

1912

Program of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Institute

F. B. Crossley

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

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

Recommended Citation

F. B. Crossley, Program of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Institute, 3 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 333 (May 1912 to March 1913)

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

PROGRAM OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
INSTITUTE.

The fourth annual meeting of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology will be held jointly with the Wisconsin Branch in Milwaukee, immediately following the sessions of the American Bar Association, August 29-31. Following is the program:

First Session, Thursday, August 29, 1912, 2 P. M.

Presiding Officer—Chief Justice John B. Winslow of Wisconsin, President of the Institute.

Address of Welcome—His Excellency, the Governor of Wisconsin; Hon. G. A. Bading, Mayor of Milwaukee.

The President's Address—Chief Justice John B. Winslow of Wisconsin.

The Annual Address—Hon. Frank L. Randall of Minnesota.

Report of Committee G of the Institute, on Crime and Immigration—Gino C. Speranza of New York, Chairman.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

4:30-6:30 P. M.—Informal reception by the Committee on Arrangements to members of the Institute at the Hotel Pfister.

7:00 P. M.—Annual dinner of the American Bar Association at Hotel Pfister. Open only to members of the American Bar Association. Tickets should be procured from the Secretary of the Association.

Second Session, Friday, August 30, 1912, 9:30 A. M.

Presiding Officer—Judge Alexander H. Reid, President of the Wisconsin Branch.

The Annual Address of the President of the Wisconsin Branch—Judge Alexander H. Reid of Wausau.

Report of Committee A of the Wisconsin Branch—C. B. Bird of Wausau, Chairman.

Special Report on the Office of District Attorney—M. B. Rosenberry of Wausau.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Report of Committee C of the Wisconsin Branch on the Organization of Courts—John B. Sanborn of Madison, Chairman.

Report of Committee D of the Institute on the Organization of Courts—Professor Roscoe Pound of Massachusetts, Chairman.

PROGRAM OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

LUNCHEON.

12:00—Luncheon at the Hotel Pfister. Persons desiring to attend the luncheon should notify the Secretary and procure tickets in advance.

Third Session, Friday, August 30, 1912, 2 P. M.

Presiding Officer—Chief Justice John B. Winslow of Wisconsin.

Report of Committee C of the Institute on Judicial Probation and Suspended Sentence—Judge Wilfred Bolster of Massachusetts, Chairman.

Report of Committee F of the Institute on the Indeterminate Sentence and Release on Parole—Edwin M. Abbott of Pennsylvania, Chairman.

Special Report on the Indeterminate Sentence—Herman Grothorst of Wisconsin.

Special Report on the Constitutionality of the Indeterminate Sentence—Judge C. D. Rosa of Wisconsin.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Fourth Session, Friday, August 30, 1912, 8 P. M.

Presiding Officer—Judge Alexander H. Reid, President of the Wisconsin Branch.

Report of Committee D of the Wisconsin Branch on Sterilization of Criminals and Defectives—Dr. A. W. Wilmath of Wisconsin, Chairman.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Report of Committee F of the Wisconsin Branch on Prison Labor—A. F. Beliaz of Wisconsin, Chairman.

Special Report on Prison Labor—Dr. E. Stagg Whitin of New York, Secretary of the National Committee on Prison Labor.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Report of Committee I of the Wisconsin Branch on the Treatment of Recidivists—R. E. Smith of Wisconsin, Chairman.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Fifth Session, Saturday, August 31, 9:30 A. M.

Presiding Officer—Chief Justice John B. Winslow of Wisconsin.

Report of Committee A of the Institute on System for Recording Data Concerning Criminality—Judge Harry Olson of Illinois, Chairman.

Report of Committee No. 3 of the Institute on Criminal Statistics—John Koren of Massachusetts, Chairman.

Report of Committee E of the Institute on Criminal Procedure—Judge William N. Gemmill of Illinois, Chairman.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE AND THE AMERICAN BAR

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Report of Committee B of the Wisconsin Branch on Testimony of Non-residents and Incriminating Evidence—Judge C. A. Fowler of Wisconsin, Chairman.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Report of Committee E of the Wisconsin Branch on Affidavits of Prejudice—B. R. Goggins of Wisconsin, Chairman.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

Sixth Session, Saturday, August 31, 2 P. M.

Presiding Officer—Chief Justice John B. Winslow of Wisconsin.

Report of Committee No. 1 of the Institute on Co-operation with other Organizations—W. O. Hart of Louisiana, Chairman.

Report of Committee No. 2 of the Institute on Translation of European Treatises on Criminal Science—John H. Wigmore of Illinois.

Report of Committee No. 4 of the Institute on State Societies and Membership—Oliver S. Rundell of Wisconsin, Chairman.

Report of Committee B of the Institute on Insanity and Criminal Responsibility—Edwin R. Keedy of Illinois, Chairman.

Report of Secretary.

Report of Treasurer.

Report of Managing Editor of the Journal.

Report of Managing Director of the Journal.

Election of Institute Officers.

Adjournment of the Institute.

Immediately following the adjournment of the Institute, there will be a business session of the Wisconsin Branch for the hearing of special reports and for the election of officers.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE AND THE AMERICAN BAR.

The law in its classic theory regarded crime as a purely objective thing, an injury to society it is true, but a material damage. It did not regard crime with aversion or even as the outcome of moral turpitude: it regarded merely the result, and punishment was administered, as compensation for the loss.

This theory looked to the past: It was concerned with,

(a) The material damage to society;

(b) The injury other than material, and finally came to regard punishment as:

(c) The expiation of crime, as for a sin.

Neither the earlier theory nor its later development looked to the

future. Only in recent years have students of the subject come to do so. And the change of attitude marks the beginning of the modern school of criminology, for it finds its center and its objective in *the individualization of punishment*.

So long as the law was concerned with the thing done, the objective fact of crime, regardless of why, or by whom, it was committed, the result being the same the punishment should always be uniform. When, however, crime becomes a subjective thing as well, viewed in the light of contributing and palliating circumstances, together with the result, individualization of punishment became necessary.

The keynote of modern criminal science is then individualization of punishment. This cannot be too often emphasized. It considers the offense against society and fully protects it, but nevertheless keeps in view always as of equal importance the offender, his heredity, his environment, his motives, his possibilities, his limitations, and tries to so regulate the punishment to, without sacrificing the rights of society, save if possible the offender for a useful place in it.

The Bar has been accused of taking no interest in this great modern movement. Unfortunately the charge is in a large degree justified. Yet it may be explained. When crime was regarded merely as an objective fact for which there was a penalty, the law stated the penalty and the courts concerned themselves only with the law, taking no interest in the causes of the crime. The change from the old idea to the new, however, has changed all that, and with the awakening to the importance of the individual factor in crime, came a desire for a scientific study and acknowledgement of the contributory factors to crime. Such an awakening has been taking place for many years in Continental Europe; it has only just begun in America. It became necessary, therefore, for the American student to know the results of the European experiments along this line, and to formulate our own experiences.

Dean John H. Wigmore, with happy inspiration, conceived the idea of a conference representing all classes interested in the administration of punitive justice. Such a conference was called as a unique and useful way of celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Northwestern University Law School. Out of that first National Conference of Criminal Law and Criminology, whose purpose is "to further the scientific study of crime, criminal law and procedure, to formulate and promote measures for solving the problems connected therewith, and to co-ordinate the effort of individuals and of organizations interested in the administration of certain and speedy justice."

Two conferences have been held since: The second in Washington

PRISON REFORM IN OHIO

in 1910; the third in Boston in 1911; and the fourth is to be held in Milwaukee, August 29th, 30th, and 31st, 1912, in connection with the meeting of the American Bar Association.

The need of such an organization and of such conferences, to anyone giving the subject even the most cursory attention, must indeed be apparent. The great number of problems connected with the whole subject of crime, the formulation and administration of the criminal law and contributory sciences which may be properly included under the term criminology, show to any observer the necessity for an organization of scientifically trained men—the Bench and the Bar, the professors of law in the great universities of the country, the criminologists, the penologists, the sociologists, the teachers, the physicians, the alienists, the superintendents of juvenile and reformatory institutions, the psychologists, the police officers, the probation and parole officers—men of public spirit who have the knowledge and desire to labor tirelessly for a solution of those great problems.

Of such is the American Institute which formulates for discussion, both in its national conferences and through its state societies, these problems, calling them to the attention of the country, forcefully, thoughtfully, convincingly, attracting the attention of the Bench and the Bar, as few organizations could hope to do and bringing together these scientific men whose conclusions will be respected and given attentive consideration, both by the Bench, charged with the greatest responsibility in such matters, and by the Bar, which must guide, whether it would or not, if progress is to be made.

The Bar has its duty in connection with this great movement which cannot be shirked. Unless it assumes it cheerfully, its leadership will be wrested from it and the community will force progress under less competent guidance. The importance of the work of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology and that of its Journal in making that work known cannot be overestimated. The others interested have fully awakened to this fact. Let not the Bar be the laggard in this mighty procession towards a proper administration of criminal justice in America.

NATHAN WILLIAM MACCHESNEY.

PRISON REFORM IN OHIO.

Ohio is taking a distinctly forward step in prison management. The last vestige of the contract labor system has been abolished. Convicts are no longer to be driven like slaves for unjustly swollen profits in the service of corporations who have secured their labor at small cost.

PRISON REFORM IN OHIO

This reform has come about in response to a radical change in public sentiment.

The problem now is what to do with the 1600 idle convicts. Temporarily, according to Carl D. Ruth in the *Cleveland Leader* for July 21, they are being employed at tearing down the old buildings in which bolt and nut and cigar manufacturers have made their huge profits; others are employed in a huge stone quarry near the city of Columbus, and still others are at labor on the state farms during the summer months, or are kept busy with repairs at other state institutions.

New plants are to be established within the penitentiary at Columbus for the manufacture of soap, shirts, underclothing, overalls, shoes, etc., the products of which will be *used by the state* (hence the term "state use system") for its wards in the penitentiary and reformatories throughout the commonwealth. Another industry at which many prisoners will be employed is coffee-roasting. Ovens are being installed. Hundreds of tons of coffee are used each year in the state institutions of Ohio. The green berries will be purchased on the docks in New York, and shipped to Columbus, whence the roasted product will be distributed.

The law forbids the sale of prison-made goods in the general market, and hence the competition of the state with free labor is restricted. It is estimated that the penitentiary and the state reformatories will be able to use practically the entire output of the prison factories. If not the law permits the sale of the surplus to county and municipal institutions.

There are yet some particularly flagrant illustrations of the contract system of prison labor in this country. In Connecticut, if the New York *Daily People* of December 26, 1911, is correctly informed (see this Journal, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 117), contracting manufacturers have forced prison officials to resort to physical punishment in order to speed up the convict workers, and a political boss replied to citizens who were indignant because of the situation, "Well, what in h— are you going to do about it?"

The system continues in vicious activity in South Dakota, where many men are employed at making shirts. The state receives three cents for the manufacture of each shirt and on the average each man earns fifty-four cents a day for the commonwealth. The contract expires in 1915. The people of South Dakota forbid its renewal.

Many are very optimistic with respect to the reformation of criminals and no doubt there are numerous striking illustrations of successful efforts in that direction. The permanent rehabilitation of the adult criminal, nevertheless, excepting the one who has slipped but once by

ERRORS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

accident, so to speak, will continue to be the subject of unfavorable prophecy. Even, however, if we may not be able, by all means, to apply educational measures so skillfully as to reform great numbers, even if it were impossible by all means to set but one right, we should still be unjustified on any grounds whatever in placing this obstacle—prison contract labor—in the way. We must credit many convicts with intelligence enough to recognize that contractors are waxing fat upon practically unremunerated toil. It is a bad object lesson in the exploitation of the helpless; one that does not add to the chances of honest life after prison terms have been served. It is immoral, too, on the part of the contractor and on the part of the state, which allows it in as far as it consists in securing a gain without making adequate return therefor.

There is an aspect of the state use system that must not be overlooked. Besides avoiding the "horrible example" afforded by the old system, it is an economy to the state. Dr. Arthur F. Shepard of the Ohio State Board of Administration, estimates that henceforth the state of Ohio will save several thousands of dollars annually that have hitherto been paid from the treasury for the purchase of soap alone for the state penal institutions, and other thousands on each of the other commodities to be manufactured in the penitentiary.

ROBERT H. GAULT.

ERRORS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

In this JOURNAL (May, 1912, p. 131) are printed the replies of prison officials of the United States and Canada, well-known and reliable men, to the question whether they had ever known of unjust condemnation to death or to imprisonment. These gentlemen generally agree in the testimony that, so far as their personal knowledge extends, the convictions have been just and well founded. It would seem from this testimony that British and American procedure is eminently fair to the offender; many think it favors the criminal to the detriment of the public. It is well for the nation to be reassured on this point, for serious distrust of the judiciary would be a distinct calamity.

At the same time the courts are not infallible. Errors do occur in both civil and criminal matters. Without questioning in the least the value of the opinions and memories of wardens we should not end the inquiry with this evidence, but should carry it into police and court records. When the penalty can be corrected the state can indemnify, if it will, the innocent sufferer; but when the penalty is death the wrong done in the name of justice can never be set right; and it is here that the inquiry becomes most important. In a recent volume of 523 pages

THE CORONER IN ITALY AND AMERICA

by Erich Sello (*Die Irrtümer der Strafjustiz und ihre Ursachen*, Berlin, R. v. Decker) is an immense collection of cases of error of courts in various countries of Europe taken from standard sources, and the exhibit is one that cannot be ignored. The cases are recited with fulness of detail. The sources of error are numerous and varied. In some cases the court condemned to death or life sentence persons who were insane; in others the witnesses rendered false testimony to shield themselves or gratify revenge; in others the medical post-mortem examination was superficial and the experts' advice misleading. In some cases the conviction was based on resemblance of hand-writing, together with bad reputation; in others a mad impulse of a mob urged by a plausible suggestion influenced the decision; in others malice was affirmed when the homicide was really in self-defense; there were cases of mistaken identity; in others the case turned on the testimony of children suggested by the police.

These stories do not tend to impeach the integrity or wisdom of courts; they do compel consideration of the chance of irreparable injustice in enforcing capital punishment. They should also awaken discussion as to the reasonableness of providing indemnity for men who have been put to expense, and subjected to humiliation and unspeakable misery by police and public prosecution without even an apology, much less pecuniary reparation. A great state cannot afford to be mean and unjust when its honor is at stake with its own citizens.

CHARLES R. HENDERSON.

THE CORONER IN ITALY AND AMERICA.

Caesare Civoli has an article in the March-April number of *Il Progresso del Diritto Criminale*, the Italian magazine published in Rome, devoted to the study and reform of the practical application of criminal law in Italy, which shows how different are the difficulties that affect similar institutions under different circumstances. In America, there has been a good deal of criticism of the action of coroners in finding deaths and injuries as due to accident, resulting in the freeing of employes of large manufacturing and industrial corporations, who manage heavy machinery, locomotives, or tramcars. During the summer last past, Judge Sultzberger, of Common Pleas in Philadelphia, commented upon such actions severally, holding that such a discharge was in excess of the coroner's jurisdiction. On the other hand, Civoli, Professor of Criminal Law and Practice in the University of Padua, complains of injustice done on the other side. In Italy, the police make arrests for assault and manslaughter too freely, subjecting persons—

CHIEF JUSTICE HARRY OLSON AND HIS COURT

perhaps guilty—to a detention prior to trial, which often exceeds the maximum term upon conviction. A particular example of this is where the act is in self-defense where, of course, a prison or jail case is always made out. He makes no suggestion as to the best way to overcome the difficulty, as it is impractical to empower the policeman to determine the juridical relation; he can but determine the existence or non-existence of the fact. It seems to an American, it may humbly be submitted, that the personal inconvenience might be reduced to a minimum with a due regard to public safety, by the institution of a coroner's court in Italy and with the conversion of the coroner's court in America into a preliminary court of record with a right of appeal in the commonwealth.

JOHN LISLE.

CHIEF JUSTICE HARRY OLSON AND HIS COURT.

In these days when so much is heard about the "breakdown of the law" and the "law's delays," often ascribed to rules governing pleading and procedure, and to the failure of our judges properly to administer such laws and rules as are in existence, it is refreshing to learn of one court in which a large amount of all classes of litigation is speedily and satisfactorily transacted. The answer to the demand for more promptness by our courts in disposing of litigation is frequently that if we have more speed it must be at an increasing sacrifice of justice, but in the Municipal Court of Chicago we find a court almost up to date with a tremendous and constantly increasing amount of business and hear on all sides expressions only of satisfaction from the people.

This court came into existence about five and one-half years ago upon the abolishment of the Justice of the Peace system of administration of municipal law so notorious that it was a by-word throughout the land. The change in so comparatively short a period of the sentiment of the people of Chicago toward the administration of its law is due to the character of the act creating the court and to the genius of its first and present Chief Justice. Scarcely too much can be said in tribute to Chief Justice Olson, who has been instrumental in building so effective an organization in so short a period with so little to copy or model after. To give a clear conception of the work of this court and the character of cases coming before it, some statistics from its reports are here submitted:

CHIEF JUSTICE HARRY OLSON AND HIS COURT

RESUME OF WORK OF THE CIVIL AND CRIMINAL BRANCHES—COMPARED

Total number of all classes of cases filed and disposed of during the year ending December 3, 1911, as compared with previous years:

	Year Ending November 30, 1907.		Year Ending December 6, 1908.		Year Ending December 4, 1909.		Year Ending December 4, 1910.		Year Ending December 3, 1911.	
	No. of Cases Filed.	No. of Cases Dis- posed of.	No. of Cases Filed.	No. of Cases Dis- posed of.	No. of Cases Filed.	No. of Cases Dis- posed of.	No. of Cases Filed.	No. of Cases Dis- posed of.	No. of Cases Filed.	No. of Cases Dis- posed of.
Civil	37,104	30,877	49,002	46,845	47,113	48,490	48,267	48,649	53,223	50,931
Criminal	15,079	13,755	10,187	10,467	10,057	10,130	9,559	9,825	12,012	11,770
Quasi-Criminal	45,535	44,472	56,698	56,742	62,019	61,781	70,703	70,479	72,189	71,434
Preliminary Hearings	97,718	89,104	115,887	114,054	119,189	120,401	128,529	128,953	137,424	134,135
			8,249	7,721	6,524	6,460	7,701	7,018	9,631	9,526
			124,136	121,775	125,713	126,861	136,230	136,571	147,055	143,661

342

Number of cases of all classes pending, December 5, 1910.....	9,900
Number of warrants outstanding (not heretofore classed as pending)	1,365
Cases of all classes filed during the year ending December 3, 1911	147,055
Civil suits reinstated	158,320
	1,331
Cases of all classes disposed of, year ending December 3, 1911	159,651
Total number cases of all classes pending, December 3, 1911	143,661
	15,990

CHIEF JUSTICE HARRY OLSON AND HIS COURT

SEMI-ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE NUMBER OF CIVIL CASES FILED AND THE NUMBER DISPOSED OF FROM DECEMBER 4, 1911, TO JUNE 1, 1912. ALSO NUMBER OF DEMANDS FOR TRIAL BY JURY, VERDICTS BY JURY, DISAGREEMENTS, FINDINGS BY COURT, VERDICTS AND JUDGMENTS AND FINDINGS AND JUDGMENTS VACATED, AND FEES PAID TO JURORS IN FIRST AND SECOND DISTRICTS.

Class of Cases—	No. of Cases Filed		No. of Cases Disposed of	
	First Dist.	Second Dist.	First Dist.	Second Dist.
First Class	634	...	538	...
Tort	1341	22	1256	23
Forcible Ent. and Det.	6908	94	6329	97
Attachment	1178	202	1213	206
Distress for Rent	73	2	47	1
Replevin	540	6	511	7
Contract	16116	344	16771	372
Total	26790	670	26665	706
Grand Total	27460		27371	

From December 4, 1911, to June 1, 1912, there were 25 more filed than were disposed of in the First District; in the Second District there were 36 more cases disposed of than were filed. There were 2073 more cases filed and 3485 more cases disposed of than during the same period of last year.

Money Judgments—	First Dist.	Second Dist.
Trial by Court	\$ 627,336.68	\$ 5,145.66
Trial by Jury	235,054.58	2,208.37
By Confession	398,694.05	8,478.91
By Default	839,213.89	13,263.47
Total	\$2,100,329.20	\$29,096.41
Grand Total	2,129,425.61	

	First Dist.	Second Dist.
Demands for trial by jury by Plaintiff.....	1012	15
Demands for trial by jury by Defendant.....	1537	16
Verdicts by jury favor of Plaintiff	717	13
Verdicts by jury favor of Defendant	271	8
Disagreements	8	...
Findings by court favor of Plaintiff	16982	400
Findings by court favor of Defendant	8080	285
Verdicts and judgments vacated	19	...
Findings and judgments vacated	688	19
Fees paid to Jurors, Civil	\$67,839.65	...
Fees paid to Jurors, Criminal	10,702.45	...
Total	\$78,542.10	...
Number of Executions ordered	1112	203
Number of Executions issued	10830	203
Number of Mortgages acknowledged	19751	347

CRIMINAL BRANCHES—

Six Months Ending May 31, 1912.

	CASES DISPOSED OF											TOTAL CASES DIS- POSED OF															
	NEW SUITS FILED					QUASI					CRIMINAL																
	JURY TRIALS		PRELIMINARY			QUASI			CRIMINAL				CRIMINAL														
	QUASI	PRELIM.	CRIMINAL	TOTAL	DISCH'D	HELD TO C.C.	NOLLE PROS.	DISCH'D WT. PROS.	DISCH'D Def. not found	TOTAL	DISCH'D	FINED	CO. JAIL	HOUSE COR.	NOLLE PROS.	DISCH'D WT. PROS.	DISCH'D Def. not found	TOTAL	DISCH'D	FINED	CO. JAIL	HOUSE COR.	NOLLE PROS.	DISCH'D WT. PROS.	DISCH'D Def. not found	TOTAL	
December, 1911..	30	5965	562	1354	7881	101	207	134	30	85	2897	1504	3	823	713	136	184	6280	291	349	6	207	201	100	149	1303	8120
January, 1912....	49	4470	634	1117	6221	119	190	132	22	59	2906	1047	5	729	935	157	63	5842	302	227	6	161	227	102	99	1124	7488
February, 1912....	38	5472	578	1210	7260	106	253	159	33	102	2630	1215	1	740	579	212	147	5524	282	228	9	153	286	82	154	1200	7377
March, 1912.....	39	6038	585	1208	7829	97	234	176	29	51	2456	1261	4	778	873	278	153	5803	382	277	16	160	345	93	110	1333	7723
April, 1912.....	64	6369	671	1541	8601	108	223	152	31	84	2690	1390	5	832	750	236	117	6220	373	379	12	128	317	116	74	1399	8217
May, 1912.....	84	6705	594	1277	8576	123	175	157	60	116	2979	1655	5	777	600	177	283	6476	359	400	19	127	185	132	154	1376	8483
	304	35937	3624	7707	48368	654	1282	916	205	497	16756	8072	23	4679	4450	1196	947	36125	1939	1860	68	942	1561	625	740	7735	47408

6,331 more new suits filed and 7,014 more cases disposed of than during the corresponding period last year.

CHIEF JUSTICE HARRY OLSON AND HIS COURT

MONEY JUDGMENTS.

	Dec., 1907,	Dec. 7, 1908,	Dec. 5, 1909,	Dec. 5, 1910,
	to	to	to	to
	Dec. 6, 1908.	Dec. 4, 1909.	Dec. 4, 1910.	Dec. 3, 1911.
First District.	\$3,226,018.92	\$3,706,725.78	\$3,541,092.86	\$4,028,062.85
Second Dist...	42,343.02	50,364.77	52,590.54	68,191.73

Totals ..\$3,268,361.94 \$3,757,090.55 \$3,593,683.40 \$4,096,254.58

The following statement shows by what means this total is arrived

at:

Default	\$1,906,112.92
Trial by Court	1,064,279.59
Trial by Jury	419,906.45
Confession	705,955.62
	<hr/>
	\$4,096,254.58

Below is shown by months, the amount of money judgments entered by the Municipal Court of Chicago during the past year, as compared with similar figures for the Circuit and Superior Courts of this county, illustrating, in part, the relief of these courts:

	Municipal.	Circuit.	Superior.
December, 1910	\$321,957.11	\$104,262.36	\$ 97,305.71
January, 1911	298,932.08	110,128.53	102,391.48
February	337,845.37	38,171.12	114,875.47
March	344,164.64	57,773.44	114,871.60
April	333,421.92	92,199.87	154,529.53
May	383,334.53	92,539.57	128,254.02
June	383,811.73	161,396.04	133,872.91
July	377,945.47	76,366.88	124,660.00
August	221,663.17	15,191.59	70,828.36
September	327,784.75	13,818.31	51,997.54
October	371,416.11	290,140.60	79,507.14
November	348,957.76	95,849.54	88,050.90

An examination of these statistics shows:

1. That at the end of 5½ years' operation, the court is able to speed the disposition of business so that it actually disposed of 951 more cases than were filed in the last six months, indicating that here at least there is no "breakdown" because of delay.

2. That money judgments for the last year amounted to over four million dollars. An amount greater than was entered by all the courts in

CHIEF JUSTICE HARRY OLSON AND HIS COURT

the Circuit, Superior and County Courts of Cook County and all the Circuit and County Courts of the state down to Cairo.

The most notable features of the court are:

1. The judges as a body have large administrative powers, with a Chief Justice with very great power to expedite business.

The most significant single act of this body has been the investigation of one of its own members' conduct on the bench and his discipline—suggesting perhaps, a substitute for the *recall* of judges.

2. The power of the judges to make rules of procedure, enabling the Court to adopt the notice system of pleading—with affidavits of claim, and of merits in defense. Under these pleadings about one-half the judgments entered have required only the administrative action of the court, the defendants being unable to make the affidavit of merits.

3. The keeping of accurate and detailed Judicial Statistics.

4. The court is practically self-sustaining.

5. The tendency to reduce crime because of swift judgment. *Eighty per cent* of the criminal and quasi-criminal cases are disposed of within *twenty-four* hours of arrest, and *ninety per cent* of the total within two weeks.

6. The power of the Chief Justice enables him to segregate classes of cases, resulting in the creation of the Domestic Relations Court and a court for the hearing of all automobile speed cases. The work of the Domestic Relations Court is worthy of the attention of all persons interested in American courts and is set forth in detail in the first annual report of its able presiding judge, Charles N. Goodnow.

The court hearing automobile speed cases has been in existence but a short period, but has already practically stopped the speeding mania in Chicago by making one standard of punishment for that offense throughout the city and meting out that punishment quickly.

Perhaps the greatest acknowledgment that could be paid to this great court is that its system or something like it has been adopted in New York City, Buffalo, Cleveland and Milwaukee and will be soon adopted by Philadelphia, Atlanta, Birmingham, St. Louis and Kansas City.

F. B. CROSSLEY.