

1924

Editorials

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

Editorials, 14 J. Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 482 (May 1923 to February 1924)

This Editorial 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.

EDITORIALS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIM- INOLOGY AT HOTEL STATLER, DETROIT, JANUARY 11, 1923

(Professor Keedy presiding.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Members of the Association and Guests—It is my sad duty to open this meeting with the announcement of the death of the President of this Institute, Mr. James Bronson Reynolds. Mr. Reynolds was out of health for some time and died on the 1st of January. His work is familiar to us and it is fitting that we should express our appreciation of his work and our regret at his death by rising and standing for a moment in silence. (All the members arose.)

The chair then appointed a committee to draft a fitting resolution on Mr. Reynolds' death and any other resolutions that may seem proper to present. The committee consisted of Mr. Chute, Mr. Veiller and Mr. Drown.

The chair called upon the Secretary to read a report that the President had prepared for this meeting.

THE SECRETARY: This is not a report upon the special work that Mr. Reynolds had in hand, namely, a survey of the administration of criminal justice in several cities. That report, owing to Mr. Reynolds' illness, is not completed. I understand from his secretary that it will be finished, however, within a week or two. This is a report touching the general features of his work which he finished two or three days before his death and asked me to read at this meeting.

REPORT OF JAMES BRONSON REYNOLDS,

President of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology,
for 1922 and 1923

The President desires to submit to the Board a statement of the leading activities in which he has shared during the two years of his Presidency, and deeply regrets that he is unable to present the report in person.

The report is presented under the following titles:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For inspiration and vision of the larger relations of the criminal law and its administration, I have been and continue to be profoundly indebted to Dean Wigmore. I trust I have been true to both. To the JOURNAL of the Institute and to our Secretary, Mr. Gault, I have constantly profited by extended council, generous co-operation and helpful judgment. To Mr. Harley and Colonel Chamberlain I have owed practical contact with the best work being done in our field. In conferences with Mr. Crossley I have felt obligations for his wise, sound and broad understanding of our great problem and need of national criminal statistics, and I earnestly hope that he may be able to give the energy to push this work forward. To Mr. MacChesney and Professor Millar I have likewise owed extended and highly suggestive conversations. To all other members of the Committee I have been indebted at different times and desire to acknowledge their very generous aid.

It has been my regret that my residence was not nearer to the Board, but I have at all times sought to make my official policies and utterances in accordance with my best knowledge of the sentiments of the Board.

I believe I owe it to the Board and to myself to make the above statements in view of the new departures that we have undertaken, and their relation to my interviews with members of our Board.

FINANCES

Before my election to the Presidency, Dean Wigmore, Mr. Gault and myself, individually, approached the Carnegie Corporation. Our various labors resulted, as the Board is aware, in a contribution of \$10,000.00 a year for five years. Subsequently, through an interview of Dean Wigmore with Mr. Fosdick, correspondence of Mr. Crossley and Mr. Gault with the Rockefeller Memorial, and repeated interviews of my own with the Memorial officers, a contribution of \$10,000.00 a year for two years was obtained. This gift terminates March, 1924, and we are informed it will not be renewed.

My efforts at the moment are directed to induce the American Law Institute to recommend that we receive at least \$10,000.00 a year from the Carnegie Corporation for three years to meet the previous conditional gift of the Carnegie Corporation and our own needs in developing our work relating to criminal statistics.

Each year Mr. Gault and I have made general appeals for funds; and other members of the Board have solicited individuals.

SURVEYS

The Carnegie Corporation was specially impressed by our appeal for aid in favor of general propaganda in behalf of the improvement of the criminal law and its more efficient and intelligent administration. It therefore limited its five-year contribution to the work of the surveys of the criminal law administration in cities and other political units. A statement of what has been done in this field is hence of supreme importance. The President appointed Mr. Gault as chairman of a Committee on Surveys and has been in constant correspondence and helpful relations with him. Serious conferences and correspondence urging surveys have been undertaken in the following cities: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Atlanta, Birmingham, Memphis, Buffalo, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. In addition, direct appeal has been made by letters and interviews with Chambers of Commerce and other bodies in the states of Connecticut and New Jersey, and with the National Chamber of Commerce at Washington. Detroit and Cleveland have both been visited; the former, to study the consolidated criminal court in that city, and the latter, to study the results of its crime survey and to urge such constructive activity as had commended itself to representative citizens following the Cleveland survey.

In Boston, two conferences were held, but leaders decided that the Pelletier scandal made action at that time unusually difficult. In New York the Chamber of Commerce was at first disposed to raise a large sum of money for a state-wide survey, but in the end the district attorney convinced the chairman of its committee that the addition of two judges to the highest criminal court and the reduction of the calendar of cases awaiting trial justified the conclusion that the crime wave had been overcome. Not all of his committee, however, accepted that view, but agreed with the contention of the President that the Court of General Sessions of New York greatly needed consolidation and that other not less important matters merited constructive attention. This field will continue to need attention.

In Philadelphia an invitation was given to the President two years ago to meet a dinner conference of representative lawyers, of whom Senator Pepper, Professors Mikell, Lewis and Keedy of the Law School, State's Attorney Rotan, and Mr. Carson, former President of the American Bar Association, were the best known. After warm discussion, in which various points came up, such as the general ignorance of an outsider and the belief that the local political machine was

being attacked, the meeting endorsed the President's proposal of a survey, and the judges of the Highway Criminal Court subsequently approved the same, and the President of the Philadelphia Bar Association was asked to name a committee, of which he should be chairman, to undertake the work. The Committee has worked carefully and hard for two years, special praise being given to James Collins Jones, counsel to the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce for generous sacrifice of his own time to the task. The caution and conservatism of a majority of the commission are to be regretted, but important results seem likely to emerge.

While in Philadelphia, I was visited by the editor of the *Baltimore Sun*, who had showed sufficient interest to send a reporter to Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago. I had correspondence with others in Baltimore. Later an association was formed under the auspices of the Board of Trade in the belief that a survey and aggressive work were equally needed in Baltimore. By invitation, I met the executive body of this organization and have been in constant touch with its executive officer, a young lawyer of high abilities.

Atlanta, Birmingham and Memphis were likewise interested last spring, the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta was addressed and individual citizens were conferred with in each city.

Last summer Mr. Gault had valuable conferences with Mr. Vollmer, the new Chief of Police of Los Angeles. I had previously corresponded with the Bar Association and the Chamber of Commerce of that city, but agreed with Mr. Gault that the appointment of Mr. Vollmer as Chief of Police offered exceptional opportunities for our efforts. With Mr. Gault and Mr. Vollmer I hope that an important, thorough survey may be made.

Two meetings were addressed in Buffalo and conferences held. The major group of the Board of Judges of Detroit was met a year ago.

In the state work, the Board of the Connecticut Manufacturers' Association and officers of the State Chamber of Commerce were urged to undertake a state-wide survey, but without result to date, hesitation to intrude on professional fields seeming to hold back those bodies from aggressive effort to secure greater efficiency in the administration of the law.

The State Board of Welfare of New Jersey also invited me to a conference, later held, but they were not able to secure the legislative appropriation for \$10,000.00 for a state-wide survey.

In addition to the above surveys, I should mention four minor surveys now being made under the direct supervision of the President, in the cities of New Haven, Hartford, Bridgeport, Connecticut, and Birmingham, Alabama. These are undertaken for the purpose of exhibiting the state of criminal law administration in cities of about 100,000 inhabitants. Through the co-operation of the director of the Baltimore commission, who is best in a position to do so, it is planned to add comparative comments from that city at the close. Questions as to manifest differences will be raised and various propositions offered for consideration. The policy of the Institute not to make hard and fast recommendations will be observed. More extended description of this work has already been sent to Mr. Gault.

It is particularly agreeable to note that the officials, without exception, of these cities have welcomed our visits, given us information freely, and at times taken considerable pains to help us. In no single instance has any rebuff been expressed. The results will be presented as soon as possible, and we hope may be published in our own JOURNAL.

This, I trust not too detailed report, would indicate to the Board the outlines of the particular task in which we have been engaged. It has involved extended correspondence, and preparation of many plans, and considerable travel. I hope it may not be necessary for me to say that I have at all times carefully refrained from proposing specific reforms, which I understood to be a part of my obligations as President.

My aim has always been to urge surveys under the direction of the most competent community leaders, among whom lawyers should be properly represented.

STATISTICS

The Committee on Statistics was created a year and a half ago, with Mr. Crossley as chairman, through the offer of \$10,000.00 for one year by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. After organization the Committee selected Mr. Warner as director, the arrangement being made that he should give part time service. Mr. Warner's activities have continued since that date. I had not met him when he was chosen, but was impressed by the endorsement of Dean Wigmore and Mr. Crossley and have since been entirely satisfied that their judgment regarding him was wise. My only present desire is that his work shall be heartily supported and facilitated by every means in our power.

In the large, I understand that the work has involved the assumption of the belief that we need a National Bureau of Statistics, and a consequent study of ways and means by which the present ignorance may be succeeded by a National Bureau and for which statistics should be sought which our study would show available and of the greatest value. Our work in relation to penal institutions I understand to be nearly completed. It is equally desirable that the same study be made by states regarding police and the criminal courts. That Mr. Warner has received the approval of officials who have met him as our representative I think is evidenced by the recommendations which he was asked to make to the Census Bureau for its report on criminal statistics undertaken at the beginning of 1923, and by the adoption of nearly all his recommendations. It was understood that these recommendations were informal and merely represented his own best judgment and experience.

THE JOURNAL

It has been my regret that earnest appeals which I have made to various men of means have not produced larger funds for the JOURNAL. Its value we all realize, and its possibilities with more funds are beyond debate. I can only express the hope that we may still continue to seek funds for its cause.

MISCELLANEOUS

Without committing the Institute, the President has urged the study of the history of criminal law in this country, and the creation of whole time professorships of criminal law in our law schools. Until such historical study is given and such professorships are created, I doubt if we shall attain the high standard of intelligent consideration of the criminal law which we deserve.

CANADA

One most important achievement has been the creation of the Committee on Law Enforcement in Canada through the present Canadian Premier, who happens to be an intimate friend of the President, and by him through the President of the Canadian Bar Association. Judge Coatsworth of Toronto was made chairman, and an able, competent committee joined with him. Reports on their work have been too well summarized by Mr. Harley to require a review.

I spent one day of valuable conference in Toronto. The results produced seem far superior to those of the Committee on Law En-

forcement of our own Bar Association. I believe we may count upon the Canadian committee for stimulating help in all our endeavors.

CONCLUSION

If I have refrained from comment on general principles, it has been solely because I have been too much aware that to do so before this Board would be to carry coals to Newcastle. My conviction of the importance of our mission and its nation-wide service has steadily increased. The need of greater efficiency, intelligence and humanity in the administration of the criminal law, and the not less need for a thorough scrutiny of our substantive criminal law and of our antiquated codes of criminal procedure has been pressed constantly upon me.

I trust our great task may continue to receive public attention and have greater public interest and active approval.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) JAMES BRONSON REYNOLDS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone wish to comment on the report of the President? If not, I will ask Professor Crossley of Northwestern University to present his report on Criminal Records and Statistics.

PROF. CROSSLEY: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—I have taken the liberty to attempt to summarize a somewhat extended report, a report that would contain much detail that would not be of interest to most of us here; and when I have concluded this summary, if anyone present wishes to ask any question about the work of this Committee with reference to any particular phase of its work that I have not covered, I shall be glad to answer such inquiries as far as my information will permit. The chief undertakings of the Committee are:

I. Under the direction of S. B. Warner, Director, the preparation of a plan for Criminal Records and statistics based upon: (a) A study of existing methods or systems of records in penal institutions; (b) Court records; (c) Police records.

II. A survey of Criminal Records and Statistics in the State of Ohio under the direction of R. E. Miles, director of the Ohio Institute of Public Efficiency.

III. A similar survey for the state of Georgia under the direction of the Department of Public Welfare of that state;

In addition the Committee has in hand the following reports:

1. A report upon Classification of Crimes by Hugh Lester of the Boston bar.
2. A similar report by the Director, S. B. Warner.
3. A report upon Methods of Personal Identification and the Technique Required for the Detection of the Identity of Criminals by John A. Larson, Division of the Criminologist, Department of Public Welfare, State of Illinois.

The Director, Mr. Warner, has practically completed his study of records concerning prisoners in institutions and is ready to turn to one of the two remaining topics—Court and Police Records. It is estimated that either of these topics will require at least a half year of study before recommendations can be made in a definite form. (April 24, 1923.)

In the August, 1923, issue of JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW AND CRIMINOLOGY Mr. Warner published a report, with an introduction by Mr. Sanford Bates, Commissioner of Corrections for Massachusetts, entitled "Factors Determining Parole From the Massachusetts Reformatory," and in August, 1923, completed his report on information which should be published concerning criminals. This report, consisting of some 160 pages, has been mimeographed and a copy forwarded each member of the Committee. Difficulty was experienced in securing constructive criticism or helpful comment from members of the Committee on this report and at a meeting of the Committee held September 20, 1923, Mr. Warner was authorized to appoint a special committee of the following persons to examine and comment on the report: Messrs. Bates, Cass, Shute, Lewis, Hellwig, Butler, Whitman, Gault and Wilcox. At the same meeting the Director was authorized to appoint the following committees with reference to this report: On Application of Report to Women's Institutions—Miss Katherine Davis, Miss Ruth Topping and Miss Jessie L. Hodder; On Application of Report to Boys' Reform Schools—Harry McLaughlin.

One of the features of the report just referred to and which might be helpfully considered at this meeting is the classification of crimes recommended.

The Committee has recommended that the Director endeavor to develop a plan of co-operation with the Probation Association in his work, and that as soon as possible an analysis be made under his direction of police and court records of Ohio, Georgia and Oregon.

Ohio Survey—The Ohio Survey was pursued under the following general plan. This survey is now complete and the report is here and

may be seen by anyone interested. Supplementing the report are a large number of exhibits, including forms at present in use.

Georgia Survey—Will be made under a plan somewhat similar to that followed in Ohio and is now nearly completed.

Copies of the three reports—Classification of Crimes and Methods of Personal Identification—are here and may be seen by anyone interested.

Finances—The Committee has been enabled to carry on through an appropriation of \$10,000 in 1922 by the Rockefeller Foundation and an appropriation in 1923 of a similar amount by J. D. Rockefeller, Jr. Mr. Rockefeller at the time of his contribution stated that it could not be further continued and if the work is to be completed it will be necessary for the Institute to secure funds from some other source. The present available resources will probably be exhausted by July 1 of the present year and the Director estimated that it will probably take two additional years with an expense of \$10,000 per year to complete the work of the Committee. Suggestions on this matter will be gladly received. The Committee will also be glad to hear discussions on any phase of its work, particularly on Classification of Crimes and on the question whether the next step should be a study and report on police records or on court records.

THE CHAIRMAN: According to the report the discussion of Prof. Crossley's report was to be opened by Prof. Warner, who I understand is not here. Next on the list is the Hon. Sanford Bates of Boston.

MR. BATES: I am very glad to come here from Boston to participate in what I hope will be a dry subject. Until some of us are willing to sit down and be pretty dry about this, I don't think we will get very far, and I may have considerable to say about it because I have had considerable connection with the matter of statistics for the last two or three years and I do hope that this is going to be a discussion, and if anything I might say gives rise to any ideas in your minds that you don't put it off too long, but speak about it when you have those ideas in mind.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that is what we are here for, to get at the truth, and in listening to anyone tell things that may or may not be true. I represent in a way the American Prison Association. I am Vice-President of that body and have been Chairman of their Committee on Criminal Law and Statistics for three years and we have been trying to find our bearings in the fundamental subject of statistics for a long time. I think we are in sight of land, however. I think we have made progress in the last two or three years. The Census

Bureau, for example, has taken an exceedingly progressive view of the whole matter of Criminal Statistics. They have adopted some suggestions made in New York which some of us were very doubtful about their accepting. I think you know the Central Identification Bureau is going along pretty well at this time. These two years alone are evidence of considerable progress toward the goal which we are seeking. I have nothing to say about the portion of this report or the portion of Mr. Reynolds' report which relates to Criminal Law, although I realize our Committee of the Prisoners' Association is a Committee of Criminal Law and Statistics, but it seems to me the thing before us for discussion is the question of Criminal Statistics. Now I spent a great many very enjoyable hours with Prof. Warner in Boston where he was the most of last year. I learned some of the secrets of the reformatory from him and some of the secrets have been published in the report of the journal. We have been over together the question of the kind of tables which should be published and the kind of statistics which should be gathered by institutions and now here again I have nothing to say about the Court or Police Statistics because that is not my particular field, but I should like to suggest some things about Institutional Statistics. Is there a common form, a uniform set of schedules which can be handed out to our various prisons and reformatories with the explanation they will be filled out and with that help they will be of some use to us. That is the purpose of Mr. Warner's second report. I have made some recommendations, some of which he has adopted and some of which I will comment on if there is time. I would like to read portions of the last two reports of the Committee corresponding to those of the American Prison Association. In 1922 their committee said this:

"As the title of this committee implies, there are two important subjects more closely allied than appear on the surface, to which it and the whole association should address themselves with greater definiteness than in the past.

"The administration of the criminal law is distinctly related to the administration of our penal institutions. In their endeavor to improve mentally and physically the persons committed to our prisons and reformatories, the authorities in charge of these institutions must of necessity concern themselves with the experiences these men and women have had with the police and the criminal courts. The conduct of the police, the methods of detecting and prosecuting crime, the expeditiousness of the trial courts, the principals followed in imposing sentence, etc., not only determine the number and to some extent the

character of those eventually committed, but largely shape their mental attitude toward authority and society in general; and the mental attitude of the prisoner is a foremost element in his eventual reformation. Therefore, our concern is not merely to improve the administration of penal institutions, and thus enhance the possibilities of reformation, for these institutions—their potentialities and limitations—are in a sense inseparable from the nature and administration of criminal law. Penology has its own particular problems, to be sure, but a sound penological program cannot be formed without a full consideration of the activities of all the forces that determine who shall be committed to institutions and why. It was surely with these things in mind that our association determined to have a committee on criminal law.

"The field of criminal law and its adjudication is so vast that it would be presumptuous perhaps for your committee to come forward with specific recommendations in regard to the many subjects of more or less immediate importance to this association. It is enough to make mention of some of them. For example: The unanimity of jury verdicts, the elimination of the double trial, the retention or abolition of the constitutional privileges accorded defendants, the bail bond evil, the use of the indeterminate sentence, the substitution of probation and parole for confinement in prison, etc. Most of these subjects are being considered by the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, the American Judicature Society and other bodies.

"It is difficult for one to interpret his work to another. That is to say, the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology and other organizations do not get their message over to the institutional trustees and administrators; nor do the prison and reformatory people get their message over to the judges and the lawyers. Some of us have attended meetings of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology in which the conception of distinguished judges about institution management was astonishing, and we have talked with institution heads whose conception of the law and the place of the institution in a scheme of law enforcement was equally amazing. We are all equally responsible for this unfortunate condition. We should cooperate with them for mutual benefit and have a voice in each other's counsels, for our interests coincide.

"There is one subject, however, which the committee hopes may be given special consideration during the coming year. In many of our states the department supervising prisons also retains the supervision of paroled prisoners. Inevitably many of the persons paroled come again before the courts on a charge of crime. At this point it is

of the utmost importance that there should be mutual understanding and co-operation between the judges, district attorneys and probation officers, and those in charge of our penal institutions. The question whether the defendant shall be given a new sentence or returned to the institution for violation of parole, the value of having the judge familiar with the defendant's institutional record and of making sure that the institution thoroughly understands the intentions of the judge are manifestly of great importance. In many of our states, the laws requiring successive sentences to the same or different institutions and the disposition of paroled men coming before the court on a new charge are hopelessly involved. It would be a step toward progress and co-operation if the American Prison Association should appoint a committee to meet with similar committees from the American Bar Association, the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, and the American Judicature Society for the purpose of making a study and report relative to this and other subjects of common concern. Improvement of criminal law and its administration can only come through the co-operation of the several agencies directly concerned, among them being the American Prison Association. Your committee, therefore, suggests the appointment from its members of such a committee.

"The second subject assigned to your committee is that of criminal statistics. The connection between it and the administration of criminal law is quite obvious, for adequate statistics afford us the measurement not alone of the volume of the work of the criminal courts, but how crime is dealt with. Institutional statistics of crime have in times gone by been the chief concern of successive committees of this association, but it has always been recognized that they are but a part of a complete system of criminal statistics. Once more an opportunity lies at hand for co-operation. Recently a substantial grant has been made to the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology for the promotion of adequate criminal statistics, and a director of its Committee on Criminal Records and Statistics has been appointed. It has been strongly urged upon your committee that it withhold definite recommendations until the Institute makes its reports. Might it not be a wiser procedure that the Institute be urged not to make a report until after a conference and thorough discussion with a committee on criminal statistics from this association? Since no complete system of criminal statistics can be established without the co-operation of the institutions, their representatives should be party to any recommendations affecting their work. Your committee has

also been in communications with the chairman of the Committee on Institutional Statistics of the American Statistical Association, who has expressed his desire to co-operate.

"In order that attention may be directed to specific, practical questions which confront your committee and other organizations charged with a study of what can be done to secure serviceable criminal statistics, the following may be mentioned:

"1. The drafting of model laws adapted to the needs of the different states for the establishment of state bureaus of criminal records and statistics.

"2. The preparation of standard tables for the presentation of criminal statistics, the material for which is to be drawn from the records of the police, the courts and the institutions.

"3. The introduction of standard records in the police departments, criminal courts and institutions for criminals and delinquents, which sufficiently meet the needs of these agencies and lend themselves to compilation by a central bureau of criminal records and statistics.

"The program is as necessary as it is ambitious. Your committee fully realizes that it is useless to make new demands on the federal courts for better institutional statistics until the institutions themselves improve their own records.

"In conclusion, the committee begs to draw attention to the growing sentiment in the country for the adoption of some universal system of identification of criminals. The importance of this was strongly stressed at the annual meeting of the International Association for Identification, held recently in Boston. The education of public opinion so that prejudice against the finger-print system may be removed, the establishment of a central identification bureau, and a better recognition of the importance of identification as an aid, not only in the conviction of the guilty but in the protection of the innocent, are immediate steps to be considered by those concerned with the reduction of crime. The subject is being considered also by the International Prison Commission.

"Summarized, the recommendations of your committee are as follows:

"1. That a committee of five representatives of the American Prison Association be appointed to meet with similar committees of the American Bar Association, the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, and the American Judicature Society, to discuss pressing questions of criminal law and its administration, and to recommend measures for improvement.

"2. That a committee of five representatives of the American Prison Association be appointed to co-operate with the Committee on Statistics of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, to the end that the report of the latter organization may take due cognizance of the needs of the American Prison Association and secure its hearty support.

"3. That the association pledge its aid to the International Prison Commission in its momentous endeavor to establish international criminal statistics.

"4. That the association endorse the movement to secure a national identification bureau and that it recognizes the importance of some system of universal identification."

Last year another report was made by this same committee of the American Prison Association:

"The Committee on Criminal Law and Statistics, appointed at the Detroit Congress of the American Prison Association, herewith submits its report.

"The original committee, consisting of five representatives, has been augmented by the addition of Mr. Lawrence Veiller of New York City.

"1. Important progress has been made during the past year with respect to the matter of criminal statistics. Shortly after the organization of your committee, contact was made with a similar committee of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, and your Chairman and the Director of that Committee, Prof. Sam B. Warner of Oregon, have had many conferences.

"The most important action taken by your committee was in connection with the Federal Decennial Census of Penal Institutions. The Chairman attended two meetings in New York City, called by the Director of the Census, at which a number of states were represented. At the request of the Director of the Census, your Chairman and Prof. Warner submitted suggestions to the United States Government looking toward the improvement in the scope and usefulness of the Federal Census. Practically all of our recommendations were adopted. A careful analysis of the scope of the new Federal Census has been made by Prof. Warner and it is printed in full in the JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY for May, 1923, to which reference is made. It will be seen from this report that at the conclusion of the 1923 census we shall have made considerable headway toward a compilation of prison statistics which will lay the foundation for more intelligent preventive work.

"1. In the conferences, with the Director of the Census and the results accomplished thereby, there was a gratifying co-operation between the representatives of this Congress, the National Conference of Social Work, the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, the American Statistical Association, and other groups.

"Your committee has further advised and co-operated with the Committee of the Institute in an analysis of some of the Massachusetts penal statistics, with a view to making the same more uniform and useful. Some of the results of this investigation are printed in the August number of the Journal, and will simply be referred to in this report.

"We may congratulate ourselves that progress has been made toward the accumulation of useful statistics. There still remains, however, the difficult task of making uniform the institutional statistics of our various states. The Committee of the Institute is working upon this problem. Your committee will be glad to receive suggestions and samples of forms which the members of the American Prison Association now use for this purpose. Such a unification will be slow in coming, but the results to be gained in economy and increasingly intelligent action are worth our continued attention.

"2. Your committee has attempted to carry out also the resolution passed at the last meeting which suggested a joint meeting of committees of the American Prison Association, the American Bar Association, the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology and the Judicature Society. The Chairman has been in correspondence with Hon. Floyd E. Thompson of Illinois, Chairman of the Section on Criminal Law of the Bar Association, and with ex-Governor Charles S. Whitman of New York, Chairman of the Committee on Law Enforcement of the Bar Association.

"Both of these gentlemen were enthusiastic over the possibilities of a joint discussion and perhaps co-operative action by these organizations. Your committee was invited to attend the annual meeting of the Bar Association in Minneapolis. There was no appropriation to defray the expenses of the members of the committee and they were therefore unable to accept the invitation. The ground has been broken, however, and we may be sure that if in the coming year it is possible to hold some such joint meeting, the other organizations having to do with the enforcement of the criminal law will be ready to co-operate.

"It is interesting to note that an act of the Legislature of Massachusetts, recognizing at once the need for bringing our criminal law up to date and also the need for co-operative effort to this end, has

provided for the appointment of a special commission, of which your Chairman is a member, and which is now investigating the subject in this Commonwealth. The membership of the special commission consists of a justice of the Superior Court, a justice of the lower courts, a district attorney, a probation officer, the Commissioner of Correction, and one other person. Your committee feels that a greater mutuality of understanding and more satisfactory progress towards the solution of some of the problems of criminal jurisprudence would be realized if some similar conference could be held representative of the entire country. It therefore recommends:

First—That the Committee on Criminal Law and Statistics be continued in the hope that further attempts at co-operation may be undertaken;

Second—That the matter of uniform statistics for penal institutions be studied and that suggestions from the members of the Association be sent to the Committee for its consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAW AND STATISTICS,
AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION.

"I suppose that we all have pretty nearly in mind what we want to accomplish by all this labor, but it might pay to state them again and see whether you will agree. What are the purposes of criminal or institutional statistics? After we have spent all this money how are we going to be better off? It seems to me there are five main headings under which we should consider the use of criminal statistics. First, the matter of identification. Every penal institution wants to know who its people are and a great many of these statistics are necessary for the plain purpose of identification. Second, to assist in the reform of the individual. Surely it must be elementary to commence with the reform of the individual until you know all there is to be known about him. His mentality, his physical make-up, his industrial environment, his progress in school, what kind of pals he went around with, those things seem fundamental. These things are not always easy to get—to get money enough out of the Legislature to properly investigate those things.

"3. The whole matter of parole and parole supervision—that is, successful parole operation—is based on the proper understanding of the case through proper investigation and criminal statistics, and I imagine that is what led our friend Prof. Warner to branch out with the article entitled 'Predicting Parole Success.'

"4. One great purpose of giving, if not publishing, criminal statistics might be called 'stimulation by comparison.' That is, if all our institutions and agencies know that they are to publish certain statistics each year as to what they are doing, and how they are doing it, naturally they would be stimulated to do more along the line of what is generally regarded as proper administrative work; and lastly, and most important of all, the whole matter of giving statistics would be useless and a waste of money unless it was pointed toward proper preventive work. That is, in brief, what we are after—to identify the criminal to properly treat him, to carry him along through the parole period and to stimulate ourselves to better work and analyze all the causes which led people into these institutions to prevent that particular thing happening again. And therefore we would look at the matter of giving statistics from more than one point of view, and, as Prof. Warner points out in his report, there are a lot of statistics which have been gathered by a good many states, but are absolutely useless because they don't help toward any of these aims. There are other statistics which are valuable to the institution which gathers them, but have no bearing whatever upon the broad, country-wide question of other people's troubles or the question of preventive work.

"For instance, we want to know whether an individual is married or single, but from the point of view of prevention, if we find the majority of criminals are married, we can't stop the civil institution of marriage very well, can we? Now the same with some of the things that Prof. Warner has brought out. The majority of parole successes in Massachusetts Reformatory were men who have never gone to church. That doesn't follow that as a matter of prevention we should close all the churches in Detroit. Now we give statistics for one purpose and publish them for another purpose and Prof. Warner has kept that fact quite clearly in mind in this report."

The question before us is this, is there any outline which we can devise here today or at some adjourned meeting of a smaller committee which will give us a reasonable basis for the accomplishment of these duties, which we can hand to the institutions of this country and say, "Whatever else you do, fill them out each year and forward to some central body for comparison." Prof. Warner thinks there is; he has set out a simple schedule in this report. It is quite possible that the wardens and superintendents of our reformatories think it is all bunk and refuse to do it, but I believe it is worth a try and I believe there are statistics which can be gathered which will be of national use.

I went to see Dr. Healy at the suggestion of Mr. Warner a day or two before I came here. He worked a number of years in Chicago and laid the basis there for his work on the individual delinquent. He has done an equally impressive work in Boston. He took his copy of this work up and said: "That's all nonsense! There's nothing there that would help me to prevent delinquency. If you want to do something which will secure your fame to posterity, get up a system of details which will have a real bearing upon the prevention of crime." I said: "That's all right; now you tell me just what details to secure that will secure to posterity the prevention of crime." He didn't have time to tell me. He said it was a matter of long study and that he would have to take more time than he had at his disposal. Here is what Prof. Warner says: "That the statistics so far as the institutions themselves go should contain a more careful investigation into the cause of the crime. A medical and psychiatric examination of the prisoner such as those now given; a record of the reaction of the prisoners to the various conditions presented in prison life."

Wouldn't we like to have that and how are we going to get it? In his own report he says the great trouble with the Boston Reformatory is that they are based on what the prisoner tells them. How are you going to get it otherwise?

4. Investigation into the environment where it is contemplated placing the prisoner on parole.

That is the first practical hint as to the kind of statistics which will have a plain bearing upon the preventive point of view. I do not think that because the proposition is difficult we should back away from it. There are things in our own mind that we know bear on prevention. Some are these: Are crimes of certain kinds more apt to be committed in small cities or rural communities? That would be valuable. We know in the first place whether certain kinds of environment tended in certain ways, or whether the same amount of preventive work is going on in the small communities as in the larger. Those statistics are rarely found in any of our institutions. I think a detail such as Prof. Warner suggests—the location of the crime, the district in which it was committed, and the length of time the prisoner was there—are valuable, not so much for preventive work as for stimulation by comparison. Then the people in that state will know that certain communities are more reliable in the matter of crime prosecution and conviction than others perhaps, or that a better system of crime repression exists in certain districts. I think we should go through these tables and analyze each of these points of view to see

whether they are sufficiently valuable to impose this additional burden on the institutions of the country, and at the same time we want to bear in mind that we want to have them know certain statistics for their own use and certain ones that are used. Take, for instance, the question whether a boy smokes cigarettes or cigars—a lot of them gather that—but it isn't valuable to you or me. Now I hesitate, at this time at least, to embark on a discussion of each of these twenty-six tables which Mr. Warner has put in this report and say whether or not that table should be adopted as an institution statistical table or not, but someone has to do it some time or other. Someone has to do it who understands the difficulties in the operation of this thing. Someone has to sit down and fight that thing out because it won't do us a particle of good to get out a suggested schedule for these institutions which they will never fill out. It was tried awhile ago, but it all went for nothing for one or two reasons—either the tables were not practical ones or the proper approach had not been made to the institution so they didn't co-operate.

I wrote Prof. Warner and I understood from him that he had adopted my suggestions. But I want to refer to one matter Mr. Crossley mentioned—about the classification of crimes. It seemed to me entirely impossible to put robbery and burglary in one classification—a robber is a young desperado and a burglar is an old, shifty hand. I wouldn't classify a fifty-year-old second-story worker who never carries a gun with an eighteen-year-old robber.

There is one thing I would like to say inasmuch as this other report of Prof. Warner was before you and has been brought up. It is in the nature of a confession. A large part and practically all of Prof. Warner's information which led me to write that article on "Factors Determining Parole" was obtained from the active chairman of a board of three in our Parole Department. That man has since left the employ of the state and has accepted a position with an association outside whose attitude is hostile to the state administration. He knew at the time he gave this information to Prof. Warner that he was going and the rest of us did not, and I believe in justice to the Massachusetts Parole Board I should make the statement that, through no fault whatever of Mr. Warner's, he placed too much reliance upon some of the things that that particular member of the State Board of Parole told him at the time. One of the things is this: That the Board of Parole never paroles a gunman. I don't want that to get out. There are a great many other statements made in that particular report which I personally did not approve of and don't now, but I had

to accept one of two alternatives. I either had to say to him you can't publish it at all or else I had to contemplate all that work he did going for nothing, and I tried to write a preface which would cover up my difficulties and at the same time let that article be published. I don't know whether you are able to read between the lines or not in that preface, but if you are, that article was released in the interest of science and not because I endorsed every word in it.

For example, the active chairman said: "We pay no attention whatever to this great natural history chart which our department offers them." It can't be possible that a parole board can efficiently do its work unless they look to see the history, the bringing up, the mentality, the physical weaknesses of the man they have before them. They have taken the parole successes in one column and the parole violations in the other and shown these little bits of information; and it doesn't bear very much on the prevention of parole successes.

Suppose we say that of 57 men who have been in high school, 46 of them fail. The moral according to that would be, "Don't go to high school." You will notice, if you have read Prof. Hart's report following, that while no one of these things decides the issue there is all through the tendency which, if the Board is wise enough to grasp, they can aid themselves in predicting parole successes. The Board of Parole could have predicted with success 80 per cent of the cases coming before them. So much for that particular report. I think it is mighty interesting and I think it helped us to learn that the mistakes of the Parole Board ten years ago can be partly avoided by verifying our statistics. It is obvious, if you ask a criminal what is the character of his mother, he is going to lie to you one way or the other. That's unreliable statistics, but that does not mean that that fact should not be recorded. It is a question of what the fact is, and the fact that these statistics as gathered were not verified does not mean that they should not be gathered. It means that it is extremely important what that mother was in the case referred to. We have also learned from Prof. Warner's report that if the Parole Board takes the time, if they are wise enough and if they are not swayed by anything except to get the truth, they can be materially assisted in performing their function by the verified statistics; and I am willing that report should go out with whatever good it will do. There are many statements in it I would not make, but the main details of course are correct and can be used for whatever good other institutions can get out of it.

I made a report to Prof. Warner about the tables which he suggested, but I will withhold reading that and be very glad to go over it

at any time if this meeting gets to the point of really adopting these tables to be sent out to institutions. I hope that will be done. The preventive work will never be a success until the foundation is laid, and it must start in the penal institutions. There must be a useful table gotten up.

I want to say one thing more. I refer to Dr. Healy, who made a remarkable statement to me the other day. I have said repeatedly, and other people have, that we had no crime wave in Massachusetts. Our present population is half again as much today as it was ten years ago. Mr. Chute's report shows the situation is favorable. We had a thousand arrests for crime other than drunkenness in 1922—than what we had in 1921—in spite of the increase in population, in spite of arrests of automobilists. What's the reason for that? I know people have said that there have been crime waves in some of these middle western states, and some of your institutions are full. I have heard it said by bar associations and others the reason is because we don't treat the prisoner rough enough; we parole him too quickly and we don't treat him as a criminal should be treated. Well, we parole him in Massachusetts and we try to treat him with humanity in Massachusetts and we don't have a crime wave.

I think Dr. Healy gave the answer the other day. He said he had followed down several thousand juvenile cases which he saw in a middle western city and also followed down the same number of cases which he had tried in Boston, and that he found that six of the cases in Boston had succeeded—that is, had reformed—to one in Chicago, and I asked him the reason and he said its plain to be seen that the preventive work—the work which is being done so admirably by all the charitable and civic agencies in Boston—is far superior to that in Chicago; the crime wave is stopped before it ever got a start. I think that is the object of the future. It is not how we run the reformatories or prisoners. We can help to reform a certain number of men in our reformatories and we turn some men out of prison who never come back again, but the fundamental, deep down work that we should be interested in is shutting off the source of supply, and the best way we can do that is to give to posterity the reasons why we have men in the institutions today. That is why I am interested in the matter of statistics and that is why I am willing to give some time to lay out a program which will give to this preventive people and let them have the credit for it. If they won't do it—we will take the blame for the faults—just remember this, that every man that goes into prison has been turned over to us by someone else. Just remember the prison is

the house at the end of the road and the person who fails in prison is no more the failure of the prison than the failure of every other institution along the highway.

Let this thing work backward and all these other reformatory and preventive agencies get together and get the benefit of this work, and I think the situation will be reflected over the rest of the country, that the people in Boston who have been spending millions to make real homes and bring children up in better surroundings, take them out of institutions and put them in homes. The constant preventive work and generally effective playground work and all these myriads of hours that have been put in are beginning to bear fruit and that is the great, encouraging and outstanding feature with us in Boston—that our prisons will no longer be the important things in this matter of delinquency. The prisons will be given material on which to work.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of Prof. Crossley, as emphasized by Mr. Bates, that the criminal statistics with which we are dealing today are of four kinds—Institutional Statistics, Police Statistics, Court Statistics, and what might be called medical statistics, the kind to which Dr. Healy made reference. I take it Prof. Warner's report and Mr. Bates' discussion were concerned almost altogether with the Institutional Statistics. Prof. Crossley just tells me that so far as the Institutional Statistics are concerned his Committee thinks for the present they have about completed their work. From this time on the emphasis will be with Police and Court Statistics with particular emphasis on the police; that his Committee will not concern itself with what I have described as medical statistics. Mr. Bates in his discussion presented a very clear statement of what he conceives to be the purpose of institutional statistics. I think it would help our discussion here very much and clarify it if someone speaking later would be in a position to put forth in the same way what they consider the advantage and purpose of police statistics and court statistics. I will now call on Dr. Davis.

DR. DAVIS: I don't feel at all prepared to take part in this discussion. I haven't had the privilege of seeing the reports on any of the statistical matter with the exception of the report on the Massachusetts Reformatory. As probably most of you know, it is six years since I have been active in work with criminals or had any special interest in criminal statistics; for seventeen years I had a very active interest in criminal statistics—first as head of a state institution for women and later in New York City. In the discussion of this question there are so many elements that enter into it. Suppose we agree here on a

set of statistics which we feel is the minimum that we can ask from the institutions of the country. We will then be far from a solution of the question in my judgment.

A good deal of my seventeen years was spent in the actual handling of the management of the institutions themselves, both for men and women, although my next experience was with women. I am not at all sure we need different statistics for women than we do for men. There are some definite reasons. In the first place, there is a smaller group of women in New York State—only about 1/16 getting into our penal institutions for any offense whatever. A very small proportion of the women in New York State are sent to State Prison. Last year I think we had forty in the whole great state of New York sent to State Prison, with ten million population. Of course the reformatories take cases of vagrancy or felonies, with the exception of murder in the first degree and second degree and a decreasingly small proportion of women convicted of felonies go to the reformatories. A considerable portion of women convicted of felonies are placed on probation in New York State, but, as you all know, the very great proportion of women in any state who are committed to institutions are sex offenders and a very large proportion of those convicted of felonies did those felonies in the course of an irregular life. For instance, they are convicted of robbery when the robbery was committed when, for example, they were with a man whom they found to have some money or valuables upon his person—that has always been so. One thing that prevents our getting a very good record or any perfect record of the crimes committed from our institutional records is in New York, and I think in nearly every state, for example, a man commits an assault with a deliberate attempt to kill. I have known cases where a man has actually remarked, "I am going to give this man a painless death." He is under the influence of liquor; he gets off with assault in the second degree. The calendar is crowded in New York. If a man will save the state the expense of trial and will take a plea of guilty in the crime of lesser degree he is permitted to take a plea to the offense which is very much less in its significance to what he would get if he fought the case. That is well known to criminals, in my judgment, among themselves. If they have the nerve to say, "I did it," they get a short sentence.

Once when I was parole commissioner in New York we had a case of an attempt at a very serious sex offense and the criminal was only prevented from accomplishing the whole of his purpose by the entrance of the postman. It occurred in an office building in Brook-

lyn where the stenographer was left alone in a room. The plea was that the man was under the influence of liquor when he made the attempt to commit the crime. He pleaded guilty to the last degree and was sentenced to the New York penitentiary. His mother and all his friends came to the Parole Commission to beg a very early parole on the grounds that he was not responsible for what he did because of being under the influence of liquor. He was an awfully nice fellow when he wasn't drunk. Well, our Parole Commission didn't give parole at that time. That same afternoon a committee meeting was held in my office composed of judges of all the leading courts in New York City for a set purpose not connected with this case. When we got there and I described the case, I said: "If a case like that came before you, and it was up to you to impose a sentence between a maximum and minimum, what would you do if you were convinced that the man was intoxicated when he committed the crime?" and without exception every judge in the room said: "I would give him a shorter term before paroling him if I was convinced he was intoxicated"; and I said: "Gentlemen, I disagree with you. I would give it to him twice over, once for the crime and once for getting so drunk he didn't know what he was doing," for I consider when a fellow lets himself get so drunk he doesn't know what he is doing he should be punished. The case with the Parole Commission is the thing to which they will give emphasis. Where you come to the question of parole I fancy it can be very different from New York—particularly is depends somewhat on what association they have with politics. I know from personal experience the pressure brought down upon officials to lower the degree of crime, to lower the punishment imposed—the pressure that comes from politics. I remember very well during Mayor Mitchell's campaign receiving the promise of one hundred votes from Mayor Mitchell if I would recommend the parole of a man who was manifestly in waiting at that time to be paroled, and the politicians said, "We will promise you a hundred votes from Mayor Mitchell if you will let that man go," and I said, "Gentlemen, I am not buying votes." He lost by more than 100 votes. I know that from my own experience and politicians didn't like me very much because of those things.

You spoke of the difference between the prisoner's own statement and the actual facts of the case. All that sort of thing. There are some things that you can take fairly certainly as probably the truth and other things that you cannot take at all. There is ordinarily no reason why you can't believe a prisoner when he says he was born in Italy or New York City. He has no particular reason as a rule for

lying about that. There are other things—like the question of his mother. When we worked in the Laboratory of Social Hygiene in New York we took the records of the prisoner's own statement. We took their history on all of these points. Then we had field workers who went out and checked up and then we had verified statements. The state of New York never did that. We did it because we were working with the state, but it is an awfully expensive matter to do the field work. We tried to do it in the Parole Commission in New York. It is a question of money. Then there is a copy of the records. Just now I am interested in the study of probation in New York. That is the question that comes before our officials right along—when we have a limited amount of money, shall we spend it in having work done well or write about it. Very often they have to choose even in the institution itself. There is the question of the officials you have under you. There again the personal equation enters in.

Now a word about the Hart records. You can make, I believe, mathematical comparisons as between groups which will tell satisfactorily whether there is any trouble, whether there is a distinguishable difference between two groups, but that will only point out that there may be a significant difference between two sets of facts and it will not take into account all these other facts. There are all of these things that have to come into account. I haven't studied these tables, so I can't pass on them. In a great many institutions officers of the institution were not of the type who cared much whether they had the same kind of a parole. It is six years since I was anywhere engaged in this particular kind of work and I recognize the fact it has moved in a great many directions. I hope our efforts will be crowned with success. Mr. Bates has spoken of the crime wave in Massachusetts. He and Dr. Healy think Boston is far ahead of Chicago because its preventive work is so successful. I agree that preventive work is the important thing. I remember when we first put up the question of the *indeterminate* sentence in New York. He said: "I am with you up to this point—I will give the man one chance; if they fail on that, put them on the scow and take them down the harbor." The improvement in our private agencies to do preventive work is keeping people out of prison. By the greater use of probation we get a different group in our prisons today than we did a quarter of a century ago. A group that is much more the leavings. It is the bottom of everything. I don't believe any statistics we can devise and the application of those statistics for a long time is going to very greatly help the situation in the institutions. That is no reason why we should not go on and get

our centralized bureau, get some centers, and say if a man will go to Philadelphia if you leave New York and vice versa. A case like that happened to me, in which a couple of weeks ago a man was put on probation in both places and each place asked him to go to the other. I am with you in everything that I can do and if I serve on the Committee I don't think we should have very greatly different statistics for women than for men. We require more for women. This is one thing that everyone who deals with statistics should remember—it is a question of violation of parole. You want your men to be morally decent, but nobody ever heard of the parole of a man prisoner being revoked or the man prisoner failing on probation because he went out with women, unless he did make some serious offense and had a run-in with the police. If he chose to go around with prostitutes in a reasonable degree, he is all right on parole, all right on probation, but a woman can't do one thing of that sort if it is known, and it usually is. That you have to remember. It touches me in a tender spot because sometimes the records of men and women are compared unfavorably; that is, that more men succeed on probation or parole than women. If a woman goes out and stays all night with a man everyone that knows it jumps on her. A man, they don't ask. The landlady don't say a word about it providing he has a latchkey and comes in sober. There is that difference in considering the success of parole and probation for these two classes of people.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now call on Mr. Chute of New York, Secretary of the National Probation Association.

MR. CHUTE: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief because I think we ought to have someone discuss the statistics, and it is very likely that what few suggestions I will give will be very much along the line of the two previous speakers—on the social side of this question rather than on the technical statistical side. I am not going to discuss this report, though I have read it, but I don't feel for that reason very much more qualified to criticize it; first, because it is so good and complete that I see very little to attack in it as far as it goes, and second, because the subject is one with which I am confronted and have been dealing directly, namely, the subject of Institutional Statistics. So I will just point out one or two things which occurred to me here. It seems to me that we have all developed the idea in this discussion today that there should be emphasis on the social use of the statistics we are using—the plans that we are making—and for that reason I feel that a very important thing for this Committee to consider is a relationship between the statistics of crime wherever they

are collected, and for that reason to stop at Institutional Statistics and parole statistics and not to take up equally thoroughly, if not more thoroughly, the police and the court statistics, would make them almost valueless. So I hope the Committee will be able to take up both police and court statistics; in other words, statistics of crime from the first record, the first contact with the offender down to the very end, and that the whole scheme will be co-ordinated and interrelated. Then that will throw light on this separate division of institutional statistics.

Personally, I hope that the greatest emphasis will be placed on court statistics and police statistics; we need to study standardization. I think the latter will be found a somewhat simpler problem than the court statistics. If, as Mr. Bates points out, we are kept out of institutions, we should in the future lay greater emphasis on our records and facts gathered about the case handled before they get in the institution, and that means in the courts. The police don't apply a treatment. That is largely statistical, purely a statistical account of how many are received, on what charges, without the proper authority to develop social statistics. On the other hand, in the courts increasingly the statistics are social statistics, and the statistics that we will use have the purposes that have been mentioned, namely, understanding the delinquent and applying social treatment.

Now, complying with the chairman's request that there be an attempt made to formulate court statistics, I noted down these general points:

1. To show the cause and antecedents of crime and a better understanding of the criminal.
2. To show the methods of the court in dealing with cases.
3. To show the results of supervising treatment work undertaken by the courts.

Both of these reports that we have discussed—the report on Criminal Statistics and the special printed report which most of you have seen on Parole in Massachusetts—raises the question how we will get the statistics that will be valuable to us socially. It was referred to by one of the speakers, the matter of the example of the injustice to the delinquent, particularly referred to the character of the mother. That raises the question, If you don't get that from the prisoner and if you don't get most of those things from a statement of the prisoner, who are you going to get them from? We will have to get those facts, the important facts, through the social investigation, and that investigation of the institution is limited and falls practically on what can be done by parole officers. The social information ob-

tained by the courts comes first and is getting to be more extensive. That information obtained by the probation officers in their investigation of cases in practically all cases is made by the social investigation when they come into court. The importance of standardizing those statistics is not in the question of the institutional and parole statistics because those statistics should be, as they are not today, always available to the institution and the Parole Commission. That did not seem to be brought out anywhere in this statute in Massachusetts, though I suppose that was one of the things aimed at before it had direct information from the probation officers who had been handling the case, because most cases in Massachusetts that are at all suitable for probation are tried out on probation before being sent to the institution.

Mr. Bates referred to the constructive part of this statute in Massachusetts and I will merely emphasize what he said in reading the suggestions of Mr. Warner for something better than they have now. Perhaps the reader falls into the error that we must guard against in making statistical studies of making it too scientific in the way of too much a matter of records and statistics and not enough consolidation or getting of information from the practical people on the job and so perhaps this particular board in Massachusetts did not get very much help from information received and that it didn't make very much difference in the results of the case. That probably is largely true, maybe not so much so in Massachusetts as in other places, because the information is not of the right sort, but these items of information suggested by Mr. Warner ought to be reiterated, I think, namely, the more careful investigation of the cause of the crime. What came from the first talk with the offender from these social agencies? The medical and psychiatric examination which was not used in Massachusetts as much as it might be, the study of the prisoner. I would disagree with Mr. Bates there. I don't see why it is not possible to make a record of the reactions of the prisoner to get a line on his real character there, not merely the number of rules he may disobey but a study of the prisoner. When we get trained prison officials who are experts in criminology and in treating the offender in the proper manner, the proper compilation of information as to what kind of a prisoner he is, etc., it will help materially. And then, most important of all, the fourth point, the investigation in the environment in which it is contemplated placing the prisoner on parole. Mr. Warner began at whether the fact of the kind of a home the prisoner was going into was a proper item for determining whether he should be paroled, whether that had anything to do with the prison character of the man.

It seems to me that is the most important question. It is a question of what the results may be due to the environment he may get into. It raises the question of efficient parole supervision. I think it fails more not because of the mistakes so much as the lack of thorough parole treatment after they are released—the efficiency of the follow-up work that should enter into statistics. Now on the subsequent work of the Committee and the courts especially. Of course that is something that we tremendously needed and that it should be approached, you might say, in this cold-blooded, scientific manner that this Committee could attack it, would be if imminent help to those of us who are working for improved administration of probation throughout the country.

Our own association has a committee on records and statistics composed chiefly of active probation workers, and it is endeavoring to limit its work to two things at the present time:

First, getting together of a minimum of record forms and simplifying and getting out a sample set of case record forms for probation officers which can be recommended for the whole country as a basis of statistics.

Second, a minimum of statistical tables and information that probation officers ought to keep on their work as a basis for their reports. We have not been able to go thoroughly into this as to what is going on all over the country. We have gotten such reports as we could from the probation officers throughout the country, more especially from the juvenile courts, and on that going ahead with the developing of some standardized records, forms and tables for probation officers. We want to co-operate very closely on just what the whole country is doing in all of its court records and what the country might be asked to do. All of the courts might be asked to take as a minimum all records of their work to include these points of causes and antecedents and methods of treatment, somewhat along the same way of this study of institutions, which would be a very valuable contribution right now. I think the social factor should be kept in mind. I think there is a good deal of truth in Dr. Healy's attitude, although we may feel he is looking at a different side of things entirely and he is forgetting the importance of simply knowing the broad facts of delinquency; yet the mere getting of those facts without getting along with them a better understanding of mentality, social conditions that cause those cases, the work might not be worth the effort we offer and time we are putting in it, but if we put the emphasis on the social factors, character

and treatment, then this will contribute toward a real solution of the crime question.

Mr. Bates' talk was very illuminating and the very fact that Massachusetts can have a Commissioner of Correction talk as he did today shows the progress being made in that state. The general attitude in a good many states seems to be reactionary rather than progressive, as Mr. Bates' statement indicates.

MR. BATES: If I may be permitted another few minutes. I did not want to spend too much time on this report, which has been passed around to the Massachusetts Reformatory until my good friend Mr. Chute put his finger upon the meaty part of it. That is the most interesting part of the report. We all want criticism, we want to know where we are wrong; but from those who tell us where we are wrong we want to know what is right. (Reads.) A more careful investigation into the cause of the crime. That's a suggested change. Original character of father and mother. (Reads from report.)

DR. DAVIS: It has been my good fortune in the last two or three years to deal a good deal with people especially interested in psychiatry; they say all unadjusted individuals that are not necessarily criminals have a personality that has not been able to make its adjustment. Prof. Thomas wrote a book on the unadjusted girl. He cites a case in a reformatory of a girl who had violated her parole, that the proper adjustments were not made for this girl. She was placed under three different sets of plans and finally ran away, and he points out that sufficient account was not taken of her personal make-up. What are you going to do when you have about three parole officers for an institution of considerable size? They can't give much time to each parolee. Some of the psychiatrists in New York have as patients daughters and sons of some of the wealthiest people in the United States. I heard of a case where a young man of a very wealthy family could not adjust himself. They employed a young physician who had had special psychiatric training to accompany him on a trip around the world and he behaved himself beautifully, but within two weeks from the time he landed in New York City he was in trouble again.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am glad to introduce Professor Arthur E. Wood of the University of Michigan.

PROFESSOR WOOD: The report deals with institutional records, and the schedules suggested should throw light on problems relating to the character of prisoners, and to the causative factors in crime. They should also serve, to some extent, as a guide in the treatment of prisoners. If ever they could become used uniformly over the coun-

try, before long a considerable body of information would accumulate and take the place of the ignorance which now so generally prevails concerning prisons and their inmates. Not the least valuable part of the report is the revelation of the amount of statistical junk that is now collected by our prison authorities, and gravely published by the states. Perhaps the first requisite in penal science is a sense of humor!

One is moved at the start to make a few observations concerning the dangers of the statistical method in this field. One does not care to repeat the stale joke about the different varieties of lies, yet one can say without hesitation that as yet in the field of penology we have many figures but no statistics in the real sense of that term. For example, much has been written to show that the immigrant is a criminogenic factor in our environment beyond what would be warranted by his numerical proportion in the population. But in most of such discussions no attempt is made to take account of the special age grouping of immigrants as contrasted with the age distribution of the native population. Crime rates like disease and mortality rates are comparable only the basis of identical age groups. Recently the Eugenics Record Office of the Carnegie Institute has amassed data that puts the immigrant from southeastern Europe in an unfavorable light as compared with the northwestern European immigrant. The basis for such a conclusion was the study of the admissions to various state hospitals and asylums with particular reference to the distribution of races among such admissions. The conclusion is very properly assailed by the biologist, Professor H. S. Jennings of Johns Hopkins University, partly upon the ground that it takes no account of the admissions to other than state institutions. Furthermore, Professor Jennings points out that those admitted to state institutions constitute only a small proportion of the total defective group. Such considerations seem to deny the popular saying that anything can be proved by statistics. The saying holds only for those who are incapable of checking up on statistical methods. The endeavor of the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology to secure uniform prison statistics is highly commendable; but it is to be hoped that the enterprise will be undertaken with the full realization of the dangers that are involved in the interpretation of the material that is to be gathered by our uniform schedules.

A limitation of the statistical method may possibly be seen from another angle. After we get our data from the statistical tables we may conclude that we have a good deal of information about prisoners *in general*; but we shall not even then have explanation of why Sam

Jones, for example, committed the precise crime that he did. As a supplement to the generalizations that we get from statistics we need a large number of case histories of adult offenders, similar to the ones that Dr. Healy collects for juveniles. In the Judge Baker Foundation studies no conceivable biological or social fact is omitted in the diagnoses. We cannot expect to have such complete analyses of all prisoners, nor of any considerable part of them. But we can make a beginning in the social diagnosis of prisoners; and we can, at least, refrain from concluding anything about the causes of crime from the fact that in a certain prison 15 per cent of the recidivists for the crime of robbery-while-armed were left-handed males from the Balkan States who had been in the country on the average of seven years!

We may now turn to the consideration of some of the detailed provisions of the report. Only brief comment may be made upon them here. They should be subjected to an all-day discussion by a specially trained group.

First, of supreme concern is the classification of crimes. The one adopted in the report has a false simplicity, inadequate for the material to be covered. No place exists in the classification for such crimes as traffic violations, drug peddling, bootlegging; and many other types would be misfits in the schedule as presented. More specific headings should be presented under the topic of Race; possibly the census list of countries from which our immigrants come could be adopted, though they are inaccurate designations of race. The statement in the report that prison authorities can tell the race of a man by "looking at him" is positively amazing. It suggests the housewife's familiar designation of all preserves with "T. M." I am unconvinced by the author's reasons for omitting the occupation of prisoners, possibly the most outstanding fact in his environment! He would record permanent unemployment as due to incapacity or unwillingness, but makes no provision for temporary unemployment due to the same causes. He would require the prison authorities to keep a report of occupational progress within the institution, but not of educational progress. The list of mental and physical diseases is grossly incomplete and vague; and there is no provision for record of industrial accidents. Certain other matters in the wording of some of the schedule headings are unclear to me, but mention of them would convey no meaning to the reader who did not have the tables before him. There are also certain suggestions for the inclusion of further data in the tables which one might make; but, again, these are matters that should be gone over carefully by a small group working together.

In conclusion, I should say that to get such record blanks adopted by penal institutions over the country would mean a great step in progress. But before we can hope to do so there must be developed a scientific interest in the problem that is now conspicuous by its absence among the authorities. The other day in Nevada they put to death a prisoner by lethal gas. But before subjecting the prisoner to the ordeal they tried it on a cat. One is inclined to think that the prison wardens will want to have these schedules tried on some one else before they adopt them. At any rate, before approaching the Nevada authorities with this formidable array of tables I should want Community Service, Incorporated, to try teaching them other forms of recreation!

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a very pleasant announcement to make. Dr. Jacoby and Mr. Butzel have invited those in attendance at this meeting from out of town to luncheon at 12:45 at a table in the main dining-room. We will consider ourselves adjourned until two o'clock.

(The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p. m. by Chairman Keedy.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion this afternoon will be opened by Mr. Drown of Philadelphia.

MR. DROWN: I am simply a laboratory man on statistics, and Dr. Warner sent me this report, which I won't discuss, because it seems to me rather too detailed for general discussion. As Mr. Bates said, this is a problem which will have to be discussed by people getting around the table and sitting down to work hours at a time until the job is finished.

I never could understand why the institution should be studied first. It seems to me it is a problem of co-ordinating statistics of the police, and the courts and the prosecuting attorney's office, which has not been mentioned this morning, and the institutions. And the question has been discussed here as a matter of prevention. Of course it is. That is the ultimate object, but it seems to me there is an immediate problem of improving the administration of criminal justice which has got to be tackled at the same time if it were to be called the problem of prevention. And in order to get criminal statistics, we have got to have some central body; that is the essential—a central body which has power to obtain reports from these different units in the system. We cannot get the police statistics until we have some higher body which can compile the statistics. Sometimes the body which compiles the statistics cannot be relied upon to produce statistics. We have already found that out in the Municipal Court in Philadelphia. It was

demonstrated pretty well by our Bureau sending a representative there to study the court, and they were able to point out problems that our court could not point out. And so it is necessary for an outside body that is absolutely detached from any political administration to go in, or at least have power to compel the keeping of records, and the form in which the records shall be kept; to exercise some control over checking those records, and checking the accuracy and their completeness.

One of the primary problems in criminal statistics, it seems to me, is the matter of the complaints and the apprehension of the offenders. With relation to those two facts, some police statistics show practically all of the reported crimes. The figures show a small percentage of apprehensions, and that information I think can be obtained only through the control of the central body. Even in this record it deals with simply the state institutions. I think we have the problem in the whole system of criminal statistics of sentencing the offenders to the county jail, or the house of correction, and so forth. I know in Philadelphia it rests with the judge, in a great many cases, where he shall send a convict, whether to the house of correction, or the county jail, or the state penitentiary, but in the past some convicts have pleaded to be sent to the state penitentiary, even with the additional two years' sentence, rather than be sent to the county prison, and the judges in a great many instances have consented to send them to the penitentiary for that additional two years.

Only by a co-ordinated system of criminal statistics can we get complete information, about which Dr. Davis spoke this morning of pleading guilty to lesser offenses, and the failure of the police officers and detectives to prove the evidence that they collect, when they made the arrest, when the case comes up for trial. We had a problem in Philadelphia in connection with the keepers of bawdy houses. In our criminal division we had a percentage of convictions in 1922 of 6/10 of one per cent. In Canada in two years they had a percentage of convictions of about 98 and 100 per cent.

There is also a problem Dr. Davis spoke about, in connection with the complaints and the apprehension of the offenders. Mrs. Mary Louise Markey made a survey of the situation in Ohio—a survey of the criminal statistics. I happened to see a copy of the manuscript of her report. She speaks of the clerks in one institution reporting on the matter of illiteracy. There were two parallel columns: "Literate" and "Illiterate." The clerk was supposed to check in the column applicable to the case; in every case both columns were checked, so the person was both literate and illiterate. When the investigator spoke to the

clerk about that, he said: "That is my mistake; I overlooked that; I meant to call everyone of them literate."

Mr. Bates this morning spoke about the classification of offenses. I can't agree with Dr. Warner in his classification here, because I think a more detailed classification is necessary. I think there is not enough detail about the different kinds of offenses. It is all right to have this group, but I think some information should be given of the offenses included in these large groups. And one particular item—larceny—I figure should come under fraud.

I think Prof. Wood made a very good statement this morning when he said that we expect too much of statistics. I think a great many of us are apt to think that we can explain too many things through statistics. They are useful for some purposes, but they are not useful for everything.

Prof. Wood spoke about the co-operation of universities in this work and I can't agree with him there, because the matter of statistics is one of detail which requires full time. I don't see how anybody can really tackle this statistics job unless he gives his whole time and attention to the matter. They could be used as consultants. We have got to have somebody who is going to go into it and spend all the time in it, because statistics is not a subject which can be gone into hurriedly and half-heartedly, on part time.

I am submitting a little bit of the work of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia in statistical work. We have for about four years now had a statistical department, varying from 10 to 11 people, and of course we have been criticized for having such a large force, but judges of the criminal courts fail to realize that our court is really a group of several courts. We have the juvenile court, the domestic relations, the women's misdemeanor, and the boys' court, and the criminal division, which has a special probation department for handling women, and another branch for handling men, and a special division of the criminal division for handling the illegitimacy cases and unmarried mothers, and so forth. Then there is the civil division, or bureau for following up children. When an order for support is made on a man for the support of his wife, that support is in effect until stopped by the court; the support is in effect for one year, and it can be renewed. We have a large bureau following up the complaints to see that they pay the money. If they don't pay it, find out why they don't pay it, and in a great many cases there is a good reason, illness or unemployment, something of the sort, and all those cases must be in-

vestigated, and there is constantly a list of complaints, as a matter of routine.

Then there is another bureau which deals with the securing of employment primarily for husbands who are non-supporting, and also for juveniles and fathers of illegitimate children and other clients of the court who are unable to find jobs for themselves.

There is a medical department, which is a large organization consisting of several branches. The medical examination of children, medical examination of dependent and neglected children who are to be committed, medical examination of girls' cases, with particular attention to venereal diseases, and the medical examination of unmarried mothers, and the follow-up work of those cases in connection with the co-operation of the Probation Department, and the mental examination in each one of those branches. And after experience with the statistics of the court there, you will find that we are only dealing with one very small item in the whole problem of criminal statistics. There are other courts in the city, in Philadelphia—the Magistrates and the Court of Sessions, which is the criminal court. Our criminal division is a small one. Sometimes we have two of the general criminal courts of the county, and the district attorney has the decision of which cases shall be tried in our criminal court and which shall be tried in the Court of Sessions. Of course he also has some control over the grand jury and indictments, and that is another big unit and problem of complete criminal statistics.

It seems to me that as a first step which we have got to know is how many crimes are reported to the police, and how many apprehensions are being made, and what kind of cases are being apprehended, and what are not apprehended, and how those cases are brought in; what the results of conviction are, and the methods of the prosecuting attorneys' office in handling them, and what happens after conviction.

THE CHAIRMAN: We want you to go a little more into detail, please, of the character of your statistics, and tell us what you think you can accomplish; just what you conceive to be the purpose of the statistics that you have collected.

MR. DROWN: Statistics of the Municipal Court?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DROWN: Our statistics have intended to show what the problems are before the court, and what the volume of business is, and how much work we have to handle, which is something very few people realize. Take a juvenile division where the court has been socialized to as great extent as any other division. It is not perfect, but still

socialized to quite an extent. The children are hampered in several ways. They would be arrested and brought to the house of detention. The probation officer stationed there hears the case and the prosecutor and the police officer who makes the arrest. The decision is made as to what shall be done with the child after the hearing. Very often he is placed on probation. That is not always the best thing to do, but with the big volume of cases coming in, you cannot always do the best. As Dr. Davis says about the mental examinations and the observation of the mental defective cases, you cannot spend all the time on each case that you come to. If you have a laboratory you can select the cases that you are going to handle and receive; but in the court you have got to take what comes to you, and you have got to do the best you can with the facilities that you have. Then cases are also brought in on complaint, and all those cases are investigated; that is a matter for the court to handle; those cases are investigated and they are settled outside of court, or in the court. I think one of the most important things we have been able to show to the people of Philadelphia in regard to the court is the vast volume of work that is done, without any court hearing, without the judge entering into the problem at all, by preliminary investigation and adjustment by the probation office.

As to the question of juvenile delinquency, about 75 per cent of the work is handled outside, and probably about eight or nine thousand juvenile delinquency cases in a year; that is, in all branches. Of course one judge could not handle all those cases, and the Probation Department is relied upon to make full investigation and recommendations.

In the domestic relations division, somewhere around 75 per cent of the cases are settled without the husband and the wife appearing before the judge in a formal hearing; and the misdemeanor cases, relating to the younger girls, a great many of them are settled without coming before the judge. Of course sometimes it is felt it is much better to bring the cases before the judge; it is much better for the child. And the street walker cases, of course they are practically all court cases. They have to be handled that way. You cannot dispose of them informally. And in the boys' court, most of the cases settled are dealt with through the Probation Department, without coming into court. I think the principal thing we have been able to show is that this vast volume of work is being handled through the Probation Department, and not handled by the court.

Now, it is only by establishing a complete and thorough system of records that you can account for every case. House of Detention

cases, under the old system, the statistical department simply receive the records, and make no attempt to find out whether they received the record for every case that was handled; and the first year, in going over those records, they found that between 1,000 and 1,200 cases never came into the statistical department, which shows that some statistics don't tell the whole truth.

MR. BUTZEL: The problem of tackling anything that has to do with the administration of criminal justice is perfectly complicated by the fact that we have no professional group who are responsible for the administration of criminal justice. There is no one group, unless it is this Institute, that assumes any responsibility whatsoever. . . .

Now, here in the city of Detroit we have about nine or ten agencies dealing with the people. In the prison with which I have the honor of being associated; we have no hesitancy in going down and asking the court an impertinent question once in a while, and the judge often comes up and goes through the prison. Now, we have a great deal to say about the police, and want closer co-operation, but we have at least the basis.

As far as getting police records generally established, it is possible in some cities, and hardly possible in some average American cities, to get a case record out with a much different type of men—of detectives and policemen—that is going to be worth very much. It is possible we can have a group of social workers attached to the Police Department specifically for the purpose of making case records. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Jacoby, Director of the Psychopathic Clinic in the Recorder's Court of Detroit.

DR. JACOBY: When one sits through a discussion of the sort that took place today with the thought at the end he is going to be called upon, he finds usually that all the previous speakers have stolen his thunder.

It has occurred to me, however, in this discussion, that one of the causes of disagreement, as to the kind of records which should be kept, and therefore the kind of statistics which should emanate from those records, comes from the fact that there is such a strict lack of uniformity as to what the function of a prison is.

There are those of us in the community who would determine the admission to prison on the basis of the possibility of the reformation of the offender, by surrounding him with nice things, and there are still others who look simply upon the prison as a hospital where a clinical attitude is to be taken toward the offenders.

It seems quite obvious that it is essential that there must be uniformity in thinking, as to what the function of a prison institution is before we can have any records which would be of ultimate value.

Mention has been made here of the danger of having impractical records because of their complexity and being of a type which cannot be handled by the average city employee. In medicine, in surgery, and in the other branches which have to do with human activities, there has been a development of a uniform type of records. Hospital associations and medical societies discuss now and again methods of taking their records and of keeping them. So it is not to be wondered at that in the present situation, where there is, as Mr. Basil pointed out, no uniform group of individuals who can call themselves a specialized profession, there should be such difficulties. In Detroit, in the clinic with which I happen to be connected, the clinical attitude is generally entirely towards the offender. A complete history and record is made of him, just as would be done in any well regulated hospital, if he went to a hospital because of illness. From that record certain statistical facts are taken off upon a card. This card then shows such data as his name, his age, the charge, a short statement of sentence or history of the circumstances of the offense.

We have individuals brought in for larceny where the charge could very easily be robbery. We have also individuals brought in for unlawfully driving away an automobile where it might just as properly have been grand larceny, depending upon the attitude of the police officer. One very striking incident was that of two drunken men who in the course of their debauch went to sleep in an alley. One of them awoke from his sleep and found \$10 missing. He made complaint to the police that he had been robbed of \$10, and the police arrested his companion on the charge of robbery armed. The facts in the case were probably that the \$10 was spent for liquor, and not only was there no robbery committed, but it is very doubtful whether the man arrested had anything to do whatever with the crime.

The card further contains a statement, as I said before, of the circumstances of the arrest, and of the offense, and a medical diagnosis and a list of the outstanding social factors which have operated in his present situation. Roomi is also left on the card for the disposition made of him in court.

But where an individual goes from the court to the prison or to the hospital, a carbon copy of the record is sent to the commanding officer, the medical superintendent or warden, as the case may be, of the institution to which the man is sent.

The problem of personnel in the making of a record is of the greatest importance, as has been referred to here a number of times today. It is therefore valuable, we have found in practice, to have a space in the record of the individual for the investigator, whether he is probation officer, social worker in the psychopathic clinic, or what not. In other words, to keep out of the record, as far as possible, the impression of the worker which may or may not be in accordance with the fact. So there is a portion of our record definitely set apart labeled impression in which the social worker or investigator can go as far as he likes in venting his particular feelings towards this particular offender. Thus we find it is possible to keep the body of the record more strictly in accordance with the facts as they exist. Even so the problem of training workers and investigators in making active records is extremely difficult, and an institution such as this one in devising an ideal form of record and finding the personnel to operate the record is indispensable.

DR. DAVIS: How large proportion of the cases here in Detroit, going through the courts, are you able to handle in the clinic?

DR. JACOBY: There are between 20,000 and 25,000 persons tried a year in the court, but we handle between 1,000 and 1,500.

DR. DAVIS: How do these cases come to you?

DR. JACOBY: They are referred to us by some judge or other officer. There are, informally, a good many cases from the Police Department. Sometimes it is a surprisingly serious case; a man arrested is unquestionably guilty and the policeman who makes the arrest believes or thinks that something is wrong with him, and he is sent to the clinic.

DR. DAVIS: Can the police officer dispose of the case in itself, before it goes into the court?

DR. JACOBY: We have those that are so committed to the hospital.

DR. DAVIS: Could you do that in a serious case, such as rape?

DR. JACOBY: We have done it.

DR. DAVIS: Do you send your records, in cases where they have become court cases, to the judge.

DR. JACOBY: No, the record is confidential, and is exactly similar to any other medical record; it is regarded as privileged information. That is generally done where a patient has a card, sometimes in the form of a letter; the letter is usually made as simple as possible and still state the thing fairly and accurately. It reads sometimes as fol-

lows: "The examination of this man shows so and so, and we recommend therefore the following: . . ."

DR. DAVIS: Does the judge ever take notice of the recommendation?

DR. JACOBY: In about eighty per cent of the cases.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any new business to be brought before the meeting.

MR. BATES: I would like to offer a resolution. It seems to me we ought to get something definite on record.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, Mr. Warner's report has not been approved by the Committee; is that right, Mr. Crossley?

MR. CROSSLEY: Correct.

MR. BATES: Then, let's make it an informal report. I will read my resolution. (Reads resolution.)

"RESOLVED, That the report of the Committee on Records and Statistics, and those of its directorate made to the Committee, be received and approved as a basis of discussion, looking towards the establishment of uniform criminal records and, through such records, the compilation of useful statistical information. That the Committee be reminded that consultation and co-operation with the active workers in all fields is desirable. That records, as to the police, prosecution and judicial activities are equally as important as institutional records. That records should tend to assist in the identification of and reform of individuals; in the improvement of standards of treatment; and in the prevention of future delinquency; and that the Committee proceed as expeditiously as possible, with the means at its hand, in the preparation of useful forms on which such records may be kept as will lend themselves to compilation at some central place."

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now call for the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

MR. CHUTE: Mr. Chairman, we have prepared this resolution because of the death of the president, Mr. Reynolds, and submit it to you unanimously as follows:

(The resolution, as published on the first page of this number, was unanimously adopted.)

MR. CHUTE: One other resolution: RESOLVED, That our appreciation and thanks be expressed to our friends, Dr. Jacoby and Mr. Fred Butzel, for making the arrangements for our meetings, and for having provided an enjoyable luncheon.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have all heard the resolution. I take it that it is carried unanimously. May we have the report of the Nominating Committee?

MR. CROSSLEY: The Nominating Committee submits the following report: For President, Edwin R. Keedy; First Vice-President, Sanford Bates; Second Vice-President, Floyd E. Thompson; Third Vice-President, James H. Tufts; Fourth Vice-President, Fred M. Butzel; Treasurer, Bronson Winthrop; Secretary, Robert H. Gault. Executive Board for the term expiring 1925—Henry Barrett Chamberlin, Katherine B. Davis, August Vollmer, Arthur E. Wood; for the term expiring 1926—John H. Wigmore, Herbert Harley, Edward Alonzo, Amos W. Butler. Mr. Chairman, I move the Secretary be instructed to cast the ballot for the nominees in the report.

(The report was unanimously adopted.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Members of the Institute, it is a great pleasure for me to be elected President of this organization. I have been interested in it for a great many years; in fact, from its beginning. I had the honor of being elected the first secretary of this Institute when it was organized fifteen years ago. And I have been chairman of one of its committees since that time and within recent years its Vice-President.

On the other hand, it is with very great trepidation that I accept the position. It is a difficult thing to pick up the work of another man, a work in which he was very much interested, and to which he was able to contribute greatly. Mr. Reynolds, our late President was tremendously engrossed in the work of this Institute; he was so situated that he could give it all of his time and attention; he was particularly interested in the work of the Committee on Surveys and of the Committee on Records and Statistics. Of the things that he could give to the Institute I am only able to give one, and that is interest. I am not so situated that I can give the time and the attention to the work that he did. But what I am able to give I shall be very glad to give. I have not been personally familiar with the details of the work that he was doing, either with the surveys, or with the work of the Committee on Records and Statistics. I shall do what I am able to do, and I thank you very much for the honor.

If there is nothing further before the meeting, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

A VOICE: I move we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

(Adjourned at 4:30.)