Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 11 | Issue 4 Article 14

1921

Notes and Abstracts

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS

ANTHROPOLOGY—PSYCHOLOGY—LEGAL-MEDICINE

Summary of Present State Laws in United States Re Certification of Consulting Psychologists.—1. Six states now have laws on their statute books, permitting requiring psychologists or clinical psychologists to determine the mental status and condition of feeble-minded, epileptic, and insane persons, for purposes of giving testimony in courts of law, committing to appropriate institutions, or authorizing sterilization.

2. In four of the states (New York, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois), the law relates to the determination of mental deficiency only.

3. In two of these states (Wisconsin and California) mental deficiency and epilepsy are mentioned. (It should be added that Dr. Woods writes that she believes the law in Wisconsin would be interpreted to mean that only determination of mental deficiency pertains to the function of the psychologist).

4. In one state (California) the law relates to determination of the mental status of feeble-minded, epileptic, and "persons" afflicted with incurable chronic mania or dementia.

5. The requirements of these laws have close bearing on the professional training of those qualifying as psychologists. To be able to make a diagnosis of mental deficiency, epilepsy, "chronic mania or dementia" it is absolutely necessary to have knowledge of all mental disorders; for it is obvious that no one can make a diagnosis of any of these conditions, who is unable to differentiate among mental states which resemble each other in certain features, but which are essentially different in origin, outcome and treatment. Any program of professional preparation which falls short of the requirements of existing statutes will, thus, result in the rendition of inefficient service.

6. Nevertheless, only three states (Wisconsin, California and New York) define the qualifications in respect to training of persons functioning under the title psychologists. California designates the Ph. D. degree in psychology; New York specifies two full years of post-graduate study in psychology, at an incorporated college or university.

7. The qualifications of persons other than psychologists, who are authorized under the laws to determine mental deficiency, either in coöperation with the psychologists or independently, are far from satisfactory. In some of the states, superintendents of the poor and other persons without specified technical training of any kind may commit alleged feeble-minded persons. Where physicians are empowered to determine mental deficiency, the specified requirement usually is simply graduation from a recognized medical school, with experience in general practice. This Committee has scrutinized the curricula of various first-class and second-class medical schools, and finds nothing to justify the assumption that graduates of them have technical knowledge of mental deficiency, or of the methods of determining mental status in alleged mentally defective persons. A few medical schools of Class A offer a few weeks of instruction which includes reference to mental deficiency, but such lectures are, with one or two exceptions, optional with medical students. There is no reason to suppose that graduates of medical schools, who have no further tech-

nical training, are qualified to determine the mental condition of alleged mentally deficient persons.

8. In several states where laws authorizing psychologists to determine mental status have not been passed, psychologists have, nevertheless, been summoned to give expert testimony in courts, concerning the mental condition of accused persons, and of others engaged in litigation.—LETA S. HOLLINGSWORTH, Chairman, Section on Clinical Psychology of the American Psychological Association.

Criteria for Determining Anatomical and Physiological Ages.—In this series of investigations on criteria of anatomical and physiological ages, the writer has presented new data in the form of a graduated series of roentgenograms of the carpal and metacarpal bones of infants and school children, discovering marked differences among boys and girls and between boys and girls of the same age. For boys the coefficient is higher between the exposed area of carpal bones and height (.879) than for girls (.726) and boys also have higher coefficient of variability (29.94) by the Pearsonian coefficient than girls (12.698). It has been discovered that twins of the same sex may differ greatly in anatomical ages.

Larger boys and girls mature physiologically as a rule earlier than small ones, and early maturity is followed as a rule by a rapid cessation of growth in stature.

Physiological age has a direct bearing on physical training, social adjustment, industrial work, and pedagogical advancement. Another experimental study just completed shows that the mental age of the individual bears a direct relationship to the physiological age as indicated by height and weight. The results show that at each chronological age the physiologically accelerated boys and girls have a higher mental age than those of the average or below the average physiological age. The girls, when classified on this basis, show a higher mental age for a given chronological age than do the boys. Girls are on the average mentally older than boys.—BIRD T. BALDWIN. Abstract of paper presented before the American Psychological Association, Chicago, Dec., 1920.

COURTS—LAWS

On the Age Limit in the Juvenile Court.—There are always two ways of doing a thing. One is to anticipate it, study it, prepare to meet it and develop whatever is good in it. Another, and perhaps more often adopted, is to ignore its presence until its occurence and then in excitement, hurry and negligently, because unprepared, find many worries, difficulties and perhaps disaster as a result of our inattention. Which of those are we, who are greatly interested, taking with regard to the proposal to increase the age limit of the jurisidiction of the Children's Court? We all know that it will come up, and come up shortly, for already at the last Legislature more than one bill was introduced looking to that end. Knowing it is coming, how shall we act? Let a bill be introduced and then all, at sixes and sevens, rush off to Albany in different camps preparing for and against the measure? Is it not better for all those who are concerned or may be affected to come together, hear both sides of the question, for there are two sides, and wisely determine the best course and how to meet it? There are many sides to be considered.

First: How will it affect the work of the Children's Courts? Will it be necessary only to change the age of jurisdiction from sixteen to eighteen, or would it be better to give a joint jurisdiction to the Magistrate's Court, so that a case of a young person between sixteen and eighteen would in the first instance go to the Magistrate's Court, or in the discretion of the magistrate, to the Children's Court? If this was passed ,would it deprive the youth of any right guaranteed by the Constitution? Would it be necessary to make arrangements in the courts for forcible detention places in the case of the larger grown boys? Would it be necessary to provide additional exclusive places of detention for the larger and more sophisticated girls from the younger and more innocent ones? And many of the other questions that would refer purely to the custody of the children.

Second: How would the procedure of the court have to be changed to meet the case? Would the newcomers be charged with felonies and misdemeanors, or would an act by a boy or girl of seventeen years be only an act of juvenile delinquency? Do young people between the given ages appreciate the right and wrong of larceny, assault, burglary, robbery, and the taking of people's property, or even lives? And should they be placed in the minor preventive institutions, or should they, when their responsibility is fixed, be treated with more advanced educational or corrective measures?

Third: Are the institutions now being so generally and so satisfactorily used the proper places for the advanced youth, or should they be sent to the care of the sheriff for temporary care, and to jail, the reformatory or prison for disposition? Are the institutions, such as the New York Catholic Protectory, New York Jewish Protectory, Aid Society and the Children's Village, prepared to receive the older ones proposed? Do the charters of these institutions permit of their taking children over sixteen years of age? Should the charters be amended or should new institutions be organized? Will the managers and supporters of these and similar homes, now being so efficiently conducted, be willing to extend their work? If not, can the Children's Court handle the cases and the youths with better success than the present method? Will the Legislature increase the age for the reception of girls at the State Training School for Girls and the various other institutions that now receive only those under sixteen years?

Fourth: If the change is made, how many more cases will be held in the Children's Courts? Will it be necessary, in order to handle the cases, to slur over the work of all of them, due to the increase of cases to consider, and will it be necessary to increase the number of Children's Courts? Would it be better to establish a "Youth's Court" (as in Chicago) and there treat the cases of the more advanced, rather than crowd out the care of the little ones by herding them and their disabilities into one tribunal with their seniors? Is the problem of the child under sixteen often the same as the one over sixteen, or is it mostly a separate and new problem? And, finally, should not every interest, including those of an older growth, be consulted when we are considering this important proposed step?

At the present time there are but two institutions here that can receive youths over sixteen years and these are the Roman Catholic House of the Good Shepherd for girls, and, in special cases, the House of Refuge for boys.

If we should make the change let us do it intelligently, and before making

the attempt, let us come together and consider whether from all points of view it is wise to do so, and in every way how to secure the best results.

In establishing the Children's Courts the state has secured a real gain, and before this gain is jeopardized, let us make sure the step is one in advance. Is it?—Robert J. Wilkin, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Re Local Boards of Child Welfare—Laws of New York—Chap. 700.—AN ACT to amend the general municipal law, in relation to local boards of child welfare. Became a law May 11, 1920, with the approval of the Governor. Passed, three-fifths being present.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section one hundred and forty-nine of chapter twenty-nine of the laws of nineteen hundred and nine, entitled "An act relating to municipal corporations, constituting chapter twenty-four of the consolidated laws," as added by chapter two hundred and twenty-eight of the laws of nineteen hundred and fifteen, is hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 149. *Appointment of boards in counties.* The board of child welfare of a county shall consist of seven members of which the county superintendent of the poor shall be ex-officio member. If any county have more than one superintendent of the poor, the county judge shall designate, by writing, filed with the county clerk, the superintendent who shall serve as a member of such board. The other six members of the board shall be appointed by the county judge for such terms that the term of one appointive member of the board shall expire each year thereafter. Upon the expiration of the term of office of a member of the board, his successor shall be appointed by the county judge for a full term of six years. In case of the failure of any appointive member to attend meetings of the board during a period of three consecutive months, it shall be the duty of the secretary of the board at once to certify such fact to the county judge. Unless the county judge excuse such absence in writing for illness or other good and sufficient reason, the term of office of such member shall at once cease and determine. Such excuse shall be filed with and made a part of the records of the board. If a vacancy occur, otherwise than by expiration of term in the office of an appointive member of the board, it shall be filled for the unexpired term. It shall be the duty of the county judge to fill every vacancy within thirty days after such vacancy occurs. At least two members of the board shall be women. Appointments shall be made in writing and filed with the county clerk.

§ 2. Section one hundred and fifty of such chapter as added by chapter two hundred and twenty-eight of the laws of nineteen hundred and fifteen and amended by chapter five hundred and four of the laws of nineteen hundred and sixteen, is hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 150. *Appointment of boards in cities.* The board of child welfare of a city wholly including one or more counties shall consist of ten members. The members of the board shall be appointed by the mayor for such terms that the term of one member of the board shall expire each year thereafter. Upon the expiration of the term of office of a member of the board, his successor shall be appointed by the mayor for a full term of nine years. In case of the failure of any appointive member to attend meetings of the board during a period of

three consecutive months, it shall be the duty of the secretary of the board at once to certify such fact to the mayor. Unless the mayor excuse such absentee in writing for illness or other good and sufficient reason, the term of office of such member shall at once cease and determine. Such excuse shall be filed with and made a part of the records of the board. If a vacancy occur, otherwise than by expiration of term in the office of a member of the board, it shall be filled for the unexpired term. It shall be the duty of the mayor to fill every vacancy within thirty day after such vacancy occurs. At least three members of the board shall be women.

§ 3. Section one hundred and fifty-three of such chapter, as added by chapter two hundred and twenty-eight of the laws of nineteen hundred and fifteen and amended by chapter three hundred and seventy-three of the laws of nineteen hunrded and nineteen, is hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 153. *Regulation governing allowances.* The following provisions shall govern the granting of allowances pursuant to this article:

1. A board of child welfare may, *in its discretion,* when funds have been appropriated therefor, grant an allowance to any dependent widow or to any mother *whose husband* is an intimate of a state institution for the insane *or confied under a sentence of five years or more to a state prison;* provided such widow or mother reside in the county or city wherein she applies for an allowance and is deemed by the local board of child welfare to be a proper person mentally, morally and physically to care for and bring up such child or children, provided further such widow or mother has been a resident of the county or of the city wherein the application for an allowance is made for a period of two years immediately preceding the application and is a citizen of the United States or whose husband was a resident of the state for a period of two years immediately preceding his decease or commitment or whose child or children were born in the United States and who declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States within a period of five years immediately preceding his decease or commitment.

2. Such allowance shall be made by a majority vote of board duly entered upon the minutes of any regular or special meeting, and may be increased, diminished or totally withdrawn in the discretion of the local board of child welfare.

3. Before granting an allowance the board shall not only determine that the mother is a suitable person to bring up her own children and that aid is necessary to enable her to do so, but further that if such aid is not granted the child or children must be cared for in an institutional home.

4. Such an allowance or allowances shall not exceed the amount or amounts which it would be necessary to pay to an institutional home for the care of such widow's child or children.

5. An allowance granted by the board shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by the local authorities for such purposes, or otherwise available by the board for such purpose; such local authorities shall appropriate and make available for the board of child welfare and include in the tax levy for such county or city, such sum or sums, as in their judgment, may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this article; such moneys to be kept in a separate fund and to be disbursed by the proper county or city fiscal authorities on orders of the local board of child welfare and upon proper vouchers therefor.

6. An application for allowance ay be made directly to the local board of child welfare or to any member of the board.

7. A full and complete record shall be kept in every case coming either directly or indirectly within the jurisdiction of the board; such record to be available to the proper authorities of county or city interested therein.

8. An allowance made by the board shall not be for a longer continuous period than six months without renewal, which allowance may be continued from time to time at same or different amounts, for similar periods or less, either successively or intermittently or may be revoked at the pleasure of the local board of child welfare.

§ 4. Section one hundred and fifty-four of such chapter, as added by chapter two hundred and twenty-eight of the laws of nineteen hundred and fifteen and amended by chapter five hundred and fifty-one of the laws of nineteen hundred and seventeen, is hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 154. *Appropriations and limitations for purposes of article.* The board of supervisors of a county, and the board of estimate and apportionment and the board of aldermen of a city to which this article is applicable, shall annually appropriate and make available for the board of child welfare and include in the tax levy for such county or city such a sum as, in their discretion and judgment, may be needed to carry out the provisions of this article, including expenses for administration and relief, but should the sum so appropriated be expended or income exhausted, during the year and for the purposes for which it was appropriated, by reason of extraordinary and unanticipated emergencies or conditions, additional sums may be appropriated by such boards as occasion demands to carry out the provisions of this article, which, in cities, shall be paid from unexpended balances or contingent funds where such exist, but, where such do not exist, shall be raised by temporary loans on notes, certificates of indebtedness or other obligations and the amount necessary to pay such obligations shall be included in the next annual tax levy, and, in counties, such additional appropriations shall be paid from funds in the county treasury, but, should there be no such funds available therefor, the county treasurer shall borrow a sufficient sum to pay such appropriations in anticipation of taxes to be collected therefor; it is further provided that no board of child wellfare shall expend or contract to expend under the provisions of this article or otherwise, any public moneys not specifically appropriated as herein provided; the board of supervisors of any county may determine, as provided in section one hundred and thirty-eight of the poor law, whether or not the actual expense for the relief of widowed mothers and their children under this article shall be a charge upon the county or upon the respective towns thereof. Each such board of child welfare shall, from time to time, audit and cause to be paid all expenses for administration and the wages and salaries of its employees.

§ 5. This act shall take effect July first, nineteen hundred and twenty.

STATE OF NEW YORK }
Office of the Secretary of State. } *ss:*

I have compared the preceding with the original law on file in this office, and do hereby certify that the same is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of said original law.

FRANCIS M. HUGO,
Secretary of State.

Re Administration ot Criminal Law in California.—The Berkeley Den of Lions at its weekly luncheon, December 30th, 1920, held at the Hotel Whitecotton in the City of Berkeley, unanimously passed the following resolution:

That, whereas, a great wave of crime is sweeping the country and that the same should be curbed and to the end that a more speedy, accurate judgment may be meted out to the perpetrators, it was resolved as follows:

"That in all cases of felony or misdemeanor punishable by a prison sentence, the question of responsibility be not submitted to the jury, which will thus be called upon to determine only that the offense was committed by the defendant.

"That the disposition and treatment (including punishment) of all such midemenants and felons, i. e., the sentence imposed, be based upon a study of the individual offender by properly qualified and impartial experts co-operating with the courts.

"That provisions be made permitting the transfer of such misdemeanants and felons at any time after conviction from one institution to another affording a different kind of treatment upon the presentation of evidence of the needs for such action satisfactory to the court which passed sentence.

"That no maximum term be set to any sentence.

"That no parole or probation be granted without suitable psychiatric examination.

"That in considering applications for pardons and commutation careful attention be given to reports of qualified experts showing the applicant's mental age and mental stability and that in drafting statutes determining or defining juvenile delinquency, mental age and mental stability, within reasonable limits, be regarded as of importance with the calendar age of the delinquent.

"It is recommended that an act be introduced to supplement existing laws providing for the establishment and maintenance of municipal courts of record and defining the jurisdiction of such courts. That the act follow the language of the act initiated by the Detroit Citizen's League. The purpose of the act, as stated by the proponents, is as follows: 'To modernize our city courts so that they will measure up to the needs of our rapidly growing city.'

"The American Judicature Society in discussing the proposed change says that, 'If adopted by the people, Detroit will be the foremost city in America in the administration of criminal laws.'"

A recent statistical table from the Superintendent of the Detroit Police Department, indicates that crime has actually decreased in some cases as much as 66%. In fact, comparisons for the months of November, 1919, and November, 1920, indicate that burglary was reduced 66%, burglary of business places reduced 51%, highway robbery reduced 61% and pickpockets reduced 53%. Considering the fact that there is a crime wave in nearly every city in this country, this showing of Detroit is a remarkable one, especially when we further take into consideration the fact that Detroit has an unusually large unemployment problem.—From August Vollmer, Berkeley, California.

National Association of Magistrates (England).—The purpose of the National Association is to keep magistrates informed of current thought and practice on all matters affecting their duties, more especially on the non-legal side.

Much excellent work done by benches throughout the kingdom possesses a national value, rather than merely a local one, the problems involved being

themselves national; such as juvenile delinquency, on which there have been many independent local inquiries, but little attempt to make the conclusions of one accessible to the others. Magistrates are now unable to approach their difficult tasks in the light of collective knowledge because there exists in the kingdom no body whose business it is to collect and collate information of the activities of the various benches, and recirculate it for their mutual benefit. Therefore, it is suggested that the Magistrates' Association shall:

1. Establish a clearing-house for information on all aspects of the work of magistrates, other than the purely legal; to collect, collate, and publish data from local and central authorities.

2. Review current penal thought, practice, and experiment, in the United Kingdom and abroad, and provide a medium for discussion.

3. Make available for the use of magistrates, especially those who are members of Probation Act committees, the voluntary forces of the community.

4. Publish information respecting voluntary homes and schools (certified and otherwise), farm colonies, retreats, and other institutions likely to be of use to magistrates in their work.

5. Strengthen the administration of statutes aiming more particularly at the reclamation of offenders; e. g., the Probation of Offenders' Act, and call attention to their needs and defects; for example:

(a) The need for state grants towards the cost of administering the Probation of Offenders' Act;

(b) The transferrence of probationers from one jurisdiction to another;

(c) To publish case-results, showing success or failure of methods employed;

(d) To consider means whereby the Probation of Offenders' Act may be better adapted to the use of Courts of Session and Assize;

(e) To urge the need for the appointment in all courts of summary jurisdiction of an officer for the receipt and payment of all moneys payable under Affiliation and Bastardy Orders.—From Lawrence Veiller, New York City.

The Lynching Record for 1920.—I send you the following relative to lynchings for the past year. I find according to the records compiled by Monroe N. Work, of the Department of Records and Research of the Tuskegee Institute, that there were 56 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings. Of these, 10 were in Northern states and 46 were in Southern states. In 42 of the cases, the prisoners were removed or the guards were augmented or other precautions taken. In 14 instances armed force was used to repel the would-be lynchers. In four of these instances the mobs were fired upon and as a result, seven of the attackers were killed and several wounded.

There were 61 persons lynched in 1920. Of these, 52 were in the South and nine in the North and West. This is 22 less than the number, 83, for the year 1919. Of those lynched, 53 were negroes and eight were whites. One of those put to death was a negro woman. Eighteen, or less than one-third of those put to death, were charged with rape or attemtped rape. Three of the victims were burned to death. The charges against those burned to death were: rape and murder, 1; killing landlord in a dispute, 2.

The offenses charged the whites were: murder, 5; insulting woman, 1; no charge except being a foreigner, 1; killing officer of the law, 1. The offenses

charged against the negroes were: murder, 5; attempted murder, 4; killing officer of the law, 5; killing landlord in dispute, 6; rape, 15; attempted rape, 3; assisting fugitive to escape, 3; wounding another, 2; insulting woman, 2; knocking down guard, escaping from chain gang and then returning and surrrending, 2; jumping labor contract, 1; threatening to kill man, 1; cutting a man in a fight, 1; for receiving stay of death sentence because another confessed crime, 1; peeping through window at woman, 1; insisting on voting, 1.

The states in which lynchings occurred and the number in each state are as follows: Alabama, 7; Arkansas, 1; California, 3; Florida, 7; Georgia, 9; Illinois, 1; Kansas, 1; Kentucky 1; Minnesota, 3; Mississippi, 7; Missouri, 1; North Carolina, 3; Ohio, 1; Oklahoma, 3; South Carolina, 1; Texas, 10; Virginia, 1; West Virginia, 1.—Robert R. Moton, Principal of Tuskegee Institute.

A Grand Jury Speaks Out.—It has been a commonly accepted idea for centuries that the sins of the parents shall be visited upon the children. While not contradicting that, the October grand jury (Chicago) suggests that the sins of the children be visited upon the parents. The jury recommends that this be accomplished by holding parents responsible for all expenses incurred by the state in prosecuting juvenile offenders when the offenses are shown clearly to be due to neglect or improper training of the children.

There is room for doubt that this system of bringing parents to task could be worked out in a practical manner, but there is little room for doubt that morally at least parents are responsible for much of the crime in Chicago, as the jury asserts. The large number of crimes committed by offenders between 16 and 25 years of age is sufficient evidence of this.

The chief influence in the life of a boy of 16 is, or ought to be, in his home. If this influence is good the boy is not likely to commit a crime at 16 or 18 years of age. While the possible charge of contributing to the delinquency of a child is practically the only legal club over an indifferent parent, the fact remains that such a parent is morally responsible.

The street corners and vacant lots of the city are the kindergartens of a school of crime. The primary and intermediate classes meet in vicious poolrooms. Cabarets and tough saloons are offering advanced lessons, and postgraduate instruction is available in the jails and penitentiaries. Parents who provide their children with clean entertainment and interests in their own homes and who watch and select the companions of the growing boy and girl will keep them out of the path to a criminal education.

Mothers who are too busy with clubs and matinees, teas and politics, to do this work, and fathers who are too busy with business and pleasure to assist in the training of their children, are as much, or more, to blame for recruiting of the ranks of criminals as the recruits themselves. In view of a lack of law to cover the situation the grand jury is to be thanked for pointing out the facts. If a development of public opinion is started to put some of the responsibility for crime upon careless parents, crime will be reduced.—Editorial in the Chicago *Tribune,* November 2, 1920.

Crime Drive Is Begun in Chicago.—Chicago's greatest drive on organized crime was launched by the Chicago Crime Commission on Thursday, December 9, when a number of the city's leading business and professional men, churchmen and officials concerned with the administration of the criminal law,

met at the Union League Club and conducted an inquiry into many phases of the subject.

The chief feature of the conference was a unanimous decision to speed up the work of the criminal courts through the placing in operation of a plan suggested by the Commission to provide additional criminal court judges. It was pointed out by Edwin W. Sims, President of the Commission, that the present clogged condition of the criminal court dockets, with 1,973 cases pending, constituted a serious deterrent to the war on organized crime, and he estimated that the volume of crime in Chicago could be reduced fifty per cent through the trial of criminal cases within sixty days of commission of the offense.

"To clear the dockets of the criminal courts and then to keep them clear," was Mr. Sims' summary of the plan, and he declared that the need for prompt action was imperative.

Numerous valuable suggestions were made by the public officials present at the conference, and some excellent data for future use by the Commission were presented. The utmost desire for coöperative action was manifested by everyone at the meeting, which probably was the most important gathering ever held under Commission auspices.

On the day following the Union League Club conference, a meeting of the public officials concerned was held in the office of William R. Parker, clerk of the criminal court, at which detailed arrangements for placing the Commission's plan in operation were perfected. It is believed that this smashing attack on organized crime will be in full swing by the middle of July.

Committees of the Institute, 1920-1921.—

Committee "A"—Insanity and Criminal Responsibility.

Edwin R. Keedy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Chairman.
Victor Arnold, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Chicago.
Adolph Meyer, M. D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
Orin N. Carter, Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, Springfield.
William E. Mikell, Dean, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.
Morton Prince, M. D., 458 Beacon St., Boston.
Charles Boston, New York City.
John H. Wigmore, Dean, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago.
Ira Robinson, Grafton, W. Va.
Sidney Kuh, M. D., Alienist, Chicago.
Burdette G. Lewis, Commissioner of Charities and Correction, Trenton, N. J.
Harold Moyer, M. D., Chicago.

Committee "B"—Probation and Suspended Sentence.

Charles L. Chute, State Probation Commission, Albany, N. Y., Chairman.
Edith Abbott, School of Civics and Philanthropy, Chicago.
A. C. Backus, Judge Municipal Court, Milwaukee, Wis.
Miss Minnie F. Low, 1800 Selden St., Chicago.
Homer Folks, Yonkers, N. Y.
Joel D. Hunter, Superintendent, United Charities, Chicago.
Thomas C. O'Brien, Deputy Commissioner of Prisons, 24 State House, Boston.

Committee "C"—Classification and Definition of Crime.

Eugene A. Gilmore, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Chairman.

Nathan William MacChesney, 30 N. La Salle St., Chicago.
Ernst Freund, University of Chicago.
Robert W. Millar, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago.
Samuel K. Dennis, United States District Attorney, Baltimore, Md.

Committee "D"—Modernization of Criminal Procedure.
Robert W. Millar, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago, Chairman.
Wm. C. Rigby, Judge Advocate's Department, Washington, D. C.
Edwin R. Keedy, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia.
James Bronson Reynolds, North Haven, Connecticut.
E. Ray Stevens, Ninth Judicial Court, Madison, Wis.
Lawrence Veiller, Secretary of Committee on Criminal Courts of the Charity Organization Society, 105 E. 22d St., New York.

Committee "F"—Indeterminate Sentence; Release on Parole and Pardon.
Edward Lindsay, Warren, Pennsylvania, Chairman.
Will Colvin, State Superintendent Pardons and Parole, Springfield, Ill.
Amos W. Butler, Superintendent Charities and Correction, Indianapolis.
E. C. R. Bagley, Superintendent of Prisons, Room 24, State House, Boston.

Committee "H"—Public Defender.
James Bronson Reynolds, North Haven, Conn., Chairman.
Reginald Heber Smith, 60 State St., Boston.
Robert O. Harris, Tremont Building, Boston.
Walter J. Wood, Los Angeles, Cal.
Mayer Goldman, 7 Beekman St., New York City.
Charles Edwin Fox, District Attorney, City Hall, Philadelphia.

Committee "I"—State Police.
P. O. Ray, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Chairman.
August Vollmer, Chief of Police, Berkley, Cal.
Frederic B. Crossley, Northwestern University, Chicago.

Committee "J"—Criminal Statistics.
Dr. Horatio Pollock, Board of Health, Albany, N. Y., Chairman.
Miss Annie Hinrichsen, Secretary Commission on Public Welfare, Springfield, Ill.
John Koren, Pemberton Square, Boston.
Miss Edith Abbott, School of Civics and Philanthropy, Chicago.
Dr. Thomas W. Salmon, 50 Union Square, New York City.

Committee "K"—Criminal Law and Procedure in Europe.
Dr. John R. Oliver, The Latrobe, Baltimore, Md., Chairman.
Dr. George Kirchwey, School of Philanthropy, New York.
George F. Deiser, Drexel Building, Philadelphia.
Benjamin Malzberg, University of Paris (American Fellow), 151 Rue St. Jacques, Paris (V).
Edwin R. Keedy, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia,
John Koren, Pemberton Square, Boston.
William Healy, M. D., Judge Baker Foundation, Boston, Mass.

Committee of Publications.
Robert H. Gault, Northwestern University, 31 West Lake St., Chicago, Chairman.
Joel D. Hunter, Superintendent United Charities, Chicago.
Robert W. Millar, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago.
John H. Wigmore, Northwestern University Law School, Chicago.
Frederic B. Crossley, Northwestern University, 31 West Lake St., Chicago.