

Winter 1938

Current Notes

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

Current Notes, 28 *Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology* 773 (1937-1938)

This Note 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.

CURRENT NOTES

NEWMAN F. BAKER [Ed.]

Northwestern University Law School
Chicago, Illinois

Unusual Report—At the meeting of the Association of American Law Schools at Chicago, December 29, 30, 31, the Committee on Survey of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure made their report as follows:

“A committee on Survey of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure would seem to cover so interesting and important a sphere of activity and to perform so useful, if not invaluable, a service, that to suggest abolishing it must seem like an attempt to undermine law and order itself. But this committee, like all things mortal, must be judged by its works, rather than by the pretenses of its title, and by that test the suggestion immediately becomes much more sensible. Abolishing a committee which has accomplished nothing worth remembering and whose reports are not worth reading would involve no serious loss. Whether these hard words fit this committee is easily tested:—if only those who can recall one useful deed this committee has ever accomplished will speak in its behalf; if only those who have ever even taken the trouble to read its annual report will vote for its continuance, it will, we believe, die quietly.

This is not said in bitterness, nor does it reflect on the members of the committee. The difficulty is

inherent in the impossible task that has been assigned to it. The committee, it should be observed, has no authority to criticize or advocate any reforms in the criminal law. Nor is it concerned with the teaching of criminal law. Its sole function is to ‘survey.’ But a ‘survey of crime, criminal law and criminal procedure’ carried on by a voluntary committee without funds is necessarily so far removed from the painstaking and penetrating sort of research to which academic men are accustomed that they cannot be expected to take this shallow and superficial ‘survey’ seriously. Excellent reports of what is being done in the field of criminal law are published each year by the Section of Criminal Law of the American Bar Association. Even assuming the work of this committee to be a useful one, it is a mere duplication of work already being done and being done better.

This committee is anomalous. The Association has no other standing or special committee on any other particular branch of the law. It is argued that the committee should be continued even though dormant because it may be wise to have the committee available on short notice should an important problem arise. We do not believe that it would take any longer in such a case to appoint a

new committee than to wake up a dormant one.

Serious efforts have been expended to make the committee's work more useful. During the year 1936, we began our year's work by asking ourselves whether this committee was performing a sufficiently useful function to justify its existence. None of the members of the committee at that time seemed wholly satisfied and we proceeded, therefore, to discuss possible means of making the committee more useful, and carried on considerable correspondence over this problem. Whether or not we succeeded must be judged from our report of a year ago. Since the membership of the committee this year is largely the same as last year's, we are frank to say that we do not feel the committee succeeded.

When this committee was appointed early this year, the chairman again laid before the other members the question whether the function of the committee should or could be expanded into more useful fields. Only Prof. Jerome Hall had any specific suggestions to offer. These are stated in his minority report. The undersigned feel there is no sufficient justification for continuing the committee and recommend that it be not continued.

Respectfully submitted,
 CHARLES P. NASH, JR.,
 C. S. POTTS,
 CHESTER H. SMITH,
 HENRY WEIHOFEN, *Chairman.*"

Hall's Dissent—Professor Jerome Hall of Louisiana State University wrote a minority report:

"I do not think the committee should be discontinued. Many of

its limitations are those of most of the Association's committees which do not take active steps to facilitate the aims and interests of teachers in their respective fields. Besides, though many of these committees may be dormant during a particular period of time, it may be wise to have them available on short notice should an important problem arise. In short, the criticisms made, being of such general application, would call for similar procedure as regards many of the Association's committees, and that, it seems to me, should be the concern of the Association rather than that of any particular committee.

I am not at all satisfied that the committee has tried to function this year. So far as the writer is aware, there were no meetings or discussions whatever, and the majority report is ambiguous in that regard. The only contact which the writer had with the committee was the receipt of a letter from the chairman on the 11th of May, to which he replied on the 17th of May. In this reply, he stated:

I think we might file a report which, among other things, would

(1) refer again to the American Law Institute project with the suggestion that inasmuch as the State is a party to criminal proceedings, some of the required funds might well be appropriated by the government;

(2) state the present status of penal law revision in New York and Pennsylvania;

(3) recommend a joint session with the Section on Criminology of the American Sociological Society whenever that Society meets in Chicago. The Criminology Section meets twice and I think there is a good prospect that they could be induced to turn one of their meet-

ings into a joint session with the Law School Association group.

The undersigned recommends that the committee continue and that its report include the above three items together with such additional matters as other members of the committee may suggest.

JEROME HALL."

Professor Floyd A. Wright of Oklahoma and James J. Robinson of Indiana also presented separate statements urging that the Committee be continued not as a "survey" committee but to give help to instructors on criminal law and procedure. Professor Robinson wrote to the Chairman:

". . . I am not aware that there is any other committee in any organization which is charged with the responsibility of considering the many problems which are connected with the teaching of criminal law and procedure in American law schools. You are well aware of the acute problems which exist in this field of legal instruction. In fact, my chief objection to your report is that it may seem to abandon or to ignore all of these problems. I believe also that this committee has a unique opportunity in helping law teachers to keep up with legislation, judicial decisions and administrative developments in this field. . . . Current developments, moreover, in the field of criminal law in legislation, judicial decision, administration, teaching and writing, justify the existence of a committee of the Association to help those of us who work in this field to keep in touch with all of these developments."

Round Table Program—The "Crimes" section of the Association of American Law Schools met

on Friday, December 31, to discuss topics proposed by the Council consisting of: Wayne L. Morse, University of Oregon, Chairman; George H. Dession, Yale University; Alfred L. Gausewitz, University of Wisconsin; Norman D. Lattin, Ohio State University; Charles B. Nutting, University of Nebraska. The topics for discussion were "The Limits of Deterrence" by Dr. Hans von Hentig, formerly of the Law School at Kiel, Germany, and professor of penal law and criminology at the University of Bonn - am - Rhein. Discussion led by Norman D. Lattin, Ohio State University. "The Proper Role of Legalism in Administration of Criminal Law" by Alfred L. Gausewitz, University of Wisconsin. Discussion led by George H. Dession, Yale University. "Some Legal Obstacles to Proper Parole Administration" by Paul Raymond, John B. Stetson University. Discussion led by Charles B. Nutting, University of Nebraska.

Judicial Criminal Statistics—The Bureau of the Census has recently completed its study, "Judicial Criminal Statistics, 1935" with the new statistician, Ronald H. Beattie writing the text and preparing the analytical tables under the supervision of Dr. Leon E. Truesdell, Chief Statistician for Population. The 1935 report covers 110 pages and is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Price 20c.

The statistics covered by this report have been gathered from courts and relate to the work performed by those agencies charged with the prosecution of alleged offenders, the determination of guilt, and the selection of the punishment

to be imposed upon those who are guilty.

Many States have collected certain statistics on the criminal business of their courts for their own use. However, these data have not been as useful as they should have been by reason of the fact they were not on a uniform basis and therefore not comparable. Criminologists and students of criminal administration therefore urged that the Federal Government undertake the collection of such statistics from the States in order that through Federal supervision a uniform plan could be followed by all States and the data be recorded and reported in uniform and therefore comparable terms. The Wickersham Commission in its report on criminal statistics recommended that this work be undertaken by the Census Bureau.

An Act of Congress approved March 4, 1931, authorized the Bureau of the Census to compile and publish annually statistics relating to crime and criminal administration. In 1932 a number of States were invited to cooperate in furnishing statistics on court dispositions. Sixteen States, including the District of Columbia, responded. Twenty-four States furnished information for 1933, 27 States for 1934, and 30 States for 1935, the year covered by the present report.

Value of Criminal Statistics—Mr. Beattie's introduction to the 1935 Report, *supra*, is worthy of wide circulation. We are glad to reprint it in its entirety:

"The American people are today devoting a great deal of energy and effort to the dual problem of controlling crime and improving

the administration of criminal justice. Governmental and private agencies are cooperating in programs for crime prevention. Frequent conferences are being held on the question of better methods of law enforcement. As a result, a great variety of suggestions are being made for the reform of criminal law and procedure, the reorganization of the administrative agencies enforcing the criminal law, and the development of new techniques for preventing or controlling criminal behavior.

"Each proposal or suggestion is supported by assertions of fact which presumably demonstrate the need for the proposed remedy. These 'facts' are almost invariably descriptions of existing conditions in statistical terms. Who has not heard hundreds of statements similar to these? 'The figures show that crime has been steadily increasing in this city for the last five years.' 'Too many robbers and burglars are being granted probation.' 'Large numbers of dangerous criminals are paroled from prison almost as soon as they are sent there.' 'There were three times as many persons arrested in our county last year as there were in blank county but we had only two-thirds their number of convictions.'

"Unfortunately, the actual data available on crime and law enforcement have been so fragmentary and so lacking in uniformity that very few general assertions of this nature could justifiably be made, and consequently the conclusions drawn from such alleged facts were very apt to be erroneous.

"The frequency with which statements of statistical nature are made in this field demonstrates

how dependent we are on this type of data for any knowledge at all of our success or failure in criminal law enforcement and suggests very forcefully the need for reliable data on crime and criminal justice in order that any kind of intelligent approach may be made to the solution of the social problems involved. It is only through measuring the extent or frequency of certain types of occurrences that we are able to learn enough about them to suggest reasonable changes. This means that the use of statistical data on crime is not only desirable, but is absolutely essential to any effective suggestions for reform or improvement.

"It was through the crime surveys carried on in various sections of this country from 1920 to 1932 that the possibilities of statistical information on the administration of criminal justice were revealed. These surveys served as the developing and testing ground for statistics on criminal administration. They demonstrated that by accounting methods much could be learned about the administrative agencies enforcing the criminal law, the allocation of responsibility for the various dispositions made of criminal cases, and the relative efficiency of their work. These surveys, however, provided a picture of conditions in the locality limited to the particular time the survey was made. They showed how a statistical accounting could be made but, of course, did not provide for a continuous program of accounting. From these beginnings there developed the idea of a system of criminal statistics whereby the activity of each agency involved in law enforcement could be measured annually. This could be done only by means

of keeping records on a uniform basis and preparing summaries or reports of such activities in comparable terms. A real beginning has been made toward the collection of national criminal statistics in the work on uniform crime reports carried on by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice, the work of the Bureau of Prisons in the same Department, which gathers comprehensive data on Federal courts and prisons, and the work carried on by the Census Bureau in collecting, from the States, judicial criminal statistics of prisons and jails."

Beattie's Conclusion—The tables of Judicial Criminal Statistics, 1935, emphasize that law enforcement is more than ever dependent upon *administration*. Mr. Beattie concludes his text with this statement:

"The statistical analysis of major offenses reported in 1935 has shown that there is considerable variation among the States in the distribution of offenses coming before the courts of general jurisdiction, in the disposition of defendants prosecuted, and in the sentences imposed on convicted offenders. This variation, undoubtedly, is due in part to differences in court jurisdiction and in legal procedure. However, much of the variation results from the differences in administrative practices and in the relative efficiency of the agencies engaged in law enforcement.

"Because of the limitations which exist in the present collection of the data, the statistics presented in this report must, of necessity, be interpreted with caution. As the development of a uniform system for the collection of judicial

criminal statistics progresses and as increased support is given by the States, statistics will be collected which can be analyzed much more intensively and which will furnish us with those facts essential to a more intelligent understanding of the criminal business of our courts and of the administrative practices of judges and prosecutors.

"The data presented in this report demonstrates again the importance of the prosecutor in the trial and disposition of felony offenders. The number of cases dismissed and the number of defendants who enter pleas of guilty account for nearly three-fourths of all defendants prosecuted. . . . Procedural outcome can be summarized as follows: About three-fourths of the defendants prosecuted for major offenses are convicted. Dismissals account for more than two-thirds of the defendants eliminated without conviction. Pleas of guilty account for four-fifths of all who are convicted. Only one-fourth of the defendants prosecuted in the courts of general criminal jurisdiction are disposed of by means of trial. Of those defendants convicted, approximately one-half received sentences to a State penitentiary or reformatory and about one-fourth were given probation or suspended sentence.

A. B. A. Officers—The Section of Criminal Law of the American Bar Association has chosen the following men to guide the important work of that body for the coming year: *Officers*: Chairman, Rollin M. Perkins, 202 Law Building, Iowa City, Iowa; Vice-Chairman, Louis S. Cohane, 844 Buhl Building, Detroit, Michigan; Secre-

tary, Henry W. Toll, Equitable Building, Denver, Colorado. *Council*: The officers ex officio and for term ending in 1938 Sanford Bates, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York; James J. Robinson, 1130 East First Street, Bloomington, Indiana. For term ending in 1939 Albert J. Harno, University of Illinois Law School, Urbana, Illinois; Earl Warren, District Attorney, Oakland, California. For term ending in 1940 George A. Bowman, 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Sylvester C. Smith, 97 South Main Street, Phillipsburg, New Jersey. For term ending in 1941 Arthur J. Freund, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri; Wayne L. Morse, University of Oregon Law School, Eugene, Oregon. *Chairmen of Committees*: *Education and Practice*, Cornelius W. Wickersham, 14 Wall Street, New York City, Cooperation with American Prison Association, Sanford Bates, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York; Cooperation with Council of State Governments, Richard Hartshorne, Court of Common Pleas, Newark, New Jersey; Cooperation with International Association of Chiefs of Police, J. Weston Allen, Tremont Building, Boston, Massachusetts. *Criminal Law Enforcement*, Philip Lutz, Jr., 33 Circle Tower, Indianapolis, Ind. *Criminal Procedure*, Robert E. Nash, Rockford, Illinois. *Personnel in Criminal Law Enforcement*, Daniel Bartlett, Liberty Central Trust Co. Building, St. Louis, Missouri. *Psychiatric Jurisprudence*, Louis S. Cohane, 844 Buhl Building, Detroit, Michigan.

Probation Association—We are pleased to record our gratification at the progress in work done and resultant prestige of the National

Probation Association. A recent report states: "The membership and support of the Association has increased. On April first of this year our total paid-up membership was 15,466, an increase of 2,426 over the previous year. A campaign this year to secure more probation officers as members was successful. Six hundred eighty-six new probation officer members were added to our active roll. In 113 probation departments all the officers are members of the Association."

The new directory, recently published by the Association, shows an increase in the number of probation officers of 725 over the number, 4,195, indicated in the previous directory, published in 1934. For the first time the directory lists the names of all regularly appointed probation officers in the United States and Canada, and of hundreds of volunteers and workers from other fields who have added probation work to their duties. Of the total number of probation officers listed in this latest compilation, 80 per cent, or 3,985, are regularly salaried probation officers. The remaining 935 have other duties or combination of duties, such as sheriff, welfare worker, minister, attendance officer, attorney or judge, in addition to their probation work. Thirty years ago volunteers made up the majority of probation officers. Now the proportion is reversed.

The rapid growth of state administration of probation is one of the most significant disclosures of the new directory. Two years ago only four states had probation officers appointed and paid by state departments or bureaus, while today thirteen commonwealths have state-administered probation. All

but three of those thirteen combine the administration of probation with that of parole.

Juvenile Crime—A significant program was inaugurated last year by the Junior Barristers of the Los Angeles Bar Association in devoting their major activity to juvenile crime prevention. The Committee of the Los Angeles Bar made a report to the State Conference and its program was adopted by the State organization and is being copied by other junior Bar associations throughout the United States.

The Committee now plans an extended analysis of the juvenile Court, Adoption, and Child Welfare laws of the state preliminary to making recommendations for codification or redrafting these laws.

Kansas Report—The Kansas Judicial Council Bulletin for October, 1937, summarizes the work of the Kansas Courts for the year ending June 30, 1937. There were 2,848 criminal cases disposed of within the year ending June 30, 1937. Of this number 1,053 cases were dismissed before trial on the merits. In 1,429 cases the defendants entered pleas of guilty. There were 366 cases tried by jury, resulting in 272 verdicts of guilty, 80 of not guilty, and 14 hung juries.

Only 80 verdicts of not guilty as compared with 1,053 cases dismissed by administration officials. We might conclude that "criminal law" has truly become a branch of "administrative law."

Oregon Bar Plans—Oregon has an integrated, or compulsory, Bar which during recent years has taken a very active interest in law enforcement problems. Each year

the law enforcement committee of the Bar submits a report dealing with proposals pertaining to criminal law administration. The committee consists of: A. E. Clark, Chairman; Charles W. Erskine, A. G. Fletcher, J. L. Hammersly, G. J. Meindl, David Sandeberg, Walter T. Durgan, Wayne L. Morse, John S. Hodgkin, L. A. Liljeqvist, Dal M. King, Joseph B. Felton, and Francis V. Galloway. Their report for this year is to deal in part with the problem of crime prevention. The committee will also submit a report on sentencing practices.

Dean Morse of the University Law School is preparing for the committee a parallel column report comparing the proposals of the model code of criminal procedure with the provisions on the Oregon statute books dealing with the same subjects. It has been observed that when Bar committees discuss criminal procedure reform they usually center their attention on a few specific reforms without first viewing the procedural set-up in its entirety. It is hoped that by submitting a comparative study such as the one mentioned above, greater progress can be made in getting some of the recommendations through the legislature.

Recommendation for Georgia—On November 2, 1937, The Prisons Industries Reorganization Administration, an agency of the Federal Government, released a report entitled, "The Prison Labor Problem in Georgia." In the transmittal letter addressed to President Roosevelt, it is stated that this survey is the twelfth of its kind undertaken by the Administration, and in some respects one of the most important, in that it is the

first time the services of the Administration have been requested by a State where all the prisoners are housed in and work from road camps.

General recommendations for the useful employment of prisoners and for bringing the State into line with the best modern thought are summarily presented as follows:

"1. Creation of a new appointive unpaid nonpolitical board with overlapping terms to have complete control of all phases of prison administration, to function through a full-time executive officer named by it, and with all personnel chosen and retained on a merit basis.

"2. Retention of the present salaried Prison Commission as the Parole Board, with enlarged authority to pass on all cases in which prisoners are released before expiration of their maximum sentences.

"3. Abolition of the present practice of turning State prisoners over to the county convict camps for those inmates selected for road work. Development of consolidated camps under State control for misdemeanors.

"4. Designation of the new penitentiary, the camps, the farms and tubercular hospital to receive specific types of prisoners, after classification.

"5. Establishment of a receiving and classification unit at the new prison at Reidsville for all felons committed. Employment of a physician, a psychologist, a social caseworker, and an educational director, all on a full-time basis, to examine every prisoner on arrival and assist the warden in deciding on assignment and treatment.

"6. Establishment of an educational and vocational training program sufficient at least to eliminate

illiteracy and to give trade or agricultural training to promising young offenders.

"7. Development of ten or more state-use industries at Reidsville, with appropriations for equipment and for a revolving fund of \$100,000.00 to finance operations.

"8. Revision and strengthening of present probation and parole laws, and provision for an adequate State system of probation and parole work with a full-time staff chosen on a merit basis.

"9. Construction of a new cottage-type women's institution for all women committed in the State regardless of length of service."

The administrative changes needed for probation and parole were stated as follows:

"Radical changes clearly being needed in the probation and parole administration of Georgia, the state should seek to secure the best possible. The minimum essentials will include:

1. A full-time paid parole board. The Prison Commission might serve in this capacity if relieved of the administration of the prison system as recommended elsewhere in this report. There are many excellent reasons for separating the paroling authority from the control of the penal institutions.

2. The parole board should eventually be appointive instead of elective, in order that it may not be directly submitted to political pressure and in order that members may be obtained who are specially qualified but who may not care to engage in the hurly-burly of political campaigns.

3. There should be established a state office to administer adult parole and probation, in charge of a director appointed by the parole board, with a staff of probation-

parole officers, one to be located in each of the 33 superior court districts. This office would serve the judges and the Parole Board in the investigation and supervision of cases.

It is of the utmost importance that the director and staff be selected for merit through competitive examinations. The success of the work will depend largely upon the quality of the personnel. Probation and parole work call for a high degree of competence and skill. While certain personal qualities are indispensable, education and training are also important.

4. Certain changes in the probation, parole and sentencing laws of the state are needed, as previously indicated in this report. The courts should be given broader discretion in the use of probation in felony cases. Parole should not be mandatory in any case. The parole board should be given authority to order parole without the concurrence of the Governor, and should be authorized to adopt rules regarding eligibility for parole, with only broad statutory limitations. It is important not only that gangsters and other dangerous prisoners be kept in custody, but also that offenders who are not confirmed criminals be released before they have been demoralized by association with vicious criminals—or preferably given a trial on probation without being subjected at all to such associations."

California Report—The California Board of Prison Terms and Paroles, David F. Bush, Chairman, recently made its report for the year July 1, 1936 to June 30, 1937. In the letter of transmittal to Governor Frank F. Merriam a most

remarkable statement was made:

"Each year the Board has restated its faith in the parole system, as such, and in the success of its operation in California. One evidence of the soundness of that belief is to be found in certain figures used later in the report, but repeated here.

"During 1936-37 there were 28,230 felony arrests in California, of which only 20 were men on parole. During this same period there were an average of 2,205 men on parole from San Quentin and Folsom prisons in California."

Lehman on Parole—A powerful defense of parole was made by Governor Herbert H. Lehman of New York in an address before the New York State Conference of Social Workers on October 20, 1937. He said:

"Even though under parole there may be 100 cases of successful readjustment and only 5 failures, those 5 are frequently enough to damn the system of parole in the eyes of the public, particularly if they are of a character which lend themselves readily to sensational exploitation."

Asserting that there is no subject on which there is greater misunderstanding than parole the governor outlined and answered some of these misconceptions:

"1. In the first place, most people believe that the Parole Board can release convicts at any time and under any circumstances that may seem advisable to them. This of course is completely contrary to the facts.

The Parole Board in this State has no power to release from prison any inmate who has not served the minimum of an indeterminate sentence.

2. There is a belief that when a convict is released from prison he is turned loose on the community without supervision. This too is incorrect. When a prisoner is conditionally released by the Parole Board after he has served his minimum sentence, less allowance for good behavior, he remains under the direct and constant supervision of the Parole Board until the expiration of his maximum sentence.

3. There is a general impression that parole shortens the sentence of prisoners. This is entirely untrue. The limits of all indeterminate sentences have been fixed by the Legislature for different crimes.

4. There is a belief that if fixed sentences were given as punishment instead of indeterminate sentences there would be an improvement. This reasoning, I believe, is fallacious. A fixed sentence would not be substantially longer than a minimum sentence now imposed under our system of indeterminate sentences.

Another statement, so well recognized by criminologists, but overlooked by many other groups, was neatly presented by Mr. Lehman:

"Let us not forget that parole or no parole, at least 95 per cent of all men who enter prison leave prison at some time or other. Only those do not who are put to death in expiation of their crimes, or who die while still serving their sentences. Society must receive all the rest back some time. The problem faced by society is how these individuals, vicious many of them, may be made to constitute less of a menace to society. It is to meet this problem that we have the indeterminate sentence, plus parole release from prison."

The American Jail—The Standing Committee on Jails of the American Prison Association has circulated a booklet entitled "The American Jail, What It Is and What To Do About It," by Russell B. DeVine of Richmond, Virginia. Publication was made possible through the generosity of G. Howland Shaw of the Department of State, Washington, D. C.

From it we learn that there are today in the United States approximately 3,700 county and city jails, besides more than 10,000 local lock-ups. In the year 1936 there were more than 1,000,000 commitments to jail in the United States, or one in every 120 of the total population.

Mr. DeVine says:

"The jails are literally full of large groups of people that common sense dictates should not be there, for the simple reason that no good purpose is served either them, or society, by sentencing them to jail. The enormous numbers of drunks and vagrants cannot be either punished or cured by being thrown in jail for a few days or weeks. These unfortunates need indeterminate sentences, fixed as to maximum and minimum periods, and hard work or proper medical treatment as indicated on state farms or colonies. The large group of people serving time in the jails because of inability to pay the fines assessed should not be there at all, but rather, permitted to pay their fines on the installment plan. Women should have other provision made for their detention and should not be sent to jail. Only an occasional jail is equipped to care for females and jails having matrons are few and far between. Juveniles and insane persons com-

pose other important groups of jail inmates, who should never, except in cases of serious emergency or necessity, be sent to jail. Civilized people will not much longer tolerate this. The chronic "repeaters," in for first one thing, then another, and accounting for 60 per cent of the committals, manifestly require other measures than the never ending jail sentences of brief duration. Witnesses and prisoners awaiting trial, the large unconvicted group, constitute another large class obviously having no business in jail for months at a time."

He proposes (1) keep people out of jail, (2) shorten the time spent in jail by witnesses and people awaiting trial, (3) establish a new and better system of handling convicted misdemeanants. Specifically he advocates the installment collection of fines, extension of bail and personal recognizance, extension of probation, establishment of regional state farms for places in which sentences would be served, the abolition of the fee system, and central State administration. He concludes, "England, which gave us our present system, met the same issues now before us, sixty years ago, and abandoned the set-up that we still cling to. *It can be done.*"

Crime Conference—The second Wisconsin Crime Control Conference was held at Milwaukee on November 5, 1937. The conference dealt with the subject of Delinquency Among Women and Girls. Illegitimacy, venereal disease, psychiatric approach to the problem of delinquency, rehabilitation, and home conditions as influencing delinquency all received attention,

along with discussion of the social responsibility of school and church in preventing delinquency. At the evening session a summary was presented by the President of the Conference, Professor A. L. Gause-

witz of the University of Wisconsin Law School.

A general session on Juvenile Delinquency is planned for the November, 1938, meeting at Madison, to be followed by county and circuit section meetings.