

Winter 1929

## History of the Movement to Establish a State Reformatory for Women in Connecticut, A

Helen Worthington Rogers

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Helen Worthington Rogers, History of the Movement to Establish a State Reformatory for Women in Connecticut, A, 19 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 518 (1928-1929)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

# A HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT TO ESTABLISH A STATE REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN IN CONNECTICUT<sup>1</sup>

HELEN WORTHINGTON ROGERS<sup>1a</sup>

Since its enactment in 1917 the statute which created the Connecticut State Farm for Women has had the good fortune to receive the accolade from the hands of both the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* and the United States' government, the former publishing its text in full<sup>2</sup> as an example of progressive legislation, the latter acknowledging it to have been made the basis of the standard form of law<sup>3</sup> recommended to state legislatures when establishing institutions for women offenders.

The local movement which culminated in this model law should have significance for those concerned with the technique of penal progress. The woman's reformatory obviously represents a forward step in the institutional treatment of a specific group of social delinquents. Nevertheless, as an integral part of our correctional system, it is comparatively recent and still limited to less than twenty states.<sup>4</sup> Although its extension is inevitable, so concomitant is it with better public health and greater justice in our various commonwealths, its pathway, in the future as in the past, will be beset with obstacles. Inasmuch as in this prolonged but ultimately successful campaign in Connecticut many of these common obstacles were encountered and overcome, its history should make a modest contribution to the literature of the whole.

Women offenders<sup>5</sup> and their incarceration were not unknown to colonial Connecticut but, comparatively few in number<sup>6</sup> and mostly of the servant class, they were usually fined or flogged for their petty violations of the current religious and secular laws—penalties involving

<sup>1</sup>Bibliography, Notes and Abstracts, p. —.

<sup>1a</sup>Edgehill Terrace, New Haven, Conn.

<sup>2</sup>Vol. VIII, No. 4, Notes and Abstracts, pp. 595-599.

<sup>3</sup>Standard Forms of Laws for the Repression of Prostitution, the Control of Venereal Diseases, the Establishment and Management of Reformatories for Women and Girls, etc., compiled by the Law Enforcement Division of the War and Navy Departments and approved by the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, December 14, 1918, pp. 24-28.

<sup>4</sup>1922.

<sup>5</sup>The first charge of delinquency against a woman appears on the colonial records for 1640; mention is made of women prisoners in 1647, 1672, 1757 and in 1794.

<sup>6</sup>Between 1636-1776 approximately sixty women were charged with being the sole or joint violators of the laws.

no imprisonment. "Dangerous delinquents" and important witnesses, however, were committed to the primitive detention houses of the period<sup>7</sup> although not in sufficient numbers to receive special statutory recognition until 1793. In that year the general court provided that women convicted of the same crimes for which men were sentenced to Newgate prison<sup>8</sup> must be *confined with none but females and kept at suitable labor* in the county jails and workhouses to which they were committed. In 1821, the same law which gave the court optional power to send such offenders to Newgate specified that an apartment *must be prepared for the purpose*; it also substituted for the flogging of women convicted of theft imprisonment in the county jails *at suitable labor*. As these two statutes affected only a negligible number of women in institutions already established they obviously bear no direct relation to the subsequent movement for a separate institution. They are, however, of passing interest because the state herein formulated for the first time in relation to delinquent women, two fundamental principles of the reformatory ideal—i.e., *sex segregation* and *employment during incarceration*<sup>9</sup>—and also because the protests which followed actual commitments to Newgate—that notorious blot on the escutcheon of Connecticut—and to the state prison, its successor, in which absolute segregation, physical and psychic, was impossible, helped to keep before the public an inherent weakness in its penological system. Had these repeated demands for a separate building<sup>10</sup> at the state prison—beginning in 1825 and lasting, intermittently, until the present time<sup>11</sup>—

<sup>7</sup>County gaols were established as follows: Hartford, 1640; New Haven, 1660; Fairfield, 1680; Windham, 1726; New London, 1761; Tolland, 1785; Litchfield, 1786; Middlesex, 1786. Women were detained in the Hartford house of correction as early as the beginning of the witch-craft craze in 1646.

<sup>8</sup>The copper mines near Simsbury used as a state prison, 1773-1827; women were not committed there until after 1800.

<sup>9</sup>Labor for women offenders had been implied, *but not specified*, in the statute of 1727, which established a house of correction for keeping, correcting and "setting to work" certain offenders.

<sup>10</sup>The number of women confined in the state prison has never exceeded twenty at any one time.

<sup>11</sup>The repeal of the law was first recommended in 1825 by a special legislative committee (appointed in 1824), after its discovery that a woman had already been committed to Newgate in which no suitable quarters had been provided and where all the attendants were men. The recommendation was ignored and a new state prison authorized (1826) to which several women prisoners were transferred in 1827. The new board of directors at once registered protest in the name of economy, propriety and humanity (reports of 1828 and 1829); they heartily agreed with the Auburn executive who was willing to add four hundred and fifty men to the like number he already had in order to be rid of five females. In their report for 1830 they uttered still graver warning—a prophecy fulfilled by the birth of an illegitimate child, the result of intercourse between a former guard and a woman convict (report for 1841)—since fourteen women were now being confined under male supervision. A suitable building and a sepa-

ever ripened into a larger movement for a separate institution for all types of women offenders, as did a similar situation in Indiana and in Massachusetts, this history would have been a briefer one, but they were, unfortunately, limited to an official group whose primary object was the solution of a serious administrative problem.

Although the origin of any movement such as this, conceived in discontent and first articulate in pity, is necessarily nebulous and any date assigned to it likely to be both arbitrary and artificial, there is no evidence, so far ascertained, of any organized movement to establish a *separate* institution for the specialized treatment of delinquent women during the seventeenth, eighteenth or the first half of the nineteenth centuries. But by the beginning of the second half of the latter century it was evident, from the establishment of the reform school for boys in 1851 and the creation of the new committee on humane institutions by the general assembly of 1856, that the Connecticut conscience was at last reacting to the serious penological and eleemosynary problems being forced upon it by a rapidly increasing and no longer homogeneous population. Within this general awakening there arose in the two largest centers of population, New Haven and Hartford, the special concern for the now noticeable number of delinquent women and wayward girls without adequate custodial care and training—a concern which was soon to find expression in the first genuine attempt to supply this need by remedial legislation.

Because of these two fairly well differentiated classes of offenders with their corresponding groups of interested citizens, both as yet few in number, it was natural and perhaps inevitable that the first phase of this movement should have been a co-operative one. Inspired by petitions and proceeded by a joint resolution<sup>12</sup> emanating from the House, a special act<sup>13</sup> was passed by the general assembly of 1864 which had in it the definite germs of a reformatory for women. This act directed the newly created committee on the revision of statutes to assume an additional duty stated as follows:

---

rate department in charge of women were urged. With the opening of the latter in 1832, the former being refused, the board ostensibly accepted the situation, simplified if not solved, and made no official appeal for further separation until after the establishment of the Connecticut State Farm for Women (report of 1923). (Individual members of the board, however, Col. Norris G. Osborn and Mr. Edward A. Fuller, and the warden, Mr. Albert Garvin, appeared at hearings in favor of the institution.) Two special legislative commissions in 1871 and in 1885 also urged their elimination but without success. Thus, in spite of the advice of special commissions and permanent boards of directors over a period of one hundred years, women may still be committed for felony to the Connecticut state prison.

<sup>12</sup>Senate Journal (1864), p. 392.

<sup>13</sup>Special Act No. 73, sec. 2 (1864).

"Sec. 2. That said committee be also authorized and directed to inquire into the necessity or expediency of establishing in this State, one or more institutions for the reformation of juvenile offenders, *and for the punishment and reform<sup>14</sup> of abandoned women;*<sup>15</sup> and report the result to the next General Assembly of this State, together (with) such plans, estimates and bills for public acts, as in their judgment may be desirable for the information and action of the General Assembly, in the premises."<sup>16</sup>

The revision of the statutes, as specified in section 1, was presented to the legislature of 1865, but, so far as has been ascertained, nothing had been done to carry out the provisions of the second section of the act. The repudiation of these duties was natural and probably justifiable, the committee<sup>17</sup> having been organized for a definite task and the subsequent assignment being alien both to the interests and to the training of its members. Thus the first definite gesture toward the establishment of a state institution for delinquent women was ignored by an indifferent legislative committee. Although petitions were again presented no further legislative action was attempted at this session.

But in this joint movement of the sixties neither of the two groups was daunted. Petitions were presented to the assembly of 1866 in even greater numbers than at the two previous sessions, the majority of them, however, stressing the urgent need of a reform school for girls. These petitions, referred to the committee on humane institutions, resulted in the creation of a "Commission of Enquiry Respecting a State Industrial School for Connecticut"—the first of the several commissions to be appointed during the history of the movement. Its duties were to inquire

"into the expediency and desirableness of *establishing an institution for the reformation of abandoned young women*<sup>18</sup> in this state; and also as to the necessity and best methods of Establishing a Reform or Industrial School for unfortunate, vagrant and vicious girls and 'to report to the next General Assembly some suitable plan for the establishment of a Home or a Reform School for such women and girls.'"

From the report<sup>19</sup> of this commission,<sup>20</sup> presented in 1867, it appeared that its members had been divided as to the wisdom of the state's caring for delinquent women, the majority agreeing that this

<sup>14</sup>"Relief and Reformation" in the original resolution.

<sup>15</sup>The italics are the author's.

<sup>16</sup>No name appears on the original resolution still preserved in the state capitol, but the House Journal indicates that both resolution and bill were introduced by Charles Ives of East Haven.

<sup>17</sup>Henry Dutton, Loren P. Waldo and Daniel R. Booth.

<sup>18</sup>The italics are the author's.

<sup>19</sup>Fifteen hundred copies were ordered for the use of the General Assembly.

<sup>20</sup>T. R. Fessenden, D. C. Gilman and J. P. Whitcomb.

should be done in private rather than in public institutions, the Home for the Friendless recently opened in East Haven<sup>21</sup> being cited as an excellent example of the former plan. Accordingly, the majority report was as follows:

"The undersigned, therefore, are constrained to report in respect to the first topic of inquiry *that it is inexpedient for the state to establish an institution for the reformation of abandoned young women.*"<sup>18</sup>

Thus the second definite attempt to secure a reformatory for women was side-tracked by a commission with a paramount interest. The movement as a whole, however, was ultimately to gain from the work of the very same group that repudiated it. Its detailed plans for an institution for neglected and delinquent girls under sixteen represented the most progressive penology of its time,<sup>22</sup> the outstanding features being its emphasis on *educational rather than punitive methods of reform* and on *the family or cottage system rather than on the congregate type of building*. These two principles, introduced by the commission and later materialized in the actual institution, were to make an important contribution toward the inheritance of the woman's reformatory movement.

Thus, by 1870, Connecticut had added to her penal system, already consisting of the state prison and the ten county jails, correctional institutions for both boys and girls, the first supported and managed by the state, the latter privately managed but partially supported from public funds. The effort to separate the women from the state prison had been for some time quiescent and the more recent attempts to establish a separate institution for older offenders had subsided before the stronger interest in the younger and more hopeful group. Nevertheless, in the judgment of the writer, it is legitimate to date the beginning of the movement to establish a reformatory for women in Con-

<sup>21</sup>Incorporated in 1867 as a "temporary home for friendless and homeless women and girls who through necessity and crime have no other refuge—to give them employment and instruction with the ultimate design of providing them a more permanent situation and of fitting them to maintain themselves." The institution is now maintained chiefly for aged women.

<sup>22</sup>On these plans the assembly deferred action until its next session when the matter was indefinitely postponed (Senate Jour. [1867], p. 78). Anticipating this fate, the friends of the younger group, now numerous, active and organized, determined to establish a private institution under a self-perpetuating board of directors. Securing sufficient funds to guarantee its existence—funds to which women contributed generously, Harriet Beecher Stowe and Dorathea Dix among them—they won from the assembly of 1868 the charter for a Connecticut Industrial School for Girls, together with an appropriation of ten thousand dollars, conditional on the collection of at least fifty thousand from other sources. The first inmate was received in January, 1870. In 1919, the institution was taken over by the state as "Long Lane Farm."

necticut as early as 1864, a year antedating the establishment of the first woman's prison in Indiana in 1869 and that of Massachusetts in 1870.

In spite of its early start, however, a quarter of a century was to elapse before another attempt at legislation. Meanwhile, the important rooting processes of the principles of *segregation, employment, instruction* and of the *cottage system*, as applied to delinquent women and girls, was apparent both in various gubernatorial messages<sup>23</sup> and in the reports of official investigators. The stricter enforcement of the first three in the state prison was urged by the commission of 1871<sup>24</sup> of which Charles Dudley Warner was a member, and for women in the jails by the surgeon-general in 1872.<sup>25</sup> The cottage plan, now in operation at the reform school for boys and the industrial school for girls was praised and encouraged by governors Andrews, Bigelow and Lounsbury in 1879,<sup>26</sup> 1881, 1882 and 1887. To these four, now firmly entrenched, two new principles were to be added to the growing inheritance of the movement, i. e. *the indeterminate sentence* recommended by Governor Andrews in 1879 and *conditional pardon or parole* for women as well as for men, championed by the Connecticut Prison Association in 1879 and 1880 and endorsed by Governor Bigelow in 1881.

From the viewpoint of the future women's reformatory, however, the birth of the State Board of Charities<sup>27</sup> in 1873 and of the Connecticut Prison Association in 1875<sup>28</sup> were the most significant events between 1870 and 1890 because these two organizations were to become in a peculiar sense the champions of better institutional care for delinquent women. The former was the outcome of the investigations inaugurated by Governor Jewell in 1871-2 during which the conditions under which women prisoners were still incarcerated, became one of the determining features in arriving at the joint conclusion that a new department for the supervision of all state institutions had become imperative.<sup>30</sup> Since women were to be represented on the board, at least one of whom was to visit regularly and frequently all correctional

<sup>23</sup>1871, 1872, 1873, 1879, 1881, 1882 and 1887.

<sup>24</sup>Charles Dudley Warner, Gurdon W. Russe and Francis Wayland. Their report appears in the Legislative Documents for 1872.

<sup>25</sup>Nathan Mayer, M. D., whose report was also included in Legislative Documents (1872).

<sup>26</sup>The general assemblies met biennially after 1877.

<sup>27</sup>First recommended for boys committed to the reform school.

<sup>28</sup>This board did not function until after a reorganization so that its first report was not published until 1881-2.

<sup>29</sup>Organized March 9, 1875, as the Prisoners' Friends Corporation; it became the Connecticut Prison Association, December, 1876.

<sup>30</sup>Legislative Documents (1872).

institutions, it was equipped, potentially, to furnish sympathetic supervision and advice as to the care of women offenders. Over the public board, however, the private association<sup>81</sup> had certain advantages; one of its avowed objects being to "promote reformatory systems," it was able to concentrate on penal affairs and free to advocate principles and policies rather than to discuss technicalities. It was thus destined, many years later, to lead the woman's reformatory into the promised land.

After its long period of incubation of more than twenty-five years, 1867-1893, the movement entered into the second state of active development during the early nineties. But, as in the sixties, associated with a sister movement, it had come to a standstill because of the greater popular interest in the latter, so now it was fated to become part of another issue and was again to suffer because of this relationship.

In the effort to establish a *joint* reformatory for men and women—a conception which for nearly two decades was to confuse and to overshadow all proposed legislation affecting the latter—were surprisingly and, for a time, inextricably, merged two apparently parallel reformatory interests, both based on dissatisfaction with the institutional treatment of two classes of offenders, i. e. young men in the city almshouses and young women in the county jails. The outstanding leader of the first group was Professor J. J. McCook, then of the department of economics at Trinity College, Hartford. Interest in the problems of public relief and of venality had taken him into the local almshouses where young men sentenced by the courts, chiefly for vagrancy, were being housed at considerable expense to the community but without opportunity for reform.<sup>82</sup> From an early plan for stopping the supply of this vagabond class by drastic legislation against tramping his thought had progressed, step by step, to the constructive idea of an institution which should be, not merely a place of detention, but a graded industrial school. In the beginning his attention had not been drawn to the similar needs of delinquent women but they were ultimately included in his legislative program. Meanwhile the State Board of Charities had called attention to the condition of women in the county jails. One of its members, stirred by the idleness and promiscuity, openly branded them as schools of crime for every woman committed, particularly for girls

---

<sup>81</sup>The Connecticut Prison Association became a semi-public agency in 1903 when the probation system of the state was placed under its general supervision and state aid for necessary clerical service allowed.

<sup>82</sup>The State Board of Charities had already, in 1804, called attention to this unfortunate practice of the courts in using the almshouses as houses of correction.



over sixteen for whom the state made no other provision; she urged that a reformatory be built for them at once. This appeal, made in 1890 by Mrs. Virginia T. Smith of Hartford and later endorsed by her colleague, Mrs. George Anna Woolsey Bacon of New Haven, was the first of the many demands ultimately made by the board in behalf of this institution and, as far as has been ascertained, it was the first to be made by any public official since the early agitation of 1864-7. Realizing, however, that a similar condition existed for young men over sixteen, Mrs. Smith's final pronouncement was in favor of a reformatory for both young men and women.<sup>33</sup> Thus, these two apparently parallel and separate interests converged to a common demand for a joint institution.

In 1893 Professor McCook secured the presentation to the general assembly of a bill<sup>34</sup> defining the offences of both the vagabond and prostitute classes, providing graded penalties with an indeterminate sentence between one and five years and establishing a reformatory for third offenders of both sexes. Although final action was deferred, the document was ordered printed as a proposed law in the public acts of that year. In 1895, governor Coffin's message calling attention to the recommendation of the State Board of Charities<sup>35</sup> that the proposed legislation be enacted, was followed by the introduction of a bill which, revised and enlarged by a group of eminent men,<sup>36</sup> was to become chapter 317 of the public acts of 1895 creating a dual reformatory. The sections numbered seven and eight established what its friends apparently accepted as a genuine woman's reformatory.

"Sec. 7. There shall be a woman's department, which shall be known as the Woman's Reformatory; and in said department the officers and employees shall, as far as practicable, be women, and the buildings and grounds of said department shall, so far as practicable, be separate from those occupied by male prisoners.

"Sec. 8. All females above the age of sixteen years who shall be convicted of any offense which, under the laws of this state might be punished by imprisonment in a jail, may be committed to the reformatory; and after sufficient accommodations are provided by the board of directors of the

<sup>33</sup>Report for year ending June 30, 1890, p. 160, signed by Mrs. V. T. Smith; also report for years ending June 30, 1892, p. 49, signed by both Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Bacon. During the decade prior to its reorganization and the appointment of a paid secretary, the active work of the board seems to have been performed by these two women members.

<sup>34</sup>S. B. 208.

<sup>35</sup>Report for 1895, p. 4.

<sup>36</sup>H. G. Newton, chairman of the committee on humane relations, assisted by Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin of the supreme court, later governor of the state, Hon. Francis S. Wayland, dean of the Yale Law School, and the Hon. Samuel Fessenden, speaker of the house.

reformatory and proclamation is made to that effect by the governor, no female whom the directors of the reformatory are willing to receive shall be committed to any jail in this state on any criminal process or sentence, unless pending her trial, or temporarily until a convenient opportunity is had for conveying her to the reformatory or to the state prison or by the directors of the reformatory."

After two public hearings this bill, favorably reported, passed both houses with an appropriation of \$50,000. In spite of a permissive clause in the law<sup>37</sup> no women were appointed to the board of directors who at once voted to begin the experiment with young men between the ages of sixteen and thirty, leaving the woman's reformatory to a later period. How much later this would have been is now a matter of conjecture as the law was repealed at the next session of the legislature. The directors<sup>38</sup> had begun their task conscientiously, visiting similar institutions including the Massachusetts Reformatory for Women and enlisting the help of Z. R. Brockway of the Elmira Reformatory under whose direction plans for housing one thousand inmates on the congregate plan were prepared. These elaborate and expensive plans and the selection of a site near the residential section about two miles from the Hartford City Hall proved their Waterloo. A powerful lobby, composed not only of irate property owners and others likely to be affected by the proposed disintegration of the jail system but even including members of the State Board of Charities,<sup>39</sup> presented itself at the assembly of 1897. With political, property and social welfare interests against it, the institution was, of course, doomed. Acting on governor Cook's recommendation<sup>40</sup> for an early investigation, a resolution<sup>41</sup> was passed under suspension of the rules, placing this in the hands of the committee on humane institutions which, in turn, presented a bill for repealing the act of 1895, stopping all building operations and appointing a commission to sell the property.<sup>42</sup> This recommendation was immediately passed, wiping out at a single gesture the results of the efforts between the years 1893 and 1897.

<sup>37</sup>Sec. 2 provided that of the five members two might be women.

<sup>38</sup>Walter Hubbard, George W. Swan, Edward M. Chapin, J. J. McCook and Frederick A. Spencer.

<sup>39</sup>Reports for 1895-6, pp. 42-45.

<sup>40</sup>Gubernatorial message for 1897.

<sup>41</sup>No. 18, introduced by Senator, later, Governor Lounsbury.

<sup>42</sup>It is only fair to state that although the committee on humane institutions recommended the repeal of the act of 1895 it, at the same time, urged that the structure be begun on a new foundation in which many of its excellent features could be retained. Accordingly, the commission appointed to sell the site was also instructed to investigate the subject and to recommend suitable legislation to the next general assembly.

This spectacular denouement, however, proved to be not the end but the beginning of an increased momentum in the general reformatory movement in Connecticut—a movement of which the woman's reformatory was still an integral part. To this momentum, from this period onward, there contributed a growing number of private organizations, the outstanding groups being either associated with the churches or composed of socially minded women. Among the former were the Connecticut Federation of Churches,<sup>43</sup> the General Conference of Congregational Churches of Connecticut,<sup>44</sup> the Hartford Federation of Churches,<sup>45</sup> the Connecticut Christian Endeavor Union<sup>46</sup> and the Connecticut Temperance Union.<sup>47</sup> All of these, during the decade between 1899 and 1909, passed resolutions, held regular or special meetings in behalf of prison reform and sent delegates to public hearings when the women's reformatory legislation was under discussion. The intermittent activities of these church groups were chiefly in the nature of propaganda not only for the establishment of a state reformatory but also in behalf of the indeterminate sentence, probation, parole and the general reform of the jail system. The activities of the groups in which women played the leading parts, on the other hand, tended toward more definite experimentation in behalf of better institutional treatment of delinquent women. These included the Connecticut Woman's Christian Temperance Union<sup>48</sup> and the several

<sup>43</sup>The federation joined with other religious and social welfare groups in sending delegates to the state houses when bills were under consideration.

<sup>44</sup>This conference had a standing committee on Moral Legislation; it devoted sessions to reformatory subjects in 1899, 1902, 1903 and 1908 and sent delegates to hearings.

<sup>45</sup>The federation devoted sessions to various aspects of penal reform, including the woman's reformatory, in 1901, 1902, 1904, 1905, 1913, 1916 and 1917. In 1905, at a special meeting, Rev. H. H. Kelsey of the Fourth Congregational Church, Hartford, pleaded for a separate institution for women. In 1911, following the failure of the reformatory bills, the Rev. Rockwell Harmon Potter of Center Church, Hartford, preached on Prison Sunday, October 22, a sermon in which the establishment of the institution was urged. This sermon, "An Irrational Fear; an Appeal for a Christian Penology," was printed and widely distributed.

<sup>46</sup>The union was especially active under the leadership of Judge Edgar M. Warner of Putnam. Its committee on Prison and Jail Work, organized in 1899, after 1900 issued circular letters, leaflets, enlisted a hundred clergy in the use of Prison Sunday and furnished speakers on request.

<sup>47</sup>The union's devoted representative for many years was H. H. Spooner of Kensington.

<sup>48</sup>As early as 1874 this organization had done evangelistic work among delinquent women in the state prison and the county jails. In 1882 it began a campaign which culminated in the passage of the Police Matron Law in 1892. The New Haven branch had worked for wayward girls prior to the establishment of the Home for the Friendless and the Florence Crittenden Home.

equal suffrage organizations<sup>49</sup> but the work which contributed even more directly to the future woman's reformatory was done by men and women associated with the private institutions for the care, protection and training of young delinquent women during these many years of procrastination on the part of the state. Private philanthropy had created the industrial school for girls after the failure of the state to do so in 1864 and it had opened the East Haven Home for the Friendless in 1867; it was now to add three other institutions, i. e., the Hartford Shelter for Women<sup>50</sup> in 1901 and, in 1902, the Florence Crittenden Home in New Haven and the House of the Good Shepard of Hartford, to which should be added the shorter-lived ventures which preceded them—the Faith Home and the Door of Hope in New Haven and the House of Mercy in Hartford. These private institutions not only educated the general public as to the nature and necessity of correctional institutions for women as an integral part of the community equipment, but their representatives took a leading part in the campaign for a state institution; for these services they should be given their proper rating in the history of the development of the reformatory idea in Connecticut. The increasing use of these private institutions by the courts for young women under twenty-one years of age<sup>51</sup> and the subsequent subsidies from public funds was a tacit confession on the part of the state of its responsibility and no doubt ultimately made easier the transition from the private to the public correctional institution for women but, temporarily, so long as the number committed annually remained small, tended to retard its establishment.<sup>52</sup> Of significance to the movement during this decade, also, was the agitation for and the final establishment in the statutes of the two principles of the *indeterminate sentence* and of *parole* already tentatively introduced.<sup>53</sup> From the firm establishment of these

<sup>49</sup>The equal suffrage groups helped in the passage of the police matron law and were untiring in their activities for the various women's reformatory bills as they appeared in the legislature from time to time.

<sup>50</sup>Established by the Woman's Aid Society of Hartford, organized in 1878.

<sup>51</sup>In 1905 the general assembly first authorized the commitment by courts of girls between sixteen and twenty-one to certain private institutions chartered by the state. In 1907, largely through the efforts of the Hon. Albert McC. Mathewson, judge of the New Haven city court and a member of the Florence Crittenden Home, this scope was enlarged.

<sup>52</sup>Report of the State Board of Charities (1909-10), p. 34.

<sup>53</sup>As early as 1835 the state prison board had pleaded for long rather than short sentences for its prisoners; the State Board of Charities had advocated them in 1886, 1897-8 and 1889-1900 and Governors Andrews and Bigelow in 1879, 1880 and 1881. In 1901 the indeterminate sentence became a law. Parole had also been urged by the state prison board in 1881 and 1896; it was written into the reformatory bill of 1895 and subsequent bills and was finally incorporated into the men's reformatory bills in 1909.

two principles in the penal system of the state the future reformatory for women was to reap advantage.

Thus the movement of 1893-1897 was far from obliterated but, on the contrary, was to be lifted up on this wave of popular interest and private experiment to enter upon a decade of marked legislative activity. This period, however, was to be characterized quite naturally by confusion, non-cooperation and lack of leadership. From the nature and number of the bills presented to the legislature between 1897 and 1909 it was obvious that although the reformatory urge was well in the saddle it was no longer moving centripetally. Instead of one group, united as in 1903-5 in the support of a single institution, there were now at least three: the first still loyal to the conception of the joint institution, the second, urging a separate, self-governing woman's reformatory and a third, demanding a separate institution for men. Thus, to the confusion incidental to the presentation of the needs of both sexes at the same time was added that resulting from a divided opinion as to the type of institution best meeting the needs of wayward women. Only a clear and far-sighted, unwavering militant leadership could have separated these issues and crystalized public opinion for the latter's cause but this was, unfortunately, lacking. The logical leadership had been entrusted to the commission of 1897 but its final report, delayed until 1900, included no constructive program except the general recommendation that a reformatory, without details as to its scope, be established. The Connecticut Prison Association had as yet taken no active part in the movement and the State Board of Charities, deeply conscious of the needs of both groups of offenders, threw its influence first on one side and then on the other but mostly in favor of the joint institution<sup>54</sup> believing that the latter plan was more likely to receive favorable consideration from the general assembly. With this confusion of projects, this division of opinion and with no militant leadership, the negative outcome of the legislative attempts during this decade was inevitable so far as the woman's separate institution was concerned. The various legislative attempts of the period, however, are worth a brief summary.

In 1899, governor Cook, who had so bitterly opposed the former project, had the distinction of being the first governor of Connecticut to advocate, in his official capacity,<sup>55</sup> the establishment of a state reformatory for women. But as he did not urge legislation so soon after

<sup>54</sup>See reports of the State Board of Charities for 1889-1890, 1801-2, 1893-4, 1895-6, 1897-8, 1898-1900, 1901-2, 1903-4, 1905-6, 1907-8, 1909-10, 1911-12 and 1915-16.

<sup>55</sup>Gubernatorial message for 1899.

the "sad expensive failure of 1895" none was attempted at this session. In 1901, three bills were introduced, all of them providing for delinquent women, two in a duplex,<sup>56</sup> one in a separate institution.<sup>57</sup> The latter, "An Act to Establish a State Reformatory for Women," was introduced by the State Board of Charities.<sup>58</sup> Although, historically, it represented the third attempt to secure legislative action in behalf of a separate institution for delinquent women, it was the first bill for its actual establishment that succeeded in getting before any general assembly. It won the approval of the committee on humane institutions, the other two bills having been rejected, but was eventually killed at the instigation of the committee on appropriations.<sup>59</sup> In 1903, two bills were presented, one,<sup>60</sup> the second bill to be introduced for the separate reformatory for women, the other, backed by the State Board of Charities, for the dual institution.<sup>61</sup> Acting on governor Chamberlain's reference to the recommendation of the board for this general reformatory, the committee on humane institutions rejected the woman's reformatory bill to consider the second but ultimately substituted for the latter still a third, drafted in committee, providing, however, not for the joint institution recommended but for a reformatory for men only. With the passage of this bill all immediate legislative attempts for the woman's separate institution naturally came to a standstill pending the development of its rival. In 1905 the commission appointed in 1903 presented its plans for a four hundred thousand dollar institution and in so doing, its work apparently came to an end. Because of this hiatus there was a curious revival of the earlier project for the dual institution. In 1907 two bills were introduced—one,<sup>62</sup> an attempt to further the reformatory for men, the other,<sup>63</sup> the dual institution containing an interesting proviso that the woman's department was to be "if necessary of secondary importance," a role certainly played by the woman's reformatory throughout the entire drama. Action on both bills was postponed. But the year 1909 proved to be an important one in the history of reformatory legisla-

<sup>56</sup>H. B. 384 was identical with the repealed law of 1895; H. B. 248, backed by the mayors, judges and police officials of Hartford and Meriden, provided for a department to be known as the "Woman's Humane Institution."

<sup>57</sup>H. B. 176.

<sup>58</sup>See report of state board of charities for 1901-2, p. 25.

<sup>59</sup>Killed in the House on the motion of Charles Barnes of Southington.

<sup>60</sup>H. B. 162.

<sup>61</sup>S. B. 64.

<sup>62</sup>This became Ch. 180 of the Public Acts of 1903.

<sup>63</sup>House Joint Resolution No. 331, authorizing the purchase of a site.

<sup>64</sup>H. B. 453 established a Connecticut Humane Institution which was to include a woman's department to be known as the Woman's Humane Institution; such institutions might be established in every county.

tion in Connecticut; of immediate benefit to the men's but ultimately to the woman's as well. Three bills<sup>65</sup> were introduced; two of them provided for delinquent women, neither of them, however, in an independent institution. One of these two,<sup>66</sup> having considerable backing, was reported favorably by both the judiciary and appropriations committees, but the bill which entered committee providing for the establishment of a joint institution emerged, as it had in 1903, an act for the establishment of a reformatory for young men,<sup>67</sup> an act speedily made a law. Tragic as this outcome must have seemed at the time to the loyal friends of the joint institution, it was, in the judgment of the writer, ultimately salutary for it removed the woman's reformatory movement for the first time in its history from all entangling alliances.

The effect of this separation of issues was evident during the next five year period. Not only did the agencies already interested increase their activities and focus their strength but several new organizations were added to the movement. The State Board of Charities, now that the hope for a duplex institution was irrevocably lost, ranked the woman's reformatory as the state's greatest need.<sup>68</sup> The Connecticut State Prison Association, which hitherto had played no conspicuous part, woke, in 1910, to a new sense of responsibility under its new president, Professor William B. Bailey, then of Yale University, and Mr. Clarence Thompson, its executive secretary, to assume a leadership which it was to keep to a successful end. The Connecticut Social Hygiene Association, immediately after its organization in 1910, created a committee on sociology<sup>69</sup> for the study of the social evil—a study which resulted not only in the recommendation of a reformatory for women to the society at large and that, in turn, to the preparation, publication and distribution of valuable data but also to an effective speaking campaign conducted by its executive secretary<sup>70</sup> in behalf of the institution. The Connecticut State Conference of Charities and Correction,<sup>71</sup> also born in this same year, devoted several sessions to the cause in 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1914 to

<sup>65</sup>H. J. R. 441 again endeavored to secure a site for the men's reformatory; H. B. 483 was identical with H. B. 453 of 1907; S. B. 14 was also a modification of the latter.

<sup>66</sup>S. B. 14.

<sup>67</sup>Amended in 1909, 1911 and 1915.

<sup>68</sup>Reports for 1909-1910 and 1913-1914.

<sup>69</sup>Prof. William B. Bailey of New Haven was chairman, Dr. T. N. Hephburn an active member.

<sup>70</sup>Dr. Valeria H. Parker.

<sup>71</sup>Later, the Connecticut Conference on Social Work.

which were invited as speakers well known superintendents of similar institutions.<sup>72</sup> The Connecticut Suffrage Association, under the leadership of its energetic president,<sup>73</sup> followed up the trial of a famous white slave case<sup>74</sup> with a series of mass meetings to which women from all over the state flocked in striking demonstration of the potential solidarity of Connecticut women when a moral issue is put squarely and dramatically before them. The subsequent temporary closing of the houses of prostitution brought to the front the pertinent question as to what should be done with their former inmates. The Hartford Vice Commission, created in response to this local agitation, recommended in its report<sup>75</sup> the establishment of the reformatory for women as the much needed preventive as well as curative measure. Last, but not least, a new grouping of old organizations, founded in 1913 under the name of the Protective Committee of Hartford, proved to be the progenitress of a future group of vital importance in the history of the movement. This committee, made up of representatives of several women's groups already interested in the underprivileged woman—the Woman's Aid Society, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Shelter for Women, the Civic Club and, through affiliation, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Connecticut Federation of Women's Clubs and the Girls' Friendly Society—engaged an investigator<sup>76</sup> to visit the local courts and places of public recreation and invited several specialists<sup>77</sup> to confer with it with the result that when the investigator's report was made in October, 1914, the committee was ready to announce itself in favor of a woman's reformatory and to pledge its assistance in the passage of any bill proposed by the official commission then already at work.

It was against this substantial background of interest in a common goal among these various groups that the legislative movement went forward between 1910 and 1915. In 1911 the Connecticut Prison Association had presented to the legislature a bill<sup>78</sup> prepared by its

<sup>72</sup>Mrs. Martha P. Falconer, then superintendent of Sleighton Farms, Pa., Dr. Katherine Bement Davis, then of Bedford Reformatory, N. Y., and Mrs. Amelia Amigh of Illinois.

<sup>73</sup>Mrs. Thomas M. Hepburn of Hartford.

<sup>74</sup>*Pignuiola-Fusco* case.

<sup>75</sup>Published and distributed by the suffrage association after the Hartford board of aldermen had refused to appropriate money for the purpose.

<sup>76</sup>Mrs. Nannie Melvin.

<sup>77</sup>Mrs. Jessie N. Hodder and others.

<sup>78</sup>H. B. 665 provided for a commission of three men and two women; its expenses were not to exceed \$500; its duties were substantially those of the commission of 1913. Introduced by Mr. Barr of Suffield.



committee on crime and laws<sup>79</sup> calling for a commission of inquiry into the advisability of establishing a reformatory for women. The committee on humane institutions, to which it was referred, recommended its rejection but presented a substitute which was in turn rejected by the committee on appropriations, the recent establishment of the men's reformatory then in the process of building especially weighing against it. In 1913 a similar bill<sup>80</sup> was introduced. After two public hearings this was favorably reported and became Chapter 180 of the Special Laws of this year by the signature of governor Baldwin on May 13. By this law the commission<sup>81</sup>—the first to be established for the consideration of an institution disassociated from either delinquent girls or men—was empowered:

"To investigate the laws, conditions, and customs of this state pertaining to commitments of women to jails and the state prison, and the general subject of the advisability of the establishment of a state reformatory for women, to investigate the institutions of a similar character in other states, particularly as to the direction, supervision and maintenance thereof."

At the beginning of the legislative session of 1915 its report<sup>82</sup> was presented together with the draft of a proposed law. This commission had consisted of five men and two women, among them the president of the Connecticut Prison Association, who was also the chairman of the Connecticut Social Hygiene Society's committee on social evil, and several others of public welfare training and experience. Meeting promptly, it had several meetings; each member had assumed some personal obligation, one visiting the Massachusetts Reformatory for Women and four, the New York Reformatory for Women at Bedford. Use had been made of the material gathered by the Social Hygiene Society, the records of the Prison Association and the statistics relating to the commitment of women to the state prison and the county jails ending September 30, 1911. In its report the commission recommended in detail the nature of the institution desired but the actual bill, as prepared by the commission itself, embodied none of these excellent provisions but called for another commission of three men and two women, serving without pay, who were again to examine the laws of the state with a view to recommending changes arising

<sup>79</sup>Arthur Deerin Call, Ralph O. Wells, Edgar M. Warner, Stetson K. Ryan, Hon. Frank S. Bishop and Rev. Rockwell Harmon Potter.

<sup>80</sup>H. B. 867, introduced by Charles L. Spencer of Suffield, February 7.

<sup>81</sup>Edwin C. Pinney, Arthur R. Kimball, William B. Bailey, Alena F. Owen and Alma Lyman.

<sup>82</sup>Report of the Commission on a Reformatory for Women. Public Document—Special (1915).

from the establishment of the reformatory, to select a site, secure options or purchase land, prepare specifications, visit similar institutions and make recommendations regarding the maintenance and support of the institution. This bill<sup>83</sup>—the third in behalf of a separate reformatory for women—had two hearings before the committee on humane institutions, but in spite of the petitions which poured in from all over the state, from the various chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution and from sixty local civic organizations, many of them equal suffrage groups, and in spite of the fact that at the hearing there were representatives from influential organizations, the Traveler's Aid Society, the Bridgeport Children's Aid Society, the Industrial School for Girls, the Connecticut Humane Society, the Equal Franchise League, the state prison and others, history once more repeated itself; the bill was favorably reported by the committee on humane institutions only to be rejected by the committee on appropriations. The general assembly of this year, however, did pass a minor bill<sup>84</sup> affecting delinquent women which was subsequently incorporated into the final woman's reformatory law, i. e., providing that the court should appoint female attendants for women committed to institutions (except jails) unless accompanied by a member of their own families.

The failure of the legislature of 1915 to act left the movement where it had previously been—sans reformatory and sans commission; dogged determination, however, survived. The Connecticut Prison Association once more went bravely at the task. At the suggestion of its president, who had been chairman of the defeated commission of 1913, it organized a special committee on delinquent women, selecting as its chairman an active member of the Hartford Protective Committee.<sup>85</sup> The committee itself, composed of eighteen women,<sup>86</sup> represented almost as many towns and organizations throughout the state. In addition to these, the president of the Prison Association and the

<sup>83</sup>S. B. 290, introduced by Frederick M. Peasley of Cheshire.

<sup>84</sup>H. B. 171 which became Ch. 72 of the Public Acts of that year.

<sup>85</sup>Miss Mary A. Goodman of Hartford.

<sup>86</sup>Mrs. Henry Bridgman, Norfolk; Miss Mary S. Bushnell, Hartford; Mrs. Augusta A. Crane, Waterbury; Mrs. W. H. Cummings, Plantsville; Mrs. Lee Wilson Dodd, New Haven; Miss Edith M. Douglass, Newington; Miss Helen M. Hall, Gildersleeve; Mrs. Appleton R. Hillyer, Hartford; Mrs. Edward H. Lorenz, West Hartford; Mrs. Myra M. MacFarland, Winsted; Mrs. R. L. McLain, Winsted; Mrs. George M. Minor, Waterford; Mrs. Frank A. Mitchell, Norwich; Mrs. Frederick G. Platt, New Britain; Miss Edith A. Plunkett, Hartford; Mrs. A. K. Rogers, New Haven; Miss Emily Whitney, New Haven; to which were added as members of a special Hartford committee under Mrs. Hillyer as chairman, Mrs. Richard M. Bissell, Mrs. Joseph R. Hawley, Mrs. Emily V. Mitchell, Mrs. Bernard T. Williams and Professor Edwin Knox Mitchell.

executive secretary of the Social Hygiene Association served as advisory members. Its tasks were (1) to prepare a bill for presentation to the legislature of 1917 and (2) to organize the women of the state behind the effort to secure its passage. Letters of invitation to the future members of the committee went out on May twenty second, nineteen months before the convening of the general assembly. Its first meeting was held on June 7, 1916, eighteen months in advance. Five sub-committees of three members each were at once determined upon, i. e., finance, statistics, scope, publicity and legislation. The first of these ultimately raised by private subscription the entire expenses of the campaign—about fifteen hundred dollars. The second, during the summer and early fall, tabulated the commitments of women to all of the county jails for the year ending September 30, 1916, and made an intensive study of the Hartford group. The Social Hygiene Society added to these its own statistical studies and later published and distributed leaflets that were used to good effect during the year. In the autumn of 1916, the committee on scope began active work. Letters were sent to every state in the union for the purpose of securing copies of all women's reformatory legislation enacted up to that time. The laws of the ten states found to have established reformatories, tabulated under separate headings,<sup>87</sup> were presented to the committee as a whole and the provisions best suited to local conditions decided by actual ballot, the committee having first decided in favor of a specific rather than a general law. The outline thus decided upon<sup>88</sup> was placed in the hands of an attorney<sup>89</sup> for legal adaption. Meanwhile the committee on publicity had been carefully organizing its campaign. Hundreds of letters asking for opportunities for its speakers and for the support of the bill were mailed to men's as well as to women's clubs; also to chambers of commerce, granges, inter-city conferences of social workers, Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Girls' Friendly Societies, Equal Suffrage organizations, Congresses of Mothers and to all of the churches of the state. Through

<sup>87</sup>Published in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. VIII, No. 24 (November, 1917), pp. 518-553. Reprinted by the Committee on Delinquent Women of the Connecticut Prison Association, December, 1917. Revision reprinted in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. XIII, No. 3 (November, 1922), pp. 382-407. Reprinted by the Bureau of Social Hygiene, December, 1922.

<sup>88</sup>With the exception of a clause providing for the transfer of women from the state prison, a provision favored by the committee but deleted at the request of the secretary of the State Board of Charities. Since then two unsuccessful attempts to secure this transfer have been made in 1921 and 1923.

<sup>89</sup>Eliot Watrous of New Haven.

cooperation with the Connecticut Social Hygiene Association the latter's executive secretary again spent a large part of her time in filling speaking appointments, making in all two hundred and fifty addresses. In addition to the statistical sheet a small folder representing in question-answer form the need and nature of the proposed institution, were widely distributed. A part time press agent was also employed to prepare copy for the newspapers. As the climax of its work, a mass meeting held in Hartford's largest theatre simultaneously with the opening of the general assembly to which its members were invited, was addressed by Dr. Katherine Bement Davis, formerly superintendent of the Reformatory for Women at Bedford, New York, then parole commissioner of New York City.

The legislative year thus opened auspiciously. Governor Holcomb, in his gubernatorial message for 1917, conceded the increasing need of an institution for a more humane, intelligent and efficient care of unfortunate women than Connecticut now provided, but at the same time drew attention to the serious objection to a new institution on the grounds of initial expense and subsequent maintenance. These objections, he suggested might be minimized by connecting it with the Industrial School for Girls whose site was ideal and on which the state had already spent substantial sums. His recommendation, therefore, was the appointment of a commission to investigate the feasibility of the plan and its probable cost, reporting at the same session, if practicable, if not, at the next assembly. Thus, curiously, the effort to ally these two institutions in 1864 was repeated more than half a century later, but, fortunately, not with the same results.

Three bills were introduced, partly as the result of the governor's suggestion but also because of the inherent difficulty in ascertaining and in bringing together all the individuals interested in but working independently for the same object. Senate bill 124<sup>90</sup> provided for a commission along the lines of the governor's recommendation. Senate Bill 12,<sup>91</sup> modelled on the act which had created the reformatory for men, called for an appropriation of four hundred thousand dollars to establish a similar institution for women. Senate Bill 126<sup>92</sup> was the one prepared and sponsored by the Connecticut Prison Association. These bills were referred to the committee on humane institutions. At once, urgent invitations to have delegates present at the approaching

---

<sup>90</sup>Introduced by George W. Klett of the sixth district.

<sup>91</sup>Introduced by Charles C. Hemenway of the second district and the Hartford Times.

<sup>92</sup>Introduced by Henry H. Lyman of the third district.

public hearings were dispatched to the eighty-four towns<sup>93</sup> in which one or more of the organizations already described had branches, also to a large number of individuals known to be interested. The response was such as to overflow the regular committee room, to cause adjournment and to fill the former senate chamber. In spite of the fact that three bills had been introduced by three independent agencies the spirit of cooperation finally prevailed. No one appeared for the first bill, probably because both of the other two had been altered to provide for the use of the property belonging to the industrial school for girls if found feasible, but chiefly because public opinion was so overwhelmingly in favor of immediate action and of a separate institution. The sponsor for the second bill appeared but gallantly withdrew it for a substitute bill which was the third with a few minor changes made at his request. This action left the field open for the consideration of the association's bill which summarized not only the best features of the laws of other states but, what was more important for its passage, spoke the language of Connecticut by incorporating those sound penological principles which had been developing in the state for more than a century—the fundamental principles of *sex segregation*, of *employment during imprisonment*, of *reform through education*, of the *family group of housing*, of the *indeterminate sentence* and of *parole* to which had been added the still more modern requirements of *classification*, of *mental and physical examination*, of the *resident woman physician*, the *admission of infants with their mothers*, of *freedom of transfer among state institutions*, of the *all-woman staff* and of the *institutional title without stigma*.

The hearing had been planned with extreme finesse. The need of the institution from its various angles, the research work of the committee and a description of similar institutions in other states, illustrated by photographs, were presented briefly by chosen speakers. After

<sup>93</sup>FAIRFIELD COUNTY, Bethel, Bridgeport, Danbury, Darien, Fairfield, Greenwich, Huntington, New Canaan, Norwalk, Ridgefield, Sherman, Stamford, Stratford and Westport; HARTFORD COUNTY, Berlin, Bristol, Canton, East Hartford, East Windsor, Enfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Hartford, Manchester, New Britain, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, Southington, South Windsor, Suffield, West Hartford, Windsor and Windsor Locks; LITCHFIELD COUNTY, Kent, Litchfield, New Milford, North Canaan, Plymouth, Sharon, Thomaston, Torrington, Washington, Watertown, Winchester, Woodbury and Warren; MIDDLESEX COUNTY, Chatham, Clinton, Cromwell, East Haddam, Middlefield, Middletown and Portland; NEW HAVEN COUNTY, Ansonia, Branford, Cheshire, Derby, East Haven, Hamden, Madison, Meriden, Middlebury, Milford, New Haven, North Haven, Orange, Seymour, Wallingford and Waterbury; NEW LONDON COUNTY, Griswold, Groton, New London, Norwich and Stonington; TOLLAND COUNTY, Ellington, Stafford and Vernon; WINDHAM COUNTY, Brooklyn, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfort, Putnam, Thompson and Windham.

this, one by one, the delegates from the various organizations rose rapidly from the floor and from the gallery, naming his or her organization and the number of members represented. The general effect was a very striking and convincing proof of the strong, state-wide, determined and united sentiment, especially among women, for the immediate establishment of a reformatory for women in Connecticut. With suffrage imminent, this demonstration won the day. Senate Bills 12 and 124 were formally rejected in favor of the substitute for S. B. 126.<sup>94</sup> This was favorably reported on April third, referred to the committee on appropriations, which at once approved its modest request for fifty thousand dollars, passed by the house on May eighth, by the senate on May tenth and became Chapter 358 of the public Acts of 1917 by the signature of governor Holcomb on May sixteenth, nineteen hundred and seventeen—fifty-three years after the initial attempt to secure the consideration of a correctional institution for women in the state of Connecticut.

\* \* \* \* \*

A brief summary will throw into clearer relief the peaks of this prolonged movement. As indicated by the legislative records it began in 1864 and lasted, intermittently, until 1917. During this time three distinct waves of public interest are apparent: the first between the years 1864 and 1867; the second between 1893 and 1909 and the third between 1901 and 1917.

The first began in 1864 with the attempt to secure from a commission already established for another purpose the consideration of institutions for both wayward girls and delinquent women. Unsuccessful, it renewed its efforts in 1866, won a special commission for this purpose but came to a stand-still in 1867 when the latter reported against the project for women and the general assembly refused to establish the institution for girls. During the twenty-six years which followed no further legislation was attempted.

The second of these joint endeavors, i. e., the attempt to found a duplex institution for both men and women, began in 1893 and lasted until 1909. Unsuccessful in 1893 it succeeded in getting a law passed in 1895 only to have it repealed in 1897. Renewed in 1901, 1903, 1907 and in 1909, the efforts were abandoned in the latter year when the reformatory for men was established.

The third wave of interest, characterized by its attempts to secure a separate and independent institution for delinquent women, was latent in and arose almost simultaneously with the desire to es-

---

<sup>94</sup>File No. 774.

establish the joint reformatory in 1893 but did not emerge as a distinct issue until 1901; it lasted from that year to its successful outcome in 1917. The first bill for a separate woman's reformatory was introduced in 1901, the second in 1903, after which no legislation was attempted until after the men's reformatory had been granted in 1909. For the first time freed from entangling alliances, efforts were renewed in 1911, resulting in an unsuccessful bill, with a successful bill for a special commission in 1913, a fourth rejected bill in 1915 followed by a victorious end in 1917.

During the movement taken as a whole, from 1864 to 1917, eighteen bills were introduced. Five of them concerned the use or creation of commissions—in 1864, 1866, 1911, 1913 and 1917; eight, the establishment of a woman's reformatory as a separate department in a joint institution for men and women—in 1893, 1895, 1901 (2), 1903, 1907 and 1909 (2); and five the separate and independent institution—in 1901, 1903, 1915 and in 1917 (2).

Apart from the legislative record with which this article has been chiefly concerned, certain generalizations as to social technique lift themselves up out of the confusion of the years. The woman's reformatory movement was a protest against the unhygienic, uneconomical, unjust and unethical treatment hitherto afforded delinquent women in Connecticut. Its ultimate goal was the establishment of a correctional institution supported by the state in which the essential and fundamental reformatory principles would be applied for their rehabilitation. Its progress toward this goal has been found to depend 1. on the education of the general public, especially on that of its women members, as to the necessity and the nature of such an institution, and 2. on the organization and direction of this educated opinion for legislative action.

The obstacles to progress, both in education and in organization, were both negative and positive and both difficult of removal. The educational progress was hampered, on its negative side, by an indifference based on subconscious satisfaction with the penal system as it was but still more on the lack of faith in the redeemability of the human spirit, particularly the human spirit in the body feminine. On the positive side, it was handicapped by the antipathy of women to the public discussion of sexual problems, by the unwillingness of the taxpayers to make a doubtful investment when other more popular demands were before them and, on the part of those directly associated with the present system, resentment at the implied criticism and the proposed disintegration of that system.

In view of these obstacles the educational process, on its positive side, was necessarily slow and laborious. Compared with other delinquent groups in the community, the number of delinquent women was small, less hopeful and the appeal for them less dramatic in character. Before the public could be taught to feel the vital needs of this particular group, it had first to be trained to respond to the needs of the larger, the more hopeful and the more picturesque groups, i. e., the juvenile delinquents of both sexes and the young men offenders. Thus, though the women's reformatory movement was an integral part of the general reformatory urge and was at times with difficulty disassociated with other reformatory projects, it was compelled to wait its turn in patience at the legislative turnstile until these groups had been provided for. From this enforced delay, however, certain advantages were gained—complete separation of the issue, greater solidarity of interest, increased momentum and a fuller, richer inheritance accrued from many years of experiment on the part of private and public institutions. Without these Reformatory R's thus established—complete institutional separation of the sexes, the indeterminate sentence, the cottage system facilitating classification, reform through physical rehabilitation, employment and education rather than punishment, and parole—such an institution would not have been ready for a complete existence.

The general public educated to accept these principles and the more popular institutions established, organization for legislative action encountered, on the negative side, inertia, confusion of ideas as to the form which the institution should take, lack of cooperation between the various groups interested and the difficulty of securing militant leadership at the right psychological moment. On the positive side there was, again, the active opposition of those genuinely satisfied with the system and the readily organized political hierarchy in behalf of its followers employed in that system. That these obstacles can be surmounted by patience and intelligence has been demonstrated. In Connecticut the victory was finally won by the creation of an overwhelming demand for the institution from a large, obvious and influential number of citizenry, by a clear cut plan, by a well planned campaign, by a leadership at once strong, intelligent and logical and by the choice of the right psychological moment for the presentation of this demand.

Taken as a whole, the woman's reformatory movement in Connecticut was built, like the coral reef, by the contributed efforts of countless, forgotten and unthanked men and women in many and varied



organizations and as individuals in public health, in social hygiene, in churches, in clubs and in other groups but it finally came to rest upon the laps of the progressive and public spirited women of the community, for many years waiting their emancipation from lack of sympathy with the handicapped of their own sex, from their reluctance to appear publicly in their behalf, from their inexperience in cooperative effort and from their lack of influence in the body politic.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Connecticut Archives. Crimes and Misdemeanors, 1663-1789. Index. Entries under Crime; Newgate Prison; Workhouses.  
Public Records of the Colony and State of Connecticut, 1636-1781.  
Private Acts of the Connecticut General Assembly, 1789-1917.  
Public Acts and Laws of Connecticut, 1672-1917.  
Journals of the General Assembly: Senate, 1840-1917; House, 1837-1917.  
Messages of the Connecticut Governors, 1812-1917.  
Connecticut Reports:  
    Newgate Prison, 1773-1825.  
    Connecticut State Prison, 1828-1917.  
    Connecticut Commissions relating to Penal Affairs, 1786-1917.  
    Connecticut State Board of Charities, 1882-1917.  
    Connecticut Prison Association, 1878-1917.  
    Connecticut Industrial School for Girls, 1870-1917.  
    Connecticut Conferences of Charities and Correction, 1910-1917.  
    Florence Crittenden Mission, New Haven, 1902-1917.  
Proceedings:  
    National Conference of Social Work, 1874-1917.  
    National Prison Association, 1872-1917.