

## Part II

### STATISTICS RELATING TO SOCIAL STATUS OF OFFENDERS

The Committee on Statistics of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology in its statement of the minimum requirements of Criminal Court records reported that court statistics should furnish information not only regarding the criminal process but should furnish also the following data regarding the social status of the defendants:\* Age, sex, color, race, birthplace of parents, conjugal condition, education, occupation, citizenship and previous convictions. It is important to note that the reports of the Municipal Court of Chicago, excellent as they are on the whole, do not contain information on one of these points. The reports of the police department, however, furnish some of the information. Statistics showing age, sex, conjugal condition, color, nationality, and occupations are given in the police reports. Statistics regarding education, citizenship and previous convictions are not furnished in Chicago either in the police or court reports. Moreover, it should be noted that the police statistics relating to nationality and occupation are far from satisfactory. The table of occupations is not very dependable since the occupations of more than 10 per cent are not given at all. The statistics for "nativity" are not at all equivalent to the more accurate data regarding "race, birthplace and birthplace of parents" recommended by the Committee on Criminal Statistics.

In the following pages, then, such statistics as are available regarding the social status of those arrested in Chicago are presented. It should be explained that in all the tables that follow, the statistics relate to "persons arrested" and not to "charges." Since nearly all the tables in Part I dealt with "charges" instead of with "persons arrested," the 1913 total in the two parts will be different.†

#### Sec. 1. Age and Sex of Chicago Offenders.

In the following table are presented statistics from the **Annual Report of the Police Department, 1913**, showing the age and sex of the persons arrested in 1913:

TABLE 27. NUMBER OF MEN AND WOMEN ARRESTED BY AGE GROUPS.

Age	Male			Female			Total	
	No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent		No.	Per cent
Under 16 yrs of age	40	*		6	.1		46	*
From 16 to 19 yrs.	12,151	12.7		817	6.9		12,968	12.1
From 20 to 24 yrs.	23,433	24.6		3,639	30.9	85.0	27,072	25.3
From 25 to 29 yrs.	19,500	20.4	69.2	2,776	23.6		22,276	20.8
From 30 to 39 yrs.	23,093	24.2		2,767	23.5		25,860	24.1
From 40 to 49 yrs.	11,478	12.0		1,307	11.1		12,785	11.9
From 50 to 59 yrs.	4,401	4.6		355	3.0		4,756	4.4
60 years and over..	1,390	1.5		105	.9		1,494	1.4
Total .....	95,486	100.0		11,771	100.0		107,257	100.0
Per cent .....	89.0	....		11.0	....		100.0	....

\*Less than 1 per cent.

\*See *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. I: 426 (Sept., 1910).

†See Table 1, note, in Part I of this report. In 1913 there were 107,257 "persons arraigned" and 109,764 "charges," so that there were 2,507 cases of more than one charge against the same person. It should, however, be explained further that if the same person is arrested at different times, this is, of course, counted as two arrests since there is in Chicago no method of counting repeaters.

For this reason, our statistics showing "number of persons arrested," do not bear comparison in any exact way with English statistics, since the English method is to count each person arrested only once, and if anyone is arrested more than once, this fact appears in the statistics of previous convictions.

This table shows that in Chicago, as in all other parts of this and other countries, the great majority of the persons charged with crimes or misdemeanors are adult males between twenty and forty years of age. Thus, in Chicago, 89 per cent of those arrested were males, and 69.2 per cent of the total number of males arrested were between the ages of twenty and forty. It is important to note, however, that in Chicago a large number of boys under twenty are among those arrested. Last year more than 12,000 boys between the ages of sixteen and twenty were arrested. Looking at the table of percentages carefully, it is clear that youth is an important factor in crime and disorder. Thus 12.1 per cent were under twenty years of age, 57.7 per cent were under thirty, and 81.9 per cent were under forty years of age.

### Sec. 2. Chicago's Women Offenders.

Table 27, which shows that only 11 per cent of the persons arrested in Chicago in 1913 were women and girls, should be compared with the following table from the most recent United States Census Report on Prisoners. This report, published in 1910, gives the following statistics regarding the sex of prisoners committed during 1910 to the two state penitentiaries of Illinois, the Cook County Jail, and the Chicago House of Correction.

TABLE 28. SEX OF PERSONS COMMITTED TO ILLINOIS STATE PENITENTIARIES, COOK COUNTY JAIL, AND HOUSE OF CORRECTION.

Committed to	Male		Female		Total	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
State penitentiaries (Joliet and Menard) .....	821	97.3	23	2.7	844	100.0
Cook County Jail .....	595	90.2	65	9.8	660	100.0
Chicago House of Correction .....	11,410	89.3	1,379	10.7	12,789	100.0

This table is of interest in showing that the percentage of women prisoners is greatest in the House of Correction and smallest in the penitentiary, where only 2.7 per cent of the prisoners are women.

Examining the statistics in Table 27 relating to the age of the women arrested, it appears that a large proportion of the women are, like the men, under forty years of age. Seven per cent were young girls between the ages of sixteen and twenty, 61.5 per cent were under thirty, and 85 per cent were under forty years of age.

With more than eleven thousand\* women and girls arrested in a single year, it seems important to bring together such other statistics as are available relating to Chicago's women offenders. The question of greatest interest is probably the reason for their arrest.

The following tables show the number of charges against the women arrested, the character of the charges, i. e., whether they were felonies or misdemeanors, and the disposition of the cases in the Municipal or Criminal Court.

TABLE 29. CHARGES: MEN AND WOMEN OFFENDERS, 1913.

Offenses.	Men.		Women.	
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.
Felonies .....	10,237	10.5	966	7.8
Misdemeanors .....	87,156	89.5	11,405	92.2
Total .....	97,393	100.0	12,371	100.0

\*The police report shows 11,771 women arraigned, but it should be pointed out that the number of women arrested was probably considerably larger than this. In the year 1912, for example, there were 9,561 women arraigned, but the police matron's report, published in the General Superintendent's report for that year, showed 12,631 women and 1,851 young girls arrested and brought to the different police stations in the same year. Unfortunately, the chief matron's report is not included in the report for 1913: The following table showing the number brought to the different precinct stations is taken therefore from the report for 1912:

Women arrested .....	12,631
Young girls arrested .....	1,851
Total .....	14,482

As a matter of fact even this total of 14,482 women and girls arrested is very far still from the total number of wretched, degraded, criminal, or

Table 29 shows that less than 8 per cent of the women arrested were charged with felonies and that 92.2 per cent were charged only with misdemeanors. Corresponding statistics for the men arrested are presented in the same table, and show that 10.5 per cent of the men were arrested on felony charges and 89.5 per cent for misdemeanors; that is, a slightly larger percentage of the men than of the women are charged with serious offenses. A comparison between the percentages of men and women convicted and discharged, which is also important, is presented in Table 30.

TABLE 30. NUMBER AND PER CENT OF MEN AND WOMEN CONVICTED AND DISCHARGED.

Disposition	Men.		Women.	
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.
Convicted and held.....	43,629	44.8	5,946	48.1
Discharged .....	53,764	55.2	6,425	51.9
Total number arrested...	97,393	100.0	12,371	100.0

Although the total number of men arrested is almost eight times the number of women arrested, this table shows that the percentage of convictions is slightly higher among women than among men. This may be due to the fact, shown in the next table, that a larger percentage of the women who are convicted are fined and that convictions are more easily secured for that reason.

TABLE 31. DISPOSITION OF CASES OF MEN AND WOMEN CONVICTED.

Disposition	Men.		Women.	
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.
Sentenced .....	2,379	5.4	163	2.8
Fined .....	38,697	88.7	5,437	91.4
Paroled .....	1,597	3.7	321	5.4

dependent women who passed through the police stations during the year. The following table, taken from the chief matron's report, is important enough to be included:

Disposition of Women Brought to Police Stations, 1912.  
(FROM CHIEF MATRON'S REPORT.)

Sent to House of Correction.....	1,032
Sent to House of Good Shepherd.....	82
State Home for Female Juvenile Court.....	577
Sent to Erring Woman's Refuge.....	17
Sent to Martha Washington Home.....	21
Held to Criminal Court.....	144
Sent to County Jail.....	12
Fined .....	2,908
Released on Peace Bonds.....	121
Discharged by the Court.....	5,371
Held as Witnesses.....	2,318
Insane Women Sent Home.....	88
Insane Women Sent to Detention Hospital.....	205
Runaway Girls Returned to their Parents.....	300
Runaway Girls Returned to Institutions.....	24
Destitute Women Sent to County Agent.....	37
Destitute Women Sent to Home for the Friendless.....	50
Destitute Women Sent to Aid Societies.....	26
Destitute Women, Employment Found.....	73
Sick Women Sent Home.....	127
Sick Women Sent to Hospital.....	135
Women Lodgers .....	1,617
Lost Women Returned to their Homes.....	161
Children Lodgers .....	1,255
Destitute Children Sent to Home for the Friendless.....	20
Destitute Children Handed over to Humane Society.....	2
Lost Children Sent Home.....	2,731
Foundlings Sent to St. Vincent's Infant Asylum.....	34
Foundlings Sent to Foundlings' Home.....	3
Boys .....	1,521
Returned to Courts.....	3,459
Total .....	24,471

Disposition.	Men.		Women.	
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.
Weekly payments or peace bonds .....	956	2.2	25	.4
Total convicted .....	43,629	100.0	5,946	100.0

From the statistics of disposition presented in Table 31, it is evident that a very small per cent of the men and women convicted, only 5.4 per cent of the men and 2.8 per cent of the women, were sentenced to imprisonment of any kind. The great majority of those convicted, 88.7 per cent of the men and 91.4 per cent of the women, were fined. But although only 163 women were sentenced in 1913, a large number were committed for the non-payment of fines, and the records of the House of Correction show 1,568 women were committed there in 1913. The large proportion of women fined and the large proportion committed for the non-payment of fines is explained by an examination of the offenses for which they are arrested. Table 32 shows the specific offenses, both felonies and misdemeanors, for which women were arrested and convicted in 1913.

TABLE 32. OFFENSES FOR WHICH WOMEN WERE ARRESTED IN 1913.

I. Felonies (including all larcenies.)

Offenses.	Arrests.	Convictions.
Abduction and kidnaping.....	8	...
Abortion .....	5	...
Arson .....	7	...
Burglary .....	21	2
Confidence game .....	35	6
Contributing to delinquency .....	80	43
Embezzlement and forgery.....	11	...
Larceny .....	639	254
Malicious mischief .....	13	3
Murder and manslaughter.....	58	3
Receiving stolen property.....	44	7
Robbery .....	24	6
Threats to kidnap or murder.....	5	3
Other felonies .....	16	...
Total Felonies .....	966	327

Burglary includes Accessory and Attempted and Having Burglar's Tools; Larceny includes Accessory and Attempted; Murder includes Accessory and Assault to Commit; Robbery includes Accessory and Assault to Commit; Conspiracy, Counterfeiting, Incest, Perjury, Abandonment of child under one year old (1 case), Pandering (1 case), and Bigamy (3 cases) are included under Other Felonies.

II. Misdemeanors.

	Arrests.	—Convictions—	
		Num-ber,	Per cent of Arrests
"Disorderly Cases" (including vice).....	10,849	5,326	49.1
Adultery, etc. ....	210	64	...
Disorderly conduct .....	6,229	1,993	...
Inmates of disorderly houses and houses of ill fame	2,254	1,644	...
Keepers of houses of ill fame.....	418	315	...
Inmates or keepers of opium dens.....	22	15	...
Street walkers .....	1,645	1,273	...
Vagrancy .....	71	22	...
Miscellaneous .....	556	293	52.7
Assault .....	86	37	...
Carrying concealed weapons.....	16	13	...
Inmates of gambling houses.....	10	5	...

## REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

	Arrests.	—Convictions—	
		Num- ber.	Per Cent of Arrests.
Keepers of gambling houses.....	31	3	...
Motor vehicle violations.....	17	13	...
Obtaining money or goods by false pretenses.....	29	9	...
Resisting an officer.....	7	3	...
Selling liquor to minors or drunks.....	9	5	...
Other misdemeanors .....	351	205	...
Total misdemeanors .....	11,405	5,619	49.3
Total felonies .....	966	327	33.9
Total all offenses.....	12,371	5,946	48.1

This table shows that the different forms of disorderly conduct, including under this classification the various offenses against public morals, were charged against 95 per cent of the women arrested for misdemeanors in 1913. The percentage of convictions was very much higher for these cases than for the offenses classified as felonies; that is, 33.9 per cent of those arrested on felony and larceny charges were convicted, whereas 49.1 per cent of those arrested for the "disorderly" offenses were convicted. It is also of special importance to note that more than one-third (34.2 per cent) of all the women arrested for misdemeanors were charged with the specific offenses of street-soliciting or being inmates of houses of ill-fame. According to the Illinois Statutes, women cannot be sentenced for these offenses, they can only be fined. All of those interested in the proper care and treatment of women of this group unite in condemning the system of fining. The Chicago Vice Commission recommended the abolition of fines for this offense, and it is safe to say that little can be done for the women of this group until the present method of treatment is radically changed.

Other statistics of importance concerning the women offenders of Chicago are those showing color and nationality. The following table presents the statistics given in the police report concerning general nativity of the women arrested in 1913. For purposes of comparison statistics from the federal census are given showing the general nativity of the female population over fifteen years of age:

TABLE 33. GENERAL NATIVITY OF WOMEN OFFENDERS:  
CHICAGO POLICE REPORT: 1913.

Nativity.	Arrests.		Convictions.		Female Population 15 Years and Over, 1910.	
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.
American—						
White .....	6,823	55.1	3,532	59.4	410,034	53.9
Colored .....	1,827	14.8	1,019	17.1	17,962	2.4
Foreign .....	3,721	30.1	1,395	23.5	332,267	43.7
Total ....	12,371	100.0	5,946	100.0	760,263	100.0

According to this table\* the foreign-born women form a very small percentage of the women arrested in 1913 in comparison with their percentage of the population. That is, although 43.7 per cent of the total female population fifteen years of age and over were foreign born, only 30.1 per cent of the women arrested and only 23.5 per cent of the women convicted were foreign born. The percentage of white American women arrested is slightly in excess of their share of the population and the per cent of white Americans among those convicted is still higher, 59.4 per cent of those convicted and 55.1 per cent of those arrested, in comparison with 53.9 per cent of the female population over fifteen years of age.† It is the colored women, however, who

\*For discussion of the value of these statistics, see the section on "Crime and Immigration."

†The following table shows the number of women belonging to the various nationalities together with the percentage distribution of the population by nationalities. Unfortunately it is not possible to obtain comparable statistics of the female population by nationalities. So the percentage distribution of the total population of both sexes is given. It is pointed out in the section dealing with Immigration and Crime that this results in a comparison unfair

make the most unfavorable showing in this table. Although the colored women form only 2.4 per cent of the total female population over fifteen years of age, 14.8 per cent of the women arrested are colored and 17.1 per cent of the women convicted are colored. This disproportionately large share of colored women offenders may be attributed largely to the generally unfortunate position in which the whole colored race finds itself, the difficulty of securing and holding employment, the difficulty of finding suitable places to live, the proximity of segregated vice districts to colored residence districts, and the fact that because of the assumption that they belong to an inferior race, young colored women find themselves in a peculiarly defenseless and unprotected position.

### Sec. 3. Statistics Relating to Crime and Immigration in Chicago.

The next item of importance relating to the social status of offenders for which statistics are available is that of nativity. It has already been pointed out that none of the Chicago reports furnishes information regarding "birthplace" or "birthplace of parents" of offenders, the items included in the minimum requirements as laid down by the Committee on Statistics. The "nativity" of persons arrested and convicted is, however, given in the annual report of the Superintendent of Police. The question as to how far these statistics of "nativity" are trustworthy must, of course, be considered. In general, the method of having information about country of birth hurriedly entered by a police officer at the time of an arrest or an arraignment would undoubtedly result in many errors. It is quite probable, however, that the errors would be, on the whole, "unbiased"; that is, some English-speaking immigrants, whose foreign birth was not easily indicated by their speech, would probably be called "American"; but, on the other hand, quite as many American-born citizens who had loyally kept their foreign names or who spoke with a foreign accent would undoubtedly be called Italian, Polish or Russian. It should be noted that the number and the per cent of colored persons arrested would probably be correct.

The following table shows the general nativity of those charged and convicted in 1913, together with the general nativity of the population fifteen years of age and over; that is, the population subject to arrest.\*

to the immigrant, particularly to those belonging to the races of the "recent immigration"; this fact is less important here, however, since every foreign group, except the French, shows a smaller proportion of women offenders than their share of the population entitles them to have.

### NATIVITY OF WOMEN OFFENDERS: ALL OFFENSES. POLICE REPORTS, 1913.

Nativity.	Arrests.		Convictions.		Per Cent Distribution, Chicago Population.
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	
American—					
White .....	6,823	55.1	3,532	59.4	62.2
Colored .....	1,827	14.8	1,019	17.1	2.1
Foreign .....	3,621	30.1	1,395	23.5	35.7
Austrian .....	414	3.3	168	2.8	6.0
English .....	242	2.0	104	1.8	3.2
French .....	59	.5	40	.7	.1
German .....	1,052	8.5	364	6.1	8.3
Greek .....	17	.1	4	.1	.3
Hollanders .....	4	...	2	...	.4
Irish .....	448	3.6	159	2.7	3.0
Italian .....	183	1.5	92	1.6	2.1
Russian .....	924	7.5	304	5.1	5.6
Scandinavian .....	208	1.7	96	1.6	4.5
Other .....	170	1.4	62	1.0	2.2
Total.....	12,371	100.0	5,946	100.0	100.0

\* The population above the Juvenile Court age, that is 17 years for boys and 18 years for girls should be taken, but general nativity is given in the census only by age groups, and 15 to 20 is the nearest age group. This method of comparing the general nativity of those arrested or convicted with

TABLE 34. TOTAL ARRESTS AND CONVICTIONS BY GENERAL NATIVITY. (COMPILED FROM POLICE REPORT, 1913.)

Nativity.	Arrests.		Convictions.		Population Over 15 Years Per Cent Distribution.
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	
American—					
White .....	63,578	57.9	29,429	59.4	50.9
Colored .....	7,450	6.8	3,552	7.2	2.4
Foreign .....	38,736	35.3	16,594	33.4	46.7
Total .....	109,764	100.0	49,575	100.0	100.0

Comparing first the distribution of arrests with the distribution of the population over fifteen years of age, it appears that the Americans, both white and colored, have a larger percentage of arrests than their proportion of population entitles them to have, while the immigrant, who forms 46.7 per cent of the population, furnishes only 35.3 per cent of the arrests. Comparing the convictions with population, the American, both white and colored, makes a still more unfavorable showing; that is, 59.4 per cent of the convictions were Americans (white), while their percentage of the population was only 50.9 per cent, whereas the immigrants, who formed 46.7 per cent of the population, were only 33.4 per cent of those convicted.

It is important to note that these statistics agree with the results of other investigations bearing on the relation between crime and immigration. The federal Immigration Commission, for example, although notoriously in favor of a restrictive policy, said quite emphatically:

"No satisfactory evidence has yet been produced to show that immigration has resulted in an increase in crime disproportionate to the increase in adult population. Such comparable statistics of crime and population as it has been possible to obtain indicate that immigrants are less prone to commit crime than are native Americans.\*

In the special report of the United States Census on Prisoners in Institutions, the statement is made, after an analysis of the statistics presented, that "The figures . . . give little support to the popular belief that the foreign born contribute to the prison class greatly in excess of their representation in the general population"; and, again, it is said: "It is evident that the popular belief that the foreign born are filling the prisons has little foundation in fact. It would seem, however, that they are slightly more prone than the native whites to commit minor offenses. Probably to some degree

the population 15 years and over is that used in the United States Census of Prisoners, 1904. In the introduction to that volume, the following explanation is given: "If the general population of all ages be taken, the basis for the comparison will not be equitable for several reasons. Inmates of the general prisons are all at least 10 years of age and nearly all over 15. For the most part the immigrants are between 15 and 40 years of age. The number of children under 10 years of age is extremely small among the white immigrants as compared with the native whites. In view of these facts a comparison of the proportions of each nativity class in the white prison population with the corresponding proportions of the general population of all ages would clearly be unfair, for the inclusion of children under 10 years of age would so increase the proportion of native in the general population that it would seem as if crime were more prevalent among the foreign born as compared with the native white than is actually the case. \* \* \* In some respects, however, a comparison with the total white population 10 years of age and over is hardly fair to the foreign born. Very few prisoners are under the age of 15, and the great majority of prisoners, 94.5 per cent of the whole number, are males. Therefore, it is perhaps more significant when the percentage of foreign born among white prisoners is compared with the percentage of foreign born in the white population 15 years of age and over, classified by sex." (From Special Report of the Census Office: Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions, 1904, pp. 18-19.)

\*See Reports of the U. S. Immigration Commission, Vol. 36, Immigration and Crime, page 1.

this is attributable to the fact that the foreign born whites are more highly concentrated in urban communities."\*

The question as to whether the percentage of offenses committed by immigrants is greater for the more serious crimes than for the lesser ones is of interest. The Chicago police statistics show that there is no appreciable difference in the proportion of immigrant offenders when the statistics for felonies and for misdemeanors are considered separately. The following tables show the number of arrests and convictions for felonies and for misdemeanors instead of for "all offenses."

TABLE 35. GENERAL NATIVITY OF PERSONS ARRESTED AND CONVICTED: 1913.

I. Persons Arrested.

Nativity.	Felonies.		Misdemeanors.		Total.		Population
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	Over 15 Yrs.
American—							
White .....	6,200	55.4	57,378	58.2	63,578	57.9	50.9
Colored ....	1,055	9.4	6,395	6.5	7,450	6.8	2.4
Foreign .....	3,948	35.2	34,788	35.3	38,736	35.3	46.7
Total ..	11,203	100.0	98,561	100.0	109,764	100.0	100.0

II. Persons Convicted.

Nativity.	Felonies.		Misdemeanors.		Total.		Population
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	Over 15 Yrs.
American—							
White .....	2,389	56.0	27,040	59.7	29,429	59.4	50.9
Colored ....	400	9.4	3,152	6.9	3,552	7.2	2.4
Foreign .....	1,477	34.6	15,117	33.4	16,594	33.4	46.7
Total ..	4,266	100.0	45,309	100.0	49,575	100.0	100.0

These tables show no difference between the percentage of immigrants among those arrested for felonies and for misdemeanors; in each group of offenses only 35.3 per cent were foreign born in comparison with 46.7 per cent which is the immigrant or "foreign born" percentage of the population over fifteen years of age. The percentage of immigrants convicted of felonies is, however, 1.2 per cent greater than the percentage convicted for misdemeanors, though in both cases the percentage of immigrants convicted is less than the percentage of immigrants arrested, and very much less than the per cent of immigrants in the Chicago population.

These statistics seem at first sight not to agree wholly with the United States Special Census Report on Prisoners. In the census report statistics seemed to establish the theory that the native American was more prone to commit serious crimes than the immigrant. But the offenses included in the Chicago police statistics under "felonies" and the offenses included in the census classification under "major offenses" are not the same. It must, in the first place, be remembered that the Chicago police statistics classify as felonies some offenses that are only misdemeanors, and that some of these are important numerically. Furthermore, it is important to note that in the census classification the terms "felony" and "misdemeanor" were discarded and a new classification into "major and minor offenses" substituted. The most important change involved in the new classification was that larceny of all

\*From Special Report of the Census Office: Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions, 1904, pp. 18-19, 40-41. The comparison presented for the United States, as a whole, was as follows:

Among white prisoners of known nativity enumerated June 30, 1904, per cent of foreign born, 23.7.

In the general white population 15 years of age and over, per cent of foreign born, 1900—total, 21.9; male, 23.0; female, 20.7.

See also p. 273, *Statistics and Sociology*, by the late Professor Mayo-Smith, of Columbia University: "Care must be taken to consider the greater proportion of adults among the foreign born. Even then the amount of criminality may be due to the strange environment in which these foreigners find themselves, rather than to any influence of nationality."



kinds, grand or petit, was included among the minor offenses.\* In the Chicago police reports a precisely opposite method of classification is used. All cases of larceny are classified as felonies. Such offenses as taking a piece of fruit from a peddler's pushcart, or grain or coal from a neighboring railway elevation are classed as "felonies," according to the police method. These statistics cannot, therefore, be said to disprove the conclusions drawn in the special census report regarding the tendency on the part of the native American to commit more serious crimes than the foreign born. This fact, that the native American commits the more serious crimes, undoubtedly explains why the percentage of foreign born in the state penitentiary is proportionately much less than the percentage of foreign born convicted. For this certainly cannot be explained by an undue leniency on the part of our courts to the immigrant. The table that follows presents the statistics given in the 1910 Census Report on Prisoners showing the general nativity of the prisoners in the state penal institutions, in the Cook County Jail, and in the Chicago House of Correction.

TABLE 36. GENERAL NATIVITY OF PRISONERS.

A. In State Penal Institutions of Illinois  
(Joliet, Menard, and Pontiac.)

Nativity	Number.	Per Cent.	Distribution of population over 15 years of age in Illinois, Chicago, and Cook County*
American—			
White .....	1,998	59.2	69.1
Colored .....	873	25.9	2.1
Foreign born .....	502	14.9	28.8
Total .....	3,373	100.0	100.0

B. In the Chicago House of Correction.

American—			
White .....	894	55.1	50.9
Colored .....	150	9.2	2.4
Foreign born .....	580	35.7	46.7
Total .....	1,624	100.0	100.0

C. In the Cook County Jail.

American—			
White .....	60	63.8	43.9
Colored .....	13	13.8	2.4
Foreign born .....	21	22.4	53.7
Total .....	94	100.0	100.0

\*The per cent distribution of the population over fifteen years of age is available only for the State of Illinois and for Chicago. In the corresponding column for Cook County the per cent distribution of the male population over twenty-one years of age was substituted.

It seems clear, therefore, that the statistics show beyond any question that a larger proportion of crime is committed by the native American,

\*Except, however, when the term of imprisonment was for more than a year. The new classification was explained as follows: "The terms 'felony' and 'misdemeanor' do not afford a proper means of differentiating the more serious crimes from the lesser ones. . . . To avoid the confusing use of such terms this report distinguishes between major and minor offenses. All crimes that are universally held to be of a grave nature, regardless of how they happen to be punished in individual instances have invariably been classed as major offenses. Among them are the most aggravated forms of offenses against chastity . . . perjury, counterfeiting, and various violations of the United States laws; all the specified crimes against the person; and arson, burglary, forgery, and embezzlement among the specified crimes against property. The rule has been followed of classifying larceny and a number of other offenses, which may or may not be of a serious nature as minor offenses when the term of imprisonment was not for more than one year." (From *Special Report of the Census Office: Prisoners and Juvenile Delinquents in Institutions*, 1904, pp. 28-29.)

whether white or colored, than by the immigrant. That our immigrants form the criminal element of our population today is clearly a myth which has had a hardy survival owing to our desire to shift responsibility for our own faults. No facts have ever been found to substantiate it.

The record of the immigrant is in fact very much better than the statistics show. The great majority of all those arrested are poor people, and the poorer they are the more liable they are to conviction, since they have neither the money to employ able counsel nor intelligence enough to understand how to present their own defense. The immigrant is engaged in occupations that easily involve violations of the laws. The peddling and junk business, for example, is largely in the hands of immigrants, and undesigned violations of ordinances (petty misdemeanors) are common. Moreover, the immigrant stands a chance that the American does not of failing to understand our laws or the methods of our police or our courts. We have no system in Chicago of official interpreters, and the immigrant, particularly the immigrant from southeastern Europe, is certainly at a disadvantage in a court where he understands no one and no one, except possibly an incompetent interpreter, understands him. Keeping in mind these facts, it is indeed remarkable that all statistics relating to this subject show that in spite of all handicaps the immigrant has a better crime record than the rest of us.

Statistics are also available showing arrests and convictions by specific nationalities, but these statistics are likely to be even more inaccurate than those of general nativity.\* Moreover, the census does not give the population of Chicago classified by age and country of birth. There are given statistics showing the male population over twenty-one years by nationalities, and as the great majority of arrests are of this part of the population and as tables have already been given showing the nationality of women offenders, the tables that follow deal with the nationality of male offenders, and in these tables the per cent distribution of male offenders by nationality is compared with the per cent distribution of the male population over twenty-one years of age. The following table shows, therefore, the arrests and convictions of male offenders together with the per cent distribution of the male population over twenty-one years of age:

TABLE 37. NATIONALITY OF MALE PERSONS ARRESTED AND CONVICTED COMPARED WITH NATIONALITY OF MALE POPULATION OVER TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF AGE.

Nativity	Arrests		Convictions		Male population over 21 years of age, 1910	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
American—						
White .....	56,755	58.3	25,897	59.4	301,100	43.1
Colored .....	5,623	5.8	2,533	5.8	17,845	2.6
Foreign .....	35,015	35.9	15,199	34.8	379,850	34.3
Austrian .....	3,683	3.8	1,650	3.8	78,545	11.2
English .....	1,406	1.4	616	1.4	35,818	5.2
French .....	203	.2	100	.2	.....	....
German .....	7,757	7.9	3,343	7.7	88,176	12.6
Greek .....	1,731	1.8	976	2.2	4,496	.6
Hollanders .....	228	.2	123	.3	4,623	.7
Irish .....	2,540	2.6	999	2.3	30,793	4.4
Italian .....	3,364	3.5	1,441	3.3	22,668	3.2
Russian .....	8,546	8.8	3,645	8.4	59,664	8.5
Scandinavian .....	3,071	3.2	1,423	3.2	46,755	6.7
Other .....	2,486	2.5	883	2.0	8,312	1.2
Total .....	97,393	100.0	43,629	100.0	698,795	100.0

†See p. 51.

\*The Immigrants' Protective League, for example, reports that it is not uncommon for the police department to report that an immigrant has been arrested and that, for some reason, the services of the league are required. When the police are asked, "What nationality is the prisoner?" in order that

(In this table Bohemian and Slavonian are included in Austrian; Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish are classed together as Scandinavian; Scotch and Canadian are included under English, Lithuanian under Russian, and Chinese and Swiss under others. Polish were divided among German, Russian, and Austrian according to the method of distribution adopted by the 1910 census, Population, vol. 1, p. 879. The same classification is used in the tables in the footnotes on pages 51 and 57.)

This table shows that the Americans, white and colored both, show a percentage of arrests and convictions considerably greater than their percentage of population. On the other hand, the various foreign groups show almost uniformly a smaller percentage of convictions than their proportion of the population entitles them to have.\*

#### Sec. 4. Occupations: Conjugal Condition.

Data regarding occupations and conjugal condition are next in the list of minimum requirements regarding social status of offenders. The **Annual Report of the Police Department** for 1913 gives a list of 76 different occupations, in which 80,605 of the 107,257 persons arrested were engaged. The occupations of 14,795 other persons were not specified, but were grouped together as "other occupations," and 11,831 persons were returned as having "no occupations." It is probable that a majority of women offenders would have no occupation reported, although 4,789 were reported as "housekeepers," 288 as prostitutes, and 3 as midwives. It is not clear, of course, whether "housekeeper" means more than "housewife" or not. Since the statistics regarding the employment of women are obviously not satisfactory, it seemed well to exclude the women's occupations mentioned above along with the group of "no occupations." The remaining 90,346 persons whose occupations were returned were classified in the police court into 74 occupations, including the miscellaneous group of "other occupations." These 74 groups have been reclassified in thirteen groups. It was first planned to classify all of them into large occupational groups such as "professional men," "merchants and tradesmen," "clerks and salesmen," and "skilled" and "unskilled laborers." There were, however, a few occupations that were so important numerically that it seemed best to leave them as independent groups. These were, in order of numerical importance: chauffeurs and liverymen, peddlers, saloon and bar keepers, city and government employes, students, soldiers and sailors, and farmers. The following table shows, therefore, the occupations of persons arrested in 1913 reclassified from the table of occupations in the police report.

the right kind of interpreter may be sent, the answer is likely to be, "We don't know what nationality he is. He can't speak anything that anyone here can understand." It is safe to say that in such cases the "nationality" of the immigrant is not likely to get into the record correctly.

\*The Italians show an excess of one-tenth of 1 per cent in convictions, and this is surely so small as to be negligible! And the Greeks, who form .6 per cent of the population, form 1.8 per cent of the arrests and 2.2 per cent of the convictions. That is, the Greeks have 1.2 per cent of the arrests and 1.6 per cent of the convictions in excess of the percentage justified by their proportion of the population. In the following tables, which have been compiled separately for felonies and misdemeanors, it appears that the offenses of the Greeks are largely misdemeanors. That is, .7 per cent of the felony convictions were Greek, while 2.4 per cent of the misdemeanor convictions were Greek. This apparent excess of "crime" among the Greeks is undoubtedly due to the fact that the Greeks are largely engaged in the peddling business, and violations of ordinances would undoubtedly bring them to court often.

#### A. Nativity of Male Persons Arrested and Convicted for Felonies, 1913.

Nativity	Arrests (Offenses)		Convictions		Per cent distribution of male population of Chicago 21 years and over
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	
American—					
White .....	5,756	56.3	2,241	56.9	43.1
Colored .....	882	8.6	354	9.0	2.6
Foreign .....	3,599	35.1	1,344	34.1	54.3
Austrian .....	401	3.9	158	4.0	11.2
English .....	166	1.6	79	2.0	5.2
French .....	22	.2	10	.3	....

TABLE 38. OCCUPATIONS OF PERSONS ARRESTED DURING 1913.

*Occupations	Number	Per cent
Professional men .....	1,321	1.5
Merchants and tradesmen .....	3,790	4.2
Clerks, salesmen, etc. ....	9,445	10.4
Skilled laborers .....	13,317	14.7
"Laborers" and other unskilled workers.....	34,331	38.0
Specified occupations—		
Chauffeurs and liverymen .....	7,668	8.5
Peddlers .....	2,041	2.3
Saloon and bar keepers .....	1,871	2.1
City and government employes.....	790	.9
Students .....	494	.5
Soldiers and sailors .....	255	.3
Farmers .....	202	.2
Other occupations .....	14,821	16.4
Total .....	90,346	100.0
†Women's occupations—		
Housekeepers .....	4,789	
Prostitutes .....	288	
Midwives .....	3	
No occupation .....	11,831	
Total .....	107,257	
German .....	815	8.0
Greek .....	139	1.4
Hollanders .....	19	.2
Irish .....	186	1.8
Italian .....	392	3.8
Russian .....	1,027	10.0
Scandinavian .....	214	2.1
Other .....	218	2.1
Total.....	10,237	100.0
	3,939	100.0
	100.0	100.0

## B. Nativity of Male Persons Arrested and Convicted for Misdemeanor, 1913.

Nativity	Arrests (Offenses)		Convictions		Per cent distribution of male population of Chicago 21 years and over
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	
American—					
White .....	50,999	58.5	23,656	59.6	43.1
Colored .....	4,741	5.4	2,179	5.5	2.6
Foreign .....	31,416	36.1	13,855	34.9	54.3
Austrian .....	3,282	3.8	1,492	3.8	11.2
English .....	1,240	1.4	537	1.3	5.2
French .....	181	.2	90	.2	....
German .....	6,942	8.0	2,977	7.5	12.6
Greek .....	1,592	1.8	947	2.4	.6
Hollanders .....	209	.3	115	.3	.7
Irish .....	2,354	2.7	901	2.3	4.4
Italian .....	2,972	3.4	1,333	3.4	3.2
Russian .....	7,519	8.6	3,314	8.3	8.5
Scandinavian .....	2,857	3.3	1,330	3.3	6.7
Other .....	2,268	2.6	819	2.1	1.2
Total.....	87,156	100.0	39,690	100.0	100.0

†These figures are in accord with other inquiries, e. g., U. S. Bureau of Labor, Report on the Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners, Vol. XV, in their evidence showing that the newer industrial and commercial occupations into which women are now going make substantially no contribution to the criminality of women.

\*In reclassifying the list of occupations given in the police report the new

This table shows that a very small minority of those arrested are from the well-to-do groups. Only 1.5 per cent are in the group called professional, 4.2 per cent were classed as merchants and tradesmen, 10.4 per cent were clerks, salesmen, etc., while 38.0 per cent were laborers, teamsters, and other unskilled workers and 14.7 per cent were skilled workingmen. Going back to the tables of arrests, it will be remembered that the great majority of those arrests are for petty offenses; and since the rich are seldom arrested on petty charges, it would be expected that the great majority of the arrests would be arrests of people who were poor, or at any rate not well-to-do.

Statistics of conjugal condition are also furnished in the police report and are given below. These statistics are not very valuable because they are probably not accurate. Married men will sometimes report themselves single when they are arrested for petty offenses, and it would seem, too, from the fact that all persons are reported to be either married or single and no persons are reported with their marital state unknown, that the police statistician may have counted as "single" those for whom no report was given. The following table contains such statistics as are furnished, and it is important to note, even if the "single" group is artificially increased, that 40 per cent of the men arrested are married. This means, of course, that the humiliation and expense of an arrest and trial are shared in a large number of cases by others than those arrested.

TABLE 39. CONJUGAL CONDITION OF PERSONS ARRESTED  
IN 1913.

Conjugal Condition.	Male.		Female.		Total.	
	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.	Number.	Per Cent.
Married .....	38,351	40.2	5,163	43.9	43,514	40.6
Single .....	57,135	59.8	6,608	56.1	63,743	59.4
Total .....	95,486	100.0	11,771	100.0	107,257	100.0

#### Sec. 5. General Summary.

In summarizing the most important points relating to the social status of those arrested in Chicago, the following points should be enumerated:

1. In Chicago, as in all other places for which statistics are available, the great majority of those arrested are men. In 1913 nearly nine-tenths of those arrested were men. The number of women arrested was not only very much smaller than the number of men, but the women were arrested for less serious offenses.

2. In Chicago, again, as in all other places for which statistics are available, the great majority of those arrested are young persons; 57.7 per cent of all the men and 61.5 per cent of all the women arrested were under thirty years of age, and 81.9 per cent of the men and 85 per cent of the women were under forty.

3. The problem of the woman offender appears from the statistics of charges to be the problem of vice. In 1913, 95 per cent of all the women arrested were charged with the different forms of disorderly conduct, including under this classification the various offenses against public morals. More than one-third of all the women arrested were charged with the specific offenses of street soliciting or of occupying a house of ill-fame. According

groups were made up as follows: Under **professional men** were included 173 actors, 71 artists, 176 attorneys, 17 clergymen, 89 dentists, 205 musicians, 590 physicians; under **tradesmen** 440 bakers, 653 butchers, 82 confectioners, 145 druggists, 81 florists, 255 grocers, 152 jewelers, 185 junk dealers, 1,605 merchants, 136 milkmen, 8 stock dealers, 48 undertakers; under **skilled laborers**, 689 barbers, 222 blacksmiths, 226 boilermakers, 1,324 carpenters, 249 cigar-makers, 738 cooks, 111 draughtsmen, 802 electricians, 609 engineers, 33 harness makers, 105 horseshoers, 28 lathers, 2,069 machinists, 491 masons, 338 moulders, 1,382 painters, 21 pattern makers, 214 plasterers, 485 plumbers, 840 printers, 128 roofers, 276 shoemakers, 451 steam fitters, 40 stone cutters, 1,227 tailors, 133 tinsmiths, 69 upholsterers, 17 wagon makers; under **clerks**, 1,381 agents, 157 brokers, 5,187 clerks, 2,720 salesmen; under **city and government employes**, 562 firemen, 23 letter carriers, 25 policemen, 180 street car employes; under **laborers**, 35 bill posters, 734 janitors, 24,004 laborers, 37 miners, 1,236 porters, 611 servants, 7,385 teamsters, 289 watchmen; under **other occupations**, in addition to the group so designated in the report, are included 26 detectives.

to the Illinois Statutes women can only be fined, they cannot be sentenced for these offenses. In 1911 the Vice Commission recommended the abolition of the system of fining for such offenses, but their recommendation has never been carried out.

4. Another point of importance is the fact that the statistics of nativity show that the native American has a larger proportion of arrests than the immigrant. (See Tables 33-37.) Statistics furnished in the police report show that the native Americans, white and colored both, have a percentage of arrests and convictions considerably greater than their percentage of population. On the other hand, the various foreign groups show a smaller per cent of convictions than their proportion of the population entitles them to have. It is, of course, popularly believed that immigration is a cause of crime. This belief has largely been due to a comfortable theory that we are superior to the people of Europe, and to a desire to shift the responsibility for our shortcomings onto other people. No facts have ever been found to support this belief. The Chicago statistics in this respect agree with the statistics furnished by the United States census and the Federal Commission on Immigration. The report of the commission states emphatically that "no satisfactory evidence has yet been produced to show that immigration has resulted in an increase in crime disproportionate to the increase in adult population. Such comparable statistics of crime and population as it has been possible to obtain indicate that immigrants are less prone to commit crime than are native Americans." The special census report on prisoners after analyzing the statistics of nativity for the whole country said that it was "evident that the popular belief that the foreign born are filling the prisons has little foundation in fact." Chicago statistics furnish further confirmation of this statement.

5. The statistics relating to conjugal condition and occupation are not very satisfactory. Insofar as they are to be trusted, they seem to indicate that a majority of the persons arrested, both men and women, are unmarried, and that the great majority are poor persons. The table of occupations indicates that a very small per cent of those arrested are from the well-to-do groups, 38 per cent were laborers and other unskilled workers, and the majority of the others were workingmen from other groups, clerks, salesmen, etc. Since the great majority of the arrests are for petty offenses and since the rich are seldom arrested on petty charges, it would be expected that the great majority of arrests would be arrests of people who were not well-to-do. It is not that the poor are more criminal than the rich, but that their offenses bring them so easily within the reach of the law.

## APPENDIX A

### STATISTICS RELATING TO ADULT PROBATION

Two annual reports have been published by the Adult Probation Office since the Adult Probation Law went into effect (July 1, 1911), and a type-written report has been available for the first six months of 1913-1914. These reports show the number of persons admitted to probation each month, the total number admitted to probation by each judge for the period of a year, the offenses of which the probationers were convicted, and some other data regarding the probationers, such as age, sex, marital condition, color and nationality.

#### Sec. 1. Number of Persons on Probation.

The following table shows the number of persons admitted to probation during the years 1911-12, 1912-13, and the first six months of the year 1913-14:

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF PERSONS ADMITTED TO PROBATION DURING TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS.

Year.	Number of persons admitted to probation.
1911-12 .....	1,074
1912-13 .....	2,874
1913-14 (6 mos.).....	2,422

This table shows that the number of persons admitted to probation has been increasing very steadily. The year 1912-13 showed an increase of more than 150 per cent over the preceding year, and the number admitted during the first six months of the year 1913-14 indicates that there will be an increase of nearly 100 per cent over the year 1912-13. It is, of course, important to know whether or not there was a proportionate increase in the number of probation officers during this period. It appears from the first annual report that there were, in addition to the chief probation officer, 11 adult probation officers in 1911-12, 16 in 1912-13, and 20 in 1913-14. That is, there were 97.6 cases to every officer in the first year, 179.6 in the second year, and 242.2 during the last year. It should be pointed out, however, that these figures do not accurately represent the average number of cases cared for by the different officers because (1) many cases are admitted to probation for shorter terms than one year, and (2) some of the officers are obliged to spend all or a considerable part of their time in court so that they are available for probation work only a portion of their time. The Chief Probation Officer explained that two officers spent all their time in court, that nine spent half a day each at court, and that four others were in court "part of the time." Thus the staff of twenty officers is only a staff of twelve or thirteen officers for active service. (3) The number of cases actually on probation includes a large number of old cases as well as new cases. Thus the total number of persons on probation September 30, 1913, was 2,316; the total number of persons on probation April 1, 1914, was 3,428. It would seem, therefore, as if the number of persons on probation averaged something more than 250 persons to an officer.\* Good probationary care under such circumstances is, of course, impossible. In the Juvenile Court, it may be noted, the probation officers have under their care an average of between fifty and sixty cases.

#### Sec. 2. Offenses of which Probationers were Convicted.

The reports also show the offenses for which the probationers were convicted. The following table shows the offenses of which persons placed on probation in 1912-13 and 1913-14 had been found guilty.

The point of special interest with regard to these lists of offenses is whether or not persons are placed on probation after being convicted of offenses for which the law does not allow probation. Unfortunately, such statistics as are available do not throw much light on this point. It appears that a considerable number of persons who have been convicted of the serious crimes of robbery, burglary, embezzlement, obtaining money under false pretenses, carrying concealed weapons, and receiving stolen property have been placed on probation, but the Adult Probation Law permits probation for all of

\*The Chief Probation Officer could, of course, furnish a statement showing the exact number of cases at present under the care of each officer.

these offenses except robbery, provided the value of the property stolen is not more than \$200 or in the case of burglary provided "the place burglarized was a place other than a business house, dwelling or other habitation."\* There were altogether 167 persons placed on probation for these serious offenses during the first six months of 1913-14, and, while it is not probable that all of these 167 cases fell within the very narrow limits prescribed by the law, the exact offenses can be learned only by a study of the case records of the Adult Probation Office and these have not been examined. With regard to the cases of robbery, however, it should be noted that probation is not allowed by the statute under any circumstances.

TABLE II. OFFENSES OF WHICH PROBATIONERS HAD BEEN CONVICTED, YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1913.

Larceny .....	802	Receiving stolen property.....	20
Disorderly conduct.....	703	Vagrancy .....	19
Contributing to dependency.....	499	Keeping disorderly house.....	14
Abandonment .....	287	Confidence game.....	9
Assault .....	93	Violation 2844 Chicago Code....	9
Soliciting .....	57	Malicious mischief.....	8
False Pretenses.....	54	Inmates disorderly house.....	6
Burglary .....	37	Violation park ordinance.....	5
Contributing to delinquency....	34	Attempted burglary.....	4
Embezzlement .....	31	Patrons house of ill fame.....	4
Carrying concealed weapons....	28	Violation Chap. 38, Sec. 204, R. S.	4
Fornication .....	25	Violation Chap. 38, Sec. 167, R. S.	2
Gambling .....	23	Other causes.....	54
Violation motor law (not speed- ing) .....	22	Total .....	2,874
Adultery .....	21		

TABLE III. OFFENSES OF WHICH PROBATIONERS HAD BEEN CONVICTED DURING SIX MONTHS ENDING MARCH 30, 1914.

Disorderly conduct .....	598	Violating Chicago Code.....	20
Larceny .....	562	Embezzlement .....	13
Contributing to dependency.....	474	Confidence game.....	12
Abandonment .....	196	Malicious mischief.....	12
Assault .....	88	Patrons, disorderly house.....	5
Soliciting .....	74	Violating Motor Vehicle Law...	5
False pretenses.....	54	Robbery .....	4
Burglary .....	39	Keepers, disorderly house.....	3
Carrying concealed weapons....	36	Blackmail .....	1
Vagrancy .....	32	Selling cocaine.....	1
Adultery .....	30	Unlicensed employment agency.	1
Fornication .....	29	Other .....	64
Contributing to delinquency....	28	Total .....	2,422
Receiving stolen property.....	21		
Inmates disorderly house.....	20		

That the tendency to place persons convicted of serious offenses on probation is not decreasing is indicated by the large number of such persons placed on probation during the first six months of the year 1913-14, and this is confirmed by a mimeographed report of the work of the Adult Probation Office for the month of April, 1914, which contains the latest figures available.

\*The Adult Probation Law (Revised Statutes, 1913, Chap. 38) provides that "Power to release on probation, shall, however, be limited to the following offenses" (509b): 1. All violations of municipal ordinances where the offense is also a violation, in whole or in part, of a statute. 2. All misdemeanors, except as hereinafter limited. 3. The obtaining of money or property by false pretenses, where the value thereof does not exceed \$200. 4. Larceny, embezzlement, and malicious mischief where the property taken or converted or the injury done does not exceed \$200 in value and the place burglarized was a place other than a business house, dwelling or other habitation. 6. Burglary, when the burglar is found in a building other than a business house, dwelling house, or other habitation. "Carrying concealed weapons" is a misdemeanor and probation is therefore legal in the case of this offense, but so much public apprehension regarding "gunmen" exists in Chicago that it seems proper to classify them as a serious offense for which probation is of doubtful expediency even if legal.



These figures show that in this one month persons admitted to probation had been convicted of the following serious crimes:

Robbery 6, carrying concealed weapons 12, false pretenses 7, embezzlement 3, forgery 2, burglary 5, receiving stolen property 5, threat to kill 1, attempted rape 1.

This is a total of 42 serious crimes out of a total of 415 for the month. The explanation given for this is that persons charged with serious crimes are convicted of lesser offenses, but through carelessness the charge against them is not changed, and although they are quite properly released on probation, the record still shows them to be guilty of serious crimes. The only way the facts can really be ascertained is to have presented the record of the exact offense actually committed by each person.

### Sec. 3. Results of Probation.

The next point of importance is the question of whether statistics throw any light on the results of probation. The Adult Probation Office classifies all persons discharged as "improved" or "unimproved," and the following table presents the statistics of discharges for the last two and one-half years.

TABLE IV. NUMBER OF DISCHARGED PROBATIONERS WHO WERE FOUND IMPROVED OR UNIMPROVED DURING 2½ YEARS ENDING MARCH 30, 1914.

	Im- proved.	Unim- proved.	Died.	Total Dis- charged.	Total Placed on Probation.	Per Cent Dis- charged.	Per Cent of Discharged Who Were Improved.
First year, 1911-12.....	171	63	1	235	1,074	21.9	72.8
Second year, 1912-13....	1,167	239	8	1,414	2,874	49.2	82.5
Third year, 1913-14.... (6 months.)	987	316	5	1,308	2,422	54.0	75.5
Total 2½ years....	2,325	618	14	2,957	6,370	46.4	78.6

After a careful examination of this table, it appears fair to say that, in round numbers, the discharges are equal to slightly less than one-half of the new cases placed on probation during the same period and the number discharged improved is slightly more than three-fourths of the total number discharged.\*

### Sec. 4. The Questionable Value of such Terms as "Improved" and "Unimproved."

It is obvious, however, that the value of these statistics as to the outcome of probation depends on two points: (1) What precisely is meant by the terms "improved" and "unimproved"; and (2) whether the "unimproved" probationers were proportionately distributed among all classes of offenders or whether they were largely those who had committed the most serious offenses.

With regard to the first point, the printed reports show that in 1911-12 the unimproved group included 21 "committed" probationers and 42 others, and in 1912-13 the unimproved group included 4 "committed or vacated" and 239 others. The reports do not show the number of probationers who have been lost track of or the number absconded and the number committed for violation of probation with the institutions to which the probationers have been committed. With regard to the other point, the reports offer no information. The tables of "improved," "unimproved," etc., are for all probationers and are not given as they should be for the different offenses separately. In fairness to the Adult Probation Office, it should be pointed out that they have had very little clerical assistance, and that the absence of more elaborate statistics should probably be excused on this ground. Some light on the point

\*The Chief Probation Officer in some way draws a different conclusion with regard to the per cent discharged. In his report for six months, after presenting the figures (without percentages) he says: "The general averages of those improved by probation since the law has been in force is about eighty per cent, but during the last six months the percentage is only about seventy-five. The cause is not hard to locate. The domestic cases are by far the most difficult to get good results from, and the officer does not feel like discharging the probationer improved when he knows he is behind in his payments to his wife, does not treat her kindly, drinks or is otherwise bad. We did not commence to get domestic cases till a little over a year ago; and, therefore, are only just commencing to record the results, and this is the first report where any amount of discharges in that class of cases is made."

of the effect of probation on those guilty of serious crimes was obtained from some unpublished material in the Adult Probation Office. This material was the result of an attempt to follow up 148 felony cases that had been placed on probation, including 32 convicted of embezzlement, 34 of robbery, 111 of burglary, and 2 of forgery. As a result of this attempt to check up the records of these 148 cases, 89 were classed as "O. K.," 13 as "fair," 7 as "doubtful," 4 "no good," 3 "not working," 4 "lost," 2 "skipped," 8 "in jail or warrant out," 9 "permitted to go out of town," 9 "no report." This record is, of course, much more illuminating than a mere "improved" and "unimproved" tabulation. Translating "O. K." to mean "doing well," it appears that only 60 per cent were reported in this group, and of the remainder, who it will be noted were considerably more than one-third of the total, some were lost, the inevitable result of having probation officers overburdened with work, others had been committed to jail, and the cases of others were marked, uncertainly, as fair or doubtful or no report. Since these specific terms are so unlike the vague terms "improved" and "unimproved," it is not possible to compare this set of cases with the reports for all offenses. Such a comparison can, in fairness, hardly be attempted since the records of these cases were so much more carefully scrutinized, that this might account for a difference in returns.

#### Sec. 5. A Comparison with the Statistics Relating to Probation in New York City.

A comparison between our probation statistics and similar statistics for New York City is of interest. The **Seventh Annual Report of the New York State Probation Commission** (1913) gives the following statistics relating to adult probation in New York City.

TABLE V. NUMBER OF PERSONS PLACED ON PROBATION IN THE DIFFERENT COURTS IN NEW YORK CITY, YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30, 1913, TOGETHER WITH NUMBER OF PROBATION OFFICERS.

Court.	Persons Placed on Probation.			No. Probation Officers.
	Men.	Women.	Both.	
Magistrates Courts—				
1st Division .....	1,302	563	1,865	21
2nd Division .....	2,891	612	3,503	29
Special Sessions .....	785	105	890	16
Total .....	4,978	1,280	6,258	66

If we compare these with our Chicago figures, it appears that the number of cases placed on probation in New York City is greater; 6,258 cases compared with 2,874 cases in Chicago. That the number should be greater is to be expected because the population of New York is greater and also because the adult probation system there is very much older than in Chicago. Thus, the year for which statistics have been quoted was only the second year of the adult probation system in Chicago, whereas it was the sixth year of the corresponding system in New York. Of very great interest, therefore, is the fact that the last year (1913-14), which has seen a great increase in the number of persons placed on probation in Chicago, has witnessed a decrease in the number of persons placed on probation in New York. This has been due to the change in method of work and organization in New York, which will be noticed later.

TABLE VI. OFFENSES OF WHICH MEN AND WOMEN HAD BEEN CONVICTED BEFORE THEY WERE PLACED ON PROBATION IN NEW YORK CITY DURING THE YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1913.

Offenses.	Men.	Women.	Total.
Assault (3rd degree).....	155	7	162
Disorderly conduct .....	2,153	365	2,518
Non-support .....	1,426	6	1,432
Petit larceny .....	532	83	615
Prostitution, etc.....	500	412	912
Public intoxication .....	67	312	812
Violation local ordinances.....	127	58	125
Other misdemeanors .....	127	37	164
Total .....	4,960	1,280	6,240

This table is of interest because it seems to make clear the fact that New York, unlike Chicago, does not place on probation persons who are guilty of such offenses as robbery, burglary, and the other serious offenses which appeared in the Chicago list. (See pages .....)

It is important to note too that the New York reports show much more definitely than do our Chicago reports the effect of probation in the cases of persons discharged from probationary care. The following table shows the information given regarding discharged probationers.

TABLE VII. RESULTS OF PROBATION IN CASES OF PERSONS PASSED FROM PROBATION DURING THE YEAR ENDING SEPT. 30, 1914. (COMPILED FROM SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEW YORK STATE PROBATION ASSOCIATION.)

Completed probationary period and discharged with improvement.....	4,753
Completed probationary period and discharged without improvement....	562
Rearrested and committed.....	505
Removed to other locality with permission of court or probation officer.	8
Absconded or lost from oversight.....	418
Unstated and other results.....	22

Total ..... 6,268

This table is of interest because, although it uses also the somewhat vague term "improvement," it does show specifically the number of persons rearrested, the number absconded, the number removed, and the number for whom the results could not be stated, so that these facts at least are available.

The point of greatest importance, however, that appears in studying New York probation statistics is that the Chief Probation Officer's report to the Chief Magistrate in New York shows the number of cases investigated by the probation officers before being placed on probation and the number placed on probation without such a preliminary investigation. No statistics of this sort are furnished in Chicago, for it appears to be the rule here for the judge to overlook entirely the necessity of preliminary investigations by probation officers, and it is the exceptional cases only for which an investigation is asked. That such a system is now being adopted in the New York courts explains, of course, the decreasing number of probationers there, and the absence of such investigations in Chicago explains also the increasingly large number of cases placed on probation in Chicago. It explains also the cases reported by social workers in Chicago of the placing on probation of persons who are not first offenders, of persons who can never be located by the probation department because they have given false names and addresses in court, and of persons who are utterly unfit for probationary care, and also the cases in which one person is, almost simultaneously, placed on probation for different offenses and by different judges who do not know, of course, that the person asking for probation is already a probationer, and should be sentenced for violation of probation if for no other offense.

In contrast to the New York system, judges in Cook County appear to place on probation at random, and the probation department is obliged to accept all who are sent, although the persons released may be unfit for probation and the probation officers already have more cases than they can possibly look after. It should be noted, however, that even with the present small staff of officers allowed by law better service could be rendered.\*

\*It should be pointed out that adult probation work must necessarily be unsatisfactory in Chicago, not only for the reasons given above but also fundamentally: 1. Because of the relatively small number of officers. The law limits the number in any one county to twenty, and in Chicago the majority of these officers give all or a considerable part of their time to court work. Very little time is left for supervision of probationers. For this small number of officers there are more than 2,500 persons on probation. 2. The probation officers are not chosen through civil service examinations but are appointed by the judges. This, of course, has the doubly disastrous effect of not getting the most suitable persons for officers and in making those who are appointed feel that they do not need to maintain a high standard of work.

The Adult Probation Law went into effect July 1, 1911. In September, 1911, the chief probation officer was appointed by the Circuit and Municipal

1. If the amount of clerical and court attendance work required of them could be decreased.

2. If the officers spent a large part of time investigating cases prior to release on probation. This would certainly greatly reduce the number of persons placed on probation and eliminate the second offenders and others unsuitable for probation.

Cases are added at the close of this appendix showing that a probationer can, by giving a false address, escape probation entirely and be placed on probation a second time without being identified; that the same person may be placed on probation two or three times without its being discovered that he is already on probation.\* Investigation prior to release on probation is necessary if probation is to be more than a discharge. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the Illinois Adult Probation Law clearly expects the probation officer to investigate upon the judges' request before release.†

The last (1912) report of the New York State Probation Commission says, with regard to Preliminary Investigations:

"When so directed by a court or magistrate, probation officers are expected to investigate the surroundings, history, reputation and characteristics of defendants awaiting sentence. These investigations are of great service to the courts in determining whether the defendants will make fit subjects for probationary treatment. It is found that in a large proportion of the cases of probationers who have absconded or otherwise failed to satisfy the probationary requirements, such investigations have been neglected. The number of cases so investigated during the past year was 19,311, an increase of 22 per cent." (Sixth Report, p. 25.)

In Massachusetts preliminary investigations are absolutely insisted upon as a prerequisite for release on probation. The last report of the Massachusetts Commission on Probation (1913) discusses their method: "The standard of probation cases can only be improved by the closest co-operation of judges and probation officers. The probation officer should recommend

Courts. At the close of the first year there were eleven other probation officers, four appointed by the Circuit Court judges and seven appointed by the Municipal Court judges. The law provides for not more than twenty officers in any one county. By the close of the second year, sixteen officers had been appointed, six by the Circuit Court judges and ten by the Municipal Court judges. During the past year the number of officers has reached the full quota of twenty. Only three clerks are provided for the Adult Probation Office. If it is not constitutional to require the probation officers to be chosen through civil service, it should be possible to induce the judges to do what Judge Pinckney has done in the Juvenile Court, i. e., to establish a voluntary or extra-legal civil service of their own.

\*It is also apparent that investigation would prevent the release on probation of those who are not first offenders. The law provides for the release only of first offenders, but when no preliminary investigations are made, second offenders will inevitably be able to escape in this way.

† See Revised Statutes, chap. 38, 5091, Duties of Probation Officers. Sec. 12. The duties of probation officers shall be: 1. To investigate, when required by rule of court or by specific order, the case of any person who has invoked the provisions of this act, and as accurately and as fully as diligence will enable to ascertain (a) the personal characteristics, habits, associations and previous conduct of such persons, (b) the names, relationship, ages and conditions of those dependent upon him for support, maintenance and education, and (c) such other and further facts as may aid the court as well in determining the propriety of probation as in fixing the conditions thereof. To the end that such investigation may be properly made, a probation officer commissioned to investigate shall be afforded full opportunity to confer with the person to be investigated when such person is in custody. 2. To report in writing the result of such investigation. 3. To preserve complete and accurate records of cases investigated, including a description of the person investigated, the action of the court with respect to his case and his probation, the subsequent history of such person if he becomes a probationer during the continuance of his probation, which records shall be open to inspection by any judge or by any probation officer pursuant to order of court, but shall not be a public record, and its contents shall not be divulged otherwise than as above provided, except upon order of court.

after a most careful study of the case, and the court should never place on probation any person unfitted for probationary treatment." (Fifth Annual Report, p. 7.) Probation is recommended only when "the past history and present disposition of the person investigated indicate that he may reasonably be expected to reform without punishment."

The Chief Probation Officer's Report in the **Annual Report of the Board of City Magistrates of the City of New York, 1913**, shows the results of the new method, i. e., preliminary investigation before probation, in New York City.

"Under the old method of placing on probation without preliminary investigation (with some exceptions) probation officers received many more cases than they could properly look after, but since last April, when only about 20 per cent of those investigated were placed on probation, the number of cases have materially decreased. During the last eight months of 1912, 1,691 defendants were placed on probation, while during the same period in 1913, under the new system, but 974 were placed on probation. Of that number 369 were disorderly persons and only two had been investigated by probation officers. Under the present system the probation officers have been enabled to devote more time to individual cases, with the result that there have been fewer revocations for violation of probation, and the accounts of the disorderly (non-support) at the Department of Charities are in much better shape than ever before" (p. 73).

The Chief Magistrate reports, for the year ending December 31, 1913, the following results from the change in probation methods in New York City:

"The new probation system has worked admirably in every way. The probation officers, men and women, are now engaged actively in investigating cases, or, as is part of their duty, in seeing that the defendants obey the terms of probation by frequent visits, careful inspection, and active personal interest in those concerned. This they can do, as they do not now have to waste a whole lot of time sitting in the court rooms waiting for possible cases; then to be hurriedly considered as an emergency and disposed of more or less unsatisfactorily. . . .

"One fault of the old system was that cases were carelessly put on probation. Men and women with prison records, who deserved no consideration, and whose cases were hopeless, were turned over to the probation officers, instead of being punished, as they should be, at once. This clogged the probation system. The officers carried long lists of these perfectly impossible people, so far as reformation was concerned, on their hands. These scamps, as soon as they got on probation, either ran away or disappeared, and often turned up again in prison; or they kept the probation officer chasing all over the city and state looking after them, disappearing from one locality to turn up to the annoyance and danger of some other place. The same was true of the women.

"Now, under the new system, we have reduced the number of cases some 60 per cent, which means that probation, which is a favor to the defendant, and based on the hope of the magistrate that he can be reformed without being sent to prison, and this hope in turn founded upon the written report and investigation made by the probation officer, is not misused. Then, too, the probation officer is not laden down with all that waste and rotten material, and gives the cases the real sort of inspection to which they are entitled, looking after the defendant and encouraging him or her to a better life. The removal of this incubus of perfectly useless material gives the probation system a chance to prove what it can do; makes the defendant feel that he is put on his honor and highly favored by the court in an effort to improve himself and retrace his or her steps in a criminal career away from a disorderly way of living" (pp. 29-30).

#### **Sec. 6. Statistics Relating to Restitution and Earnings of Probationers.**

Further information regarding the results of probation is furnished by the statistics relating to restitution and the earnings of probationers. A very good summary of these results is included in the typewritten report of the Chief Probation Officer for the first six months of 1913-14, and this is quoted in full below:

"The first year the amount of restitution was not kept, but the second year we find the total amount to be \$21,790.28. The first half of the third year we find the total amount to be \$8,211.57. I am satisfied that the officers have

not kept an account of all restitution, so that I can only give results as they are reported to the office.

"With reference to the earnings of probationers, I find that the first year we only kept the earnings during September, and thought it a great thing that the probationers earned \$30,905.50 in that month, and figured that if that good showing continued every month for a year the total would be \$360,000.00, but the actual result during the second year was more than \$548,000.00. During the first half of the third year the earnings exceeded that sum more than \$20,000.00. The amount being \$570,127.64, which, if continued at the same rate for the rest of the year, will show more than a million dollars earned in one year. This, indeed, is a large sum of money for people to earn, who, under the old law, might have been in jail at the expense of the county."

This statement alone is a more than sufficient justification of the cost of probation service to the county and to the city, and it is also a more than sufficient justification for a demand for a change in the law that so inadequately limits the number of probation officers for a great city like Chicago.

#### Sec. 7. Further Reasons for Increasing the Number of Adult

##### Probation Officers.

A further reason for a considerable increase in the number of adult probation officers is that much of the so-called social work in the courts, which is done by a large number of volunteer organizations, should be done by the Adult Probation Office. At present, for example, the following organizations have representatives giving all or a large part of their time to social work in the Boys' Court and the Criminal Court: Legal Aid Society, the Juvenile Protective Association, the Bureau of Personal Service, the Catholic Women's League. In addition to these private organizations, both the Adult Probation Office and the County Welfare Bureau have representatives in the courts. These groups of workers are all unrelated. No one has any authority or control over anyone else. They are responsible only to the heads of their organizations in four different parts of the city. The situation is saved, in part, by the fine spirit of co-operation among the workers, and they believe that they have the field of work so carefully apportioned that the work is co-operating and not duplicating. This can, however, scarcely be possible, and in any event, if the work is worth doing, it should all be concentrated in the hands of one public authority; and there can be no question that the one absolutely essential public authority in the field is the Adult Probation Office.\* This office should have an adequate staff on a civil service basis, which alone insures competency, and should have full control of all social work in the courts, as the Probation Department of the Juvenile Court does of similar work in that court.

#### Sec. 8. Summary.

1. The reports of the Adult Probation Office show a marked increase in the number of persons placed on probation during the three years since the

\*The one social worker who does not seem to be related to this office is a representative of the Juvenile Protective Association in the Criminal Court, who, in her own words, "investigates all of the sex cases that are held to the Grand Jury." She considers her work as supplementary to the work of the State's Attorney's office. The complainants or witnesses in these cases are chiefly young girls, and she is there in order that their stories may be told to a woman instead of to one of the lawyers in the State's Attorney's office.

There appears to be no reason, in this case, why the State's Attorney should not appoint one woman lawyer as a regular member of his staff who could hear such cases. There can be no question but that a woman lawyer can do such work far more effectively than a man. There seems to have been a bad precedent set in the Court of Domestic Relations when the State's Attorney was given an additional appropriation by the County Board to employ a woman investigator for the bastardy cases. Here again a woman lawyer, appointed as a regular member of the State's Attorney's staff, should have been appointed for such work. A woman assistant State's Attorney would be more satisfactory in many ways than an "investigator." The "investigator" cannot appear before the Grand Jury, whereas an assistant State's Attorney could, and her position in the court would be one of great influence. Moreover, no additional appropriation would be needed for such work, since the State's Attorney could at any time assign one of his assistantships to a woman instead of to a man.

Adult Probation Law was passed. Unfortunately the number of probation officers has not increased proportionately. That is, there appears to have been in round numbers about 100 cases per officer during the first year of the court, about 180 the second, and about 245 during the year just passed. Good probationary care under such circumstances is obviously impossible. In New York, the average number of cases per officer is about 95.\* In the Juvenile Court of Cook County, the average number of cases per officer is about 50 to 60.

2. The reports also show the offenses of which probationers are convicted. The question is raised as to whether or not the Adult Probation Law is being violated by the placing on probation persons convicted of offenses for which probation is not legal. The list of persons convicted of serious offenses and placed on probation during the first six months of the year 1913-14 is as follows: False pretenses, 54; burglary, 39; carrying concealed weapons, 36; receiving stolen property, 21; embezzlement, 13; robbery, 4. Whether or not the offenses of these 167 persons entitled them to be placed on probation can only be determined by ascertaining the exact offenses committed.

3. With regard to the results of probation, statistics as to whether discharged probationers are "improved" or "unimproved" are of little value since the standard of what constitutes "improvement" is probably a variable one. It is suggested that statistics could show each time the number of probationers who had absconded, the number who had moved out of the city by permission, and the number who had been re-arrested or for whom warrants had been issued, and the number for whom no report had been recently obtained.

4. In comparing Chicago and New York statistics, one very important point appears: that in New York it is not customary to place persons on probation until a preliminary investigation has been made by probation officers. The convicted person for whom probation appears to be desirable is not hastily released as in Chicago, but is remanded until a thorough investigation has been made. If it does not appear that the prisoner is likely to improve under probationary care, he is not released and the time of the probation officer is conserved for more hopeful cases. A system of preliminary investigation in Chicago would greatly reduce the number of persons placed on probation, and would make possible more successful work with the smaller number of probationers who would be under care. At present the Chicago system makes it possible for second offenders to escape on probation, for persons to give false addresses and thus to escape any supervision by probation officers, or for a person to be placed on probation almost simultaneously by several different judges. Investigation by probation officers is absolutely essential if probation is to be more than a discharge.

5. The valuable results of probation are more tangibly presented in the statistics relating to restitution and earnings of probationers. The earnings of probationers during the past year may be said to be, in round numbers, more than a million dollars, and the amount of money paid back in restitution during the year is between \$15,000 and \$20,000 (estimating for the whole year on the basis of statistics for six months.) There can be no question as to the success of a system that not only relieves the taxpayers of the heavy burden of supporting thousands of persons in jail for minor offenses and at the same time saves the men and women from the demoralization of a prison term and makes it possible for them to earn large sums in independent employment and to pay back the money they have stolen.

6. At the present time, the Adult Probation Department is not the only organization doing social work in the courts. The County Welfare Bureau and three private societies have representatives giving all or a large part of their time to some form of social service work in the courts. There can be no question but that the work which is now being done by the representatives of these different organizations is socially useful and should not be given up. All such work, however, should be unified and centralized under some controlling authority. Since the Adult Probation Department is the social service agency of first importance in the courts, it would seem to be

\*This is obtained in the same rough way as the Chicago figures, by dividing the total number of cases placed on probation within the year last past by the number of officers. It is explained elsewhere that the resulting averages are not accurate, but they are perfectly valid for purposes of comparison.



most advantageous to have all the social service work done by this department. This is, of course, another urgent reason why the Adult Probation Law should be so amended as to make possible a very great increase in the number of adult probation officers, and the placing of the department on a civil service basis.

**Sec. 9. Illustrations of the Results of the Failure to Investigate Cases Before Placing them on Probation.**

S—— W——

August 19, 1913—Placed on probation for one year by Judge Brentano in the Criminal Court on three charges of burglary and was warned that he would be arrested the first time he was caught loafing.

May 26, 1914—In Boys' Court under the name of W—— on disorderly charge (joy riding in stolen auto). Claimed he did not know it was stolen. Case postponed to June 3d then to 30th, when the defendant was not in court. Officer asked to have him discharged, which was done.

M—— C——

July 1, 1914—Placed on probation in Morals Court by Judge Goodnow on adultery charge.

August 9, 1914—Arrested on disorderly charge under another name. Discharged.

J—— B——

Put on probation on larceny charge by Judge Goodnow. Ten days later placed on probation again by Judge Dolan, not knowing of former probation. Arrested again—case continued for several months by Judge Burke in the Criminal Court to give boy a chance to make good by working steadily, etc. J—— was out on bond at this time. If his conduct had been good during this time, case would probably have been disposed of in some way without inflicting further punishment. However, at final hearing his conduct had been so unsatisfactory that he was sentenced to Pontiac.

H—— M——

July 10, 1914—Placed on probation by Judge Brentano on larceny charge. Amount involved, \$95. Preliminary hearing June 8, 1914. At time of offense was on probation, which did not expire until June 29, 1914. (An immoral woman.)

H—— S——

December 5, 1913—Placed on probation for six months on burglary charge by Judge Brentano. Felony waived. Charge changed to petit larceny. Boy had already served 30 days in House of Correction on disorderly charge. In less than week stole \$20 from fellow employe and left town. At end of six months was discharged improved, though at the time in the County Jail, held to Grand Jury on three charges of burglary—came into jail April 13, 1914. Case still pending. Relatives can do nothing with him.

J—— T——

Placed on probation under another name. April 4, 1914—Probation Department never could locate. May 21, 1914—Held to Grand Jury on burglary charge under name of J—— T——. Through guard at jail discovered his identity. Notified Probation Department and he is now in Pontiac.

T—— J——

April 2, 1914—Placed on probation by Judge McDonald—held on robbery charge. One and one-half years before had been placed on probation (sleeping in empty cars) and later, about one year before, spent three months in the House of Correction for stealing.

H—— S——

On probation three times. Twice at the same time under different names. Was just about to be placed on probation again (robbery charge) when it was discovered that another judge had sentenced him to one year in the House of Correction for violation of probation. Now in House of Correction serving this sentence.



TABLE VIII.

OFFENSES OF MEN, WOMEN AND BOYS PLACED ON PROBATION  
BY THE VARIOUS JUDGES DURING THE SIX MONTHS  
FROM JANUARY 1 TO JUNE 30, 1914.

(From records of the Adult Probation Office.)

## A.—MEN.

Judge.	Abandonment.	Adultery and Fornication.	Assault.	Burglary.	Confidence Game.	Contributing to Delinquency.	Contributing to Dependency.	Embezzlement.	Larceny.	False Pretenses.	Malicious Mischief.	Receiving Stolen Property.	Violating Miscellaneous Ordinances.	Disorderly.	Other.	Total.
Bowles .....			4						4	1			1	18		28
Brentano .....	1				2			1	1							5
Burke .....				3					8							11
Caverly .....			2	4					8	1			1	28		44
Dever .....						1										1
Dolan .....			1					1	17		2	2	1	4		28
Fake .....		2	7						19	1		5	10	72	8	124
Fisher .....									2				1	2		5
Fry .....	22		1			1	88		12					65	1	190
Gemmill .....	1					1	2									4
Goodnow .....		5						1	8	1			1	6	1	23
Graham .....									34	1	1	3		8		47
Hill .....	1								3							6
Hopkins .....		10												2	1	13
Jarecki .....										1						1
Kearns .....	7					1	11									19
Kerstens .....			2	4	3			2	13						1	25
Mahoney .....			1						11		1		1		1	15
McDonald .....			9	8	7			1	19	2				1	4	51
McKinley .....			1		4			1	14						1	21
Moran .....	3						17									20
Pettit .....			1	2	1			1	6							11
Rafferty .....									5				2	6	4	17
Robinson .....									1	1				1		3
Rooney .....									1				1			2
Ryan .....									23	6		1	2	20		52
Sabath .....		1	19					1	17	5	2	7	11	22	3	88
Scott .....	1								4							5
Scully .....			3			5	4		12		1	1	2	28	1	57
D. Sullivan .....									5							5
J. Sullivan .....			1					1	6					4		12
Torrison .....	2					1	12									15
Turnbaugh .....													1	18		19
Uhlir .....	124		6			8	300		6		1		2	19		466
Wade .....			1						1			1		4		7
Walker .....			2	2	2			3	24	1		1				35
Wells .....			2					1	35	4	2		2	10	1	57
Williams .....									1							1
Stewart .....									9					1		10
Newcomer .....			1													1
Levy .....														1		1
Total .....	162	18	64	23	19	18	434	14	329	25	10	21	39	342	27	1545

TABLE VIII—Continued.

## B.—WOMEN AND GIRLS.

Judge.	Adultery.	Assault.	Contributing to Dependency.	Disorderly.	Fornication.	Larceny.	False Pretenses.	Soliciting.	V. S. 2807.	V. S. 2014-19.	Other.	Total.
Graham .....	..	..	..	1	..	4	..	..	..	..	1	6
Bowles .....	..	..	..	2	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	4
Caverly .....	..	..	..	2	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	3
Dolan .....	..	1	..	1	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	4
Fry .....	..	..	3	8	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	14
Fake .....	..	1	..	1	1	2	1	..	..	..	..	6
Goodnow .....	6	1	..	7	4	2	..	15	..	50	1	86
Hill .....	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Hopkins .....	9	..	..	22	16	..	..	9	..	32	..	88
Jarecki .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	2
Kearns .....	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Kerstens .....	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Mahoney .....	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	1	4
McDonald .....	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	2	5
McKinley .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1
Moran .....	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Newcomer .....	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Rafferty .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1
Robinson .....	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2
Rooney .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Ryan .....	..	1	..	2	..	10	1	..	..	..	..	14
Sabath .....	..	..	..	3	1	4	1	..	3	..	..	12
Scott .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Scully .....	..	..	1	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Stewart .....	..	..	..	..	..	13	..	..	..	..	..	13
D. Sullivan .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1
Turnbaugh .....	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2
Uhlir .....	..	1	20	3	..	1	..	..	..	..	2	27
Wade .....	..	..	..	2	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	5
Wells .....	..	..	..	..	..	26	..	..	..	..	1	27
Williams .....	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2
Total .....	15	8	26	57	22	88	4	24	3	83	10	340

TABLE VIII—Continued.

## C.—BOYS.

Judge.	Abandonment.	Assault.	Burglary.	Contributing to Delinquency.	Contributing to Dependency.	Disorderly.	Embezzlement.	Larceny.	Malicious Mischief.	False Pretenses.	Receiving Stolen Property.	Robbery.	Vagrancy.	Violating Miscellaneous Ordinances.	Other.	Total.
Bowles .....	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3
Brentano .....	..	..	2	..	..	..	1	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Burke .....	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	7
Courtney .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Dolan .....	..	1	..	..	..	6	..	10	3	..	..	..	..	1	..	21
Fake .....	..	4	..	..	..	6	..	6	1	..	..	..	1	3	..	21
Fisher .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Fry .....	..	2	..	2	..	13	..	8	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	27
Goodnow .....	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	5	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	9
Graham .....	..	3	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	7
Hill .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Hopkins .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	1
Kerstens .....	..	..	7	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12
Mahoney .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	6
McDonald .....	..	4	8	..	..	..	..	7	..	..	1	4	..	..	..	24
McKinley .....	..	..	2	..	..	..	1	2	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	7
Moran .....	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Pettit .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1
Rafferty .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5
Ryan .....	..	2	..	..	..	4	..	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	18
Sabath .....	..	1	..	..	..	8	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	22
Scott .....	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	2	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	4
Scully .....	..	5	..	4	..	48	..	84	1	5	3	..	..	12	..	162
D. Sullivan .....	..	..	1	..	..	3	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6
Torrison .....	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4
Uhlir .....	5	1	..	8	3	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18
Wade .....	..	1	..	..	..	5	..	5	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	12
Walker .....	..	..	3	..	..	..	..	16	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	20
Wells .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	6	..	2	..	..	..	3	..	12
Total .....	5	24	25	19	4	102	3	192	6	10	5	7	4	30	3	439

## APPENDIX B

### NOTE ON THE COUNTY JAIL AND THE HOUSE OF CORRECTION

In discussing the costs of a system that involves the arrest and the trial of large numbers of innocent persons, it was pointed out (Text p. 36) that not the least of these costs was the imprisonment of many people who were later released without conviction. Statistics were given showing that in 1913, 691 persons suffered the really terrible experience of imprisonment in the County Jail, and were then released either because they were tried and found not guilty or because the Grand Jury or State's Attorney did not think the evidence against them warranted their being tried.

The report of the jailer, from which these statistics were taken, shows the disposition of the cases of all the persons imprisoned during the past year as follows:

TABLE I. DISPOSITION OF CASES COMMITTED TO COOK  
COUNTY JAIL DURING THE YEAR ENDING  
DECEMBER 30, 1913.

Disposed of in Municipal Court.....	3,783
Bail given in Municipal Court.....	1,151
Sent to penitentiary.....	260
Sent to reformatory .....	78
Sent to House of Correction.....	764
Committed to State Insane Asylum.....	7
Jail sentence expired .....	283
Released on probation .....	298
Stricken off Criminal Court.....	117
Own recognizance Criminal Court.....	26
No bill Grand Jury.....	290
Nolle pros. ....	39
Not guilty .....	245
Bail given Criminal Court.....	865
Order of Circuit Court.....	127
Order of County Court.....	11
Order of U. S. Court.....	214
Habeas Corpus .....	5
Died .....	3
Supersedeas bonds .....	15
Miscellaneous .....	12
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>8,593</b>

This report shows that of the 8,593 persons who were held in the County Jail last year, only 283 were there serving sentences, but 338 others were later committed to Joliet or Pontiac so that they were judged to merit imprisonment. Seven hundred and sixty-four others were sent to the House of Correction, but how many of them were sent because of their inability to pay fines and how many were actually committed, the statistics, of course, do not indicate. It is not possible to ascertain whether the 3,783 whose cases were "disposed of in the Municipal Court" were discharged, or fined, or whether they reappear among those sentenced. The great majority are undoubtedly discharged or fined. Certainly an examination of this table makes it clear that not only hundreds, but probably thousands of innocent persons are imprisoned for longer or shorter terms in the County Jail. The question of the length of time they are imprisoned there is a matter of great interest and the following table shows the time spent there by the different classes of prisoners:

## REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

TABLE II. NUMBER OF PERSONS COMMITTED TO COOK COUNTY JAIL, 1913, WITH REASONS FOR COMMITMENT TO JAIL AND NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT IN JAIL

(Data from County Jail Records.)

Time spent in County Jail	Cases continued	Held to Grand Jury	*No billed	Awaiting trial after indictment	†Pending after commitment	Sentenced to jail term	‡Miscellaneous	Total
Less than 1 week.....	3,303	276	2	245	74	175	147	4,222
1 week and less than 2.....	1,090	119	27	75	..	48	42	1,401
2 weeks and less than 3....	331	52	67	66	..	18	20	554
3 weeks and less than 4....	145	30	55	65	..	12	38	345
4 weeks and less than 8....	103	9	109	406	..	58	26	711
8 weeks and less than 12...	5	1	17	389	..	29	13	454
12 weeks and less than 16..	2	...	3	321	..	30	6	362
16 weeks and less than 20..	...	1	...	154	..	20	7	182
20 weeks and less than 24..	1	...	...	65	..	12	5	83
24 weeks and less than 28..	...	...	...	35	..	19	1	55
28 weeks and less than 32..	...	...	...	12	..	7	1	20
32 weeks and over.....	...	...	...	\$27	..	27	2	56
Total .....	4,980	488	280	1,860	74	455	308	8,445

\*This does not include all "no-billed" cases, for many of the others who gave bail and left the jail probably failed of indictment when they came to the Grand Jury.

†These are cases sentenced to the House of Correction and merely put into the jail directly from court until they can be conveyed the following day to the House of Correction.

‡Under this heading are grouped the cases for safekeeping either U. S. or local, the remanded cases, warrants, a few held as witnesses and on writs of ne exeat.

§Includes 3 for 32 weeks, 1 for 33, 1 for 34, 3 for 35, 3 for 36, 1 for 37, 1 for 38, 2 for 39, 3 for 40, 1 for 41, 1 for 42, 4 for 46, 1 for 48, 1 for 50, and 1 for 54.

||Includes 1 for 32 weeks, 1 for 33, 4 for 34, 1 for 35, 3 for 36, 1 for 37, 2 for 38, 1 for 39, 1 for 43, 4 for 44, 1 for 47, 1 for 50, 3 for 52, 1 for 56, 1 for 60, and 1 for 63.

This table, unfortunately, does not follow the classification in the preceding table. It is not possible, for example, in this table to ascertain how many of those who were held to the Grand Jury were discharged, for although one group includes "no-billed" cases, it is pointed out that all of the "no-bills" are not included and the other groups such as "stricken out," "nolle prossed," and "tried and found not guilty" are equally impossible of identification.

In spite of these drawbacks, the table indicates very clearly the great hardships caused by "the law's delays." Of the "no-billed" cases, for example, 251 were kept in the County Jail for periods ranging from two to sixteen weeks, surely a terrible punishment for people against whom there is not sufficient evidence even to secure an indictment. Of those held awaiting hearings before the Grand Jury or continuances, the table shows that 587 "lay in jail," as the saying goes, for periods varying from two to twenty-four weeks. The longest periods of imprisonment, however, are endured by those who are awaiting trial after indictment. The table shows that 1,860 persons unable to secure bail were held in jail for this purpose last year and that 1,409, or 75 per cent of these men, who it must be remembered are supposed to be innocent until they are tried, were held in jail awaiting trial for periods varying from four weeks to one year.

Not only because of the long periods during which these thousands of persons awaiting trial or hearing are confined in the County Jail, but also because of the fact that 455 persons are sentenced to terms of imprisonment there, some of them for periods longer than one year, it is important to know something about the conditions of the jail cell-houses. No investigation of the jail has been made for the Committee, but the report made in May, 1912, by the Inspector of Institutions for the State Charities Commission has been published in the *Institution Quarterly*\* and is fortunately available. Concerning the so-called "newer cell-house," which was built nearly twenty years ago, the State Inspector made the following report:

"The so-called newer cell-house was built in 1895. There are seven tiers of cells in the department; each tier has twenty-six cells which are placed in rows of thirteen.

The jail room has windows on all sides save the south; the east wall is mainly windows, the west and north sides have fewer windows, but good air circulation is provided for the outer corridors.

The fifth, six and seventh tiers of cells are on one floor. Therefore the men of the fifth and sixth tiers exercise on a common corridor, as this corridor is between the two rows of cells, and the solid iron doors are closed during exercise hours, and light is admitted only through the bars at the northern extremity. Artificial light is used throughout the day.

As minors are placed on the seventh tier, they easily communicate with the men. They are not allowed on the ground corridor, but, when they walk on the platform surrounding their cells, they are closely associated with the older men.

Men are locked in their cells save for two hours in the morning, two hours in the afternoon, and one hour in the evening. The boys exercise in the schoolroom during one hour of the evening.

Each cell is of iron, has bars in the back, solid door, sanitary toilet; wash bowl with running water and two bunks.

As the only openings in the cells are the bar backs, those cells which are opposite solid walls are very dark. The wall on the west side has few windows and consequently the cells on this side are very dark. Men who offend in any way are placed on this side, while obedient prisoners receive the cells on the eastern sides. In the dark cells it is necessary to use candle light for reading, as the electric light in the corridor is too far away to light the cells.

Shower baths are accessible to the men, at their option. Every one must bathe twice a week in summer and once a week in winter. Separate towels are provided.

On the first floor are placed four tiers of cells. When it is remembered that there are two men to a cell (when the jail is crowded, additional men are placed in the cells), that each tier has twenty-six cells, one can conceive what it means to have the occupants of all these cells exercising in a common dark corridor."

Concerning the cells in the so-called "old jail," which was built forty-two years ago, but which is still in use, the following report is made:

"The old jail department was built in 1872; where, in the newer section, steel was used in the construction, in this section, stone was used.

There are four tiers of cells arranged in two rows. The cells are placed back to back, seventeen in a row. The windows are in the upper halves of the walls so that the lower cells are dark. There are ten windows on the north side, ten on the south side, two on the west, and none on the east.

The exercise corridor surrounds the cells, and all the men in the old section occupy this common corridor during exercise hours. During the day of inspection about 300 men were confined in this department.

Each cell has a sanitary toilet, a wash bowl, with running water, and two canvass hammocks with blankets. The only ventilation is secured by means of bar doors. As, during the winter months, it is often necessary to confine five men in a single cell, the inadequate provision for light and air cannot be overestimated.

Tubercular and venereal patients are kept on the fourth tier of cells.

Prisoners are transferred to this old cell-house, after they leave the receiving cells; if their behaviour is good, they are transferred to the dark

\*The *Institution Quarterly*, vol. IV, No. 3: 83-84. (Sept. 30, 1913.)

side of the new cell-house and thence to the lighter side of the new cell-house."

Certainly this description of dark, crowded, and unventilated cells and of equally dark, crowded corridors is very important in view of the statistics that have been presented. With regard to five men in a single cell, the State Inspector speaks moderately in saying that "the inadequate provision for light and air cannot be overestimated." It is, however, important to recall in the light of these descriptions the fact that the great majority, about 85 per cent, of the prisoners in the County Jail are only there awaiting trial; they have not been found guilty, and in the vast majority of cases if they had not been poor they would have been released on bail.

That a great and wealthy community like Cook County, Illinois, can maintain a public institution so far behind all modern ideals of social justice is, indeed, almost unbelievable. Moreover, it is an accepted theory today that confinement under such conditions must tend not to prevent crime, but to create criminals.

In view of the fact that the report has shown that during the past year more than 14,000 persons were committed to the House of Correction and that 82 per cent were committed merely for the non-payment of fines, it has seemed worth while to include here the statistics of the report of the State Inspector\* which deal with the House of Correction.

"The so-called west cell-house is a one-year old building, which extends north and south, having windows on all sides. The building, vaulted at \$225,000 was built by inmate labor; it is attractive, from an artistic standpoint, whether looked at from the exterior or the interior.

Two rows of cells are arranged on either side of a 30-foot corridor which is itself lighted and ventilated by windows at either end, by sky-light and by windows near the roof. There are four tiers of cells. Each cell is of iron, is 6x9x8½ feet in size, has concrete floors; each cell has an outside window 2x4 feet and a bar door 2½x7 feet. Bar transoms extend across the entire front of the cells. A single iron cot, with mattress, sheets, pillows and blankets, a wash bowl with running water, and a sanitary toilet furnish each cell. In addition every man has a stool, his own towel, and books from the library, if he desires them.

The men who are lodged in this cell-house dine at tables placed in the light, cheery corridor. The inspector saw a good meal served with plates, knives and forks. As this cell-house is enjoyed by all the prisoners, and the old building is very undesirable, men who work in the shops are lodged in this department.

South of the main building is a cell-house which is 458 feet long. The wing extends north and south, having windows in the upper half of the wall on the east and west sides. The cells are of concrete, are placed back to back, and are at a distance of about 12 feet from the walls. The only cell ventilation consists of a small opening, in which night buckets are placed, and a bar door 2x5½ feet. A double iron frame arrangement is used for placing two mattresses in each cell. The cells, each 5x8x8 feet, are dark and ill-ventilated. There are 640 cells, arranged in two rows—back to back—and four tiers. The upper tier is rarely used, as the air is especially vile at this height. The approach to the upper cells is by means of wooden platform and stairs; the danger is obvious when it is considered that there are two men to a cell.

Men wash in troughs, provided with running water. Separate towels are used.

The north cell-house is north of the central wing, extends north and south, and has windows on the east and west sides. There are 408 cells, arranged in two rows and four tiers. The cells are of steel, each 5x8x8 feet, and are ventilated by iron bar doors 2x5½ feet. There are openings in the cells, for the reception of night buckets. Air is forced through these openings at night.

The windows are placed in the upper part of the wall so that the lower cells are dark. The cells are at a distance of about 12 feet from the windows, which are in the outside wall. As in the south cell-house, the stairs and platforms are of wood, the cell ventilation is bad, and two men are crowded into a single cell.

\*The Institution Quarterly, vol. IV, No. 3: 124-125. (Sept. 30, 1913.)

Both the north and south cell-houses seem especially undesirable since it is possible to compare them with the new cell-house which is a model of sanitation."

At the time of inspection there were 1,389 men and 117 women confined in the House of Correction, and during that year the reports show that 11,282 persons were committed to the House of Correction for periods of time varying from 1 day to 15 months. It is important to note too that the report by the Civil Service Commission on **Prison Labor and Management House of Correction**, which was made as recently as March, 1914, confirms the report of the State Inspector made two years previously. With regard to housing and sanitation, this report contains the following statements regarding the cell-house of the House of Correction:

"Of the three cell-houses occupied by men inmates, the south cell-house is antiquated and is generally unsuited for its present purpose. The sanitary arrangements are bad and prisoners are not assigned to the top tier of cells, which are the worst except at that season of the year when the population is greatest. This cell-house should be replaced at an early date by one of modern construction. The west cell-house is new and of modern construction, having a toilet and wash basin in every cell. The building is scrupulously clean and the inmates assigned to this cell-house take pride in keeping it so.

Sanitary conditions throughout the institution are fairly good, although in the two old cell-houses occupied by men, viz., the north and south cell-houses, toilet facilities are bad. When the old cell-houses are replaced by modern ones bad conditions will have been removed."\*

It will be noted that none of these reports criticises the management either of the County Jail or of the House of Correction; they simply point out that the cell-houses in which thousands of men, many of whom are innocent or are guilty only of minor offenses, are confined are utterly unfit to be occupied by human beings. It would seem, indeed, as if Cook County might be able to find the money to erect a modern building to replace a jail built nearly half a century ago at a time when jails were not expected to be anything more than "whited sepulchers." It has been pointed out that only a small percentage of the persons confined there have been tried and found guilty of any offense; but even if men are guilty, it is no longer considered good public policy to deprive them of light and air and to crowd five men into a cell not large enough for two.

The two following tables were prepared from data obtained from the Jailer's records. Table III shows the number of days each month on which the jail contained a specified number of prisoners. Table IV shows the length of sentence of 455 persons sentenced to imprisonment in the County Jail, together with the actual time spent in jail. This table shows that some prisoners sentenced to imprisonment for only one, two, three or four weeks spent more than that number of months in jail.

TABLE III. DAILY POPULATION OF THE COUNTY JAIL DURING 1913.

Number of days on which jail population was—								
Month.	350-399	400-449	450-499	500-549	550-599	600-649	650-699	700-749
January .....	..	..	..	..	5	17	8	1
February .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	26	2
March .....	..	..	..	..	..	1	30	..
April .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	29	1
May .....	..	..	..	..	..	4	27	..
June .....	..	..	..	2	6	10	11	1
July .....	..	..	2	25	4	..	..	..
August .....	4	14	13	..	..	..	..	..
September .....	27	3	..	..	..	..	..	..
October .....	2	17	12	..	..	..	..	..
November .....	..	..	28	2	..	..	..	..
December .....	..	..	..	11	20	..	..	..
Total .....	33	34	55	40	35	32	131	5

\*Report of the Civil Service Commission, City of Chicago, 1914. **Prison Labor and Management House of Correction**, p. 25.



## REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

TABLE IV. LENGTH OF SENTENCE OF PERSONS, TOGETHER WITH ACTUAL TIME SPENT IN JAIL. (FROM THE RECORDS OF THE COUNTY JAIL.)

Actual time spent in jail.	Less than 1 week.	1 and less than 2.	2 and less than 3.	3 and less than 4.	30 days or 1 month.	2 months.	3 months.	4 months.	5 months.	6 months.	7 months and over.	Un-specified.	Total.
Less than 1 week.....	68	8	2	..	9	4	10	..	..	21	..	52	175
1 and less than 2 weeks....	8	17	1	..	3	2	3	..	..	5	..	9	48
2 and less than 3 weeks....	..	1	3	..	2	..	..	..	..	5	1	6	18
3 and less than 4 weeks....	..	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	6	12
4 and less than 8 weeks....	..	4	2	..	23*	2	3	..	..	5	1	18	58
8 and less than 12 weeks....	..	2	1	..	..	10	1	..	..	3	..	12	29
12 and less than 16 weeks....	3	1	1	..	8	..	8	..	..	1	..	8	30
16 and less than 20 weeks....	..	1	1	..	3	5	4	1	..	..	..	4	20
20 weeks and over.....	..	..	1	..	3	4	5	3	..	18	11	20	65†
Total . . . . .	79	36	13	..	51	27‡	34§	4	1	61	14	135	455

\*Includes one 37, one 40, and one 42 day sentence.

†Includes 1 in jail for 20 weeks, 3 for 21 weeks, 4 for 22, 4 for 23, 3 for 24, 6 for 25, 9 for 26, 1 for 27, 5 for 28, 2 for 30, 1 for 32, 1 for 33, 4 for 34, 1 for 35, 3 for 36, 1 for 37, 2 for 38, 1 for 39, 1 for 43, 4 for 44, 1 for 47, 1 for 50, 3 for 52, 1 for 56, 1 for 60, and 1 for 63 weeks.

‡Includes one 66, one 68, and one 69 day sentence.

§Includes one 105, one 107, and one 114 day sentence.

|| In "term unspecified" most of the sentences are probably for one day or less for 35 cases where the prisoners were waiting trial after indictment; the rest are judgments against debtors, are attachments, or are fines, and the length of time spent in jail dependent upon the capability of the person convicted to discharge debt or fine or judgment.

The cases of discrepancy between length of sentence and actual time spent in jail are explained usually by the fact of imprisonment while awaiting trial, but partly because the sentence would read so many days in jail or so much money, or perhaps ten days in jail and fine and costs. The inability to pay fine or costs would lengthen the stay; the ability to pay would shorten it.

## APPENDIX C

### DISCUSSION OF THE VALUE, FOR COMPARATIVE PURPOSES, OF THE STATISTICS OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS

In attempting to ascertain the extent of crime, it is, of course, most important to have statistics showing the crimes known to the police. It is important also to have statistics showing the number of offenders arrested in comparison with the number of crimes and the number of offenders convicted. It has already been explained that the Criminal Judicial Statistics of England and Wales furnish such statistics annually. In Chicago, statistics of criminal complaints are available, but after a careful examination of these statistics, the conclusion was unavoidable, for reasons set forth in the following section, that the statistics of criminal complaints could not be legitimately compared with statistics of arrests and convictions.

Statistics were given in Table 1, page 20, of the text showing the number of criminal complaints and arrests on felony charges. These statistics are presented again in the table given below, showing also, over the whole period for which statistics are available, what per cent the arrests are, each year, of complaints. The question of whether or not this comparison between complaints and arrests is legitimate is discussed below.

TABLE I. CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS AND ARRESTS\* ON FELONY CHARGES, 1905-1913.

Date.	Complaints.	Arrests (Felonies),	
		Number.	Per Cent of Complaints.
1905	11,732	12,144	103.5
1906	10,754	12,376	115.1
1907	11,292	10,653	94.3
1908	11,034	10,551	95.6
1909	10,697	9,656	90.3
1910	10,718	9,376	87.5
1911	11,730	9,881	84.2
1912	13,032	10,276	78.9
1913	14,340	11,203	78.1

\*Statistics of arrests are really statistics of charges: See note 2, Table 1 in Part I of the Report.

The comparison between criminal complaints and arrests on felony charges presented in this table is of value only (1) if all criminal complaints represent actual crimes justifying arrests, and (2) if arrests upon felony charges are made only upon the filing of a criminal complaint. If these suppositions were true, if the complaints represented all of the actual crimes known to the police and if the arrests represented the number of persons charged with those crimes who had been apprehended, then the ratio of arrests to complaints would be significant and would fairly represent the percentage of crime dealt with by the police. Unfortunately, however, it seems to be true that neither of these suppositions is correct. Criminal complaints seem to include all complaints of crimes even when the complaints are unfounded. If "complaints" of burglary and larceny, for example, are made by people who later find their property, their complaints are nevertheless counted along with complaints of actual crimes. On the other hand, the statistics of arrests undoubtedly include a very large number of arrests made without the filing of a criminal complaint. Arrests on felony charges are undoubtedly made by the police "on view," and, even if this is not a common practice, it would render comparisons between complaints and arrests untrustworthy.

A much more serious difficulty in the way of such a comparison is the fact that some offenses that are not felonies are nevertheless classed as felonies in the police statistics. Included in their list of felonies, for example, is the offense "contributing to the delinquency and dependency of children." There were, in 1913, 1,528 arrests on this charge, but no criminal complaints are filed for this offense. It seems to be clear that the police statistics of arrests for

felonies include this large group of offenders not included at all in the statistics of criminal complaints.

Looking back at the preceding table in the light of these facts, it is apparent that the percentages in that table are meaningless. The table showed that during the period from 1905 to 1913 the number of arrests on felony charges ranged from 78.1 per cent to 115.1 per cent of the number of criminal complaints. According to this table, in five out of the nine years for which statistics are available, the arrests were 90 per cent or more than 90 per cent of the complaints, and in one year the arrests greatly exceeded the complaints. An excess of arrests or a percentage of arrests as high as 90 per cent is easily explained if arrests on felony charges are made by the police "on view" or in some way other than upon the filing of a criminal complaint. It should be noted, too, that the number of arrests might, of course, be greater than the number of complaints if a large number of individuals were arrested in connection with some one crime the author of which could not be discovered. In the case of the legitimate arrest of several persons who were all involved in one crime there would be a series of complaints, and no excess of arrests could be accounted for in that way. An actual excess of arrests has happened, however, in the year 1906, when arrests were 115.1 per cent of complaints.

It seems to be clear, therefore, that comparison between the total number of criminal complaints and the total number of arrests on felony charges is not legitimate.\* Even a comparison of complaints and arrests on specific crimes such as burglary, robbery and larceny, while it eliminates the difficulty caused by the inclusion of such offenses as "contributing to delinquency," is yet open to other objections that have been mentioned.

A clearer idea of the relation between complaints and arrests may be obtained by comparing complaints and arrests for specific crimes. Data for such a comparison are available for a series of years, but are given only for the years 1913 and 1912, and for these years separately.

TABLE II. COMPLAINTS AND ARRESTS FOR BURGLARY, LARCENY, ROBBERY, AND OTHER FELONIES, 1912, 1913.

Offense.	1913			1912		
	Com-plaints.	Arrests		Com-plaints.	Arrests	
		Num-ber.	Per Cent of Com-plaints.		Num-ber.	Per Cent of Com-plaints.
Burglary .....	6,534	1,053	16.1	5,458	1,117	20.5
Larceny .....	5,375	4,593	85.5	5,523	4,198	76.0
Robbery .....	1,389	1,022	73.6	1,277	1,106	86.6
Total Burglary, Larceny and Robbery. ....	13,298	6,668	50.1	12,258	6,421	52.4
*Other felonies .....	1,042	4,535	435.2	774	3,855	498.1
Total .....	14,340	11,203	78.1	13,032	10,276	78.9

\*Other felonies included in the table of arrests 1913: Confidence game 681, receiving stolen property 451, murder (including accessory to and assault to commit) 498, mayhem and manslaughter 57, embezzlement and forgery 262, contributing to delinquency 1,528, malicious mischief 250, rape 258, other offenses against public morals 188, kidnaping and threats to kidnap 78, arson 85, other felonies 163, pandering (not a felony) 36.

\*Nothing has been said about the possibility of the statistics of complaints not being accurately kept. Such statistics as are furnished by the police department have been assumed to be good of their kind. But the questionable value of all statistics of complaints is indicated in this extract from the *Final Report of the Civil Service Commission on Police Investigation, 1911-1912* (page 33): "The Commission has heard testimony and has received communications in vast number that complaints, either by writing, by telephone, or by word of mouth, when they affect gambling, street walking, disorderly houses, all-night saloons, and similar violations receive but scant courtesy at the station in precincts where these conditions abound. Some complaint has also been made that the same rule applies to petty thievery, activities of pickpockets, and even of burglaries and robberies. The method in vogue of desk sergeants writing verbal complaints on slips of paper, placing them on

This table shows that according to the statistics furnished by the police department the arrests for burglary in 1913 were 16.1 per cent of the number of complaints, the arrests for larceny 85.5 per cent of the complaints, and the arrests for robbery 73.6 per cent of the complaints. The corresponding percentages for 1912 were 20.5 per cent of the burglary complaints, 76.0 per cent of the larceny complaints, and 86.6 per cent of the robbery complaints. That is, the arrests for burglary, larceny and robbery were 50.1 per cent of the number of complaints in 1913 and 52.4 per cent of the number of complaints in 1912.

The most striking fact in this table, however, is the undue proportion of arrests for "other felonies." Although the arrests for burglary, larceny and robbery were about one-half of the number of complaints on these charges, the arrests for other felonies were four times the number of complaints in 1913 and five times the number of complaints in 1912.

It is clear that statistics of arrests and complaints are not comparable if, as these tables indicate, the arrests for burglary, larceny and robbery constitute only about 50 per cent of the complaints on these charges and the number of arrests for other crimes is four or five times the number of complaints.

A further comparison that should be examined is a comparison between complaints, arrests and convictions. The following tables present such a comparison. The first table, Table III, is compiled from the police statistics, and, therefore, includes under "felonies" some offenses, e. g., "contributing to delinquency" and "petit larceny," that are not felonies. The other table, which has been prepared from statistics furnished by the Municipal Court, is based on a different classification. The court statistics do not classify as felonies offenses that are technically only misdemeanors. This Table, Table IV, shows, together with the number of criminal complaints, the number of preliminary hearings in the Municipal Court, and the disposition during the same year of all cases that finally reached the Criminal Court.

TABLE III. CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS, ARRESTS AND CONVICTIONS, 1913. (STATISTICS FROM REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, 1913.)

Charge.	Criminal Com- plaints.	Arrests		Convictions		
		Num- ber.	Per Cent of Com- plaints.	Num- ber.	Per Cent of Ar- rests.	Per Cent of Com- plaints.
Burglary .....	6,534	1,053	16.1	289	27.4	4.4
Larceny .....	5,375	4,593	85.5	2,219	48.3	41.3
Robbery .....	1,389	1,022	73.6	171	16.7	12.3
Total Burglary, Larceny and Robbery .....	13,298	6,668	50.1	2,679	40.2	20.1
Other felonies .....	1,042	4,535	435.2	1,587	35.0	152.3
Total .....	14,340	11,203	78.1	4,266	38.1	29.7

TABLE IV. CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS (POLICE STATISTICS), PRELIMINARY HEARINGS AND FINAL DISPOSITION IN CRIMINAL COURT OF CASES HEARD THERE, 1912. (MUNICIPAL COURT STATISTICS.)

Charge.	Criminal Com- plaints.	Preliminary Hear- ings		Convictions Criminal Court		
		Num- ber.	Per Cent of Com- plaints.	Num- ber.	Per Cent of Pre- lim. Hear.	Per Cent of Com- plaints.
Burglary .....	5,379	1,127	21.0	337	29.9	6.3
Larceny .....	5,458	2,204	40.4	172	7.8	3.2
Robbery .....	1,225	987	80.6	197	20.0	16.1

a spindle and tearing them up when an officer reports thereon, needs no comment. The matter of running out and reporting on all complaints is of such vital importance to the individual citizen that the common expression by the citizen that it is of no use to make complaint should never be heard in the city of Chicago."

## REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

Charge.	*Criminal Com- plaints.	†Preliminary Hear- ings		Convictions Criminal Court		
		Num- ber.	Per Cent of Com- plaints.	Num- ber.	Per Cent of Pre- lim. Hear.	Per Cent of Com- plaints.
Total Burglary, Larceny and Robbery .....	12,062	4,318	35.8	706	16.4	5.9
Other felonies .....	677	2,833	418.5	229	8.1	33.8
Total .....	12,739	7,151	56.1	935	13.1	7.3

†Cases pending were subtracted from these columns as follows: Burglary 24, Larceny 52, Robbery 28, Other Felonies 107.

\*Statistics in this table are all for the year ending Nov. 30, 1912, since comparable statistics from the Criminal and Municipal Courts are available only for this year. For this reason criminal complaints are different from those for 1913 in Table III, which are for the year ending December 31.

A comparison between Tables III and IV shows quite clearly the result of combining and of separating the cases of grand and petit larceny. In the police statistics of felonies where they were not separated, the number of convictions was 48.3 per cent of the number of arrests; in the Municipal Court statistics of felonies which deal only with grand larceny the number of convictions was only 7.8 per cent of the number of preliminary hearings. Larceny convictions, according to the police statistics, were 41.3 per cent of larceny complaints; according to court statistics they were only 3.2 per cent of the complaints. It must, of course, be noted that these two sets of statistics are not for the same year. The police statistics are for the year ending Dec. 31, 1913; the Municipal Court statistics are for the year ending Nov. 30, 1912. There is, however, no reason to suppose that the percentage of convictions has changed very much within a year, and the difference between 48.3 per cent of convictions in the table from the police statistics and 7.8 per cent from the Municipal Court statistics can be explained only by the fact that the latter deals with grand larceny and the former with all larceny cases.

Because of this difference in the police and municipal court classification, it does not seem any more legitimate to make comparisons between criminal complaints and the criminal court convictions in the case of larceny than in the case of "all felonies."

Comparing statistics for burglary and robbery in the two tables we find that the Municipal Court statistics show a somewhat higher percentage of preliminary hearings, "cases disposed of," than the police statistics show of arrests, but the police statistics show a slightly lower percentage of convictions than the court statistics. That is, according to the police statistics, the convictions for robbery in 1913 were 16.7 per cent of the arrests on this charge, and 12.3 per cent of the complaints; the convictions for burglary were 27.4 per cent of the arrests and 4.4 per cent of the complaints. According to the court statistics, the number of convictions for robbery in 1912 were 20 per cent of the preliminary hearings and 16.1 per cent of the complaints; the convictions for burglary equaled 29.9 per cent of the preliminary hearings and 6.3 per cent of the complaints.

Both sets of statistics, therefore, show that convictions on charges of robbery and burglary are a small percentage (between 16.7 per cent and 30 per cent) of the number of arrests or preliminary hearings, and an extremely small percentage (between 4.4 per cent and 16.1 per cent) of the complaints. While it seems rather startling that burglary convictions equal in round numbers only 4 or 6 per cent of the complaints, it is probably true that the small percentages are to be accounted for in part by the fact that burglary complaints are changed sometimes upon arrest and sometimes after trial to charges of larceny.

Questions involved in a comparison of arrests and convictions are discussed with sufficient detail in the text (see pages 23-24 and 29-31). The purpose of this appendix is merely to explain that the statistics of criminal complaints furnished by the police department were not included in Tables 6, 11, 12, 13, because it appeared after a careful analysis that the statistics of complaints could not be legitimately compared with statistics of arrests or convictions. It is scarcely necessary to point out that reliable statistics of "crimes known to the police," similar to the statistics published annually in the Criminal Judicial Statistics of England, should be published each year for Chicago.

Before leaving the subject of criminal complaints, it should be explained that statistics have also been obtained showing the number of complaints received in the forty-five police precincts of Chicago, and these statistics are presented in Table V. Unfortunately, no data are available regarding the population of these various precincts.

After what has been said regarding the value of the statistics of criminal complaints, it has not seemed worth while to use Table V as the basis of a discussion of "crime areas." It should also be explained that, while statistics of arrests by precincts have not been available in the past, the department is now tabulating arrests by precincts and in the future such data will probably be published in the annual report. The sergeant in charge of the records, however, very kindly supplied such data as were already tabulated for the first two months of the year 1914, and these are presented in Table VI. Unfortunately, only the total number of arrests is given for each precinct, and the relative number of felonies and misdemeanors cannot be determined.

TABLE V. CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS RECEIVED 1912 AND 1913—BY POLICE PRECINCTS.

Precinct	Larceny.		Burglary.		Robbery		Other Crimes.		Total.	
	1913	1912	1913	1912	1913	1912	1913	1912	1913	1912
1 180 N. LaSalle.....	989	1,077	244	240	30	38	66	42	1,329	1,397
2 625 S. Clark.....	505	538	129	111	74	102	53	38	761	789
3 210 W. 22nd.....	192	268	192	180	103	92	98	100	585	640
4 2523 Cottage Gr...	125	111	74	64	48	29	28	19	275	223
5 454 E. 35th.....	219	224	199	160	58	48	55	39	531	471
6 740 W. 35th.....	68	73	90	90	56	29	27	20	241	212
7 2913 Loomis.....	30	24	33	30	28	13	15	7	106	74
8 3900 S. California.	25	13	48	26	6	4	6	5	85	48
9 (Discontinued) .....	8	.....	4	.....	1	.....	0	.....	.....	13
10 5233 Lake.....	271	159	221	175	42	47	20	10	554	391
11 5001 S. State.....	58	90	269	288	32	42	10	9	369	429
12 6344 Rosalie.....	89	104	191	146	17	25	10	18	307	293
13 834 E. 75th.....	15	11	36	43	7	22	15	6	73	82
14 200 E. 115th.....	21	15	45	31	2	3	1	0	69	49
15 2938 E. 89th.....	35	23	35	32	15	7	15	3	100	65
16 3525 E. 106th.....	18	10	18	11	6	3	6	1	48	25
17 6347 Wentworth ..	140	92	424	166	61	38	37	13	662	309
18 8501 S. Green.....	51	52	84	85	6	16	8	3	149	156
19 4736 S. Halsted...	53	62	65	47	36	21	21	15	175	145
20 1700 W. 47th.....	46	38	106	71	14	16	15	13	181	138
21 943 Maxwell.....	234	247	476	282	133	88	98	67	941	684
22 2075 Canalport....	28	46	65	70	9	5	9	23	111	144
23 1700 W. 21st Pl..	61	43	96	101	24	22	23	27	204	193
24 2250 W. 13th.....	56	57	187	179	55	50	24	19	322	305
25 2656 Lawndale.....	25	13	97	54	11	11	2	3	135	81
26 4001 Fillmore.....	84	80	232	207	32	21	53	17	401	325
27 120 N. Desplaines.	236	319	144	238	44	61	25	18	449	636
28 1637 W. Lake.....	195	235	194	188	62	50	20	9	471	482
29 2433 Warren.....	93	140	149	146	24	20	13	5	279	311
30 4250 W. Lake.....	40	36	97	65	7	4	4	0	148	105
31 5610 W. Lake.....	27	30	70	78	8	4	5	3	110	115
32 1123 W. Chicago..	53	94	179	201	36	43	7	9	275	347
33 1312 W. North....	14	29	95	94	5	13	5	3	119	139
34 2256 W. North....	69	82	212	199	31	32	15	17	327	330
35 2138 N. California.	34	43	219	158	44	36	29	27	326	264
36 3973 Milwaukee....	80	48	119	65	20	17	41	26	260	156
37 4905 Grand.....	21	14	32	18	5	5	12	12	70	49
38 113 W. Chicago...	342	358	328	248	67	64	48	43	785	713
39 1501 Hudson.....	111	65	122	67	26	16	11	14	270	162
40 2126 N. Halsted...	99	78	117	86	13	16	12	13	241	193
41 2742 Sheffield.....	96	91	204	161	17	23	19	27	336	302
42 3600 N. Halsted...	196	177	238	173	62	37	25	14	521	401
43 3801 N. Robey....	25	60	75	95	13	9	7	1	120	165
44 1940 Foster.....	127	102	248	198	20	25	23	17	418	342
45 7075 N. Clark.....	67	44	45	87	4	5	2	3	118	139
Total .....	5,363	5,523	6,543	5,458	1,413	1,277	1,038	774	14,357	13,032

## REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

TABLE VI. ARRESTS BY PRECINCTS DURING THE FIRST TWO MONTHS OF THE YEAR 1914.

Precinct	January	February	Total for 2 months
1 .....	281	248	529
2 .....	492	365	857
3 .....	439	324	763
4 .....	242	165	407
5 .....	298	223	521
6 .....	113	116	229
7 .....	82	150	232
8 .....	39	48	87
9 .....	...	...	...
10 .....	79	41	120
11 .....	234	181	415
12 .....	107	97	204
13 .....	63	63	126
14 .....	118	86	204
15 .....	175	146	321
16 .....	44	55	99
17 .....	173	190	363
18 .....	22	48	70
19 .....	206	196	402
20 .....	148	196	344
21 .....	479	404	883
22 .....	82	121	203
23 .....	127	186	313
24 .....	87	104	191
25 .....	51	51	102
26 .....	88	76	164
27 .....	805	547	1,352
28 .....	197	199	396
29 .....	99	90	189
30 .....	71	127	198
31 .....	25	50	75
32 .....	386	374	760
33 .....	185	386	571
34 .....	116	199	315
35 .....	152	287	439
36 .....	44	59	103
37 .....	32	48	80
38 .....	308	331	639
39 .....	74	121	195
40 .....	50	88	138
41 .....	102	157	259
42 .....	113	106	219
43 .....	47	41	88
44 .....	43	42	85
45 .....	35	24	59
Headquarters .....	214	44	258
Second Deputy's Office.....	370	137	507
First Deputy's Office.....	65	26	91
Detective Bureau.....	209	173	382
Traffic Division.....	113	158	271
Motorcycle Squad.....	3	5	8
Vehicle Bureau .....	560	490	1,050
Totals .....	8,687	8,189	16,876

## APPENDIX D

DISCUSSIONS OF RECURRENT "CRIME-WAVES"  
STATISTICS OF ARRESTS BY MONTHS

Discussions of so-called "crime-waves" constantly appear in the newspapers. It is a question of interest to determine whether or not these "crime-waves" occur with any degree of regularity at the same time of the year. The following table, which shows the statistics of arrests (charges) by months, shows that for the last six years there has been a marked increase in arrests in the month of March. The number of arrests has then fallen in April (with the exception of the year 1908) and increased, but less markedly, in May (with the exception of the year 1910). In four out of the six years there has been a "crime-wave" in December, in two years in January.

TABLE I. MONTHLY SUMMARY OF CHARGES: 1907 TO 1913.

(From the Annual Reports of the General Superintendent of Police.)

Month.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.
January .....	8,462	6,368	5,866	5,856	4,687	4,707
February .....	8,191	5,672	5,178	5,517	4,556	4,332
March .....	9,357	6,387	5,881	7,245	5,546	5,329
April .....	7,817	5,797	5,289	6,011	4,843	5,498
May .....	8,243	6,927	6,725	5,978	5,119	5,457
June .....	7,792	7,600	7,605	6,948	6,016	5,850
July .....	8,800	7,610	7,517	6,661	6,279	6,110
August .....	8,901	7,770	7,657	7,813	6,023	5,323
September .....	10,202	7,530	7,337	6,445	6,155	5,834
October .....	8,874	7,680	7,186	6,592	5,431	4,945
November .....	8,857	6,885	6,771	6,109	6,630	4,888
December .....	11,761	7,627	7,637	6,043	5,410	5,112
Total .....	107,257	83,853	80,649	77,218	66,695	63,385

Unfortunately, the monthly summary of arrests is for "all offenses," and it is not possible to show arrests by months on felony charges and on misdemeanor charges separately. There are available, however, some statistics of criminal complaints by months for the years 1912 and 1913. The statistics which are given below show that the "crime-wave," as far as the more serious crimes are concerned, is likely to occur in the months of November and December. These are the months when the greatest number of burglaries, larcenies, and robberies occur, but it is important to note that there seems to be a second "crime-wave" in May of almost equal proportions.

TABLE II. MONTHLY SUMMARY OF CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS RECEIVED DURING 1912 AND 1913.

Month	1913					1912				
	Lar- ceny	Burg- lary	Rob- bery	Other	Total	Lar- ceny	Burg- lary	Rob- bery	Other	Total
January .....	391	545	161	117	1,214	381	348	101	52	882
February .....	326	469	151	69	1,015	378	475	85	52	990
March .....	365	506	96	75	1,042	403	430	83	75	991
April .....	365	541	83	63	1,052	413	428	81	54	976
May .....	453	576	92	75	1,196	478	540	100	84	1,202
June .....	421	508	69	82	1,080	532	454	114	75	1,175
July .....	521	484	73	88	1,166	520	462	83	70	1,135
August .....	495	471	117	82	1,165	465	435	91	61	1,052
September .....	483	585	106	93	1,267	496	413	95	62	1,066
October .....	484	563	118	68	1,233	472	420	121	70	1,083
November .....	517	657	164	111	1,449	530	511	149	72	1,262
December .....	554	629	159	119	1,461	455	542	174	47	1,218
Total .....	5,375	6,534	1,389	1,042	14,340	5,523	5,458	1,277	774	13,032



## APPENDIX E

### STATISTICS RELATING TO ARRESTS AND CONVIC- TIONS IN CHICAGO, NEW YORK AND LONDON COMPARED

The extent of crime or treatment of crime in different countries is not subject to exact comparisons. The laws defining crimes are different, and the procedure varies from one country to another. Nevertheless such comparisons, if made with the understanding that they are subject to reservations, are interesting. The following table shows the number of arrests per 1,000 of the population in Chicago compared with statistics from New York and London. No attempt is made to use statistics for Paris or Berlin, the other cities with which Chicago challenges comparison, because the criminal code and system of courts in France and Germany is so unlike our own. The London statistics are for "persons proceeded against."

#### ARRESTS OR ARRAIGNMENTS PER 1,000 POPULATION: CHICAGO, NEW YORK, LONDON.

	Felonies	Mis- demeanors	Total Arrests	— Convictions —	
				Per 1,000 Population	Per Cent of Arrests
Chicago, 1913 .....	4.78	42.05	46.83	21.83	46.6
New York, 1913*....	3.71	19.32	23.03	15.76	68.5
London, 1912†.....	2.18	15.91	18.09	22.49	87.2‡

\*Comparison with New York is hardly legitimate because of the extensive use of the summons in New York in the last few years.

The increasing use of the summons since 1910 in New York has resulted in a decrease in arrests and an increase in the percentage of convictions. In 1913 there were 119,736 arrests excluding juvenile cases; but there were 52,294 summons cases. There were 81,952 convictions and 45,609 convictions on summonses. It does not seem fair to add the summons cases in New York since they are not included in the Chicago figures, but the increasing use of the summons in New York makes the comparison less accurate. If the summons cases were added in, the result would be 33.09 arrests per 1,000 and 24.54 convictions per 1,000. See Annual Report of the Police Department, City of New York, 1913, p. 16.

†Statistics for London compiled from Judicial Statistics, England and Wales, 1912, Part I, Criminal Statistics, p. 89 (Cd. 7282).

‡The percentage was necessarily computed on the total number proceeded against which includes 55,879 summonsed in addition to 131,167 arrested.

This table shows that Chicago has a high "crime rate," if the arrests per 1,000 of the population for felonies be taken as indicating crime; that is, Chicago has 4.78 arrests on felony charges per 1,000 population in comparison with 3.71 per 1,000 population in New York and 2.18 per 1,000 population in London. The total number of arrests per 1,000 population in Chicago is also high in comparison with these other cities: 46.83 per 1,000 population in Chicago compared with 23.03 in New York and 18.09 in London. On the other hand, if the crime rate were to be determined not by arrests, but by convictions for crime, the results are quite different: 21.83 per 1,000 of the population in Chicago, compared with 15.76 in New York and 22.49 in London. That is, the per cent of needless arrests seems to be very high in Chicago. The figures indicate that we have 46.6 per cent of convictions, compared, for example, with 87.2 per cent in London. It is possible to compare the per cent of convictions for felonies in Chicago and the per cent of convictions for indictable offenses in London with the following result:

#### LONDON: INDICTABLE OFFENSES, 1912.

Persons proceeded against .....		16,045
Discharged .....	2,718	16.9%
Discharged .....	2,326)	
Acquitted .....	392)	
Held or convicted .....	13,195	82.2%

# STATISTICS OF CRIME IN CHICAGO

87

Convicted .....	4,693)		
Committed for trial .....	4,454)		
Order made without conviction.....	4,048)		
Otherwise disposed of .....	132	9%	

## CHICAGO: FELONIES, 1912.

Total preliminary hearings .....	7,362		
Discharged without trial .....	5,959	81.0%	
Discharged by Municipal Court.....	4,749)		
No bills, Grand Jury.....	783)		
Nolle pros. or stricken off.....	427)		
Held for trial .....	1,403	19.0%	

These figures are of course not comparable in any exact sense. The offenses classified as "felonies" in Illinois are, however, very much like the "indictable offenses" in England. The English statistics include under indictable offenses in round numbers about 500 cases of "attempted suicide," about 200 cases of habitual drunkenness, about 400 "offenses in bankruptcy," about 200 cases of coining or possession of counterfeit money that would not be included here. On the other hand our police statistics include, in round numbers, 1,500 cases of "contributing to delinquency," which would not be included in the English classification. The great difference between the 80 per cent held in London and the 19 per cent held in Chicago is due in part to the fact that arrests cannot be made there without legal evidence of guilt. This would, of course, prevent the great waste involved in the needless arrests made here.

A comparison of the police force in the several cities can be made statistically as to the number of officers per 1,000 of the population and the number per square mile, as follows:

## NUMBER OF POLICE IN COMPARISON WITH POPULATION AND AREA.

	London, 1911	New York, 1913	Chicago, 1913
Number of police .....	19,156	10,266	4,430
Population of the city.....	7,251,358	5,198,888	2,344,018
Area of city in square miles.....	692.9	268.8*	184.7*
Police per 10,000 population.....	26.42	19.75	18.90
Police per square mile.....	27.65	35.79	23.98
Per capita expenditure for police.....	\$2.21	\$2.97†	\$2.92†

\*This is the land area as given in the United States Bureau of the Census Report on **Financial Statistics of Cities, 1912**, p. 137.

†Statistics of per capita expenditures for New York and for Chicago are from the same report, p. 214. It is of interest to note that similar per capital expenditure for other cities having a population of 500,000 and over is as follows: Philadelphia, \$2.69; St. Louis, \$2.84; Boston, \$3.19; Cleveland, \$1.50; Baltimore, \$2.21; Pittsburgh, \$2.07; Detroit, \$2.01. Some question may be raised as to the comparability of these per capita statistics, but the census does not discuss this point.

‡Statistics for London from **London Statistics, 1911-12**, issued by the London County Council.

This table shows that while Chicago has a smaller police force than New York or London, making the comparison both in relation to the population and area of the different cities, the numbers are not enough smaller to explain any very great difference in police methods. New York has only one more officer for every 10,000 of the population than Chicago, London has seven and one-half more. London has per square mile, however, about three and one-half more than Chicago and New York has about eleven and one-half more than Chicago. It is, of course, the population comparison that is important, since crime has a very close relation to numbers of population and a very remote relation to area of the city. The most important question obviously is that of method of organization of the force, and on this point statistics do not throw any light.\*

\*In discussing the inefficiency of the Chicago police organization, the **Final Report of the Civil Service Commission on Police Investigation** contains the following statement: "In its preliminary report the Commission, in commenting upon the large number of patrolmen assigned to special duty,

A comparison of the number of specific offenses of such crimes as murder, burglary, and robbery, committed in different cities and in different countries, cannot be made with any satisfactory degree of accuracy. It is not fair, for example, to compare arrests, for one city may be very lax about apprehending criminals, another very thorough and still another very active in making arrests, but very inefficient in arresting the right persons. On the other hand, it is not fair to compare convictions, since a small number of convictions may be due to the fact that the police have been inefficient in one city or the courts inefficient in another. However, such comparative figures as are available have been brought together below:

STATISTICS RELATING TO THE NUMBER OF CASES OF MURDER,  
ROBBERY AND BURGLARY, COMPARED IN CHICAGO,  
NEW YORK AND LONDON.

	Cases Disposed of
Murder and Manslaughter—	
Chicago, 1913 .....	149
Chicago, 1912 .....	127
*New York, 1913 .....	131
New York, 1912 .....	174
London, 1912 .....	87
Robbery and Assault to Rob—	
Chicago, 1913 .....	1,178
Chicago, 1912 .....	1,015
New York, 1913 .....	928
New York, 1912 .....	637
London, 1912 .....	45
Burglary—	
Chicago, 1913 .....	1,320
Chicago, 1912 .....	1,151
New York, 1913 .....	1,755
New York, 1912 .....	1,463
London, 1912 .....	3,270

\*The New York classification is "homicide."

With regard to the number of burglaries it should be explained that the Chicago figures are for three felonies, "burglary," "accessory to," and "assault to commit." The New York classification includes "the commission of burglary in any of its degrees." For London, the various forms of burglary were grouped together; they include "burglary," "house-breaking," "breaking into shops, etc.," "attempts to break," "entering with intent," "possessing tools."

stated that out of 3,800 patrolmen on duty, about 500 are ordinarily carried in citizen's dress, 350 on wagons and ambulances, 300 on street crossings, rail-crossings and bridges, and about 1,200 on 'special duty;' and "The Commission further stated that the assignment of patrolmen to duties that could be performed more efficiently and at a lower salary by other types of employees, is an injustice to the taxpayers, and a financial injury to the city" (pp. 42-43). A further criticism with regard to the "secret service" is as follows: "The number of men assigned to this duty is out of all proportion to the work accomplished, and a critical analysis of the work done by plain clothes men at stations should be made with a view of returning to patrol duty as many men as possible. The character of the work to which the plain clothes men are assigned is, to a large extent, such as could better be performed by a man in uniform. The presence of a man in uniform is a most corrective aid against crime, vice and disorder, and the all-important function of a police department is the prevention of crime and disorder and not to make a record for arrests. The detection of criminals is of minor importance if crime is prevented by the presence of an ample uniformed police."

APPENDIX F.  
DETAILED TABLES OF FELONIES AND MISDEMEANORS  
(ALL CHARGES), 1900-1913.

TABLE I. CLASSIFICATION OF CHARGES (FELONIES), 1900 TO 1913.  
(From Annual Reports of the Police Department.)

Charge.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.
Abandonment of child under 1 year.	9	11	1	2	6	2	1	1	9	49	45	*	*	*
Abduction .....	19	36	22	23	18	26	28	24	27	27	33	34	27	18
Abortion .....	17	25	17	10	17	16	21	11	15	3	2	3	2	3
Arson or attempt to commit arson..	85	73	100	45	13	21	19	33	46	21	22	16	25	30
Bigamy .....	22	35	21	26	26	20	26	19	12	47	44	8	8	7
Burglary .....	985	1,013	1,183	1,124	1,229	1,634	1,415	1,739	1,780	1,388	1,616	1,653	1,709	1,664
Burglary, accessory to .....	56	81	87	58	73	83	68	88	78	202	252	23	35	13
Burglary, attempt to commit.....	131	109	80	78	523	647	497	501	535	304	267	43	56	34
Children, crime against.....	1,528	821	666	692	621	647	497	501	535	304	267	43	56	34
Children, contributing to delinquency	681	740	641	599	621	647	497	501	535	304	267	43	56	34
Confidence game .....	71	29	53	38	45	49	32	27	23	18	30	13	13	20
Conspiracy .....	21	29	38	33	31	49	32	27	23	18	30	13	13	20
Crime against nature .....	199	167	272	234	230	137	150	168	115	110	127	196	205	187
Embezzlement .....	63	89	87	59	74	89	73	87	64	85	86	66	77	68
Forgery .....	12	23	5	3	8	4	15	8	14	9	8	10	5	15
Having burglars' tools .....	19	14	9	7	12	4	15	8	14	9	8	2	3	8
Incest .....	10	9	21	27	14	9	3	11	8	7	6	6	2	9
Kidnapping .....	4,532	4,138	3,977	4,007	4,369	5,224	5,420	5,329	5,234	4,732	5,398	5,051	5,841	5,560
Larceny and larceny by bailee.....	38	41	35	23	40	19	21	34	60	513	666	211	203	163
Larceny, accessory to .....	23	19	18	11	13	231	372	717	553	567	674	74	76	36
Larceny, attempt to commit.....	250	227	212	219	264	231	372	717	553	567	674	665	599	663
Malicious mischief .....	43	41	33	20	22	18	25	33	11	30	7	7	3	2
Manslaughter .....	14	16	25	20	18	27	34	52	39	38	46	34	24	41
Mayhem .....	219	170	88	61	73	53	73	68	177	35	50	26	29	26
Murder .....	33	13	15	22	13	10	17	10	46	46	82	782	659	602
Murder, accessory to.....	246	238	391	312	261	328	393	915	931	502	567	782	659	602
Murder, assault to commit .....	36	68	60	92	73	19	26	11	8	19	13	11	11	14
Pandering .....	25	53	16	9	19	19	26	11	8	19	13	11	11	14
Perjury .....	25	53	16	9	19	19	26	11	8	19	13	11	11	14

Charge.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.
Rape.....	204	250	172	175	205	172	164	139	137	70	71	33	49	70
Rape, assault to commit.....	54	72	61	69	54	67	54	127	108	73	101	60	58	53
Receiving stolen property.....	451	340	389	413	465	429	404	485	371	387	445	357	415	374
Robbery.....	835	866	852	679	507	709	719	1,001	1,200	922	933	832	859	918
Robbery, accessory to.....	7	16	18	23	9	17	11	16	19	117	201	9	60	20
Robbery, assault to commit.....	180	224	138	105	165	142	173	191	122	154	186	137	192	125
Threats to kidnap or murder.....	68	133	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Other felonies.....	17	57	49	41	60	309	384	514	386	544	481	...	11	...
Total felonies.....	11,203	10,276	9,881	9,376	9,656	10,551	10,553	12,376	12,144	11,116	12,550	10,495	11,383	10,838

\*Before 1913 the charges were simply listed and not classified into felonies and misdemeanors. The following offenses appear only in the earlier years and evidently include both felonies and misdemeanors. In addition, therefore, to those listed in the foregoing tables there were in the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 the following:

	1902.	1901.	1900.
Abandonment.....	261	288	235
Criminal carelessness.....	11	9	15
Harboring a female under 18 years in a house of ill fame.....	...	...	2
Horse stealing.....	...	...	6
Swindling.....	154	178	207
Threats.....	1,030	933	869
Total.....	1,456	1,408	1,334

TABLE II. CLASSIFICATION OF CHARGES (MISDEMEANORS),  
1900 TO 1913.

(From the Annual Reports of the Police Department.)

Charge.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.
Abandonment of wife or children.....	1,171	1,017	1,104	1,076	932	965	873	547	424	320	314	...	...	...
Adultery and fornication.....	477	286	370	342	366	495	295	68	88	82	136	68	78	74
Assault and battery.....	977	1,241	875	714	682	730	2,325	2,698	2,431	2,648	3,803	4,950	4,614	4,458
Assault with deadly weapon.....	1,396	1,128	1,193	1,080	993	1,036	1,212	1,054	1,010	868	920	482	525	532
Assignment house, inmates.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	15	131	175	211	357	240
Assignment house, keepers.....	381	339	388	412	415	421	345	166	74	4	12	21	60	42
Bastardy.....	1,192	1,129	1,203	970	836	948	1,078	1,330	1,160	137	129	71	79	77
Carrying concealed weapons.....	255	212	100	368	289	350	388	162	57	576	610	911	923	750
Cruelty to animals.....	1	1	12	14	11	26	35	52	7	28	24	142	104	58
Cruelty to children.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3	5	2	12	2

Charge.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.
Disorderly conduct .....	54,738	43,635	49,386	51,791	43,398	40,875	35,650	49,230	45,847	45,577	40,186	34,405	32,469	34,965
Disorderly house, inmates or keepers .....	1,654	1,405	660	996	782	530	504	763	408	236	474	703	707	433
Doing business without license .....	.....	.....	934	1,189	941	392	224	319	276	658	594	221	424	325
Having gaming devices .....	7	3	29	35	94	112	115	913	689	800	623	21	30	8
Gaming house, inmates .....	4,127	2,112	2,588	1,230	1,531	1,671	1,561	5,603	4,336	3,803	1,954	1,713	1,306	1,385
Gaming house, keepers .....	1,256	2,318	330	386	505	454	408	1,258	880	796	184	525	349	213
House of ill fame, inmates .....	3,195	1,663	617	347	580	236	299	1,209	897	399	566	563	813	1,001
House of ill fame, keepers .....	486	396	264	149	222	68	90	649	329	261	280	229	292	331
Intimidation .....	7	10	24	5	5	4	18	42	46	140	33	1	14	17
Impersonating an officer .....	44	53	43	64	65	60	49	52	44	22	15	20	63	50
False pretenses .....	375	358	409	413	450	500	446	403	431	457	351	497	538	392
Opium dens, inmates .....	99	133	34	37	102	176	74	281	232	146	181	223	521	422
Resisting an officer .....	167	233	350	359	348	372	506	833	626	528	734	684	682	786
Riot .....	.....	10	18	16	5	32	25	31	241	139	49	5	13	37
Selling liquor to minors or drunks .....	124	20	36	79	138	160	43	24	1	12	33	5	16	84
Speed ordinances .....	4,962	2,233	2,357	1,348	1,38	68	897	2,434	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Street walkers .....	1,645	1,516	1,730	1,619	1,778	1,731	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Threats, extortion by .....	20	7	24	15	13	10	9	9	13	70	70	.....	.....	.....
Vagrancy .....	935	850	795	1,572	1,040	1,196	542	379	361	68	631	581	750	818
*Other .....	18,870	14,366	9,086	5,267	4,040	4,051	4,764	9,428	9,791	8,981	12,037	11,109	10,902	10,751
<b>Total ..</b>	<b>98,561</b>	<b>76,674</b>	<b>74,959</b>	<b>71,893</b>	<b>60,719</b>	<b>57,669</b>	<b>52,775</b>	<b>79,937</b>	<b>70,800</b>	<b>67,890</b>	<b>65,123</b>	<b>58,363</b>	<b>56,641</b>	<b>58,251</b>

  

\*Under "other misdemeanors" for 1900, 1901 and 1902 were included the following violations of ordinances. They are probably included in the "other misdemeanors" of later years, although this is not entirely clear.

Ordinance.	1902.	1901.	1900.
Bathing .....	.....	15	16
Begging .....	.....	1	1
Bridges .....	3	.....	1
Building .....	33	39	50
Depots .....	.....	.....	9
Dogs .....	635	478	705
Express .....	1	.....	11
Hacks .....	20	32	16
Health .....	114	108	156
Junk dealers .....	6	71	28
Parks .....	442	221	274
Ordinance.	1902.	1901.	1900.
Pawnbrokers .....	.....	4	8
Porters and runners .....	.....	.....	2
Railways .....	.....	659	675
Saloons .....	.....	514	541
Sidewalks .....	.....	69	34
Streets .....	185	92	83
Telegraphs .....	.....	.....	6
Vehicles .....	.....	19	79
Weights and measures .....	.....	54	40
Other .....	7,561	7,418	6,604
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>10,319</b>	<b>9,852</b>	<b>9,943</b>

## APPENDIX G.

Detailed Lists of Offenses, Preliminary Hearings, Criminal (Misdemeanor)  
Cases and Quasi-Criminal Cases (Violations of Ordinances).CASES DISPOSED OF IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF CHICAGO,  
1908 TO 1913.

## A.—FELONY AND OTHER CASES ON PRELIMINARY HEARING.

Offense.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.
Abduction . . . . .	22	36	38	29	19	20
Abortion . . . . .	24	21	17	15	21	15
Arson . . . . .	138	108	68	44	14	40
Assault with intent to kill. . . . .	344	319	376	227	271	377
Bigamy . . . . .	32	37	25	34	31	25
Bribery . . . . .	17	6	13	5	10	17
Burglary . . . . .	1,320	1,151	1,339	1,128	1,334	1,614
Confidence game . . . . .	1,035	924	1,149	753	804	645
Conspiracy . . . . .	72	30	59	24	66	48
Crime against nature . . . . .	68	49	55	24	31	73
Enticing female into house of prostitution. . . . .	5	8	2	3	1	....
Permitting female into house of prostitution. . . . .	....	....	....	....	....	14
Embezzlement . . . . .	240	193	294	166	127	179
Forgery . . . . .	89	100	106	66	103	105
Gaming house . . . . .	....	....	....	....	2	....
Horse stealing . . . . .	40	17	26	30	33	38
Incest . . . . .	25	13	14	11	9	8
Larceny . . . . .	2,150	2,256	3,718	3,077	1,716	2,213
Murder . . . . .	103	87	116	137	106	43
Manslaughter . . . . .	46	40	25	22	16	34
Obtaining money under false pretenses. . . . .	68	67	168	1	50	270
Perjury . . . . .	25	29	32	8	20	32
Rape . . . . .	303	347	261	267	278	265
Robbery . . . . .	1,178	1,015	968	839	882	657
Receiving stolen property . . . . .	307	194	292	145	191	258
Other felonies . . . . .	451	315	365	563	325	731
Total . . . . .	8,102	7,362	9,526	7,618	6,460	7,721

## STATISTICS OF CRIME IN CHICAGO

88e

## B.—CRIMINAL (MISDEMEANOR) CASES.

Offense.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.
Abandonment .....	1,472	1,612	1,769	1,548	1,432	1,063
Adulteration of foods.....	54	96	67	44	22	98
Adultery and fornication .....	512	344	402	191	247	252
Assault and battery .....	999	1,471	819	737	769	1,270
Assault with deadly weapon.....	1,458	1,327	1,395	1,130	896	555
Automobiles .....	7,231	4,132	2,996	1,049	145	294
Child labor .....	366	199	160	114	202	....
Children, delinquent and dependent.....	1,610	1,119	733	634	361	470
Cruelty to animals .....	4	....	2	2	4	44
Cocaine .....	....	11	3	2	....	9
Dental .....	....	....	2	2	....	13
Employment of females .....	353	248	173	....	....	....
Embezzlement .....	....	....	....	34	90	34
False pretenses .....	374	358	271	357	416	321
Fish and game .....	5	2	2	5	3	7
Gambling .....	....	....	....	7	13	86
Kidnapping .....	10	....	1	....	....	....
Larceny .....	2,938	2,824	914	1,545	3,316	3,233
Lotteries .....	....	4	3	2	1	25
Malicious mischief .....	162	156	166	118	147	134
Obscene books .....	....	6	3	3	5	18
Pandering .....	54	72	62	92	....	....
Pharmacy .....	14	3	....	....	....	3
Receiving stolen property .....	202	167	131	113	264	199
Seduction .....	12	11	12	4	10	3
Vagrancy .....	214	165	151	176	71	166
Other misdemeanors .....	1,476	1,561	1,533	1,916	1,716	2,170
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>19,520</b>	<b>15,888</b>	<b>11,770</b>	<b>9,825</b>	<b>10,130</b>	<b>10,467</b>

## C.—QUASI-CRIMINAL CASES.

(Violations of City Ordinances and Bastardy Cases.)

Offense.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.
Bastardy cases .....	419	590	552	540	488	....
Buildings, unsafe .....	120	360	305	107	57	104
Carrying concealed weapons .....	1,181	1,183	1,111	831	758	952
Coal, short weight .....	34	19	19	17	19	19
Cream, under grade .....	50	15	18	55	94	194
Disorderly conduct .....	53,503	47,824	52,100	53,228	44,769	42,127
False weights and measures.....	190	113	59	94	162	279
Fire escapes .....	6	11	17	....	5	68
Gambling .....	4,966	2,323	314	372	1,364	857
Immoral exhibitions .....	3	6	27	11	14	26
Indecent exposure .....	56	73	81	136	106	138
Inmates and keepers of gambling houses...	211	2,924	1,774	1,040	510	952
Keeping slot machine .....	6	28	86	2	56	40
Keeping house of ill-fame .....	3,345	1,863	205	134	182	70
Keeping disorderly house .....	1,608	1,075	598	934	697	447
Markets, unclean premises .....	9	6	21	2	27	243
Milk, adulterated .....	1	....	18	32	6	191
Milk, under grade .....	202	246	55	218	373	860
Milk dealers, unclean premises.....	103	21	1	39	106	78
Night walkers .....	1,846	1,569	1,633	1,619	1,665	1,664
Smoke nuisance .....	248	381	663	816	320	121
Vagabonds .....	662	703	842	....	....	....
Violating park ordinances .....	1,184	2,146	2,545	1,665	1,400	....
Water closets, unclean .....	26	13	6	28	50	20
Violating other city ordinances.....	23,732	19,627	8,384	8,559	8,553	7,292
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>93,711</b>	<b>83,119</b>	<b>71,434</b>	<b>70,479</b>	<b>61,781</b>	<b>56,742</b>



APPENDIX H.  
STATISTICS SHOWING DISPOSITION OF CASES IN THE  
MUNICIPAL COURTS, 1900-1913, FROM THE ANNUAL  
REPORTS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

	DISPOSITION OF CASES IN MUNICIPAL COURTS, 1900 TO 1913.															
Disposition.	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.	1907.	1906.	1905.	1904.	1903.	1902.	1901.	1900.		
Held to Grand Jury.....	2,182	2,725	2,783	2,934	2,315	3,242	2,315	3,438	3,398	3,333	3,440	3,139	3,000	3,574		
Held to Juvenile Court.....	53	24	64	71	252	1,127	1,741	2,061	2,021	1,851	2,021	1,784	1,990	1,312		
Sentenced to County Jail.....	141	128	116	113	2,039	1,618	1,933	.....	.....	.....	.....	*2,091	†1,975	.....		
Sentenced to House of Correction..	1,933	1,209	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
Sentenced to other correc. institut'ns	2	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
Fined .....	43,690	27,448	30,612	31,647	26,987	26,292	25,307	22,698	22,362	21,542	20,412	17,825	19,063	16,366		
Paroled (probation) .....	1,918	701	120	11	95	263	401	1,315	1,243	1,165	1,329	.....	.....	1,274		
Released on peace bonds.....	105	88	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
Ordered to make weekly payments..	876	910	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
Discharged .....	56,529	48,563	49,034	44,286	39,000	35,593	29,867	59,706	50,436	43,045	46,597	41,693	40,318	45,247		
Nolle pros and stricken from docket.	2,003	3,415	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
Otherwise disposed of.....	332	167	872	227	373	423	358	212	1,223	8,383	3,343	†3,782	†3,096	†2,663		
Total .....	109,764	85,381	84,601	80,309	71,061	68,558	61,922	89,340	80,683	79,319	77,142	70,314	69,442	70,436		

\*Includes 292 cases sent to penitentiary or reformatories.

†Otherwise disposed of and still pending.

‡Includes 388 cases sent to penitentiary or reformatories.

§2,533 cases are change of venue to private justices.