

Family Court
of
Lucas County

Toledo, Ohio

1961





Paul W. Alexander, Judge
Court of Common Pleas
Division of
Domestic Relations

To the Honorable Ned Skeldon
Andy Devine
William Gernhauser
Commissioners of Lucas County

And to the Honorable Robert A. Haines, M.D.
Director of Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction

Dear Sirs:

In compliance with Section 2151.18 General Code, I submit herewith the Annual Report of the Court of Common Pleas of Lucas County, Ohio, Division of Domestic Relations, which includes the Juvenile Court, covering the calendar year 1960 showing the number and kinds of cases that have come before it, and other data pertaining to the work of the Court of interest to you and the general public.

Respectfully submitted,
PAUL W. ALEXANDER
Judge

June 1, 1962

THE FAMILY COURT CENTER

In a year of confusion marked by major construction and addition to the Family Court Center, noteworthy progress was made.

While reports of the increase in delinquency filtered through from all parts of the country, Lucas County showed a decrease. Although the decrease was small, in terms of total number of cases, it was impressive in terms of the type of offenses involved.

There was an increase in the number of minor complaints but a substantial decrease in the number of complaints of a serious nature. Especially in relation to children on probation and under the supervision of court counselors is this trend noteworthy. Violation of probation remained about the same as in former years but, in contrast to former years there were relatively few of these violation complaints for major offenses. This is significant

indication of the value of counseling with the more disturbed children.

The total number of children handled on probation was somewhat lower than in former years. This is the result of a planned program of reducing case loads of counselors so that they may do more effective work with those children who are placed on probation. It is pointed out again this year as we have in each report of recent years that effective probation can be carried on only when the case load of the individual counselors is held down to a workable level. That the effects of counseling in the court justifies the effort is indicated by the results reported in the following tables. It is hoped that the same service may be extended to a larger number of children in the coming year. This can be accomplished however only by increasing the number of supervising counselors.

THE FAMILY COURT CENTER

In relation to the noted increase in minor offenses, this is a danger signal not to be disregarded. Our past history has showed that the more serious offenders of today started out as minor offenders in earlier years. The substantial increase in the number of new and first offenders could mean that an increase in more serious offenders could be expected within a few years. This need not be the case if parents and character building organizations of the community are alerted by the symptoms and take proper steps. It is never safe to pass up a child's misdeeds with a comment that "he is young and will grow out of it." Any conduct resulting in damage to property, endangering the safety of others or disregarding the rights of others, has dangerous implications. Unless parents in particular recognize these dangers and take proper steps to control and retrain the child in question it can

be anticipated that future behavior will follow similar patterns. Referees have been particularly alert to this possibility and have urged parents of first offenders to face the facts and take steps to modify their supervision and training of younger children to bring their behavior within accepted limits.

In an effort to evaluate the real meaning of the decrease in the problem as reflected by the official figures for 1961 one must give full credit to the high calibre of police work done in this area and the cooperation between the court and such law enforcement agencies. It is only with understanding and efficient work on the part of police and court alike that the community has remained relatively free of the more aggressive and damaging manifestations of delinquent behavior.

Reporting delinquency statistics can be very confusing and misleading. Different courts have different methods of recording and reporting cases and unless an explanation of the method accompanies the report it is difficult to evaluate the meaning of various classifications and impossible to compare the extent of delinquency in different cities.

The use of Type I and Type II classifications is employed this year for the first time and was adopted with the thought that it would more accurately describe the seriousness of the problem of delinquency by separating the minor matters from the more serious situations.

In an effort to place our statistics in proper perspective cases are divided into two groups as follows:

Type I — minor cases which are settled at the time of the first hearing. Although these offenses represent technical violations they are of such minor nature that extended court action is not called for and the referee and parents can agree on a disposition and treatment that gives reasonable assurance of controlling the future conduct of the child.

Type II — more serious cases that call for extended

investigations into the basic reasons for the delinquency and for treatment by the court either on probation or in an institution. Type II cases are divided into major and minor cases. All are serious behavior problems which need correction. The term major and minor is used however to describe the offense committed.

First Offenders — this term applies to children who are before the court for the first time. It has no relationship to whether the case is major or minor. Many children who came into court as first offenders have been known violators over a period of several months and occasionally for several years, but for one reason or another were not referred to court.

Repeaters — this term applies only to children who are in court for the second (or more) time. A child is classed as a repeater even when his/her former court referral was more than a year ago.

Probation Violator — a probation violator is any child who is still on probation at the time of committing a new offense. Also a child may be found to be a probation violator if he/she violates one of the conditions under which probation was granted even though his condition of probation is not statutory law.

Total juvenile cases registered in 1961 were 2750. Of these 2207 were boys and 543 were girls. 1776 cases were Type II and 974 were Type I.

1080 individual boys and 345 individual girls made their first court appearance in 1961. This was 30 less individual First Offenders than in 1960.

60.3% of the individual children were First Offenders. 39.7% of the individual children were Repeaters.

There were 1144 individual boys and 276 girls in Court on Type II cases.

Median age for Type II First Offenders

Boys 14.10 Girls 15.4

Median age for Type II Repeaters

Boys 16.1 Girls 16

53.4% of the First Offender boys and 41.5% of the girls in Type II cases were between the ages of

7 and 14. Only 33% of the Repeater boys and 25.4% of the girls were in this same age group.

There were 135 more individual boys ages 7 through 14 years in court in 1961 than in 1960.

59.7% of the individual boys and 52.1% of the girls in Type II cases were attending grades 1 through 9 at their first court appearance in 1961.

Major cases have steadily decreased since 1958. 52.6% of all offenses were major in 1958 as compared to 44% in 1961. Auto thefts decreased from 201 in 1958 to 108 in 1961. Burglary decreased from 198 in 1958 to 149 in 1961.

Major cases of carelessness or mischief rose from 94 in 1960 to 138 in 1961; sex offenses from 28 in 1960 to 58 in 1961; ungovernability from 145 in 1960 to 239 in 1961.

Rate of Juvenile Delinquency decreased from 22.7 children per 1000 in 1960 to 21.6 children per 1000 in 1961.

PROBATION 1961

In court and on probation in 1961 were 278 children between the ages of 7-14 years and 444 ages 15-17.

In Lucas County 3.7 children per 1000, ages 7-14, were on probation.

50.8% of the individual children in Type II cases were on probation at some time during the year.

Actually it is desirable that all children in Type II classification be placed on probation. We were not able to do so in 1961 because of staff limitations. It is hoped that increases in the size of the counseling staff in the near future will enable us to give counseling services to all children who are in need of it.

11% of the boys and 13.7% of the girls on probation were not attending school. This shows the need of more intensive study of school "drop-outs."

674 children on probation were carried over from 1960 and 558 were received on probation during 1961. 623 cases were closed in 1961. There were 609 children on probation December 31, 1961.

Referrals to Common Pleas Court of boys involved in serious offenses increased to 15 in 1961.

This reflected to some extent the greater criminal sophistication of older juvenile offenders, but there was also a decision of the First District Court of Appeals affecting authority of Juvenile Courts to commit boys over 16 years of age to the Ohio State Reformatory. Thus, there was a decrease in Reformatory commitments from 7 in 1960 to 3 in 1961.

The suspension of new admissions to the Industrial Schools from July to December 1961 and the increasing costs charged by private correctional schools necessitated further use of probation in this county for some of our most disturbed children. They were poor probation risks, and the increased rate of probation violation is due in part to this continued use of probation when removal from the community was needed.

79 children were referred back to the Court by their counselors for failure to abide by conditions of probation, or for involvement in a new offense. This is an increase of 19 from 1960 and represents more intensive supervision by counselors.

The Boys Probation Department provided supervised field work experience for 3 graduate stu-

PROBATION 1961

dents from the University of Michigan School of Social Work, 1 from Ohio State University, and 1 part-time student from Bowling Green State University. The Girls Probation Department provided the same training to 1 part-time student from Bowling Green State University.

Probation Violators—

24.4% of the offenses for Type II boys and

25.7% of the offenses for Type II girls were violations of probation.

58% of the boys committed to the Industrial School and 61.9% of the girls committed were violations of probation.

Individual violations of probation —

Boys 27.8%, Girls 28%.

TRAFFIC COMPLAINTS

There were 1517 traffic complaints in 1961 as contrasted to 1802 in 1960 — a decrease of 15.8%.

Speeding complaints decreased from 1960 by 13.6%. without due regard by 30%; running red light by 11.3%.

Although there were 285 fewer traffic complaints this year than in 1960, 19 more individual children were requested to attend Traffic School. 45 more had their licenses restricted.

1146 individual boys and 193 girls were in Court on traffic complaints in 1961 as compared to 1342 boys and 214 girls in 1960—13.9% decrease.

153 individual boys and 4 girls, or 11.7% were traffic Repeaters in 1961 as compared to 203 boys and 6 girls in 1960, or 13.4%.

359 traffic complaints were for boys who were presently or previously delinquent — an increase of 33 complaints over 1960.

13 traffic complaints were for girls who were presently or previously delinquent — an increase of 1 over 1960.

There were 67 traffic deaths in Lucas County in 1961 and juvenile drivers were responsible for 1 of these deaths.

CHILD STUDY INSTITUTE

The operation of the Child Study Institute during 1961 was one of the most unusual in the history of the institution. Groups of children and members of the staff went about their daily routines despite swarms of workmen, the pounding of pneumatic hammers, electric saws and drills and the jangle of steel beams being set into place. The year was one of building and adding vitally needed new space to the present physical plant. Construction went on daily despite subzero weather, freezing spring rains and the heat of midsummer.

The transformation when wrought by year's end will provide the Child Study Institute with one of the finest and most modern physical plants of its kind in the nation. Two new boys' living units and two small segregated bedroom units for children with severe emotional disturbances will make pro-

visions for accommodating the increasing child population of future years. A new gymnasium and playground will assure better facilities for wholesome and therapeutic recreational programs. Three new and completely modern classrooms are to be equipped with the most modern teaching aids which will offer elementary, junior high school and secondary educational programs for detained youngsters. A new medical clinic and psychological clinic will be established adjacent to the residential living areas for children, giving members of the professional staff easy access to children scheduled for examination and testing. Enlarged woodshop and arts and crafts facilities are being provided on the ground floor to include larger groups of children in these creative activities.

When the new additions to our residential quar-

ters are completed, there will no longer be any need to transfer any children from the Child Study Institute to the Lucas County Jail because of overpopulation. The Child Study Institute and the Juvenile Court will then be able to meet their responsibilities toward delinquent children for some time to come.

Once again in 1961, through the continued use of skilled casework screening, especially during evening hours and on weekends, it was possible to make temporary conditional releases of 1,010 children, thus reducing the number actually detained pending a hearing to 1,295 children. This careful

intake screening policy resulted in the saving to the taxpayers of thousands of dollars in unnecessary institutional care.

The first responsibility of every member of the Child Study Institute Staff continues to be directed toward providing services to children who require detention. These services include study, observation, and a planned, constructive program of daily living in detention. As a result of these services a great deal is learned about each youngster's strengths, weaknesses, and potentialities, and with this information the court is better able to work out a suitable treatment plan designed to correct each youngster's difficulty.

This might be called a year of mobility for the clinic staff members who were moved out of their offices on August 9, so that walls could be torn down and the way cleared for the contractor to proceed with the construction of the addition to the building. One move after another, as the workmen caught up with us, through that year and into the next, often tried our patience but the vision of the new clinic facilities, taking form in reality on the third floor, helped us to surmount our frustrations.

While the change in working locations might be considered a sort of homeostatic mobility, the expansion of clinical services, through the initiation of the group counseling program for probationers, must be acknowledged to be a move forward. Preparations for the latter had been going on for more than a year as probation counselors participated in group therapy with our consulting psychiatrist, one hour a week. Beginning early in May, didactic sessions, under the leadership of the chief psychol-

ogist and dealing with the principles and problems of group counseling, helped these counselors to prepare further for counseling with their own group of probationers.

Before the end of the year, four groups were started. Each of the three psychologists, who had had previous experience in groups, assisted as a co-therapist with a counselor. A third counselor, when available, acted as Observer-Recorder for the group.

Problems were encountered and progress was seen but a more thorough evaluation will have to be left for a later date. Eventually, as counselors gain more experience in group counseling, the psychologist will withdraw from the group and attempt to organize groups of parents who have had children in the Court. Undoubtedly, there will be barriers to this plan but it is hoped that they will not be insurmountable.

By working with delinquents who have not yet

developed to the point of needing institutional placement, we hope to keep, at a minimum, the necessity for such placements which are extremely difficult to make, due to the great demand for them as the number of juvenile delinquents increases.

A knowledge of which children are likely to be rehabilitated by one method of treatment rather than another can be arrived at only through intensive study of the child and his environment. The more children to be studied in this manner, the greater are the chances of success in prescribing the most effective treatment.

More psychologists, as well as more counselors, are needed for early diagnoses and treatment of children in trouble before they become confirmed delinquents.

Lack of office space, long an obstacle, will vanish with the completion of the new building.

The treatment and correction of the delinquent child is a slow and expensive process. It is how-

ever, a service which, when well done, results in substantial savings to the community. To match our improved and expanded physical quarters a corresponding increase in the size of the clinical staff is indicated if we are to make the most effective use of our new quarters.

Reference to the statistical tables will show only a slight increase in the number of psychological studies completed because the number on the staff remained the same. Out-patient studies have fallen farther behind because of the priority which must be given boys and girls in CSI. This means that the present staff is insufficient to meet the need for early diagnosis. Reference to these tables also will show that we are dealing with youths with good potentials. Over one-half of those tested have average intelligence and should be capable of graduating from high school. Over one-eighth have above average intelligence and would be capable of succeeding in college if effectively guided. Will these boys and girls use their intelligence to contribute to society or against it?

Domestic Relations and Marriage Counseling

“of the people • by the people • for the people”

The use of the social and behavioural sciences collaterally by courts charged with adjudicating juvenile and family problems has had a significant history.

It was a legal scholar, Rudolph von Jhering (1818-1892) who was among the first in modern times to raise questions of the purposes law should serve, and the goals in individual and social living law should support. These questions set in motion a trend that has among its results the Family Court movement.

It was a committee of the Chicago Bar Association that, in 1899, conceived the statute that gave birth to the Juvenile Court Movement - - - “out of the pressing needs of the times the lawyers - - - made a court.”

It was a distinguished American legal scholar,

Roscoe Pound who suggested and encouraged the use of the skills of social, psychological and medical scientists in the attempts to “do justice” in juvenile and domestic relations matters.

The offspring of these ideas give evidence of their vitality. A list of our own states that, by statute, provide for professional counseling efforts in these areas include Colorado, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wisconsin. Hawaii has a Family Counseling Service in the District Court of Honolulu.

Ohio began its counseling services in Domestic Relations Courts in 1914 at Cincinnati.

In other countries the Family Court of Japan was established in 1947 “patterned on western models” according to the brochure released by the Supreme Court of Japan; Australia passed its Matrimonial Causes Act in 1960.

Thus, attempts are being made within the law to meet needs—*of the people*.

Historically, statutes written into our law crystallize opinions and solutions to problems expressed—by the people—, and supported by them.

Ideally, the benefits and protections of law are *for the people*:—it protects the social interest in the individual life; it furthers the dignity of the human person.

The counseling staff of the Domestic Relations Marriage and Counseling Department supplements these goals of the law by:

—*considering* with divorcing parents the possi-

bility of reconciliation. In 1961 in Lucas County 889 divorce petitions were dismissed.

—*providing* the court with social and psychological data to facilitate the making of decisions on matters of custody of children so that their best interests will be served. In 1961 counseling was offered to 1340 families in which there were children under 14 years of age.

—developing plans for maintaining child-parent ties and responsibilities if the family ties are severed. In 1961 visitation and companionship plans for the parent not gaining custody were made in 270 cases.

—offering pre-litigation counseling in as many cases as our limited staff permits in an effort to help avoid the filing of a divorce petition in situations where the hope is to “save the marriage.” In 1961 there were 100 major pre-litigation counseling cases, and 501 minor pre-litigation counseling cases accepted by the Family Service Department.

TABLE No. 1
DOMESTIC RELATIONS
LEGAL ACTIONS

(A comparative study — 1959-1960-1961)

<i>Divorce actions before the Court</i>	<i>1959</i>	<i>1960</i>	<i>1961</i>
Divorce actions pending Jan. 1 of each year.....	2482	2505	2505
Total actions filed.....	2134	2139	2149
Total actions before the Court.....	4616	4644	4654
Petitions heard	1415	1305	1251
Total actions disposed of.....	2112	2139	2166

TABLE No. 2
FAMILY SERVICE

Cases active in counseling as of 1-1-61.....	1186
Total new major cases assigned for counseling and/or investigation—1961	1596
Total minor cases which received one counseling interview in 1961.....	501
Total active cases for counseling or investigation.....	3283
Total counseling cases closed during 1961.....	1548
Total cases pending as of 1-1-62.....	1735

TABLE No. 3

**Total cases in Litigation Assigned for
Investigation and Counseling to the
Family Service Division . . . 1960 1961**

Mandatory Divorce Investigation (Where there are children of the marriage under 14 years).....	1250	1340
Step-Children Divorce Investigation (Where there were children under 14 years by previous marriages of spouses)....	86	106
Special Divorce Investigations (Where there were no children under 14 years but where counseling and possible reconciliation was indicated).....	50	38
Custody Investigations (Children over 14 years of age).....	5	1
Total litigated cases assigned to Family Service	1391	1485
Total pre-litigation marriage counseling cases	90	100
Total investigations for other courts.....	18	6
Post-divorce marriage counseling cases.....	0	5
TOTAL CASES ASSIGNED.....	1499	1596

TABLE No. 4

**WORK OF THE COUNSELING STAFF
IN 1961**

Office Counseling interviews with clients.....	5,314
Home visits to clients, collateral conferences with attorney, other professional persons, and telephone conferences with attorneys, school personnel, and clients	8,003
Total counseling contacts.....	13,317

TABLE No. 5

**TOTAL ACTIONS DISPOSED OF
IN 1961**

Divorces granted in 1961.....	1,265
Divorces denied in 1961.....	3
Divorces dismissed in 1961.....	889
Annulments granted in 1961.....	9
Total number of cases disposed of.....	2,166
<i>Marriage licenses granted</i> in Lucas County.....	4,518
<i>Divorces granted</i> in Lucas County 1961.....	1,265
(one divorce to every 3.57 new marriage)	

TABLE No. 6

**CLASSIFICATION OF CASES
CLOSED 1961**

Mandatory Divorce Investigations.....	1,047
Step-Children Divorce Investigations.....	77
Special Divorce Investigations	46
Post-Divorce Counseling	9
Post-Divorce Investigation	1
Incidental Service	1
Visitation and Companionship Investigation.....	1
Special Custody Investigation.....	1
Special Divorce Investigation.....	1
Out of Town Inquiries.....	7
Marriage Counseling	99
Card and Supplementary.....	102
No contacts	156
Total	1,548
Note: Total closings in 1960.....	1,522

**TABLE No. 7
MEASURABLE RESULTS OF 1961
CLOSINGS**

	<i>Husband</i>	<i>Wife</i>	<i>Total</i>	
Avoided or refused counseling.....	341	227	568	individuals
Accepted counseling	260	357	617	individuals
Lessened anxieties in emotional crisis	289	576	865	individuals
Improved attitude toward children's welfare	176	249	425	individuals
Clearer concept of marital role	131	217	348	individuals
Referred to other professional help	152	187	339	individuals
Apparent reconciliation			415	families
Contested divorce changed to uncontested case.....			49	cases
Financial plans arranged.....			242	families
Plans for visitation and companionship.....			226	families
Plans for custody arranged.....			270	families
No change noted.....			240	families

**TABLE No. 8
DURATION OF COUNSELOR'S CONTACTS
CLOSED IN 1961**

Less than 30 days.....	128
30 to 90 days.....	70
90 days to 6 months.....	249
6 months to 1 year.....	404
1 year to 2 years.....	266
Over 2 years.....	431
Total	1548

**TABLE No. 9
CHILD MARRIAGES—DIVORCE GRANTED
IN 1960-1961**

<i>Wife</i>	1960	1961
(at time of marriage)		
15 and under.....	24	19
16 - 18.....	296	229
19 - 20.....	173	171
Total	493	419
<i>Husband</i>	1960	1961
(at time of marriage)		
15 and under.....	1	0
16 - 18.....	70	50
19 - 20.....	156	150
Total	227	200

Note: Child marriages of wife accounted for 50.9% of all divorces granted in 1960 — 46.9% in 1961.

**TABLE No. 9A
SOME SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS
1960-1961**

Closed Cases where families used counseling:
1960 — 1522; 1961 — 1548

Apparent Reconciliations (dismissals)	1960	354 families
	1961	415 families
Contested changed to Uncontested.....	1960	56 cases
	1961	49 cases
Financial plans arranged.....	1960	169 families
	1961	242 families
Plans for Custody.....	1960	216 families
	1961	270 families
Plans for Vis/Comp.	1960	140 families
	1961	226 families

TABLE No. 10
DIVORCE STATISTICS — 1960-1961

(Based on 1236 actions for 1960 where divorce was granted and 1265 actions for 1961)

	1960	1961
Average duration of marriage before divorce (in years).....	9.5	9.7
Average length of separation before divorce (in years).....	2.1	2.1
Percent divorces following child marriage (girl under 21).....	50.9%	46.9%
Percent following child marriage (boy under 21).....	23.4%	21.9%
Average age of wife, 1st marriage (in years)	19.9	19.9
Average age of husband, 1st marriage (in years)	23.3	23.2
Percent of divorces following runaway marriage (1 or both under 21).....	16.6%	14.7%
Percent of divorces following runaway marriage (both 21 or over).....	13.5%	15.8%
Percent of divorces following runaway marriage (total)	30.1%	30.5%
Average duration of marriage before divorce in runaway marriages (in years)..	8.4	8.5
Average duration of marriage before divorce in runaway marriages (1 or both under 21).....	9.1	9.4
Average duration of marriage before divorce in runaway marriages (both 21 or over).....	7.7	7.5

	1960	1961
Married less than 1 year.....	3.3%	3.8%
Married less than 3 years.....	15.4%	13.8%
Husband a repeater.....	26.1%	31.8%
Wife a repeater.....	29.2%	33.7%
Total number of children in families.....	1,118	1,135
Percent of families with children.....	54.4%	52.7%
Percent of families without children.....	45.6%	47.3%
Average duration of marriage of families with children (in years).....	9.98	10.2
Average duration of marriage of families without children (in years).....	8.77	9.1
Average duration of marriage—		
a. wife only a repeater.....	9.3	9.1
b. husband only a repeater.....	9.3	12.4
c. both husband and wife were repeaters..	6.	6.1
Average duration of marriage before divorce for 1st marriage for husband and wife	10.5	10.9

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

The Fiscal Services of the Court, pertaining to accounting, collections, disbursements, payroll and budget control, as well as maintenance of its physical property, are discharged by the Finance Department.

Monies assessed by the court and collected by this department, fall in four general categories, viz: Reimbursement by parents for expenses advanced by the County for placement of children in boarding homes and private institutions; local support orders, payments made under the "Uniform Reciprocal Support Act" (where husband and wife are separated and one parent resides outside the State of Ohio), and restitution paid by children to claimants for damages. While restitution is assessed primarily as a corrective measure, the court does attempt to satisfy such damage to the fullest extent possible.

Excepting Medical and Dental treatment and certain other items over which there is little human control, the Finance Department maintains a rigid check to limit expenditures to budget appropria-

tion. Building maintenances, supply and care of existing equipment is supervised by this department and is a major expense item. However, until the new sections of the building, now under construction, are completed we will continue to have the services of skilled craftsmen from the Staff of the County Building Superintendent which will keep our maintenance expense at a minimum.

The total monies collected in court orders in 1961 follows:

Support of minor children (collected by The Toledo Humane Society)	\$2,663,067.00
Support of children, wards of the court maintained in private schools and foster homes.....	57,546.56
Restitution paid by children for damage or loss.....	11,142.01
Monies collected under the "Uniform Reciprocal Support Act"	42,443.00
Fines and costs in traffic cases (collected by clerk's office).....	10,335.00

Presented for consideration this year is a more detailed analysis of the disposition of cases and motions filed with this department. The statistics in recent years have indicated no reduction in the number of cases filed, fewer actual hearings required, and more being disposed of without hearing. In order to discover how this is being accomplished, and in what types of cases, a more complete analysis was necessary.

In comparison with annual reports of recent years, it is evident that the number of motions scheduled increased, especially in the support enforcement categories, i.e. motions to show cause, motions to impose sentence, non-support actions. The total hearings scheduled, exclusive of motions on pending divorces, increased to 2144 from the 1875 scheduled in 1960, while the actual hearings found necessary dropped to 971 from 1079. Responsible for this drop are the 258 cases which are known to have been settled, and the 869 continuances granted, many of which were quite apparently for the purpose of settling the problems at issue.

Gratifying is the continued increase in the

amounts of money collected for the support of children, both through the Toledo Humane Society and through the Cashier of Court. The Toledo Humane Society's collection of support payments increased 3.7% or \$92,757.00 over 1960, totalling \$2,663,067.00. The Cashier of Court's collection of support payments ordered under the Uniform Support of Dependent's Act or "Reciprocal Support Law" increased by \$6,082 to \$42,443 or by 6%. Equally disappointing however, is the inability to obtain service of summons in reciprocal support cases in no more than 52 of the 140 referred to this jurisdiction—37.14%. Previous experience, when service was being made by one probation officer assigned to make personal service (through repeated attempts if necessary) resulted in service being obtained in as many as 65% of the cases filed. A return to this system is strongly recommended.

Not truly reflective of the actual situation is the category of "Release". There were many releases from the County Jail after serving a small portion of the prescribed sentence, which were not recorded as "Motions for Release." This deficiency is being corrected.

As indicated in previous reports, there is still a need for "supervision" or "probation" by a competent officer assigned, at least part-time, to this department. A good percentage of those hearings conducted on motions of the enforcement nature emphasized the inadequacy of the two existing alternatives—a sentence to jail or a suspended sentence. Supervision, financial advice, and/or probation would be much more productive of regular support of children. Because of the case load already carried by the Lucas County Adult Probation Department, that agency's facilities can only be used by this department in the criminal charges of Non-Support. Many fathers who are failing to support need the assistance, conscious or not, of advice and supervision. It is strongly recommended that serious consideration be given to the assignment of a probation officer to this department to handle such cases. Until such time as the work load prohibits it, it is possible that this officer could also be assigned the duty of service of summons in the Reciprocal Support Actions. Probation and supervision has proved to be an effective type of treatment with juvenile delinquents. It is believed that it can be equally effective with "adult support delinquents."

CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT

1961

UNIFORM SUPPORT OF DEPENDENT'S CASES

Cases filed, referred to 36 other states..... 182

Cases received from 21 other states and Puerto Rico.... 140

 Service obtained and hearings had..... 52

 Continuances granted 80

 Motion to Show Cause..... 156

Payments received, Cashier of Court, on cases referred to this Court.

<i>1958</i>	<i>1959</i>	<i>1960</i>	<i>1961</i>
\$14,644.00	\$26,285.00	\$36,361.00	\$42,443.00

CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT
1961

	<i>Scheduled</i>	<i>Heard</i>	<i>Con- tinued</i>	<i>Settled Dismissed</i>	<i>Sentence Imposed</i>	<i>Sentence Suspended</i>	<i>Stay of Execution</i>	<i>Release</i>	<i>Body Attach.</i>	<i>Referred to Pro- bation Dept.</i>
Motion Show Cause	932	343	425	109	118	122	28		55	
Lump Sum Judgment	206	82	97	89						
Non-Support (Arraign.....	53	38	13	2	6	4			2	7
(Trial	25	12	8	3	5	3				4
(Pre-Sentence.....	11	10	1		5	5				
Motion—Increase	69	32	27	9					1	
Motion—Decrease	79	38	30	11						
Motion—Suspend/Term.	27	14	7	6						
Motion—Set Support	15	10	3	2						
Motion—Extra Medical	12	6	3	3						
Motion—Visit & Compan.....	12	7	5							
MSC — Review	17	10	6	1						
Motion—Impose Sent.....	40	11	20	6	7	2			2	
Motion—Release	10	10						10		
Stay of Execution	17	8	5	2					4	
Failure to Appear.....	37	31	4	1	23	3	3		1	
Bastardy Filed (198)										
Under 21 (51)										
Adult (147)										
Bastardy Preliminary	238	162	59	11	7				7	
Pled Guilty (60)										
Not Guilty (96)										
Bastardy—Set Support.....	25	22	2		6		1		2	
Cashier	23	13	7		7	2	1		4	
SUB TOTAL	1848	859	722	255	184	141	33		78	
Reciprocal—Petition	140	52	80	1					7	
MSC	156	60	67	2	16	25	4		25	
SUB TOTAL	2144	971	869	258	200	166	37	10	110	11
Domestic Relations	1764	472								
TOTAL	3908	1443								

JUVENILES COMMITTED TO INSTITUTIONS

BOYS	GIRLS
Lincoln Institute	Marybrook Academy
St. Michael School for Boys.....	Luella Cummings School.....
Starr Commonwealth	Gilmary School
Boys Republic of California.....	Our Lady of Charity Refuge.....
Adriel School	Sisters of Our Lady of Charity.....
Father Gibault School for Boys.....	St. John's Home for Girls.....
Harbor Creek School for Boys.....	Oesterlen Home for Children.....
Boys Town of Missouri.....	Guardian Angel School.....
St. Francis Boys Home.....	Lourdesmount School
Soldiers and Sailors Orphan Home.....	Holy Angels Home.....
George Jr. Republic.....	White's Institute
Boys Village of Ohio.....	Friends Rescue Home.....
Devereau School	St. Mary's-in-the-Field
Smith School	Peter Claver School.....
Oesterlen Home for Children.....	Dayton Children's Psychiatric Hospital.....
Nazareth Hall	Columbus State School.....
Lucas County Children's Home.....	Juvenile Diagnostic Center.....
Toledo State Hospital.....	Lucas County Children's Home.....
Columbus State School.....	Florence Crittenton Home.....
Dayton Children's Psychiatric Hospital.....	Girls Industrial School.....
Juvenile Diagnostic Center.....	
Ohio State Reformatory.....	
Boys Industrial School.....	
Total.....	Total.....

Table No. 1
TRENDS FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Commitments to Industrial Schools	96	125	140	129	127
Commitments to Private Correctional Schools	52	80	70	87	70
Commitments to other Institutions	20	9	18	29	26
Delinquents placed in Foster Homes	43	37	51	57	57
Total children removed from Community	211	251	279	302	280
Number carried on probation.....	1396	1373	1174	1221	1232

Table No. 2
DELINQUENCIES BY THE MONTH
(Except traffic)

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	157	47	204
February	142	39	181
March	180	55	235
April	157	49	206
May	159	41	200
June	198	35	233
July	232	47	279
August	232	37	269
September	222	45	267
October	197	60	257
November	192	55	247
December	139	33	172
	2207	543	2750

Table No. 3
TYPE II OFFENSES FOR WHICH
BROUGHT INTO COURT

	Boys	Girls	Total
Robbery — hold-up	28	0	28
Burglary	187	7	194
Auto theft	110	2	119
Larceny from store.....	71	20	91
Other stealing	247	17	264
Carelessness or mischief.....	322	11	333
Truancy	60	17	77
Runaway	56	72	128
Sex offense	45	28	73
Ungovernable	139	130	269
Injury to person.....	66	8	74
All other	122	11	133
	1453	323	1776

In addition to the above offenses there were 754 Type I minor offenses for boys and 220 Type I minor offenses for girls which were disposed of at the preliminary hearing. Total of 2207 boys and 543 girls brought into Court.

MAJOR CASES ONLY

	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961
Robbery	18	21	38	33	26
Burglary	137	198	197	172	149
Auto theft	179	201	125	145	108
Shoplifting	60
Other larceny	180	211	224	213	159
Carelessness or mischief.....	126	105	83	94	138
Truancy	73	55	51	51	64
Runaway	137	129	115	97	103
Sex offense	22	33	22	28	58
Ungovernable	105	145	239
Injury to person	58
CIHM	208	225
All other offenses.....	520	403	67	66	49
	1392	1356	1235	1269	1211

Table No. 4
DISPOSITION OF TYPE II CASES

	Boys	Girls	Total
Probation to:			
Court Counselor	319	49	368
Agency Worker	23	15	38
Individuals	7	0	7
Parents	61	15	76
Referred to Agency.....	50	35	85
Committed to Industrial School.....	68	21	89
Committed to other Correctional School....	30	30	60
Committed to Ohio State Reformatory.....	2	0	2
To other Institutions, non-correctional.....	14	9	23
Placed in Foster Homes.....	24	19	43
Fined	138	1	139
Restitution	187	9	196
Adjusted	63	36	99
Referred to other court.....	9	5	14
Waived to adult court.....	15	0	15
Case held open.....	60	12	72
Referred to Parole Officer.....	47	4	51
Continued on Probation.....	223	34	257
Returned to Industrial School.....	35	0	35
Other disposition	27	10	37
Pending disposition	51	19	70
Total.....	1453	323	1776
Type I cases—adjusted or dismissed.....	754	220	974

Table No. 4A
MODIFICATIONS OF PROBATION

	Boys	Girls	Total
Committed to Industrial School.....	2	0	2
Returned to Industrial School.....	1	0	1
Committed to Ohio State Reformatory.....	1	0	1
Committed to other Correctional School....	1	9	10
Placed in Foster Homes.....	10	4	14
Placed on Probation to Court Counselor....	4	0	4
Total.....	19	13	32

Table No. 5
AGE RANGE OF TYPE II DELINQUENTS

	Boys	Girls	Total
7 years	3	2	5
8	9	0	9
9	17	3	20
10	38	0	38
11	42	5	47
12	64	9	73
13	95	25	120
14	216	49	265
15	189	70	259
16	245	56	301
17	219	55	274
18	7	2	9
Total.....	1144	276	1420
Median age—Boys 15 yr. 6 mo.			
Girls 15 yr. 8 mo.			

Table No. 6

SCHOOLS ATTENDING 1961 TYPE II

Scott HS	116
Libbey HS	79
Woodward HS	77
Waite HS	64
DeVilbiss HS	51
Macomber Voc. HS	47
Rogers HS	28
Maumee HS	26
Whitmer HS	20
Sylvania HS	18
Holland HS	10
Swanton HS	9
Whitney Voc. HS	9
Clay HS	5
Anthony Wayne HS	5
Irwin HS	3
Ottawa Hills HS	3
Robinson Jr. HS	66
Jones Jr. HS	37
Jefferson Jr. HS	13
Washington Jr. HS	10
McTigue Jr. HS	9
Burnham Jr. HS	6
Eisenhower Jr. HS	4
Fallen Timbers Jr. HS	4
Fassett Jr. HS	4
Maumee Jr. HS	1
Swanton Jr. HS	1
Parkland	33
Gunckel	28
Sherman	24
Pickett	22
Lincoln	15

Hamilton	14
Fulton	12
Warren	12
Washington	11
Lagrange	11
Oakdale	10
Whittier	10
Riverside	9
Stickney	8
Walbridge	8
Navarre	7
Spring	6
Cherry	5
Fall-Meyer	5
Glenwood	5
Monroe	5
Franklin	5
Riverside (Maumee)	5
Roosevelt	5
Raymer	5
Garfield	4
Wayne Trail	4
Westfield	4
Hale	4
McKinley	4
Luella Cummings	3
Birmingham	3
Crissey	3
Harvard	3
Newberry	3
Union	3
Holland Elementary	3
Hopewell	3
Burroughs	2
Chase	2
Dorr	2
Glendale	2

Table No. 6 Continued

Irwin	2
Longfellow	2
Marshall	2
Northwood	2
Ryder	2
St. Phillip's Lutheran	2
Trilby	2
Wernert	2
Stewart	2
LCCH	2
Arlington	1
Central Avenue	1
Clay	1
DeVeaux	1
Glann	1
Glanzman	1
Mayfair	1
Mt. Vernon	1
Old Orchard	1
Point Place	1
Shoreland	1
Swanton Township	1
Berkey Elementary	1
Irving	1

PAROCHIAL

Catholic Central HS	27
St. Francis DeSales HS	6
Marybrook Academy	4
St. Ursula Academy	1
McAuley HS	1
Notre Dame Academy	1
Rosary Cathedral	7

St. Thomas Aquinas	5
St. Francis DeSales	4
St. James	4
St. Mary	4
St. Adalbert	3
St. Michael	3
Regina Coeli	2
Sacred Heart	2
St. Ann	2
St. Benedict	2
Blessed Sacrament	1
Gesu	1
Good Shepherd	1
Immaculate Conception	1
Little Flower	1
Our Lady of Perpetual Help	1
St. Charles	1
St. Agnes	1
St. Cyril & Methodius	1
St. Hedwig	1
St. Joseph (Maumee)	1
St. Jude	1
St. Pius X	1
St. Stephen	1
St. Vincent DePaul	1
St. John	1
St. Joseph (Sylvania)	1
Out of County—attending	51
Out of County—not attending	6
Lucas County—not attending	177

1420

Table No. 7

DISTRICTS — TYPE II CASES

Collingwood	197
South End	143
East Toledo	139
Pinewood	108
North End	102
Downtown	88
West Toledo	79
Nebraska	74
Lagrange-Stickney	66
West End	53
Point Place	12
Adams Township	71
Washington Township	61
Maumee (Waynesfield Township)	50
Sylvania Township	48
Springfield Township	28
Oregon Township	15
Swanton Township	8
Monclova Township	7
Spencer Township	6
Jerusalem Township	5
Waterville Township	5
Ottawa Hills	5
Harding Township	1
Richfield Township	1
Out of County	48

1420

Table No. 8

SOURCE OF REFERRAL — TYPE II

	Boys	Girls	Total
Police	1310	215	1525
Parents	32	38	70
School	34	15	49
Social Agency	5	11	16
Probation Counselor	61	15	76
Other Court	1	0	1
Other Source	10	29	39
Totals.....	1453	323	1776

Table No. 9

TYPE OF COMPLAINT

Speeding	323
Without due regard	262
Running red light	142
Stop street	59
School stop sign	5
Fail, yield right of way, vehicles.....	107
Fail, yield right of way, pedestrian.....	3
Prohibited turn	48
Wrong way—one-way street	37
Hit Skip	9
No driver's license	106
Temporary permit—No licensed driver	18
Defective vehicle (lights, brakes, etc.).....	65
Defective or illegal muffler	74
All other violations	248
Driving while license suspended	11
Total.....	*1517

* Some children had more than one charge and many had multiple penalties imposed.

Table No. 10

**ACCIDENT
(Property damage)**

None	1039
Damage other vehicle	395
Property damage (other than vehicle)	35
Damage own car	314

(Personal injury)

No injury	1381
Injury to pedestrian	7
Injury to occupant of other car	61
Injury to occupant own car	59
Fatal injury	1
Medical treatment only to injured	55
Hospitalization to one or more	10

Table No. 11

DISPOSITION OF TRAFFIC CASES

Attend traffic school	198
License restricted	300
License suspended	347
License revoked	6
Fined	1159
Repair defective parts	138
Restitution	13
Probation	8
Dismissed	164
Other	112
Return license on proof of insurance.....	152
Total.....	2597

Table No. 12
REPORT OF CLINICAL SERVICES
FOR 1961

	Boys	Girls	Total
Initial psychological studies completed.....	120	78	198
Psychological re-evaluations	5	4	9
Review conferences with P.C. and Supervisor	24	38	62
Individual treatment interviews	50		50
Group Therapy Sessions	17	28	45
Hearings attended	18	28	46
Tests administered:			
Intelligence	119	79	198
Achievement	114	82	196
Projective	281	219	500
Inventory	72	74	146
Distribution of levels of intelligence:			
Median IQ	95	97	96
Very Superior	0	2	2
Superior	5	1	6
Bright Normal	12	9	21
Average	60	44	104
Dull Normal	28	19	47
Borderline	12	4	16
Mental Defective	5	2	7

STATISTICS — PSYCHOLOGICAL
SERVICE

Psychiatric Services:

Conferences with P.C. & Psychologist.....	104
Interviews with clients	65
Conferences with Marriage Counselors	56
Interviews with clients	14
Interviews with other adults	3
Group Therapy Sessions with Counselors.....	46
Leadership at Staff Meetings	
Juvenile Court	3
Domestic Relations	10

Medical Services:

Examinations at C.S.I.	482
Supplemental examinations or treatment initiated:	
Dental care	131
Eye refractions	23
Audiograms	4
EEG	7
X-rays	3
Special Lab. tests	14
Special Clinical appointments	9
Minor Surgery	3
Venereal Disease	1
Hospital transfers	3

Table No. 13

**CHILD STUDY INSTITUTE
1961 ANNUAL REPORT
REGISTRATIONS AND TEMPORARY
RELEASES**

TOTAL REGISTRATIONS

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	157	49	206
February	172	34	206
March	158	49	207
April	154	41	195
May	119	47	166
June	129	44	173
July	185	45	230
August	150	39	189
September	179	43	222
October	154	49	203
November	137	45	182
December	90	36	126
Total.....	1784	521	2305
Less Children Released	832	178	1010
Actually Detained	952	343	1295

Table No. 14

**CHILD STUDY INSTITUTE
AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION**

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	29	22	51
February	34	21	55

March	35	25	60
April	33	22	55
May	28	19	47
June	25	19	44
July	27	14	41
August	24	20	44
September	27	21	48
October	32	21	53
November	31	20	51
December	33	21	54

Average for 1961: 30 Boys 20 Girls 50 Total

Average for 1960: 33 Boys 21 Girls 54 Total

Number of days population exceeded capacity in 1961:
361 days

Table No. 15

AGES OF CHILDREN REGISTERED — 1961

	Boys	Girls	Total
8 years and under.....	7	1	8
9	19	1	20
10	33	1	34
11	71	8	79
12	74	17	91
13	141	55	196
14	283	82	365
15	318	130	448
16	433	108	541
17	391	113	504
18	11	5	16
19	3	0	3
Total.....	1784	521	2305

Median Age, 1960: 15 years 11 months

Median Age, 1961: 16 years

Table No. 16

**CHILD STUDY INSTITUTE
1961 ANNUAL REPORT**

**TRANSFERS OF CHILDREN TO JAIL DUE
TO OVER-POPULATION AT C.S.I.**

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	18	0	18
February	27	0	27
March	39	0	39
April	27	0	27
May	29	6	35
June	11	2	13
July	13	0	13
August	11	3	14
September	14	0	14
October	12	0	12
November	23	3	26
December	17	2	19
Totals.....	241	16	257

Table No. 17

**TEMPORARY RELEASES TO PARENTS
AFTER INTAKE CASEWORK SCREENINGS**

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	57	10	67
February	85	10	95
March	66	10	76
April	60	16	76
May	65	17	82
June	68	16	84
July	87	14	101
August	87	9	96
September	83	13	96
October	85	30	115
November	54	15	69
December	35	18	53
Total Released Pending Hearing.....	832	178	1010

STAFF OF FAMILY COURT 1961

Paul W. Alexander, *Judge*
L. Wallace Hoffman, *Director*
Rita F. O'Grady, *Assistant Director*
Thomas B. Bourque, *Assistant Director*

Eve Kemp Richards, *Supervisor Domestic Relations*
J. Reginald Kelly, *Chief Referee*
Boston A. Bristol, *Chief, Finance Department*
Louise Juarez, *Chief, Transcription Department*
Ruth M. Williams, *Chief Psychologist*

Referees

Walter C. A. Bouck
Mae Bridges
Catherine Champion
Harry A. Everett
E. Wade McBride
Nellie Matt

Casework Supervisors

C. Donald McColl
Dan M. Weber

Probation Counselors

Ruth Baumann
Richard F. Bock
King Bradtke
Paul R. Brooks
Richard L. Daley
Joseph Dembinski
Stephen Dornbach
David Fike
Marjorie Gullberg
Dorcas Hanson
Barbara Johnston
Clifford Kadon
Mary Jane Lung
Richard J. Lung
Charles Makins
Bessie Munk
Lawrence Murphy

Robert Perry
Janet Tewell
Josephine Tylinksi
Donald Walker
Ray Watson
Ervin Wierzbinski

Marriage Counselors

Patricia Baumgardner
William Beausay
Ralph P. Bridgman
Fred W. Richert
Charles Riseley

CSI Professional Staff

Joan Marie Coghlin
Earl D. Douglas
Wayne J. Haefner
Dr. Henry L. Hartman
Leone Hinline
Mary Helen Jones
Dr. I. H. Kass
Angela H. Lloyd
Rev. John Meyer
William Murphy

CSI Leaders

Raymond Bester
Pauline Dedes

Raymond Devine
Robert Donovan
James Drummond
Thomas E. Ertle
Helen G. Gressler
Michael Harrah
Charles J. Hinkleman
Emma J. Hischka
Roy Hodge
Lloyd Jones
John Kessel
Margaret Manzey
Ferne J. Sage
Bernetta E. Shields
Stella Shields
Catherine R. Shrider
George R. Stamos
Mary L. Vaillant
Georgia Vines

Office Staff

Emma Babione
Mildred Baker
Marie Brunzman
Marie Crawford
Fred Dickerson
Elvira Drotar
Catherine Gaffney
Mary Geoffrion
Marie Gerbich

Frances Gibbons
Madelynn Gohring
Frances Gomolski
Helen Goodrick
Carl Guy
Pauline Hammonds
Jane Hatfield
Carolyn Himes
Elsie Humberger
Mary Jagodzinski
Margaret Jamison
Frank Jurski
Edna Layman
Augusta Managhan
Grace Messerer
Alma Miller
Madeline Mitchell
Hattie Prybylski
Laura Roth
Edna Sanford
Helen Schiermyer
Selma Schmidt
Jean Sohalski
Pauline Soltysiak
Jimmy L. Stinson
Grace Tanner
Harriette Twiss
Marie Winzeler
Edward Wolny
Ethel Wynn
Bella Yourist

WHO DOTH NOT ANSWER TO THE RUDDER
SHALL ANSWER TO THE ROCK

