Current Notes


Rules Committee—The Advisory Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure, appointed by the Supreme Court of the United States, was announced by Professor Wigmore in the March-April issue of this Journal (XXXI:657). The work of the Committee was organized at a general meeting in Washington, February 21, and a list of topics to be covered by rules was prepared. Mr. Leland Tolman of the office of the Administrator of U. S. Courts was made assistant secretary and special topics were assigned to committee members. The Chief Justice has urged that the rules be clear and simple and easy to understand. To accomplish this the Committee has the work of the Committee on Civil Rules to serve as a model, and it is hoped that the Criminal rules will meet with the same success.

J. J. Robinson, reporter for the Committee, has been in residence at Washington for several months and is devoting much of his time to committee work. It is thought to be impossible to complete the rules in time for the next regular session of Congress and as a result almost three years will elapse before final adoption. This will insure careful consideration by practising lawyers, bar committees, district attorneys and judges. Steps have been taken through Mr. Arthur T. Vanderbilt, the committee chairman, to contact every possible organization or agency which may be interested in advising the Committee.

English Committee Communication—Professor J. W. C. Turner of Cambridge University, who serves as Secretary to the Committee to consider the promotion of Research and Teaching in Criminal Science, sent the following note to the Editor:

"I write to thank you for your very kind note in the November-December number of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. I am also glad to hear from our publishers that 'Penal Reform' has reached you safely.

"Although we started our Committee at a time of great difficulty and tension, our work is developing very satisfactorily and this has been greatly assisted by the encouragement and stimulation which we have received from all quarters, not only in our own land, but also in yours."

Comment on Chicago Police—On February 20, 1941, the Chicago Crime Commission held its annual meeting and re-elected its list of officers and Bertram Cahn to serve his fourth term as president. Mr. Cahn addressed the meeting, discussing the accomplishments of the Commission during 1940. He was followed by Henry Barrett Chamberlin, the operating director, who reviewed the work of the Commission particularly in connection with the other agencies of law enforcement. These addresses were printed in the Commission's publication "Criminal Justice" (No. 67) along with the report of Rudolph W. Dvorak, assistant operating director. In this publication was an interesting comment upon the Chicago police, which is printed below. The situation described is not illustrative of Chicago policing only; it may be found in any large city. Nor does it indicate undue criticism of the police by the Commission. It merely shows the constant necessity for improved police administration in Chicago and elsewhere.

"James P. Allman is an outstanding commissioner of police. Under his management the morale and courtesy of the
policemen has shown marked improvement. Such faults—lack of efficiency which still exist need more in the way of remedy than is within the power of the commissioner.

"During the past year a close study of numerous reports, statistics and other data has enabled the Chicago Crime Commission to arrive at some definite conclusions as to defects and deficiencies in performance in the various departments charged with the administration of criminal justice. It is believed that this summary points out clearly why there are so many unsolved murders, robberies, burglaries, larcenies, failures in prosecution and groups of racketeers who flagrantly flout the law.

"In the following paragraph will be found a concise summary of the report of police stations and captains. Every captain interviewed by the Chicago Crime Commission frankly admitted that uniformed foot patrolmen have almost disappeared from the streets of Chicago. Every captain admitted that foot patrolmen are a very important crime-fighting factor in a police department. All of them agreed that mechanized details were a necessary adjunct and that more and improved squad cars were needed. No captain interviewed was able to state that he knew, through card index or otherwise, the residents of his district. Each captain was able to immediately tell how many taverns there were in his territory, but none of them was in a position to furnish a list of known hoodlums, persons with previous records or tell the number of unemployed in the community. When asked about the possible value of a card index of residents and intercommunication between stations with regard to changes of residences, there was an almost complete unanimity of opinion that the citizens would resent such close police contact and supervision.

"A summary of the answers given by the captains to some thirty questions asked of them discloses that the functions of each station are almost entirely a routine performance. Crimes reported are recorded. Squad cars respond to calls of citizens who have been victims of criminals—ask routine questions and wait for another alarm. With but few exceptions, apprehension of criminals depends almost entirely on 'lucky breaks.' If some citizen reports his car stolen, gives a good description and the license number and the thieves do not repaint or change the plates, some squad will notice the automobile, give chase and present the occupants of the car at a showup during which scores of victims will possibly identify those who had robbed them. In burglaries a tip-off may lead to a raid on a cache. Some of the articles found may be identified by the owners and a number of crimes thus solved. Some citizens who exhibit unusual alertness may follow those who robbed them until they meet a policeman or a squad car and thus bring about an arrest which, through subsequent showups, may solve a series of crimes.

"A study of reports on numerous crimes discloses an almost apathetical reaction on the part of policemen responding to reported crimes. There are exceptions, of course, and these occur in instances where specially organized squads are assigned to duties dealing with particular criminal operations. The policemen on such squads have done meritorious work. This is probably due to the fact that especially adapted men were chosen for such squads and the further fact that they were given an opportunity to carry on an intensive investigation which, aided by their knowledge of the type of crooks who operate in that field of criminal activity, led to solutions.

"The extent of unthinking routine performance is best exemplified by facts developed at a recent coroner's inquest. In this instance the police were notified that a man was lying on a sidewalk. The police came, lifted the man, put him into a wagon and placed him in a cell. Hours later a police physician was called by the lockup keeper and he, with the aid of a match, made an examination. He gave the man, who was insensible, a smell of ammonia and left. The following morning another police physician was called by the lockup keeper. He examined the man, with the aid of a flashlight this time, and pronounced him dead from a concussion caused by a blow on the back of the head. Apparently, from the testimony presented at the coroner's inquest, no effort had
been immediately made to check and identify the man. At the inquest, witnesses including the deceased's wife testified that they had been in contact with him by telephone and in person during a period of almost four hours prior to the time he was picked up from the sidewalk. That he had told them he had been robbed and beaten. The police smelled liquor on the man's breath and, despite the fact that he was well dressed and no doubt had some articles of identification on his person, assumed he was a drunken bum.

"Recently a large parcel delivery concern in Chicago was the victim of some twenty robberies and larcenies within a period of less than two months. In each instance the police came and made notes. A vice-president of the corporation, who had come from New York to assume duties here, was especially surprised over the fact that outside of the routine questions asked of the drivers by policemen who had responded to the calls of the victims nothing further was heard in the way of contact or investigation. Determined efforts on his part finally secured him an interview with a supervising captain from whom he learned that the department was undermanned and that robberies around the holidays were not unusual. Twenty crimes had been committed, considerable property and money had been stolen, routine questions had been asked and recorded—and apparently that was all there was to it. The matter was reported to Commissioner James P. Allman by the Chicago Crime Commission and immediately various commanders of some seventeen police districts involved contacted the official.

"There is no question but that Chicago should have more policemen. Chicago should have at least 9,000 policemen instead of 6,000 that it has now. New York has 18,500 and its population is only twice as large as that of Chicago. Chicago is much larger in territory than New York. When it is borne in mind that of the 6,000 policemen a large proportion serve on traffic duty and that another large number is kept busy visiting cigar stores and horse-race 'booke' parlors, not to speak of numerous other special details, et cetera, it will readily be realized that the necessary three shifts in each of the forty districts are not overmanned. One improvement which, without doubt, would serve to enhance performance could be made without much difficulty. At the present time a policeman who habitually shows unusual ability and diligence in his daily performance has no opportunity of receiving more pay than the one who is perfunctory in his duties. The only opportunity that a policeman has of earning more money depends on his ability to pass examinations when these are held for a higher rank. By ability is not necessarily meant passing the examination alone. It might be possible to devise some method of providing increases in salaries, irrespective of rank, to policemen who show special ability and diligence in the performance of their duties."

Probation Anniversary — Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes has accepted the honorary chairmanship of a committee to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the beginning of probation, it was announced by Timothy N. Pfeiffer, president, National Probation Association, sponsor of the event. Justices Felix Frankfurter and Frank Murphy are among sixty men and women from all parts of the country who are serving with Mr. Hughes in the observance to honor John Augustus, Boston shoemaker-philanthropist who "bailed out" and took under friendly supervision the first probationer in 1841.

Objectives of the John Augustus Centennial, in addition to honoring the little known social pioneer, were said to include a campaign to emphasize the need for higher standards in probation and parole services to make them more effective instruments to reduce America's crime problem. An appeal will be made for better training of probation and parole officers, elimination of political interference in juvenile and adult courts, and the extension of sound probation service to more courts.

The Association with its 17,000 national members including judges and probation and parole officers, will seek through meetings and conferences to "strengthen interest and understanding between citizens and their courts," it was said.
Authentic records concerning John Augustus were recalled by Mr. Pfeiffer who pointed out that this man, during 18 years as a probation officer in the Boston courts, a century ago, took under supervision without imprisonment some 2,000 wayward men, women, young boys and girls. Of this number only ten are said to have absconded. (See the extended article by Frank W. Grinnell in this number, pp. 15ff.)

New York Sheriffs—Louis R. Yaguda, Executive Director of the New York State Sheriff’s Association, writes to the Editor:

“Our Association is issuing a monthly paper which contains a general round-up of news from the Sheriffs’ Offices throughout the State.

“Since our last exchange of correspondence, the Sheriffs of this State have adopted a standard uniform which is being placed in use as quickly as the present uniforms become worn to the point where they require replacement. Through this means we hope to present a standard picture from one end of the State to the other, so that the wearer of the uniform can be promptly identified as being associated with the Sheriff’s Office.

“May I also call your attention to the fact that a recent survey of the resources of Sheriffs’ Offices in this State discloses the fact that they are prepared for State Defense to the extent where we have available for immediate mobilization 600 Uniformed Deputies; 1,460 Non-uniformed Deputies; Auxiliary Forces consisting of Special Deputies and Legionnaires trained in use of firearms, 8,513 men; approximately 5,500 automobiles, 443 of which are radio equipped; 8 Airplanes, 7 Sound Cars, 42 Ambulances, 402 Trucks, 11 Portable Light Generators, approximately 4,000 rifles and shotguns, and a large supply of miscellaneous equipment required for emergency purposes.

“We pass this information along to you in view of your known interest in police activities.

Louisiana Code—By Act 7 of 1940, the Legislature of Louisiana instructed the Louisiana State Law Institute to prepare a “Projet of a Criminal Code for the State of Louisiana.” Pursuant to this mandate the Institute appointed as reporters for the projet, Professor Dale E. Bennett of the Louisiana State University Law School, Professor Clarence J. Morrow of the Tulane University College of Law, and Professor Leon Sarpy of the Loyola University School of Law.

The work of preparing a “Projet of a Criminal Code for the State of Louisiana” began with the first meeting of the reporters, which was held on October 30, 1940, in New Orleans. Several meetings have since been held for the formulation of general plans and the consideration, discussion, and revision of individual work. Three sessions were held in April, 1941, attended by Newman F. Baker of Northwestern University. The aim of the reporters has been constantly to follow sound principles of codification without, however, overlooking the peculiar requirements of criminal law draftsmanship. This means that the final draft will be no mere compilation of statutes, nor will it constitute the adoption of any existing code.

Preliminary to the actual drafting, a comprehensive investigation was undertaken. To assure full consideration of all existing laws of the state and to have a ready reference thereto, two complete alphabetical and chronological lists of the criminal statutes of Louisiana, beginning with the Revised Statutes of 1870, were drafted. Surveys were made of the penal statutes and codes of other states as well as foreign countries, and of available textual materials. Opinions of many criminal law scholars concerning the problem of criminal codification were obtained.

Following the collection and analysis of this information a tentative outline consisting of eight titles was prepared. Individual assignments covering further and detailed research and initial drafting were then made.

In keeping with the policy determined upon, an attempt has been made to draw the articles as concisely as possible. To avoid resorting to lengthy enumerations, broad terms have been used whenever possible, but only after careful consideration of pertinent decisions and textual opinions to guard against the selection of terms that might be too inclusive. Each article will be designed to fully define and
set forth all of the essential elements of the particular crime.

A special effort is being made to eliminate useless and confusing fictions and to employ clear and simple language in all definitions. The reporters further hope that the completed projet will represent a thorough and careful revision and revaluation of our present criminal concepts.

Wisconsin—Y. C. A. Act—On May 10, 1941, as a part of the spring program of the Law School of the University of Wisconsin a round table was sponsored on the Youth Correction Authority Act of the American Law Institute and on a bill which has been drafted and introduced in the Wisconsin legislature to adopt that act to Wisconsin. The main speaker was Judge Joseph N. Ulman of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore and a member of the American Law Institute Committee on Criminal Justice, under whose supervision the Act was drafted. There was discussion by: John C. Burke, Warden of the Wisconsin State Prison, Waupun; Judge Henry P. Hughes of the Circuit Court, Oshkosh, member of the Committee which drafted the Wisconsin bill; Professor Alfred L. Gausewitz, Chairman of said Committee; Herbert J. Steffes, District Attorney of Milwaukee County.

The presiding officer was Chief Justice Marvin B. Rosenberry.

Commission for Educable Mentally Handicapped Children—Senate Bill No. 20 in the Illinois Legislature provides for a Commission with this title to consist of the Director of Public welfare, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Director of Labor, Director of Public Health and four others to be appointed by the Governor.

Sec. 4. The Commission shall have power, and it shall be its duty:

1. To coordinate the administrative responsibility and the services of the four (4) state offices and departments represented on said Commission insofar as they relate to the welfare of mentally handicapped children and to compose any differences that may arise between such offices and departments.

2. To stimulate all private and public efforts throughout the state in the care, treatment, education and social service of mentally handicapped children, and to coordinate such efforts with those of state departments and offices into a unified and comprehensive program.

3. To promote special classes and competent special instruction for all types of educable mentally handicapped children in all parts of the state, and to arrange for the special training of teachers for such classes.

4. To promote adequate provisions for medical diagnosis and treatment of mentally handicapped children in all parts of the state.

5. To promote vocational guidance, training, placement and social adjustment on an individual case work basis for all mentally handicapped children in need of such service.

6. To promote facilities for the care of children maladjusted to their home surroundings.

7. To investigate into the need for the establishment of a vocational school of the colony or village type for the temporary training of educable mentally handicapped children maladjusted to their home, boarding home or school surroundings who evidence or display symptoms of dependency or delinquency.

8. To study conditions relating to educable mentally handicapped children in Illinois and in other states and to report to the General Assembly, from time to time, its recommendations for such legislation as in its opinion will improve such conditions.

Largest Criminology Class—In December, 1940, Morris Ploscowe, Chief Clerk of the Court of Special Sessions, New York City, announced an in-service training course, "Criminal Law Enforcement in the City of New York," with instruction given by city officials connected with the police, district attorneys' offices, courts, probation and parole agencies. The sessions are held Wednesdays from 5:30 to 7 and all employees of the law enforcement agencies are eligible. The response to this course announcement was extraordinary. 1600
civil service employees paid the enrollment fee and began study! So far as we know this is the first course of the kind offered in this country and the popularity which it achieved is of great interest. The organization of subject matter is indicated by the lecture topics and lecturers:


Institutional Treatment of Offenders. XI. The Jurisdiction and Functions of the Department of Correction. Peter F. Amoroso, Acting Commissioner, Department of Correction. XII. Techniques in the Treatment of Offenders. Richard A. McGee, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Correction.

Board. XV. Law Enforcement Agencies in Relation to a Typical Criminal Case. Morris Ploscowe, Chief Clerk, Court of Special Sessions.

Section Organization—The Section of Criminal Law of the American Bar Association is operating under the following officers: Chairman, James J. Robinson, 1130 E. First St., Bloomington, Ind.; Vice-Chairman, Earl Warren, State Bldg., San Francisco, Calif.; Secretary, Paul H. Sanders, Duke Univ. Law School, Durham, N. C.


Committees of the Section: Coordination of Law Enforcement Agencies, Earl Warren, Chairman, Attorney General, State Bldg., San Francisco, Calif.; Education and Practice, Thomas E. Dewey, Chairman, 137 Center Street, New York City; Federal Election Laws, Arthur J. Freund, Chairman, 506 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.; Magistrates and Traffic Courts, Louis B. Ewbank, Chairman, Fletcher Trust Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.; Police Training and Merit Systems, John R. Snively, Chairman, Forest City Nat'l Bank Bldg., Rockford, Ill.; Procedure, Prosecution and Defense, Paul E. Lockwood, Chairman, 137 Center St., New York City; Nating Standards and Statistics, Dan W. Jackson, Chairman, District Attorney, Houston, Texas; Sentencing, Probation, Prisons and Parole, Wayne L. Morse, Chairman, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.; Supreme Court Rules for Criminal Procedure, Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Chairman, 744 Broad St., Newark, N. J.

Oregon Justice Bill—A bill to create a State Department of Justice in Oregon is being considered by the Legislature. It is sponsored by the Oregon State Bar and embodies many features of the questionnaires of the Bar Committee, headed by W. L. Gosslin, Esq. (See 31 J. Crim. L. 478-Nov.-Dec. 1940). The most interesting parts of the bill are set out below:

Proposed Bill to Create a State Department of Justice in Oregon

A Bill

For an act to create a state department of justice; to define its power and duties; to provide for its organization and administration. Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

Section 1. Department of Justice Created.—There hereby is created a department of the state government to be known as the department of justice.

Section 2. Appointment of Attorney General.—Subject to the powers and duties of the governor vested in him by Article V, section 10, of the Constitution, the attorney general shall be the chief law officer of the state and the director of the department of justice hereinbefore created; and, in addition to the powers and duties already vested in him by law, shall have the powers and duties hereinafter set forth. The attorney general shall be appointed by the governor, and shall serve during his pleasure. The salary of the attorney general shall be $7,500 a year.

Section 3. Assistant Attorneys General—Merit System.—The attorney general may appoint a first assistant attorney general and such other assistant attorneys general as he shall deem necessary to transact the business of the department, each to be selected and to serve under a merit system to be approved by the governor and to be removable only for inefficiency, neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, established at a public hearing before the governor, after not less than 10 days written notice to the accused of the specific charges made. The assistant attorneys general, subject to the direction of the attorney general, shall have the same power and authority as the attorney general, and shall perform such duties as he may designate. Each of said assistants shall devote his entire time to the duties
of his office, and shall receive an annual salary to be fixed by the attorney general, payable as other state salaries are paid. The attorney general also may employ and prescribe the duties of such other officers, employees and assistants as he may deem necessary, and fix their compensation, to be paid as other state salaries are paid.

Section 4. Department Divisions.—There hereby is created within the department of justice the following divisions, to-wit: (1) Civil Matters; (2) Criminal Prosecution; and (3) State Police.

Section 5. The Divisions of Civil Matters.—The attorney general shall be the legal adviser of all state and county officers and agencies . . .

Section 6. The Division of Criminal Prosecution.—The attorney general hereby is vested with the exclusive control and direction of the prosecution of all criminal proceedings in any and all of the courts and tribunals of this state and in any county or district of the state. He shall do and perform all acts heretofore done and performed by and shall be vested with all authority heretofore vested in the district or prosecuting attorney for each of the several counties of this State. The said office of district or prosecuting attorney hereby is abolished.

Section 7. The Division of State Police.—The department of state police hereby is made a division of the department of justice and the attorney general shall do and perform all acts heretofore done and performed by and shall be vested with all authority heretofore vested in the governor as to the department of state police. The attorney general may require any coroner, sheriff, constable, chief of police or other law enforcement officer to make to him such reports concerning the investigation, detection, prosecution, and punishment of crime in their respective jurisdictions as to him may seem advisable. For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the state, and for the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of criminal identification records and their exchange with the officials of other states and the Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice, the attorney general hereby is authorized to appoint officials and assistants who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties, and to create and organize such laboratories and other facilities as the attorney general may deem necessary. The crime detection laboratory created by chapter 7, title 91, O. C. L. A., hereby is placed under the jurisdiction and control of the attorney general.

Census Bureau Report on Repeaters—The Bureau of the Census reported in April that more than three-fourths of the prisoners admitted to the district jail were repeaters. Only 2,138 or 23.2 percent of the 9,230 admissions during the last half of 1940 represented individuals who were there once and once only.

This information was obtained by cooperation between the District authorities and the Bureau of the Census and is possible because of the initiation on July 1, 1933, of a permanent numbering system for jail inmates. Identification is made by fingerprints and an individual is known by his original number, no matter how many times he returns.

The investigation further shows that the 9,230 admissions represented 6,830 different individuals. Of these, 4,457 individuals, who had previously been assigned permanent numbers, were responsible for 6,554 admissions; and 2,373 making their first entry under the present system accounted for 2,676 admissions. The 184 most frequently arrested individuals were responsible for 799 arrests in the six months period, a twelfth of the total.