek out and to rescue from the dens and slums of the city those little unfortunates whose childish lives are rendered miserable by the constant abuse and cruelties practiced on them by the human brutes who

---

1 McCrea, op. cit., p. 135.
happen to possess the custody or control of them" and "to enforce by lawful means and with energy the laws referred to (for the protection of children), and secure in like manner the prompt conviction and punishment of every violator of any of these laws."  

In April 1875 the Society was incorporated by a special act. It was empowered to "prefer a complaint before any court or magistrate . . . for the violation of any law relating to or affecting children" and "to aid in bringing the facts before such court or magistrate." It was assured the assistance of all municipal and state police officers in enforcing the law.

In May 1875 the Society prosecuted its first case. By the end of the year sixty-eight prosecutions had resulted from over three hundred complaints, and seventy-two children had been rescued and provided for at the Society's interposition. Thus was marked out the New York S.P.C.C.'s primary field of activity.

In the following year the Society introduced into the New York Legislature an act "to Prevent and Punish Wrongs to Children" which was passed on April 14. This was only the first of such measures introduced by the Society. In 1883 was submitted an act "to Prevent Baby-Farming." In the following year, President Gerry brought about the codification of existing child-protective

2 N. Y. Sess. Laws, 1875, ch. 130.
3 Unless otherwise indicated, the details of this account of the New York S. P. C. C. have been drawn from its annual reports, from a printed Memorandum submitted by the Society in November 1923 to the New York State Commission to Examine Laws Relating to Child Welfare, and from the historical account of the Society which was placed in the cornerstone of its new building and of which a copy was furnished through the courtesy of the Society's officers.
4 New York Sess. Laws, 1876, ch. 122.
laws in New York State. Numerous child-protective acts have since then been sponsored by the Society.

From the very beginning of its prosecuting activities, the Society had felt the need of a shelter to house the children who came under its supervision. During its early years it made arrangements with the matron at Police Headquarters to care for children temporarily in the Society’s custody. In 1880, after it had secured permanent quarters for itself, it was able to maintain a children’s shelter in the floor-space of its own building. In this year, also, a method was established by the city magistrates to make all orders requiring the payment by parents of money toward the support of committed children payable at the office of the Society. The Society gladly undertook the labor of collecting these funds, performing this function without charge to the city or to the individuals concerned.

The great value of the Society’s services and the unquestioned need for them—the greater in New York City because of the large foreign population with its Old World conceptions of the rights of children—resulted in a rapid and sound growth of the organization. In 1876 there were 348 members; by 1910 the number had risen to 503 annual members and 484 life members. By this year the Society enjoyed a total income of $116,994.92; from members it received donations and subscription dues amounting to $39,176.33, it received an annual appropriation of $60,000 from New York City, and from invested legacies it received $3,000.00. During the year, it received an additional $8,617.42 in legacies which it added to its investment fund.

During 1910 it investigated 18,541 complaints involving the welfare of 51,000 child victims of neglect or abuse which were brought to its attention. It prosecuted 541 adult of-

fenders against children, and appeared in 7947 cases involving children in the Children's Court.¹

At this time the Children's Court of New York City had no parole officers attached to it. This labor was shared by a group of child aid organizations of which the New York S. P. C. C. was one of the most important. However, in 1912 this not entirely satisfactory situation was remedied, appropriations for probation officers were voted by the City, and the Society relinquished its share in this work. It now confined itself to the maintenance of records for all children passing through the Court, and to receiving the custody of the children for shelter during case procedure.

Of the three types of child cases involving Children's Court action—juvenile delinquency, ungovernable and disorderly children and improper guardianship and neglect—only the third to any great extent concerns the New York S. P. C. C. On occasion, S. P. C. C. agents are involved as witnesses in juvenile delinquency cases or are instrumental in bringing them to court, but this is usually accomplished through other channels. Of course, it often happens that such children are remanded to the Society for temporary shelter. The ungovernable, disorderly child is likewise outside the Society's sphere. On the other hand, the Society is the usual agent for handling cases of improper guardianship and neglect, and almost the sole agency for prosecuting outright offenders against childhood whose cases are dwelt with in Magistrates' Court, the Court of Special Sessions and the Court of General Sessions.

Feeling that a great moral danger existed in the illegal admission of children into moving-picture houses, the Society devoted special attention to this matter during 1910, and brought 87 such cases to court during the year. Its list of cases prosecuted covered misdemeanors such as buying junk from minors and general neglect, and felonies including

¹Ibid., p. 57.
abduction and criminal assault. It investigated 5,308 charges of improper guardianship and dealt with 95 theatrical investigations.

One significant feature of its work during the year was the investigation of 1,930 applications for baby-farm permits. In 1880 the Society had prosecuted one Edward Crowley who had conducted a baby-farm and maltreated his charges. Three years later it induced the New York legislature to pass an act to control baby-farming. Thereafter it made it a part of its duty to investigate all applications from such institutions.

During 1910 it collected $26,424.55 from parents under order of court to pay the board of their children maintained in institutions. This feature of its work was also begun in 1880 by arrangement between the Society and the city magistrates.

The importance of the Society’s shelter work had increased year by year. It was enabled to meet the demands made upon it in this respect through the facilities of its building which it had erected in 1893. During 1910 it accommodated 7,899 children in its rooms. These children had either been rescued by the Society from cruel surroundings and were retained in its custody until the date of their trial, or else were juvenile delinquents who had temporarily been placed under the supervision of the Society while under the control of the Children’s Court. The expenses of the shelter during 1910 occupied, as in every year, an important position in the Society’s schedule of disbursements. Apart from the overhead expenses, the cost of the children in the Society’s custody during the year was $7,771.21 and $1,498.75 was expended for their medical attendance.

In 1915 the New York S. P. C. C. helped to establish a sister society in Bronx County. This was the third such society founded by it in the metropolitan district. The two

earlier organizations were the Brooklyn and Richmond County societies. The New York S. P. C. C. did not establish these new societies as branch organizations dependent upon the parent body; but from the very beginning they developed as full-fledged, independent child-protective societies. It was felt that in this way the local community pride of the counties concerned would be awakened and would come to the support of the organizations. The existence of these younger organizations has enabled the New York society to concentrate its efforts entirely in the county of New York. Thus the superintendent's report for 1916 showed that in that year, after the Bronx County Society had taken over the jurisdiction of its district, there was an increase of 1,183 cases over the number handled by the New York Society in the previous year.

1920 was a significant year for the Society. An appeal made by the Society to Mr. August Heckscher for a motorbus brought the response from him of an offer of a $1,500,000 building for the Society with a large endowment to enable the Society to fulfill its functions better. The directors of the Society felt that the acceptance of this offer would involve it in child welfare work of a nature foreign to its purpose. As a result, Mr. Heckscher altered his gift, and established the Heckscher Foundation for Children. A $1,650,000 building was constructed in which both the Foundation and the New York S. P. C. C. would be housed. The Society agreed in 1921 and contributed $350,000 towards the construction of its wing of the edifice (this fund was derived from the sale of its former home). It entered upon its new home in 1922.

The accompanying figures indicate the development of the Society's finances and the extent of its major activities during the period from 1910 to 1922. (The form in which the Society presented some of its statistics prior to 1914 makes their inclusion in this tabulation impossible).
Throughout this period, the figures for the total income of the Society show an increase from $116,994.92 in 1910 to $234,570.34 in 1922. Examination shows, however, that none of this increase may be attributed to growth of membership or increased contributions from members. While the figures for the membership of the Society during this period are not available, it is possible to weigh the importance of this factor by the figures for the combined income from membership dues and donations. In 1910 the income from these sources was $39,189.55; by 1913 it had fallen to $31,730.35. By 1915 it had increased to $37,159.00. The establishment of the Bronx County S. P. C. C. drew some support from the New York organization during the following year. By 1919, however, the income from this

---

**Table: Activities of the New York Humane Movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members' dues</th>
<th>Special contributions</th>
<th>Income from investments and endowment</th>
<th>Federal and grantee income</th>
<th>Total net income at end of New York fiscal year</th>
<th>Salaries, executive and central expenses</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Salaries, executive and central expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>$39,189.55</td>
<td>$13,145.37</td>
<td>$64,660.00</td>
<td>$116,994.92</td>
<td>$23,857.08</td>
<td>$64,206.08</td>
<td>$66,689.66</td>
<td>$23,857.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>35,294.24</td>
<td>14,012.75</td>
<td>$62,675.00</td>
<td>112,062.98</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
<td>66,689.66</td>
<td>76,332.33</td>
<td>41,286.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bronx Co. S. P. C. C. established.

*Including $10,000 allowance by Heckscher Foundation from Endowment Fund.*
Since 1907 the New York S. P. C. C. has maintained the general principle of investing all unrestricted cash bequests. The only exceptions to this rule have been for the purpose of canceling floating indebtedness. Hence there has been a steady increase in the income from invested funds. In 1910, $13,145.37 was received from rents and investments; by 1923 this had increased to $34,553.92.

The most important source of the New York S. P. C. C.'s income is the City of New York. Of the total income from this source, fines paid to the Society represent an inconsiderable fraction, usually averaging two or three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelter expenses</th>
<th>New and old complaints affecting children investigated</th>
<th>Adults arrested for offenses against children</th>
<th>Children in cases brought into the court by the Society</th>
<th>Children passing through the shelter during the year</th>
<th>Number of meals served during year</th>
<th>Money collected to pay board of children in institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,142.81</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7,617</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$25,918.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,400.87</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>9,912</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>23,919.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,493.96</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10,775</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25,166.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,537.36</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10,550</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>14,614.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,674.54</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>10,573</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>133,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,648.29</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>7,997</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>148,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,538.57</td>
<td>7,848</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>117,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31,167.32</td>
<td>9,204</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>8,409</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,421.54</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>9,087</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>147,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,069.81</td>
<td>7,810</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>8,862</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>150,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,654.00</td>
<td>9,083</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>70,576.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,386.32</td>
<td>8,428</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>76,971.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,466.71</td>
<td>9,455</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>6,364</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>67,016.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next two years of industrial depression saw a decrease to $25,918.33. Recovery began again in 1922.

The source had increased to $46,607.76. Including extra expense of maintaining a separate shelter during the epidemic of infantile paralysis.

Including $24,985.93 for care of the Society's children by Heckscher Foundation, Aug. 28 to Dec. 31, 1922.
THE HUMANE MOVEMENT

thousand dollars annually. On the other hand, the annual appropriation by the City of New York to the Society has increased from $60,000 in 1910 to $150,000 in 1922, and during the past ten years has represented the major portion of the Society's total net income.1

Although the expenditures of the Society for items such as printing and stationary, legal expenses, telephone calls, gas and fuel, etc., are always of considerable amount, the main items of expense are salaries and shelter upkeep. Moreover, these two have expanded more rapidly than the others during the period studied. This is accounted for by two factors. There has been a slight increase in the number of the salaried staff—the force of agents has grown—and there has likewise been an increase in the shelter work undertaken. In addition, during the period from 1914 to 1920, the rapid rise of prices necessitated corresponding wage increases on the part of the Society; otherwise it faced the risk of having its employees attracted to other occupations. The rise in prices also added to the costs of the shelter work.

The figures for the Society's accomplishments indicate a perceptible though irregular increase. The Society investigates applications for infant boarding-house permits and supervises the appearance of children on the stage or in moving pictures. These and applications for aid and advice are largely routine matters and make little demand upon the Society's initiative. A truer indication of this is to be found in the investigations it makes of complaints—complaints of the neglect, abuse or exposure of children; complaints against individuals, against candy-stores, moving-picture houses and junk shops. Every year there are new investigations made or old cases reinvestigated. In addition, there are special investigations undertaken every

1 Cf. Memorandum, cit. supra, exhibit A, p. 34.
year upon request of the District Attorney or of other child protective societies. In 1914 these investigations totaled 5,001. By 1917 they had increased (excluding Bronx County in this year) to 9,204. Thereafter, there is a sharp decrease and not until 1922 is this previous total bettered.

One of the most significant indexes of the Society's accomplishments, the annual total of adults arrested for offenses against children, shows a marked decrease, from 1,003 in 1915 to 701 in 1922. In part, this may be accounted for by the giving of jurisdiction in Bronx County to the new society there in 1916. But since 1917 there has been a decrease in the figures for New York County alone. Officials of the New York S. P. C. C. do not interpret this as a weakening in the Society's efforts, but rather as an indication of the success of its work, in that criminals are more and more deterred from the commission of offenses by fear of immediate retribution; they point out also that prosperous times during the war years and after, better living conditions and prohibition made their influence towards the reduction of crime felt. There has been a similar falling-off of child cases, including improper guardianship and neglect, offenses against childhood, cases of juvenile delinquency and ungovernable children that come to the Society's attention, necessitating court action.

On the other hand, the shelter work of the Society has expanded. This is not at first evident if we consider only the figures for the number of children who annually pass through the shelter. There were 7,818 in 1910, 10,775 in 1912, 9,087 in 1918, and only 6,364 in 1922. But in 1910 the average time spent by a child in the shelter was less than three days; at present it is more than nine. Consequently there has been a real growth in the shelter work. This is indicated by the figures for the number of meals served per year—133,625 in 1914 and 168,630 in 1922.
The state of Massachusetts presents an organization of child protective work radically different from that of New York. Instead of a scattered number of societies, each serving its limited locality and united in cooperation only by a state humane association, Massachusetts is served by a single state-wide Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, which, with its headquarters at Boston, covers the state through its branch organizations.  

The Massachusetts S. P. C. C. was organized in 1878, and from that time until 1907 devoted itself almost exclusively to the city of Boston. Its policy, like that of the New York society, was conservative. It confined itself more or less to being "the arm of the law", protecting children from active forms of cruelty and prosecuting the offenders; and by keeping its expenses always within its income by investing all bequests, it built up a very strong endowment. In 1907 under the influence of its secretary, Mr. C. C. Carstens, it entered upon a new policy. It entered itself in many forms of child welfare which it had previously considered outside of its sphere and it decided to become, as its charter provided, a state organization. 

It was realized that such an expansion would prove a heavy drain upon the Society's resources. Almost certainly the mounting expenses would very soon pass the figure of the annual income. The directors of the Society decided to shoulder the responsibility for this radical step, and later explained the problem they faced and its solution:

whether unrestricted bequests should be used to build up a fund, the income of which only could be used, or whether these bequests should be applied to our current needs. We have

---

1 Exception must be made of the city of Lowell whose humane society had taken upon itself, as a share of its duty, the protection of children at an early period and which at present cooperates to a limited extent with the Massachusetts S. P. C. C.
decided that the yearly deficiency should be made up from these unrestricted bequests on the theory that we cannot allow the present work of the Society to be hampered for the sake of accumulating a large reserve fund.¹

As resources permitted, branch societies were now established in the surrounding cities and towns. By 1910 four of these had been formed—in Beverly, Brockton, New Bedford and Northampton. These branches were nominally an added expense. Nevertheless, it was expected that they would to a greater or lesser degree pay their own way. The annual report of this year said: "Wherever the Society has begun systematic local work, it has asked for local financial support as soon as it was able to show what it had accomplished during a probationary period and what its plans for the future were. Some financial support has come from all the new fields after a reasonable time. We believe that local self-support will gradually come about."²

One of the most important elements in attaining the desired financial independence of each branch would be the appeal to the local community pride of the district where it was established. For this reason, the mother society considered it desirable to make no attempt to assert absolute authority over the branch organizations, but rather to develop independent action upon their part insofar as could wisely be done. A few years later the president of the Society made the suggestion that at least one representative from each branch organization be elected to the board of directors, instead of composing it entirely of residents of the city of Boston as had been the case in the past. This suggestion was carried out.³ The Society has found it advisable to assert its authority over the branches only in

the matter of the appointment of agents and in a few cases, of expenditures of money for special purposes.

Each branch organization has been encouraged to meet its local problems in the way it considers best, and each branch organization has, since its founding, issued an annual report either as a part of the report of the mother organization or as a separate pamphlet. In 1910 the New Bedford branch, the oldest, announced a program of "emphasis upon the supervision of children in their own homes and the discipline of negligent parents whenever the welfare of the children permitted that they be left at home". It submitted a report in cooperation with the Charity Organization Society of the town to the superintendent of schools on the extent of defective eyesight, adenoids, tonsils and bad teeth among the school children and advocated a school nurse. It prosecuted cases of illegal employment of minors under fourteen on milk-wagons in the early morning. As preparation for more extended work in the future, it made an investigation of birth registration and infant mortality in the New Bedford district, and made maps of the distribution of neglected children, delinquent children, infant mortality and tuberculosis cases.

The Brockton branch during the same year stated its intention "to attack as many as possible of the problems of neglect before the children become delinquent, and to make all possible effort to bring neglecting parents to realize and assume their true responsibilities. We are also trying to establish in our office a bureau of cooperative registration and confidential exchange of information." 2

The Hampshire branch founded in March 1910, also announced a plan for a "confidential exchange" for all charitable societies in the district; this would be accomplished

2 Ibid., p. 30.
by a committee of three and an auxiliary committee made up by different organizations using the exchange. Later in the year, a temporary home being desired, the Children's Home Association was formed as a separate organization closely affiliated with the Hampshire branch, and a home was bought.

In the city of Boston during 1910 the mother society carried on a vigorous prosecution of causes of carnal abuse of young girls, a matter to which it had devoted attention during the past two years. Eighty-five cases came to the notice of the Society. Of other types of cruelty, 3,522 cases involving 7,213 different children were attended to.

No new lines of work were begun in 1911, but in the following year, the mother society organized the Children's Welfare League of Roxbury. This was to be, according to the Society's plans, the first of a series of such Leagues in the city of Boston. Preparatory to its foundation, a survey of the disposition of cases of juvenile delinquency was made, which showed that Roxbury was the worst district of Boston in this respect. In January 1912 the Welfare League was organized to draw together the thirty-five children's agencies serving the district of Roxbury and to develop a common program to which schools, settlements, relief societies, children's agencies and all welfare institutions, public and private, might contribute. One committee of the League that the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. considered highly important because it dealt not solely with socially defective children but helped all boys and girls who might choose to benefit by its services, was the Placement Bureau. Through it the pupil leaving school was carefully placed in a suitable position and his business career followed until there was reasonable assurance of his having found a place of employment fitted to his capabilities. This bureau became

\[1\text{Ibid., p. 38.}\]
city-wide by 1915 and cooperated with the Boston School Committee.

The original intention of the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. was that the Welfare League should be as largely as possible a local movement, having the moral and financial backing of the district, and independent of supervision or direction from any outside source. Consequently, in November 1912, when it was apparent that the League was firmly established, the Society withdrew its financial support, though continuing in the closest of friendly relations.¹

In 1913, pursuing this policy of encouraging cooperation among the many child-welfare organizations in the city of Boston, the Society formed a confidential exchange, enlarging upon the model created by its Hampshire branch in 1910.²

As the resources of the Society permitted, new branches were being established during this period. In 1915 a branch was formed at Hyannis on Cape Cod, and by means of rural agents work was extended to Newburyport, Framingham, Gloucester and Salem. The following year a new district office was opened at Lynn and new branch offices in Waltham, Athol, Orange, North Adams, Taunton and Attleboro. By this time twelve district offices and fourteen branches had been established.³

In 1917 the mother society began a campaign for state action on illegitimacy. Legislation in this field in Ohio and Minnesota was held up as a model. This year also witnessed a most encouraging development for the Society. The New Bedford district branch announced that it felt ready to enter upon a more independent existence. The Society willingly granted the request for autonomy. Re-

sponsibility for the conduct of the branch was now placed entirely upon its own board of directors. The only limitations were that the agents should be appointed by the central office and that the schedule of the branch society's salaries should conform to that of the mother society. In return the central office agreed during the first year to meet any deficit of the New Bedford branch up to a certain amount.\footnote{Mass. S. P. C. C., 37th Ann. Rpt. (1917), p. 26.}

In 1918, in addition to its usual routine, the Society took upon itself to patrol the neighborhoods of the military and naval cantonments near Boston for the double purpose of protecting the soldiers and sailors from intercourse with vicious girls and to protect young girls from the advances of the service men. In performing this office, the agent of the Society, then as now without police power, often usurped such power in making arrests. Under the stress of war-time needs, this was condoned by the Massachusetts courts.

In this year a district office was established in Springfield and a branch in Holyoke. This completed the Society's program of expansion, for, except in Lowell, where the Lowell Humane Society was active in child protective work, the entire state was now served by the district and branch organizations. The president of the Society announced: "We have accomplished what we set out to do a number of years ago, and the state is now virtually covered by our agencies."\footnote{Mass. S. P. C. C., 38th Ann. Rpt. (1918), p. 17.}

The financing of this expansion makes an interesting history. The income of the Society may be divided into three classes—that from subscriptions and donations, the income from investments, and the accidental income arising from bequests restricted or unrestricted in character. In addi-
tion, the incomes of all the non-independent branches of the Society have been entered upon its books as an independent source of income. On the other hand, the Society has followed the policy of not including the unrestricted bequests received during the year as a part of its income, balancing off against them any annual deficits that arise and adding or subtracting the remainder from the total invested wealth of the Society. Keeping this in mind, let us examine the financial statements for the period from 1910 to the completion of growth in 1918.

In 1910 the income from subscriptions and donations was $23,309.86, from investments $8,462.25, and from the seven branch organizations which existed by the end of the year $1,850. The addition of income from other minor sources brought the total net income to $41,414.69. In this year the expenses of the branch offices were $4,179.25 out of a total of $38,527.23. Thus, although the expenses of these organizations exceeded the income from them by nearly $2500, the Society had no deficit to meet, but instead a surplus income of $2,887.46 to be added to the $12,274.11 of unrestricted bequests, both of which sums went into the reserve the Society was building up against probable excesses of expenditure in future years.

In 1913 the income from the branch organizations had risen to $9,031.43, while the income from subscriptions, drawn, it must be remembered, almost exclusively from residents of the city of Boston, had fallen to $17,200.27. An increase in the income from investments compensated somewhat and the total was $43,720.43. By now, however, the expenses of the branch organizations had risen to $24,103.47, and the total expenditure for the year was $81,886.86, leaving an excess of expenditure amounting to $38,166.39. As the total of unrestricted bequests in the course of the year was only $18,326.16, it was necessary to draw upon the
reserve built up in the previous years to the extent of $19,840.23.

Within two years of this time, it became evident that financially, the program of expansion was gaining rather than losing ground. For various reasons, the expenses of the branch organizations had decreased to $22,039.34, while the income from them increased to $14,353.88. In 1916 the expenses of the branches leaped to $30,944.05, an increase of $8,804.71. The income from this source had increased from $7,376.90 to $21,730.78. Nevertheless, if the figures for branch expenses and income in 1916 be compared with those for 1913, it will be seen that the income had made the greater growth, despite the fact that new branches, a heavy drain, were being formed.

It should be remembered, however, that along with its program of state-wide expansion, the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. was developing new and wider fields of child help, so that there was during this period a very rapid increase in the expenditure of the mother society, from $27,230.77 in 1910 to $46,738.61 in 1913, and to $54,824.35 in 1916, so that in this latter year the total for expenditures was $97,300.48. The deficit was $30,222.20. Before entering upon this program of expansion, both in territory covered and work accomplished, the directors of the Society had counted on assistance from two sources. They believed that were the activities of the Society well advertised, and were the proper appeals made to the pride and altruism of residents of Massachusetts, there would be a steady growth in membership with a corresponding increase in contributions and donations. Even more important would be the assistance which the Society hoped for in the form of bequests. In neither respect were the directors disappointed. The figures so far quoted show a growth in the total of contributions and donations. More significant were the percentages of
annual increase. The income figures for 1914 represented a 13.7 per cent increase over those of the preceding year. Similarly, the increase in 1915 was 20.3 per cent; in 1916, 22.3 per cent. Despite the demands of war charities during 1917-18, the income of the Society managed to register an increase in each of those years, 3.7 per cent in 1917, and 5.4 per cent in the following year. The income from contributions has increased steadily through 1922.

As was to be expected, the income from unrestricted bequests has shown no such regularity as the income from subscriptions and donations. The annual figures since 1910 have varied widely, from $12,274.11 in that year to $71,368.50 in 1920. In 1922 the total was over $50,000. As has been stated, the directors looked forward to balancing those bequests against the foreseen annual excesses of expenditure. In some years the excess has proved greater than the total of bequests. In other years the reverse has occurred. However, for the period from 1907 to 1922, the two have balanced each other to within a few thousand dollars. In 1912 the income from investments was $18,882.99; in 1922 it was $18,039.92. Evidently the Society has not found it necessary to cut very deeply into its reserve funds.1

Although the limits of territorial expansion were now reached, it was not yet possible for the Society to make any radical cut in its expenditures or even to prevent them from mounting. By 1919 the total had risen to $139,431.93, and the annual deficit was $54,098.30. By the next year the total was $144,178.56 with a deficit of $43,911.27. The attention of the directors was now turned to consolidating the gains made by the Society, a labor which proved

1These figures are quoted from the annual reports of the Mass. S. P. C. C. and from memoranda recently furnished by Mr. Lathrop, the secretary of the Society.
quite as expensive as the earlier growth. The president of the Society in his 1920 address said: “We now enter upon a new period which will not be exactly like the last period, but which we hope will be equally one of improvement. The past fourteen years have been a period of development, and development for us on entirely new lines. The next period ought probably to be one of consolidation of the position we have won. Without slacking our vigilance and effectiveness in protecting any child that needs protection of this Society, the future of children's protective work must be even more preventive in its nature.” He pointed to the mounting figures for expenditure and insisted that the dependence of the Society on the greatly varying stream of bequests to pay large deficits was disquieting. “We ought to build up our invested funds until they contribute enough to pay the expenses of our general office, and the work of all our branches ought to be paid for where the work is done.”

The first step in carrying out this policy was to make as many as possible of the branch societies independent and self-supporting. Heretofore, only the New Bedford branch had enjoyed this distinction. By the end of 1921 there were three others. By January 1923 ten district and branch organizations were self-supporting. In each of these cases the mother society followed the same policy it had with the New Bedford branch, guaranteeing to cover a limited deficit. The directors felt that in the carrying out of this program they would have as an ally the community pride of each municipality where a branch was established. Their judgment has been proven correct. Where the choice was of making the branch self-supporting or else giving up the work, in that neighborhood the community has come to the

support of its organization. It is the hope and expectation of the Society that in the very near future, all twenty-seven of the district and branch S.P.C.C.s will be maintaining themselves.

During the War an exceedingly large number of the Massachusetts municipalities developed community chests or financial federations for the successful flotation of their war charities. As in other states, some proved successful, others were disastrous failures. The Massachusetts S. P. C. C. dictated to its branches no policy concerning the joining of such federations. Each society was allowed to determine its own course. In most cases they joined a federation where such had been formed in their community. With few exceptions they reported satisfaction with the arrangement. On the other hand, the Worcester branch refused to join the community chest in that city, being the only charitable organization to remain outside of it, and did not find itself discomfited by its position. During 1919 and 1920 some of the federations hitherto successful became too ambitious and collapsed. Several branches of the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. suffered. During the last couple of years saner principles of guidance have been followed by the Massachusetts financial federations, and the S.P.C.C.s have not been unfriendly to them.

Though the Society considers its function preventive, it finds itself called upon to do no small share of protective work. During 1922 it investigated the cases of 5,040 families, 1,090 of which warranted court action. Of the 13,008 children involved, only 2,094 were protected by court action. The following figures indicate the activities of the mother society and the district and branch S. P. C. C.s during 1922:
### General Statistics of the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. and Branches for the Year Ended October 31, 1922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts and Branches</th>
<th>Total families dealt with</th>
<th>Total children involved</th>
<th>Families requiring court action</th>
<th>Children protected</th>
<th>Families not requiring court action</th>
<th>Children protected</th>
<th>Families not requiring court action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athol</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>3,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Cod</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampshire</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburyport</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Attleboro</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Berkshire</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Middlesex</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** In the above totals, 1,454 children, in 673 families, were not protected. In 355 cases the complaint was unwarranted; in 154 cases the families could not be located; while in 184 cases there was failure to accomplish purpose, because the evidence was insufficient or because the law did not reach the conditions disclosed.

An important example of a humane society organized for both animal and child protective work and devoting itself almost exclusively to the latter is offered by the Ohio Humane Society, located at Cincinnati. It states its purposes:

I. To compel deserting fathers of families or their responsible relatives to contribute to the support of dependent children, and to cooperate with the officials of the Courts in the prosecution of neglectful, abusive or immoral parents.

II. To protect children—regardless of race, color or creed—from all conditions of neglect, abuse, cruelty or immorality, with a view to the future welfare of the child and the community.

III. To investigate the conditions of children about to become public charges, in order to seek homes for them in placing-out departments, or guiding them through proper channels to relatives or friends as an alternative to institutional placement at public expense.

IV. To direct attention to feeble-minded and epileptic children, stressing the question of their care and support, together with commitment to the proper institutions, where they may receive such training as they are capable of undergoing.

V. To help the unmarried mother to obtain support from the father, and to construct a plan best suited to the needs of herself and her child.

VI. To secure adequate medical treatment through public hospitals and clinics for children or their parents suffering from physical defect, or from the general physical deterioration which marks the deserted family.

VII. To make efforts to re-organize so-called "bad homes" to prevent the breaking up of families with consequent disadvantage to the children.

VIII. To compel derelict adult children properly to support their aged parents, and to insure peaceful old age for those reduced to a state of helplessness by reason of infirmity and illness.
IX. To protect animals from mistreatment, cruelty and abuse, and to enforce the laws relating thereto.¹

The Ohio Humane Society has several times sought to release itself from the necessity of carrying on animal protection. Despite the fact that there exists in Cincinnati another animal protective society, the Hamilton County S. P. C. A., to which it would gladly turn over its animal work, it has been unable to succeed in doing this without running the risk of forfeiting its charter. Moreover, a share of its income depends upon the maintenance of its activities in behalf of animals, under the provisions of the "Ohio Sheep Fund". This "Sheep Fund" is composed of the registration fees for dogs and dog kennels in each Ohio county. It was originally intended to reimburse sheep owners whose flocks had been attacked by the wild dogs which used to infest the state many years ago. It was provided that whenever there was a surplus of more than $1000 at the end of a year after paying the claims of the sheep owners, it should be transferred to the treasuries of animal protective societies in the country.² There are several humane societies in the state of Ohio whose interest is in child welfare rather than in animal protection, but who are forced to engage in a certain minimum of animal protection to receive a part of their income. Of these the Ohio Humane Society is the most important.³

As may be seen from its declaration of purposes, the Ohio Humane Society considers the enforcing of anti-cruelty laws only a minor part of its program. Thus in 1922, of the 1619 new cases investigated by the Society and the

²Ohio R. S., sec. 2833.
³Manuscript letter of May 11, 1923 from the secretary of the Ohio Humane Society.
4767 cases that it found necessary to rehandle, only 951 cases required court action.¹ In 1921, besides the cases of cruelty to children, the Society handled 158 cases of illegitimacy and 164 cases of non-support of aged parents.

In carrying out its program, the Ohio Humane Society has found it necessary to enter into the closest possible relations with the other child-welfare organizations of Cincinnati. Through the influence of the Council of Social Agencies, coordination and harmony have been obtained and the overlapping of work is eliminated. The Ohio Humane Society is represented at the various conferences and local committees, the executive of the Society serving as chairman of the Cincinnati Boarding Home Bureau, and chairman of the Committee on Illegitimacy, both committees being functional members of the Council of Social Agencies. The Society is also represented on the District Conference Committee, the Public Health Federation, and the Negro Civic Welfare Association.⁵ Finally, it belongs to the very successful Community Chest of Cincinnati.

Until 1910 the Pennsylvania S. P. C. C. had followed a program of strictly protective work in the city of Philadelphia. In the early years of the decade beginning with 1910 it was influenced by the movement started by the Massachusetts S. P. C. C., and broadened its activities.³

In 1913 it announced a program which showed the influence of the new forces that were permeating it:

Our work consists (1) of home conservation through the determined and persistent efforts which we put forth and enlist others in putting forth to secure proper home treatment for

¹Community Chest Crier (Cincinnati), April 2, 1923.
²Manuscript letter of May 11, 1923.
children where home conditions have been found, upon complaint made, to warrant public interference for their protection; (2) of presenting to the Court the cases of families in which preventive and constructive work has failed, recommending to the Court the removal of children from parents who have proven intolerably cruel or neglectful and have refused every effort toward reformation; (3) of caring for children who have been committed to our custody by the Court and endeavoring, even after having, through the instrumentality of the Court, removed the children, to reconstruct the family life, make the parents again worthy of the care of their children, and return the children to them.¹

One of its first problems was to divest itself of its childboarding functions. In 1912 it had boarded 3542 children; by 1915 it had reduced this number to 1952. Eventually its children's shelter, maintained at first solely by the Society and later jointly with the Children's Aid Society and the Seybert Institution, was turned over entirely to the latter.²

Seeking to obtain greater cooperation among the charitable organizations of Philadelphia, it formed the Children's Bureau to act as a clearing house for the child-welfare agencies of the city. This not proving an entirely satisfactory body, the Philadelphia Welfare Federation was organized in the spring of 1921, to act both as a central charitable bureau and a financial federation.³

Hitherto, having confined its activities to Philadelphia and the immediately surrounding territory, it now plans to make itself state-wide. In 1921 the president announced: "The Society must put itself as soon as possible in a position to give more satisfactory service to the eastern

part of the state outside of Philadelphia. . . If the Society is to give service to the State by means of branch offices and district committees, we shall have to pay the additional cost until such time as the communities helped can pay for their own welfare work.”

Financially, the Pennsylvania society was not so well equipped to begin a campaign of state-wide expansion as was the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. It lost rather than gained ground during the past decade. Its income from subscriptions was $13,739.53 in 1914, and by 1920 had sunk to $9,817.70. It has had during these years a steady excess of expenditure over net income, which it has had to meet either from its invested capital or from its limited amount of unrestricted bequests. It has, however, the advantage of receiving grants from the State of Pennsylvania and from the county and the city of Philadelphia, which in 1921 amounted to $14,310.66. Its total net income, exclusive of bequests in this year was $43,033.25 and its expenses were $65,175.83.

Another society that has recently undergone a transfor­mation similar to that of the Massachusetts and Pennsyl­vania societies, is the Delaware S. P. C. C. Formed in 1879, its history during its first decade was that of growth and active development. Thereafter, its founders having been taken from it by death and change of residence, it slowly disintegrated until by 1918 it was practically inactive. It had been managed for many years together with the Delaware S. P. C. A. by the non-support officer of the municipal court of Wilmington. Though sincere, he was untrained in social case work. The finances of the Society were limited; the state appropriated $900 a year, membership dues amounted to about $120, and fines raised the average an-

1Ibid.
nual income to between $2000 and $2500. Although the non-support officer declared the interest of the Society was mainly in "preventive" work, it was possible to do little more than prosecute the actual cases of cruelty in the city of Wilmington. When in 1918 an investigation was made of all the child welfare organizations of Delaware, it was advised that the S. P. C. C. unite with the Wilmington Juvenile Court and Probation Association and surrender its individual existence.\footnote{1}

The suggestion was not a welcome one to the social workers of Wilmington, and during the following year, several of them succeeded in getting on the board of managers of the S. P. C. C. One of the staff of the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. was invited to become the secretary of the Society and reorganize it. The non-support officer was dismissed as agent and the society dropped all connections with the non-support work and with the S. P. C. A. The type of work was completely changed, following as nearly as possible, with the Society’s limited facilities, the program of the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. The policy of an annual financial drive and widespread advertising was adopted, which proved remarkably successful, resulting in large donations and a series of bequests. In 1922, whereas there had been no increase in the income received from public sources and little from dues, donations as a result of a special appeal amounted to $2,247, and bequests to $5000, making a total income for the year of $10,577.13.\footnote{1}

In imitation of the policy of the Massachusetts society, the Delaware S. P. C. C. has sought to bring about as complete a cooperation among the Wilmington child-welfare organizations as is possible. In January 1922 the director

\footnote{1 Manuscript letter of April 19, 1923.}

\footnote{1 C. S. Richardson, The Dependent, Delinquent and Defective Children of Delaware (N. Y., 1918), p. 27.}
of the Society became director of the Children’s Bureau of Delaware, dividing her time between the two organizations, which, however, have separate boards of managers. In 1923 a full-time secretary and a full-time field-worker were obtained, and for the first time in its history, the Society was in a position to attend to cases of cruelty outside of the city of Wilmington. It looks forward during the next few years to expanding its work until its becomes state-wide. Because of the limited extent of the territory it will be called upon to cover, it plans to utilize the services of local agents in various parts of the state rather than to establish branch societies after the Massachusetts model.

The California S. P. C. C. is another society the type of whose work has changed. It is one of the oldest child-protective societies, having been formed in 1876. Up to the present, it has confined its work to the city of San Francisco. In the matter of child protection, the state of California is very poorly served. It is dotted with humane societies, but these confine themselves with one exception to animal protection. In a survey of child welfare work made in 1915, only three child-protective organizations were found to exist, the California S. P. C. C., the Fresno County Humane Society, and the Pacific Humane Society. Since then, the latter two societies have ceased to exist. One new society to help children has been formed, the Los Angeles Humane Society for Children.

The California S. P. C. C. asserts its purpose to be “educational in all matters involving the welfare of children”. It prefers to settle the cases that come before it out of court and to break up families as rarely as possible. In 1916, against 135 prosecutions of adults, 742 cases were

---

settled out of court, and 919 warnings were given, and of the 130 parents convicted of cruelty, 103 were released from custody on probation. Of the 3,373 children that came to the Society's attention during the same year, only 95 were not permitted to stay with their families.

Some few child-protective societies have for one reason or another neglected to a greater or lesser extent the actual protection of children from cruelty and have devoted their resources to some allied field of child welfare. The Humane Society of Kansas City (Missouri) presents such a case. Within the city there is another society, the Missouri Anti-Cruelty Society, whose agents are active in prosecuting cases of cruelty to either children or animals. The Humane Society of Kansas City has made no attempt to compete with its sister organization. Some time ago it received an endowment for educational propaganda among children and to provide a recreational camp for them; since then practically its entire attention has been turned to this field. It justifies itself by pointing to the educational value of its work:

While the Society's agents have police power, its exercise is neither a primary nor a perpetual function of the Society, since it is and probably ever will be the duty of the police, the public prosecutor, and all authorities and courts having jurisdiction in criminal cases, to apprehend, arrest and prosecute offenders in cruelty cases: and one of the chief reasons for the formation of the Humane Society was to secure the enactment of humanitarian laws, and to educate the people and public officials as to their justice and proper enforcement. When this education is fully accomplished, there will be no more need of a society to prevent cruelty than for a society to prevent murder or arson.¹

The Youngstown (Ohio) Humane Society has devoted itself to the establishment of a detention home for the Juvenile Court and to the establishment of boarding homes for children and the obtaining of hospital attention where needed. The Mansfield (Ohio) Humane Society makes charitable relief an important part of its activities. In the first six months of 1921 it assisted 145 families, representing 798 persons.

In cities and towns where S. P. C. C.s have never been formed, the protection of children has been taken over by other organizations not recognized by the American Humane Association and not to be found in its record. The number and kind of such organizations can in no way be determined. The following may serve as examples.

Louisville, Kentucky, has never had an S. P. C. C. This work has been done by the Child Protective Association of that city, organized in 1914 as a "big sister" movement to assist the Juvenile Court in probation work. In 1917 it separated from the Court and a board of managers was elected. It became a member of the Welfare League. Its procedure has been to receive all reports of cases of mistreatment, neglect and other sins against childhood. It investigates these cases and then reports those requiring action to the appropriate agency.

In Chicago a Juvenile Court Committee was organized in 1899 to pay the salaries of the probation officers of the Chicago Juvenile Court as the original act has made no provision for this. The defect was remedied in 1905. From then until 1909 the Committee cooperated in general

1 National Humane Review, vol. x, p. 86.
2 Mansfield Humane Society, 1921 Booklet.
with the Court without taking to itself any particular sphere of work. In 1909 it was reorganized as a juvenile protective association and turned its attention to community conditions affecting child life. It continued to maintain close relations with the Juvenile Court and whenever cases of cruelty to children serious enough to warrant court action came to its attention, it turned them over to the Court. Where the offense was less serious, it took the settlement into its own hands. Of recent years, however, it has turned its attention from individual case work to the promotion of "the study of child problems and by systematic agitation, through the press and otherwise, to create a permanent public sentiment for the establishment of wholesome social agencies." Nevertheless, during the year ending November 1923, it dealt with 62 cases of offenses against children.

The Social Service Bureau of Houston, Texas, was formed in 1916 by the combination of five independent organizations occupied with various forms of social work in the city. In their combined form they deal with (1) charitable relief; (2) public health nursing; (3) child welfare (including the supervision of neglected children, and the prevention of cruelty to children); (4) protection of women and girls; and (5) settlement work.

The Bureau as it exists at present is a private organization supported in part by public funds (in 1921 it received $25,500.00 out of a total income of $58,422.06 from the city of Houston). It is governed by a private board of directors, and each department has its departmental committee. The child welfare department of the Bureau de-

votes more attention at present to homeless and neglected children than to the prosecution of cruelists, but it is, nevertheless, the only child-protective organization of the city.¹

Several cities have established forces of policewomen, the larger part of whose duties involves child protection. In New York City, the force of policewomen was provided for in 1920 by legislative statute.² It is today the largest and most highly developed body of its kind and its composition and activities are described as follows by Police Commissioner Enright of that city:

There are sixteen policewomen and twenty patrolwomen attached to the police force of this department, who are principally engaged in activities for the promotion of the welfare of women and children. Their particular duties and functions in this respect are the investigation of crimes and offenses in which women and children are concerned, in cooperation with other divisions and bureaus of the police department in procuring information and evidence in all cases affecting the welfare, safety and protection of women and children. . . . In all welfare work of this character, women officers cooperate with recognized civic organizations devoted to welfare work and court officers having jurisdiction in cases affecting women and children.³

Cincinnati, on the other hand, has detailed a group of regular police officers for child protection, to cooperate with the Ohio Humane Society. The uniformed officers are trained and are capable of executing the same processes as an experienced social worker. They are acquainted with the technique of writing correct case histories, and are

¹The Social Service Bureau of Houston, Texas, Report for 1921.
³Manuscript letter of May 14, 1923.
active in problems of social psychiatry and intensive health programs for the child. They are particularly helpful in acquainting the courts and public departments of the plans and aims of the Humane Society, and they have a contact with public departments which is sometimes denied the regular social workers.\(^1\)

In general, the larger cities of the United States are served more or less thoroughly in child-protective work by S. P. C. C.\(\text{s}\) or humane societies engaging in child work. It is the rural territory in all states that suffers in this respect. As was pointed out in Chapter II on animal protection,\(^2\) in the West there are entire states without any agency whatsoever to protect either animals or children. Moreover, as has been pointed out, most humane societies confine themselves to animal protection. It is thus evident that the regions void of child protective agencies are far more extensive than those unserved by animal societies. Speaking of this lack, the secretary of the child department of the New York State Charitise Aid Association said: "the most flagrant neglect of children that has ever come to my attention has been among the children of American stock in rural communities."\(^3\)

A few societies have made definite attempts to meet this condition. The Massachusetts S. P. C. C. and its branches have agents located in all the centers of population of the state unserved by the branch societies, who are responsible for the condition of the region. Each branch society likewise is expected to serve the rural district surrounding its

---

\(^1\)Manuscript letter of May 11, 1923 from the secretary of the Ohio Humane Society.


city. In this way the state is thoroughly covered—or will be, when the Society has completed its projects—by a network of active societies and agents. So far, Massachusetts is the only state in which such organization has been effected.

In New York, the State Humane Association employed a special field agent during 1916 and a part of 1917 to visit the different local child-saving societies and help them with advice and suggestions. He also went into the counties where there were dead societies or no societies for the prevention of cruelty to children, and endeavored to start active and efficient organizations. Poverty of resources forced the Association to drop this plan in 1917.1

Interorganization among child protective societies has not been as complete as among animal societies. The New York societies are members of equal standing with the animal societies in the State Humane Association; so also in Pennsylvania. On the other hand, when the California State Humane Association was formed in 1908, the San Francisco S. P. C. C. was excluded.2

All the child protective societies except the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. belong to the American Humane Association. The Massachusetts S. P. C. C. allowed its membership to lapse because it felt that the Association's activities were so largely concerned with animal protection, that child protection was slighted.3 There has been a tendency during the last few years for some child protective societies to ally themselves with the Children's Division of the National

2Hubbard, Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in the States of Ill., Colo. and Cal., p. 104.
Conference of Social Work. The Massachusetts S. P. C. C. is a member, and representatives of the Brooklyn, the Pennsylvania, the Delaware and the Essex County (N. J.) S. P. C. C.'s have participated at recent conferences. This must not be taken to mean a defection from the American Humane Association. All but the Massachusetts S. P. C. C. continue members of the Association and the secretary of that society believes that it will soon resume its membership.

The Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor has been of much assistance to the movement for child protection during the past ten years. A bill for the establishment of the Bureau was first introduced into Congress in the winter of 1905-6 through the efforts of the National Child Labor Committee and many cooperating agencies. Although endorsed by the President and by members of the Cabinet and warmly advocated by members of both House and Senate, the bill failed to reach a vote. Re-introduced into the Sixtieth (1908-9) and Sixty-First (1909-10) Congresses, it suffered the same fate. The White House Child Welfare Conference called by President Roosevelt in 1909 warmly advocated the establishment of the Bureau.

The bill was again introduced into the Sixty-Second Congress, was passed by both houses, and approved April 9, 1911. The Children's Bureau began active operations upon the passage of the legislative, executive and judicial appropriation bill of August 23, 1912, with Miss Julia C. Lathrop as its first Chief.

The Bureau was intended to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of the people, and to investigate especially the questions of infant mortality, birth rate, orphanage, juvenile courts, desertion, dangerous occupations, accidents, diseases of children, employment and legislation
affecting children in the several states and territories. ¹

This broad program has been followed, and the Bureau has become a clearing house for information regarding child welfare in the United States and relating to actual or pending legislation in the several states affecting children. Up to 1923 it had issued a valuable series of over 100 pamphlets covering the major phases of child welfare.

Finally it should be noted that at the 1910 International Conference of the American Humane Association, the suggestion was made by the director of the National S. P. C. C. of London that an international federation of children’s protective societies be formed. His plan included: (1) a central bureau, the headquarters of the federation, located in London or New York; (2) a permanent secretary; (3) a library to contain reports, copies of the laws of different countries on all subjects relating to child welfare; (4) interchange of ideas; (5) active propaganda; (6) the arranging of visits between members of the federated societies; and (7) international congresses.² The convention took no action.

The second international humane conference, held in New York City in October 1923, was attended by representatives of the leading child-protective organizations in foreign countries, and it adopted resolutions making renewed efforts to bring about more definitely organized international cooperation.

The expansion of child protective activities in the period since 1910 is very noticeable. The growth of the Massachusetts S. P. C. C during these years is quite unparalleled in the history of child protection; and except in the cases of

a few small societies in the central part of the United States, there has been general progress throughout the whole movement. The Delaware and the Pennsylvania S. P. C. C.s, electrified into action by the example of the Massachusetts organization, have entered upon ambitious programs of expansion and development.

Finally, too much emphasis cannot be given to the great assistance afforded to all types of child work through the Children's Bureau. The years covered by this study cover also the period of its earliest beginnings and its full, rich development. It now has reached the period of its maturity and is accomplishing all that was hoped for it.

We shall study in the next chapter the significance of the widening scope of "protection" as that term has come to be interpreted by certain societies. In effect, many child protective organizations are doing vanguard service for child welfare; they are more flexible than other types of child help organizations, and it is possible for them to take the first steps in opening up new fields of assistance to child life.