

Statistics Relating to Crime in Chicago

by

**MISS EDITH ABBOTT, PH. D., CHICAGO SCHOOL OF CIVICS
AND PHILANTHROPY**

Part I

ARREST AND TRIAL OF OFFENDERS

In the following report an attempt is made to bring together from various sources the available statistics,* published or unpublished, relating to the subject of crime in Chicago, that is, statistics of complaints and arrests, trial and disposition, together with the statistics relating to the social status—age, sex, nationality and occupation—of the persons arrested. Unfortunately, there is in Illinois no central bureau of criminal statistics through which statistics from the police department, the courts, the jails, prisons, and the probation department are collected and correlated. A state bureau of criminal statistics does exist on our statute books, for, by a law approved June 11, 1912, the State Charities Commission was directed to establish such a bureau with the secretary of the Commission as director in charge. This proposed bureau was charged with the duty of collecting and publishing annually the statistics of Illinois relating to crime, and all courts of Illinois, police magistrates, justices of the peace, clerks of all courts of record, sheriffs, keepers of all places of detention for crime or misdemeanors or violations of the criminal statutes are to "furnish said bureau annually such information on request as it may require in compiling such statistics." Up to the present time, however, owing chiefly to the fact that no appropriation has been made to cover the expenses of this work, no steps have been taken by the executive secretary of the Commission towards putting this law into effect. Moreover, there has never been in Chicago any attempt at an annual "stock-taking" in which the statistics furnished by the various departments and agencies dealing with the problem of crime might be brought together and examined with the hope of determining how far the problem is being adequately met.

In the following report, statistics of criminal complaints and arrests that are furnished by the police department will be first dealt with, since questions relating to the extent or quantity of crime and the number of persons apprehended are usually first raised in any discussion of the subject.

Following this, there will be presented statistics from the courts relating to the disposition of offenders who have been arrested, statistics from the Adult Probation Office, and, finally, statistics relating to the "social status" of those arrested.

Sec. 1. Extent of Crime: Criminal Complaints and Arrests on Felony Charges.

The amount of crime in any community is a subject about which definite information is anxiously sought. Since, however, much crime is undetected, it is not to be expected that statistics should furnish exact information on this point. There should be available, however, statistics showing the number of crimes known to the authorities. In Chicago the number of serious crimes is probably best indicated by the number of "criminal complaints" received by the police. Criminal complaints for the years 1905 to 1910, inclusive, were published in the *Annual Report of the General Superintendent of Police for the year ending December 31, 1910*. Since 1910, no statistics of criminal complaints have been published, but unpublished statistics for the

*There were available at the time this report was prepared (autumn of 1914) the following published reports containing statistics relating to crime in Chicago.

1. *Annual Report of the Police Department, City of Chicago*. (Last published report, for the year ending December 31, 1913.)

2. *Annual Report of the Municipal Court of Chicago*. (Last published report, for the year ending November 30, 1913.)

3. *Annual Report of the Adult Probation Office, Cook County*. (Last published report, for the year ending September 30, 1913.)

4. *Annual Report of the Superintendent of the House of Correction, City of Chicago*. (Last published report, for the year ending December 31, 1910.)

5. There were also available the Report of the Commissioners of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, and the Biennial Report of the Board of Managers of the Illinois State Reformatory at Pontiac. These reports, however, give statistics only for Illinois and not for Chicago or for Cook County.

years 1910 to 1913 were furnished by the police department. These statistics of criminal complaints should, of course, be published each year; they are the only statistics that correspond to the statistics of "Crimes Known to the Police" that are, for example, published each year as part of the English Criminal Judicial Statistics.*

The following table shows the number of criminal complaints in Chicago for a series of years together with the number of arrests on felony charges:

TABLE 1. CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS AND ARRESTS (FELONY CHARGES): 1905-1913.**

Date.	Criminal Complaints.		Arrests (Felony Charges).		Per Cent Increase or Decrease.	
	Number.	Increase or Decrease.	Number.	Increase or Decrease.	Complaints.	Arrests.
1905	11,732		12,144			
1906	10,754	— 978	12,376	+ 232	— 8.3	+ 1.9
1907	11,292	+ 538	10,653	—1,723	+ 5.0	—13.9
1908	11,034	— 258	10,551	— 102	— 2.3	— .9
1909	10,697	— 337	9,656	— 895	— 3.1	— 8.5
1910	10,718	+ 21	9,376	— 280	+ .2	— 2.9
1911	11,730	+1,012	9,881	+ 505	+ 9.4	+ 5.4
1912	13,032	+1,302	10,276	+ 395	+11.1	+ 3.9
1913	14,340	+1,308	11,203	+ 927	+10.0	+ 9.0

This table shows that the number of complaints has fluctuated, decreasing in 1906, increasing in 1907, decreasing again in 1908 and 1909, remaining almost stationary in 1910, and increasing noticeably in the last three years. The number of arrests in 1913 represented an increase of 927, or 9 per cent, over 1912, a larger increase than has occurred in any other year during the period. It is interesting to note that there does not seem to be any consistent relation between the number of complaints and the number of arrests. In the year 1906, for example, the number of complaints decreased by nearly a thousand and the arrests during the same year increased by 232. In the following year the complaints increased by more than five hundred and the arrests decreased by more than seventeen hundred. Both complaints and arrests have increased in the last three years, although until 1913 the percentage increase was considerably greater for complaints than for arrests.

Sec. 2. Increase and Decrease in Number of Arrests, 1900-1913.

Not only the arrests for felonies but the arrests on all charges should be examined. Moreover, while the number of arrests in any one year is significant, it is also important to note the changes in the number of arrests from year to year. The next table shows the number of arrests on felony and misdemeanor charges from 1900 to 1913 and the increase or decrease each year:

TABLE 2. TOTAL NUMBER OF ARRESTS (FELONIES AND MISDEMEANORS): 1900-1913.

(From Annual Reports of the Police Department.)

Year.	Felonies.	Misdemeanors.	Total.	Increase or Decrease in Total	
				Number.	Per Cent.
1900	10,838	58,251	69,089		
1901	11,383	56,641	68,024	— 1,065	— 1.5
1902	10,495	58,363	68,858	+ 834	+ 1.2
1903	12,550	65,123	77,673	+ 8,815	+12.8
1904	11,116	67,890	79,006	+ 1,323	+ 1.7
1905	12,144	70,328	82,472	+ 3,466	+ 4.4
1906	12,376	79,177	91,553	+ 9,081	+11.0
1907	10,653	52,479	63,132	—28,421	—31.0

**Statistics for arrests are from the published annual report of the General Superintendent of Police. It should be explained that the number of arrests simply means the number of charges. That is, one person may be charged with several different offenses, e. g., burglary, assault, receiving stolen property, etc. In 1913 there were 109,764 offenses charged against 107,257 persons arraigned in the Municipal Court. (See Annual Report of the Department of Police, 1913, pp. 11 and 8.)

*For a discussion of the value of these statistics of criminal complaints and their lack of availability for comparative purposes, see Appendix C.

Year.	Felonies.	Misdemeanors.	Total.	Increase or Decrease in Total	
				Number.	Per Cent.
1908	10,551	57,669	68,220	+ 5,088	+ 8.1
1909	9,656	60,719	70,375	+ 2,155	+ 3.2
1910	9,376	71,893	81,269	+10,894	+15.5
1911	9,881	74,959	84,840	+ 3,571	+ 4.4
1912	10,276	76,674	86,950	+ 2,110	+ 2.4
1913	11,203	98,561	109,764	+22,814	+26.2

This table shows a very uneven series of increases and decreases, chiefly increases, in the total number of arrests. The number decreased slightly in 1901, increased slightly in 1902, increased very greatly the next year, increased slightly the two following years (1904 and 1905), increased substantially in 1906, and then decreased greatly in 1907.

The year 1907 was the first year following the establishment of the new Municipal Court, and there may be some relation between the work of the court and the marked decline in the total number of arrests, which fell from 91,553 to 63,132, or 31 per cent, in a single year. This decrease occurred both in the number of arrests for felonies and arrests for misdemeanors, though the decline in the number of arrests for felonies was not so great, as for misdemeanors.* However, the decrease in charges did not continue. There has been an increase each year from 1907 to 1913, the rate of increase varying from 2.4 per cent to 26.2 per cent.

Sec. 3. Increase in Arrests in 1913.

Finally, a most significant fact in this table is that there was in 1913 the greatest increase in arrests that has occurred in any single year in the entire period from 1900 to 1913.

There was in the year 1913 an increase over the year 1912 of 9.0 per cent in arrests for felonies, an increase of 28.5 per cent in arrests for misdemeanors and an increase of 26.2 per cent in the total number of arrests.

Over the year 1911 the arrests for 1913 represent an increase of 13.4 per cent in arrests for felonies, of 31.5 per cent in arrests for misdemeanors, and 29.4 per cent in the total numbers of arrests.

Over the year 1910, the arrests for 1913 represent an increase of 19.5 per cent in arrests for felonies, 37.1 per cent in arrests for misdemeanors, and 35.1 per cent in total number of arrests. The table below summarizes these percentages.

TABLE 3. PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF ARRESTS IN 1913 OVER 1912, 1911, 1910.

	Percentage increase in number of arrests in 1913		
	over 1910.	over 1911.	over 1912.
Felonies	19.5	13.4	9.0
Misdemeanors	37.1	31.5	28.5
All offenses	35.1	29.4	26.2

Sec. 4. Increase in Arrests Compared with Increase in Population.

An increase in the number of arrests should, of course, be considered in relation to the increase in population during the corresponding period. The following table shows the number of arrests to every 10,000 people in the population during the years 1880 and 1890, and the period 1900 to 1913.

TABLE 4. ARRESTS PER 10,000 POPULATION.**

Year.	Felonies.	Misdemeanors.	All Offenses.
1880	486.4
1890	565.8
1900	63.8	342.9	406.7
1901	64.9	323.3	388.2
1902	58.3	324.0	382.3
1903	67.8	351.9	419.7
1904	58.5	357.3	415.8

*It is important to note, however, that in the preceding year (1906) there had been an increase of 11 per cent, compared with 2 and 4 per cent for the two years immediately preceding 1906.

**The population for 1890, 1900 and 1910 is taken from the Federal Census. For the other years, Chicago population estimates, computed as of July 1, have been furnished by the Director of the United States Bureau of the Census.

Year.	Felonies.	Misdemeanors.	All Offenses.
1905	62.3	360.8	423.1
1906	61.9	396.2	458.1
1907	52.0	256.3	308.5
1908	50.3	275.0	325.3
1909	45.0	282.9	327.9
1910	42.9	329.0	371.9
1911	44.0	333.8	377.8
1912	44.8	334.1	378.9
1913	47.8	420.5	468.3

According to this table there were in 1880, 486.4 arrests in Chicago for every 10,000 persons in the population; in 1890 this had increased to 565.8 and in 1900 had fallen to 406.7 arrests for every 10,000 population; in 1910 the number of arrests had fallen still more to 371.9 for every 10,000 population. Since 1910, however, there has been a steady increase in the number of arrests per 10,000 population and this increase in 1913 was so substantial that the number of arrests per 10,000 population in that year was greater not only than the corresponding number for 1910, but greater than the corresponding number for 1900.

Sec. 5. Relation Between Number of Arrests and Number of Crimes.

From the statistics that have been given, it appears that there was in the year 1913 not only an increase in the number of criminal complaints per 10,000 of the population, but there was also in this year an unmistakably large increase in the number of arrests. If the number of arrests indicates the extent of crime, then there was obviously a very marked increase in crime in the year 1913. If the figures as to the relation between arrests and population are to be trusted, the year 1913 would popularly be called a serious "crime year" that put our crime-rate back more than a decade. It is very important therefore to note that the number of arrests is not synonymous with number of crimes, among other reasons because (1) a large number of persons may be arrested for complicity in a single crime; (2) many innocent persons are arrested through misapprehension and later discharged; and (3) the vast majority of arrests are for petty offenses that are not serious enough to be called "crimes" at all. Some consideration should be given to the question of "new crimes." When laws are passed creating new offenses, there may be an increase in arrests without any corresponding increase in criminality. As a matter of fact, however, the new offenses are chiefly those involving misdemeanors and violations of ordinances. New felonies are rarely created. In Chicago the police classification does, however, include two new offenses improperly classed as felonies, "contributing to delinquency," and "pandering.*" The latter is so unimportant numerically that it may be disregarded. Offenses involving violations of laws relating to motor vehicles might be considered "new offenses" in comparing 1890 and 1900 with 1910, but they are not new offenses in comparing 1910 with 1913. Violations of the factory laws, violations of the compulsory education laws, and some similar offenses are not important enough numerically to have much weight in the total of nearly 110,000 offenses.

Sec. 6. Small Per Cent of Arrests for Serious Offenses.

The most important point, however, regarding the relation between "arrests" and "crimes" is the fact that the great majority of arrests are not for "crimes" at all in the sense that most people understand the word "crime;" on the contrary, the great majority of offenses are for violations of city ordinances and for misdemeanors, and many, if not most, of them are for relatively petty offenses. The following table, for example, shows for a series of years the percentage of the total number of arrests that were made on felony charges.

*These offenses are not classified as "felonies" in the Municipal Court report. An attempt was made to ascertain why the police department classed them as felonies, but no explanation was given except that "they had been started that way."

TABLE 5. ARRESTS FOR FELONIES IN RELATION TO TOTAL NUMBER OF ARRESTS.

	Arrests (All Offenses).	Arrests for Felonies. Number.	Per Cent of Total.
1900	69,089	10,838	15.7
1901	68,024	11,383	16.7
1902	68,858	10,495	15.2
1903	77,673	12,550	16.2
1904	79,006	11,116	14.1
1905	82,472	12,144	14.7
1906	91,553	12,376	13.5
1907	63,132	10,653	16.9
1908	68,220	10,551	15.5
1909	70,375	9,656	13.7
1910	81,269	9,376	11.5
1911	84,840	9,881	11.6
1912	86,950	10,276	11.8
1913	109,764	11,203	10.2

In 1900, 15.7 per cent of all the arrests were for felonies, and from 1900 through the year 1908, the per cent of felonies ranged from 13.5 per cent to 16.9 per cent. In the last four years, however, the per cent of arrests on felony charges has shown a decrease over the earlier years, and in 1913 the arrests for felonies were only 10.2 per cent of the total.

It seems important to emphasize the fact that the table of arrests shows that out of the 109,764 offenses charged against persons arrested in 1913, only 11,203 or 10.2 per cent were really for "crimes," if we use the word crime to mean felony. Another point that should not be overlooked with regard to the relation between number of arrests and number of crimes is the fact that an increase in the number of arrests may indicate merely a change in policy on the part of the state's attorney or of the police department and a sudden decision to arrest for certain types of offenses that had hitherto been overlooked. Or the increase in arrests may be due to changes in the police force leading to greater success in the apprehension of offenders. That is, instead of an increase in crime the increase in arrests may merely indicate greater activity on the part of the police, due to whatever cause; or as has been pointed out, this may, of course, be merely pseudo-activity resulting in the arrest of large numbers of innocent persons.

Sec. 7. Relation Between Arrests and Convictions, 1900-1913.

Statistics are available, however, showing that there was in 1913 not only a very substantial increase in the number of those arrested but that there was also a noticeable increase in the number of persons convicted and held to the Criminal Court. In the annual report of the Chief of Police the disposition of cases in the Municipal Court is given each year. The following table shows the total number of cases disposed of, the total number discharged each year, and those held to the Criminal Court, fined, sentenced and otherwise disposed of. The number convicted per 10,000 population has been computed, but it should be emphasized that grouped together as "convicted" are all cases that are not discharged. Some of these are only held for trial in the Criminal Court and a few are disposed of in other ways.

TABLE 6. DISPOSITION OF CASES IN MUNICIPAL COURT, 1900-1913.*

Year	Total No. Cases Disposed Of	Discharged	Convicted Etc.	†Per Cent of Total No. of Cases Convicted, Etc.	Number Con- victed, "Held" and Otherwise Disposed of Per 10,000 Population
1900	69,124	45,247	23,877	34.5	140.6
1901	67,452	40,318	27,134	40.2	154.9
1902	68,530	41,693	26,837	39.2	148.9

* Statistics compiled from the annual reports of the police department. Juvenile cases have been excluded. In a few of the annual reports the total number of cases disposed of did not agree with the total number of charges. This discrepancy, however, was slight in every case.

† Includes all those convicted, held to the Criminal Court, and "otherwise disposed of."

REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

Year	Total No. Cases Disposed Of	Discharged	Convicted Etc.	Per Cent of Total No. of Cases Convicted, Etc.	Number Convicted, "Held" and Otherwise Disposed of Per 10,000 Population
1903	75,121	46,597	28,524	37.9	154.1
1904	77,468	43,045	34,423	44.4	181.2
1905	78,662	50,436	28,226	35.9	144.8
1906	87,369	59,706	27,663	31.7	138.4
1907	60,181	29,867	30,314	50.4	148.0
1908	67,431	35,593	31,838	47.2	151.8
1909	70,809	39,000	31,809	44.9	148.2
1910	80,238	44,286	35,952	44.8	164.5
1911	84,537	49,034	35,503	41.9	158.1
1912	85,357	51,978	33,379	39.1	145.5
1913	109,711	58,532	51,179	46.6	218.3

This table shows that along with the increase in arrests there was in 1913 a very substantial increase in the number of convictions. Of the total number of cases disposed of in 1913, 46.6 per cent were convicted and held for trial, in contrast to 39.1 per cent in 1912, and 41.9 per cent in 1911. In 1912, 33,379 persons were convicted or held for trial, but in 1913 the number of convictions had risen from 33,379 to 51,179, an increase of 53.3 per cent, in contrast to a decrease of 5.9 per cent from 1911 to 1912 and of 1.2 per cent between 1910 and 1911. There was a marked increase in the number of persons convicted and held for trial out of every 10,000 persons in the population. The number of convictions rose from 158.1 per 10,000 population in 1911 and 145.5 per 10,000 population in 1912 to 218.3 per 10,000 population in 1913.

There are, moreover, other statistics available showing that along with the increase in the number of arrests there has been an increase in cases held and convicted. In the first place there are published reports of the Municipal Court, which show (1) the largest number of cases held to the Grand Jury in any year since 1908; (2) an increase in the number of convictions for misdemeanors (criminal cases) and for violations of ordinances (quasi-criminal cases) in 1913; and (3) an increase during the year in the number of persons sentenced to imprisonment by the Municipal Court.

There are also available some unpublished statistics from the Criminal Court that indicate that the increase in arrests probably had a legitimate basis. These are: (1) Statistics showing an increase in the number of cases heard by the Grand Jury in the year 1913 over the preceding four years (but not over the preceding eight years save for the single year 1907); (2) an increase in the number of true bills found, which was again an increase over the preceding four years only, for the number of true bills in 1913 was smaller than in any one of the years from 1901 to 1909. In order to avoid duplication, these statistics will not be presented here, but will be discussed in connection with the tables in the following section dealing with statistics relating to the disposition of cases in the Municipal and Criminal Courts.

Sec. 8. Statistics Relating to the Disposition of Cases in the Municipal and Criminal Courts.

In the preceding section statistics of arrests and their possible value as indicating the extent of crime have been discussed. Statistics have also been given showing the number of convictions together with the number of cases held to the Criminal Court and their relation to the number of arrests. The statistics that have been given were all compiled from the annual reports of the General Superintendent of Police. Since the establishment in 1906 of the Municipal Court, there has been published each year an admirable report of the work of the various branches of that court, so that we have for the period 1907-1913 statistics showing the disposition of each class of cases heard in the Municipal Court. There will follow, then, tables showing separately for felonies, misdemeanors and violations of ordinances the disposition of the cases heard in the Municipal Court since its establishment, the number of cases fined, sentenced, and held to the Grand Jury, together with the number of cases discharged.

Sec. 9. Disposition of All Cases in the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1908-1913. Total Number Discharged and Convicted.

The following tables show the disposition of all cases heard in the Muni-

cipal Court from 1908* to 1913. The statistics in this table must not be compared with the police statistics for the same year, since the police reports are for the calendar year from January 1 to December 31, and the Municipal Court reports are for the year from December 1 to November 30. Percentages would, of course, be fairly comparable, but numbers cannot be compared.

TABLE 7. DISPOSITION OF ALL CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT.

(From Annual Reports of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1908-1913.)

Numbers.						
Disposition	1913	1912	1911	1910	*1909	*1908
Defendant not apprehended.....	3,586	5,413	5,965	4,080
Dismissed, want of prosecution..	6,593	5,048	3,225	2,519
Non-suits	5,340	11,186	6,505	6,290
Nolle pros.	2,433	4,238	4,322	2,981
Discharged	51,797	42,101	37,408	34,746
Total discharged	69,749	67,986	57,425	50,616	46,905	41,487
Fined	34,086	24,006	19,312	20,633	16,559	16,785
Committed to County Jail and						
House of Correction.....	14,463	11,764	13,047	13,790	12,479	13,325
Held to Grand Jury.....	3,035	2,613	2,946	2,883	2,428	†3,333
Total convicted and "held"...	51,584	38,383	35,305	37,306	31,466	33,443
Total cases disposed of....	121,333	106,369	92,730	87,922	78,371	74,930
Percentages.						
Defendant not apprehended.....	3.0	5.1	6.4	4.7
Dismissed, want of prosecution...	5.4	4.7	3.5	2.9
Non-suits and nolle pros.....	6.4	14.5	11.8	10.5
Discharged	42.7	39.6	40.3	39.5
Total discharged	57.5	63.9	62.0	57.6	59.9	55.4
Fined	28.1	22.6	20.8	23.5	21.2	22.4
Committed to County Jail and						
House of Correction.....	11.9	11.1	14.0	15.7	15.8	17.8
Held to Grand Jury.....	2.5	2.4	3.2	3.2	3.1	†4.4
Total convicted and "held"...	42.5	36.1	38.0	42.4	40.1	44.6
Total cases disposed of....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*No statistics available except for total number discharged in 1908 and 1909.

†Includes 182, or .2 per cent, held to the Juvenile Court.

The outstanding fact in this table is that the number of those discharged each year is greater than the number convicted, even when all of those held to the Grand Jury are counted as convicted. The total per cent discharged ranges from 55.4 per cent in 1908 to as high as 63.9 per cent in 1912. The cases convicted and held to the Grand Jury have not only been less than half, they have been less than 45.0 per cent of the total number of cases

*1908 was not the first but the second year of the court. Statistics for the first year are not given because comparable statistics of disposition are not available for 1907. The first annual report of the court was a very slight report and was largely devoted to comparisons between the work of the court and the work accomplished under the former Justice of the Peace regime. This first report shows that the total number of cases disposed of was 58,227, and that the number committed to the County Jail and House of Correction was 10,783, but no statistics are available showing the number of persons fined, although the total amount of fines assessed is given. Since no statistics are given showing the number discharged, it is impossible to ascertain the total number convicted.

disposed of each year since the establishment of the Municipal Court, and fell one year to 36.1 per cent of the total number of cases disposed of.*

It is important to note the reasons for the discharge of this large percentage of cases. In the year 1913, 3,586, or 3 per cent, were discharged because the defendant was "not apprehended;" 6,593, or 5.4 per cent, because of "want of prosecution;" 2,433, or 2 per cent, because the state's attorney had "nolle prossed;" 5,340, or 4.4 per cent, because the corporation counsel had "non-suited," and 51,797, or 42.7 per cent, were discharged by the court after trial. These methods of discharge should, however, be considered with reference to the separate groups of cases heard, that is, felonies, misdemeanors, and "violations," or quasi-criminal cases. In the sections following, statistics relating to each of these groups of cases will be considered separately.

Sec. 10. Disposition of Preliminary Hearings in Municipal Court, 1908-1913.

The question of the number of persons discharged is, of course, most important in the cases of serious crimes. The following table shows the disposition of all felony cases on preliminary hearings in the Municipal Court for the period 1908-1913. Similar statistics for 1907, the first year of the court, are not available.

TABLE 8. DISPOSITION OF FELONY CASES ON PRELIMINARY HEARINGS.

Municipal Court Statistics, 1908-1913.						
Numbers.						
Disposition	1913	1912	1911	1910	1909	1908
Defendant not apprehended	948	1,051	1,882	835	4,032	4,388
Discharged, want of prosecution.....	742	501	390	243		
Nolle pros.	1,298	1,746	2,178	1,429		
Discharged	2,079	1,451	2,130	2,228		
Held to Grand Jury.....	3,035	2,613	2,946	2,883	2,428	*3,333
Total preliminary hearings.....	8,102	7,362	9,526	7,618	6,460	7,721
Percentages.						
Defendant not apprehended	11.7	14.2	19.8	11.0
Discharged, want of prosecution.....	9.1	6.8	4.1	3.2
Nolle pros.	16.0	23.7	22.8	18.7
Discharged	25.7	19.8	22.4	29.2
Total discharged	62.5	64.5	69.1	62.1	62.3	56.0
Held to Grand Jury.....	37.5	35.5	30.9	37.9	37.7	*44.0
Total preliminary hearings.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Includes 182, or 3 per cent, transferred to the Juvenile Court.

This table shows that in 1913 only 3,035, or 37.5 per cent, of the felony cases were held to the Grand Jury after preliminary hearings in the Municipal Court. The remaining 5,067 cases, or 62.5 per cent of the total number, "got off" in the following way: 948, or 11.7 per cent, were discharged because the defendant was not apprehended; 742, or 9.1 per cent, were dropped for want of prosecution; 1,298, or 16 per cent, were nolle prossed, and 2,079, or 25.7 per cent, were discharged by the various judges after preliminary hearings in court, leaving in round numbers only 3,000 cases to be heard by the Grand Jury. In comparing statistics for the preceding years, it appears that the percentage held to the Grand Jury in 1913 was slightly larger than the percentage held in 1912 or 1911, but smaller than the percentage held in 1910, 1909, or 1908. Some interesting changes are to be noticed in connection with the method of discharge. The per cent of cases in which the defendant was "not apprehended" increased in 1911 and decreased in 1912 and 1913, the per

*The percentages convicted and "held" in this table do not agree with the percentages given in Table 6, which shows the disposition of cases in the Municipal Court based on statistics compiled from the annual reports of the General Superintendent of Police. The police statistics do not include some of the violations of ordinances that are heard in the Municipal Court on summons, and the number of "non-suits" would therefore be smaller. A further difference is that the police statistics do not include in their classification any group of persons "not apprehended." Still another difference results from the group "otherwise disposed of" in the police classification.

cent "nolle prossed" increased in 1911 and 1912 and decreased in 1913, the per cent "discharged for want of prosecution" has steadily increased, and the per cent discharged by the judges decreased in 1911 and 1912 and increased in 1913.

By way of summary it may be said that in the six years for which statistics are available, there have been altogether *46,607 preliminary hearings and *17,056 cases held to the Grand Jury, an average for the six years of 36.6 per cent of the cases held and 63.4 per cent discharged.

Going back to the table of arrests (Table 2, p. 20) it will be remembered that only about one-tenth of those arrested last year were arrested on serious charges. Now it becomes necessary to add the further fact that, although only a small number of felony cases are brought into the Municipal Court, about two-thirds of these are discharged without ever being held to the Grand Jury.

Sec. 11. Disposition of Cases Held to the Grand Jury, 1901-1913.

The next stage in the progress towards a trial in the Criminal Court is the hearing before the Grand Jury, where the number of cases held for trial is still further reduced. The following table shows the number of cases heard by the Grand Jury each year from 1901 to 1913, and the number of "true bills" and "no bills."

TABLE 9. NUMBER OF TRUE BILLS AND NO BILLS RETURNED BY GRAND JURY OF COOK COUNTY: 1901-1913.

Year Ending	True Bills.	No Bills.	Total.**	Per Cent of True Bills.
November 30.				
1901	2,932	989	3,921	74.8
1902†	3,038	837	3,875	78.4
1903	3,596	917	4,513	79.7
1904†	3,650	1,053	4,703	77.6
1905†	3,345	827	4,172	80.2
1906†	3,469	852	4,321	80.3
1907	2,644	336	2,980	88.7
1908	3,064	405	3,469	88.3
1909	1,551	575	2,126	73.0
1910	2,144	713	2,857	75.0
1911	2,326	806	3,132	74.3
1912	1,874	783	2,657	70.5
1913	2,468	857	3,325	74.2
Total for the period.....	36,101	9,950	46,051	78.4

This table shows that during the period for which Grand Jury statistics are available—from 1901 to 1913—the percentages of true bills ranged from 70.5 per cent to 88.7 per cent of all cases heard, and averaged for the whole period 78.4 per cent. The percentage of cases discharged by the Grand Jury varied, therefore, from 11.3 per cent to 29.5 per cent of all cases heard, and averaged 21.6 per cent for the whole period. The total number of cases heard by the Grand Jury does not correspond exactly with the total number of cases held from the Municipal Court. It is not possible to say, therefore,

*The 182 cases transferred to the Juvenile Court have been excluded from these totals.

**It is assumed that the total number of cases before the Grand Jury is equal to the sum of true bills and no bills. There are, however, a few cases "passed" each month that are heard at the next session. The total for any one year, therefore, would include a few cases held over from the preceding year, and would not include a few of the cases brought in during the current year and "passed" at the last session. The "left-over" cases heard and the "passed" cases would be approximately the same. The point is, however, that the totals do not represent the precise number of cases brought before the Grand Jury during any one year.

†The figures were lacking for the months of April and September in 1902, November in 1904, February, May and October in 1905, and September in 1906. The number of cases for each of these months was estimated on the basis of the relative number of cases during the same month of the preceding year. The figures for September, 1906, however, were estimated on the basis of September, 1907, because the reports for that year were more complete.

as a result of these statistics precisely how many of the cases held by the Municipal Court in any one year "got off" after the Grand Jury hearing, but it is fair to assume that the per cent of no bills was the same for the Municipal Court cases as for the total number of cases heard. On this assumption, the total number of felony cases discharged up to this point would have increased from the 62.5 per cent for 1913 indicated in Table 8 to 72.2 per cent, from 64.5 per cent to 75.0 per cent for 1912, from 69.1 per cent to 77.0 per cent for 1911, and so on.*

Returning to the question of the per cent of discharged cases, it may be said that, in round numbers, slightly more than one-third of all the felony cases heard in the Municipal Court are held over to the Grand Jury and that about one-fourth of these "get-off" because the Grand Jury returns "no bills."

Sec. 12. Final Disposition of Felony Cases.

Even after leaving the Grand Jury there are other chances of escape from trial, by having the case "nolle prossed" or "stricken off" by the State's Attorney. Moreover, a considerable number of cases are of course discharged as "not guilty" after trial in the Criminal Court. Unfortunately, statistics showing the number of cases which are discharged in this way are available only for a single year, that ending November 30, 1912. The following table shows for that year the total number of discharges from the time of preliminary hearing to trial in the Criminal Court together with the number discharged as not guilty after trial.

TABLE 10. DISPOSITION OF ALL FELONY CASES GIVEN PRELIMINARY HEARINGS IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF CHICAGO: 1912.

Disposition.	Number.	Per cent.	
Discharged in Municipal Court.			
Defendant not apprehended....	1,051	14.3	Discharged in Municipal Court: 4,749 (64.5 per cent). Total discharged before trial: 5,959 (80.9 per cent). Total discharged: 6,199 (84.2 per cent).
Discharged: want of prosecution	501	6.8	
Discharged	1,451	19.7	
Nolle Pros	1,746	23.7	
Discharged by Grand Jury, etc.			Found guilty: 1,932. (12.7 per cent.)
"No bills" Grand Jury**.....	783	10.6	
Nolle Pros.	89	5.8	
Stricken off	338		
Discharged by Criminal Court.			
(Tried and found "not guilty")..	240	3.3	
Sentenced to imprisonment.....	773	10.5	
County Jail and House of Correction	565		
Joliet, Pontiac, etc.....	208		
Fined	25	.4	
Probation	134	1.8	
Pending and transferred and not reported	231	3.1	
Total preliminary hearings.	7,362	100.0	

*Table 9 is of further interest since it affords an interesting contrast between the work of the Grand Jury under four different State's Attorneys. During the period of 1901 to 1904, when Mr. Deneen was State's Attorney, the average number of cases heard per year was 4,253 and the average number of true bills was 77.7 per cent of all cases heard. In the four-year period, 1905-1908, when Mr. Healey was State's Attorney, the average number of cases heard per year was 3,735 and the average number of true bills was 83.8 per cent of all cases heard. During Mr. Wayman's State's Attorneyship, 1909-1912, the average number of cases heard fell to 2,693, and the average number of true bills fell also to 73.3 per cent of all cases heard. Mr. Hoyne's first year shows a total number of cases heard and a percentage of true bills which is above Mr. Wayman's average, but considerably below the average of Mr. Healey's term and slightly below the average of Mr. Deneen's term.

**These statistics were obtained from some unpublished material collected by the Clerk of Criminal Records in the Municipal Court, with the exception of the number of "no bills" from the Grand Jury. Since he had not collected

This table may be briefly summarized as follows: In 1912, 4,749 felony cases, or 64.5 per cent of the total number, were discharged in the Municipal Court; 783, or 10.6 per cent, were discharged by the Grand Jury; 427, or 5.8 per cent, were "nolle prossed" or "stricken out" before trial. That is, out of 7,362 felony cases, 5,959, or 80.9 per cent, were discharged without ever being tried, leaving 19.1 per cent for trial in the Criminal Court. That is, a man arrested for a serious crime stands only about one chance out of five of ever getting to the Criminal Court for trial. Of those tried in the Criminal Court in 1912, 240 were found not guilty and 932 were convicted, but of the convicted only 773 were sentenced, while the others were fined or released on probation. Moreover, of those sentenced only 208 were given penitentiary or reformatory sentences. That is, a criminal in Chicago who has been arrested on a felony charge and comes before the Municipal Court, stands about one chance in thirty of going to the penitentiary or reformatory.

Sec. 13. Per Cent of Convictions for Different Crimes.

The per cent of convictions is, however, much higher for some crimes than for others, and, fortunately, statistics are available for the year 1912 showing for the different crimes the number of convictions of the cases that were actually tried in the Criminal Court. Table 11 gives therefore by crimes the number of convictions in the Criminal Court, together with the number of preliminary hearings. It should be noted that in the table below the 231 pending and transferred cases have been subtracted, which raises the per cent of convictions from 12.7 per cent to 13.1 per cent.

TABLE 11. NUMBER OF PRELIMINARY HEARINGS AND CONVICTIONS IN FELONY CASES, BY CRIMES: 1912.

(Statistics from Municipal and Criminal Courts.)

Charge	* Preliminary Hearings Municipal Court.	Convictions in Criminal Court Number.	Per Cent of Preliminary Hearings.
Arson	98	2	2.0
Assault to kill	301	34	11.3
Burglary	1,125	335	29.8
Confidence game	900	85	9.4
Embezzlement	188	26	13.8
Larceny	2,203	171	7.8
Manslaughter	40	...	0.0
Murder	87	2	2.3
Rape	326	32	9.8
Robbery	987	197	19.9
Receiving stolen property.....	183	6	3.3
Other felonies	693	42	6.1
Total	7,131	932	13.1

* From this column have been subtracted 211 cases pending, 3 transferred, and 17 unaccounted for.

According to this table there was a higher per cent of convictions for burglary (29.8 per cent) than for any other crime. This is probably to be explained by the fact that many of these cases were not very serious and that a large proportion of those convicted received House of Correction sentences; for the Illinois Criminal Code gives a definition of burglary so broad that it includes almost every kind of stealing.* The crimes in which the number of convictions did not equal 5 per cent of the number of preliminary hearings were arson, murder, and receiving stolen property. Other crimes for which less than 10 per cent of convictions were secured were larceny (grand), "running a confidence game," and "rape." In the cases of "assault with intent to kill," 11.3 per cent of convictions were secured, 13.8 per cent in the cases of embezzlement, and 19.9 per cent in the cases of robbery. In the cases of robbery and burglary alone did the per cent of convictions run above the average.

the number of no bills or true bills, the number from the Grand Jury reports (see Table 9) was used, since in this year, 1912, the total number of cases heard by the Grand Jury (2,657) and the total number held by the Municipal Court (2,613) were approximately the same.

* See Appendix C.

Sec. 14. Other Statistics of Felony Convictions.

Statistics of convictions by crimes are available also for the year 1913, but these statistics are from the police report for that year, and are for several reasons not properly comparable with the Municipal Court statistics.

The following table presents a summary from the police statistics of the convictions for the various kinds of felonies, together with the number of arrests for each of these offenses, the per cent of convictions for each offense, and the percentage of convictions for the same offenses from the Municipal Court statistics for 1912. The percentages of convictions based on the two sets of statistics are thus given in parallel columns so that they may be easily compared. The statistics are, of course, not only from different sources, but for different years, and therefore the numbers are not comparable, but the percentages may be legitimately compared. Only those offenses are included that are classified as felonies in the Municipal Court reports.* Larceny is also excluded because the police statistics are for both grand and petit larceny, and since the court statistics include only grand larceny, the two are not properly comparable.

TABLE 12. CONVICTIONS AND ARRESTS FOR FELONIES (EXCEPT GRAND LARCENY): 1913.

(Statistics from Police Report, 1913, using the Municipal Court Classification of Felonies.)

Charge	Arrests	Number	Convictions	
			Per cent of Arrests	*Per cent of arrests from court statistics, 1912
†Arson	85	3	3.5	2.0
Assault to kill	246	49	19.9	11.3
‡Burglary	1,053	289	27.4	29.8
Confidence game	681	110	16.2	9.4
Embezzlement	199	29	14.6	13.8
Manslaughter	43	2	4.7	0.0
Murder	219	31	14.2 }	2.3
Murder, accessory to.....	33	1	3.0 }	
§Rape	258	16	6.2	9.8
Receiving stolen property....	451	96	21.3	3.3
Robbery	1,022	171	16.7	19.9
Threats to kidnap or murder.	68	25	36.8	**....
Other felonies	438	38	8.7	6.1
Total	4,796	860	17.9	¶15.4

*See Table 11.

**Included under other felonies.

†Includes 1 case of "attempted arson."

‡Includes 56 cases of "attempted burglary" and 12 cases of "having burglar's tools."

§Includes 54 cases of "assault to commit rape."

||Includes 7 cases of "accessory to robbery" and 180 cases of "assault to commit robbery."

¶The percentage is changed because larceny has been omitted in order to make the two columns comparable. If larceny is included in the two columns the per cent of convictions from the police columns is 32.7 per cent, from the Municipal Court column, 13.1 per cent.

*Attention has already been called to some differences between the statistics from the police reports and from the Municipal Court reports. For the year 1913, the police report gives statistics of convictions in felony cases, but there are included some offenses that are not felonies: e. g., "larceny" includes petit as well as grand larceny; "contributing to delinquency" and "pandering" are included, although neither of these last offenses is a felony. It should also be noted that statistics showing convictions by crimes are furnished only in the police report for 1913.

Unfortunately the result of preliminary hearing and the disposition of the cases on which convictions were not secured, that is, the number rejected by the Grand Jury, the number "nolle prossed," "stricken off," or tried and found not guilty, are not published.

Comparing the two columns of percentages, it appears that although the percentage of convictions according to the police statistics is slightly higher than the percentage based on the court statistics (17.9 per cent compared with 13.1 per cent), on the whole, the police statistics for 1913 confirm the court statistics for 1912 in showing a very low percentage of convictions.

The police statistics show a slightly smaller per cent of convictions than the Municipal Court statistics for three offenses, burglary, rape and robbery, and a higher percentage of convictions than the court statistics for the offenses of assault to kill, "confidence game," embezzlement, murder and receiving stolen property.

In discussing statistics of arrests and convictions on felony charges, the fact should not be overlooked that persons charged with felonies are sometimes convicted of less serious crimes. This is probably true especially of burglary and robbery. The Illinois Criminal Code gives a definition of burglary so broad that it might include almost any kind of stealing,* and convictions for larceny sometimes follow arrests for burglary. For example, two boys were brought into the "Boys' Court" recently on charges of burglary. Their actual offense was stealing a small basket of eggs from the basement of a store where they had recently worked. The charge was very properly changed to petit larceny and the boys released on probation. The police are undoubtedly very careless and indifferent in deciding upon what charge an arrested person is to be "booked." Their mistakes may be readjusted in the courts, but they are disastrous to statistical comparisons.

In the case of robbery, as in burglary, persons are arrested, and charged with robbery** by the police when they should be charged with larceny. For example, five boys, ranging in ages from eighteen to twenty-two years, were recently brought into court charged with robbery. But their actual offense had been teasing a peddler on the street and finally taking from him five small brooms valued at 75 cents. They were finally discharged upon making restitution. These five arrests may or may not have been necessary, but it was clearly wrong for the police to charge the boys with robbery, for which the minimum sentence is one year in the penitentiary, instead of charging them with disorderly conduct or at most petit larceny.

A further statistical difficulty should be noted with regard to the police statistics, and that is that the arrests and convictions may not cover precisely the same period. That is, arrests of one year may result in convictions the following year. Arrests for burglary in December would probably not be disposed of during that year. It may, of course, be assumed that the proportions will be very much the same from year to year, and that the margin of error here is not a very large one.

Sec. 15. The Significance of Unnecessary Arrests

The outstanding fact about the statistics of convictions on felony charges is that, even if large allowances be made for possible statistical errors, there will still remain a very low percentage of convictions. Police and court statistics alike show a per cent of convictions on felony cases ranging from 13.1 to 17.9 per cent of arrests for all felonies and in the case of specific crimes, from 2.0 per cent to 29.8 per cent. Back of this lie two possible explanations: (1) A large number of innocent persons are arrested and are in consequence discharged without conviction; or (2) a large number of persons who are legitimately arrested and who should be convicted are being released because of some defect in our prosecuting machinery. Whether this defect is to be attributed to the police, the courts, the Grand Jury, or the State's Attorney's office, is not within the province of this discussion.

*The Revised Statutes give the following definition of burglary: "Whoever wilfully, and maliciously and forcibly breaks and enters, or wilfully and maliciously, without force (the doors and windows being open), enters into any dwelling-house, kitchen, office, shop, store-house, etc., or other building with intent to commit murder, robbery, rape, mayhem, or other felony or larceny, shall be deemed guilty of burglary and be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a term not less than one year nor more than twenty years." *Illinois Revised Statutes*, 1909, p. 750.

**According to the Revised Statutes robbery is "the felonious and violent taking of money, goods, or other valuable thing from the person of another by force or intimidation" and the penalty is from one to ten years in the penitentiary. *Ibid*, p. 779.

REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

One important fact, however, should not be overlooked in connection with the discussion concerning the per cent of those held for felony charges who are discharged and sentenced. All of those who are held from the Municipal Court to the Grand Jury, 3,035 persons in 1913 and 2,613 in 1912, must stay in the County Jail until their case has been heard by the Grand Jury unless they are able to secure bail. If they are held by the Grand Jury for trial in the Criminal Court, they must continue to lie in jail until their case comes to trial. The report of the jailer for 1913 showed that nearly 700 persons were kept in jail for varying periods of time and then discharged without conviction as follows:

TABLE 13. PERSONS RELEASED FROM COOK COUNTY JAIL IN 1913 WITHOUT CONVICTION.

Reason for Release	Number
Released without trial—	
No bill Grand Jury.....	290
Stricken off	117
Nolle pros.....	39
	<hr/> 446
Tried and found not guilty.....	245
Total	<hr/> 691

It is certainly a fact of great importance that nearly 450 persons were held in the County Jail last year and then released either because the Grand Jury or the State's Attorney thought there was not sufficient evidence against them to justify their being tried, or because upon trial they were found not guilty, and that 250 more were released who had been tried and found "not guilty" by the Criminal Court. These 691 persons were presumably innocent and suffered the degradation and discomforts of imprisonment without cause. Even for those who are able to obtain release on bond, the burdens and humiliation of arrest, preliminary hearing, Grand Jury hearing, and in many cases Criminal Court trial are very great, and if these are due to unjust arrests, some remedy should be available.*

Sec. 16. Disposition of Criminal (Misdemeanor) Cases in the Municipal Court, 1908-1913.

So far only the disposition of felony cases has been discussed. Equally important is the question of the number of misdemeanors and of quasi-criminal cases (violations of ordinances) and the disposition of these cases. There were, in the year 1913, nearly 20,000 misdemeanor cases disposed of in the Municipal Court. The largest single group of misdemeanors were automobile offenses, and following these in order of numerical importance were the cases of assault (including "assault with a deadly weapon" and "assault and battery"), petit larceny, contributing to delinquency, abandonment, violations of the state factory law, adultery and similar offenses, obtaining money on false pretenses, vagrancy, receiving stolen property, malicious mischief and other offenses** of minor importance numerically.

The disposition of these cases in the Municipal Court from 1908 to 1913 is shown in the following table:

TABLE 14. DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASES (MISDEMEANORS) IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT: 1908-1913.

Disposition	Numbers.					
	1913	1912	1911	1910	1909	1908
Defendant not apprehended.....	849	1,731	1,376	1,275
Dismissed: want of prosecution...	1,709	1,403	762	615	2,181	6,253
Nolle pros.	1,135	2,492	2,144	1,552		
Discharged	5,616	3,748	2,616	2,381	4,284	
Total discharged	9,309	9,374	6,898	5,823	6,465	6,253

* Thousands of other persons whose cases are postponed and continued in the Municipal Court are also held in the County Jail awaiting trial, and of course a very large percentage of these persons are also discharged without conviction. The total number of innocent persons therefore who suffer imprisonment in the County Jail is much greater than the 691 shown in Table 13. Unfortunately, the jailer's report merely shows that their cases are "disposed of in the Municipal Court," and it is not possible to determine how large a percentage of them were discharged. See Appendix B for the jailer's report for the year 1913 and for further statistics relating to the County Jail.

**Appendix G contains table showing number of cases of each charge.

STATISTICS OF CRIME IN CHICAGO

83

Fined	7,808	4,439	3,355	2,310	1,380	1,990
Committed to County Jail or House of Correction	2,403	2,075	1,517	1,692	2,285	2,224
Total convicted	10,211	6,514	4,872	4,002	3,665	4,214
Total cases disposed of.....	19,520	15,888	11,770	9,825	10,130	10,467
Percentages.						
Defendant not apprehended.....	4.3	10.9	11.7	12.9
Dismissed: want of prosecution..	8.8	8.8	6.5	6.3
Nolle pros.	5.8	15.7	18.2	15.8
Discharged	28.8	23.6	22.2	24.3
Total discharged	47.7	59.0	58.6	59.3	63.8	59.7
Fined	40.0	28.0	28.5	23.5	13.6	19.0
Committed to County Jail or House of Correction.....	12.3	13.0	12.9	17.2	22.6	21.3
Total convicted	52.3	41.0	41.4	40.7	36.2	40.3
Total cases disposed of.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

This table shows that in 1913 nearly one-half, or 47.7 per cent, of all misdemeanor cases were discharged; that the 52.3 per cent convicted were divided into 40 per cent fined and only 12.3 per cent sentenced to imprisonment in the County Jail or House of Correction. Moreover, the per cent of cases discharged was lower and the per cent of cases convicted was higher than in any preceding year since the establishment of the Municipal Court, with the possible exception, of course, of the year 1907, for which statistics are not available. But when the disposition of the convicted cases is examined it appears that the increase in the number of convictions was an increase in the number fined alone, which rose from 28.0 per cent in 1912 to 40.0 per cent in 1913, a larger percentage of persons fined than had occurred in the five years preceding. As a matter of fact, the percentage committed to the County Jail and the House of Correction actually decreased. The percentage committed in 1913 was 12.3 per cent in comparison with 13.0 per cent in 1912, 12.9 per cent in 1911, 17.2 per cent in 1910, 22.6 per cent in 1909, and 21.3 per cent in 1908.

Sec. 17. Disposition of Quasi-Criminal Cases (Violations of Ordinances) in the Municipal Court, 1908-1913.

Statistics showing the disposition of quasi-criminal cases, tell much the same story regarding discharges and convictions. Quasi-criminal cases are those involving the violations of city ordinances. There were in 1913, more than 93,000 of such cases disposed of* and 60 per cent of these were cases that may be classified as "disorderly" including cases of disorderly conduct, violating park ordinances and vagrancy ("vagabonds"). The following table shows the disposition of all quasi-criminal cases from 1908 to 1913:

TABLE 15. DISPOSITION OF QUASI-CRIMINAL CASES (VIOLATIONS OF ORDINANCES) IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT: 1908-1913.

Disposition.	Numbers.					
	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.	1909.	1908.
Defendant not apprehended.....	1,789	2,631	2,707	1,970
Dismissed: want of prosecution..	4,142	3,144	2,073	1,661
Non-suits	5,340	11,186	6,505	6,290	9,749	30,846
Discharged	44,102	36,902	32,662	30,137	26,659	
Total discharged	55,373	53,863	43,947	40,058	36,408	30,846
Fined	26,278	19,567	15,957	18,323	15,179	14,795
Committed to County Jail.....	43	58	74	12,098	10,194	11,101
Committed to House of Correction	12,017	9,631	11,456			
Total convicted	38,338	29,256	27,487	30,421	25,373	25,896
Total cases disposed of.....	93,711	83,119	71,434	70,479	61,781	56,742

*Appendix H contains tables giving complete lists of all cases disposed of.

REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

Percentages.						
Defendant not apprehended.....	1.9	3.2	3.7	2.9
Dismissed: want of prosecution..	4.4	3.8	2.9	2.3
Non-suits	5.7	13.4	9.1	9.0	15.8 }	54.5
Discharged	47.1	44.5	45.7	42.7	43.1 }	
Total discharged	59.1	64.9	61.4	56.9	58.9	54.5
Fined	28.0	23.5	22.3	26.0	24.6	26.0
Committed to County Jail or House of Correction.....	12.9	11.6	16.3	17.1	16.5	19.5
Total convicted	40.9	35.1	38.6	43.1	41.1	45.5
Total cases disposed of.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

This table shows that in 1913 more than 55,000 of the quasi-criminal cases were discharged; that is, 59.1 per cent were discharged, compared with 40.9 per cent convicted. This table shows also the method of discharge and the kind of sentence imposed. Thus it appears 44,102, or 47.1 per cent, were discharged in court, and the 12.0 per cent never reached the court; of the latter, 5.7 per cent were non-suited by the City Prosecutor's office, 4.4 per cent were dismissed for want of prosecution, and 1.9 per cent of the offenders were discharged because they could not be apprehended. The 40.9 per cent convicted were divided into 28.0 per cent fined and 12.9 per cent committed to the County Jail or House of Correction, including those committed for non-payment of fines. Looking over the statistics for the series of six years, it appears that the year 1912 showed the largest per cent of discharged cases and the year 1908 the smallest per cent discharged. In comparison with the earlier years, the year 1913 shows a larger per cent of convictions than the three earlier years. The statistics indicate that the tendency is towards fining rather than imprisoning those convicted.

Sec. 18. Statistics from Reports of Police Department Relating to Disposition of Cases in the Municipal Court, 1913.

Statistics of disposition published in the annual reports of the police department show not the number of persons committed, but only the number sentenced, exclusive of those committed for non-payment of fines. These statistics show that less than 2 per cent of those arrested in 1913 were actually sentenced to imprisonment. The following table shows the total number of persons arrested last year, the number sentenced, the number fined, and the number placed on probation:

TABLE 16. DISPOSITION OF ALL CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT AS PUBLISHED IN THE REPORT OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT: 1913.

Disposition	Number	Per cent
Held to Grand Jury.....	2,182	2.0
Sentenced to County Jail	141	.1
Sentenced to House of Correction.....	*1,935	1.8
Fined	43,690	39.8
Probation, peace bonds, and weekly payments.....	2,899	2.6
Discharged	56,529	51.5
Nolle pros. and stricken off.....	2,003	1.8
Otherwise disposed of.....	385	.4
	109,764	100.0

*Includes 2 cases sentenced to other correctional institutions.

This table shows again very clearly that the machinery of our court and police system exists chiefly for the petty offender. Out of 109,764 cases, only 2,182, or 2 per cent, are serious enough to be held to the Grand Jury; 141, or one-tenth of 1 per cent, are serious enough to be sentenced to the County Jail, and 1,935, or 1.8 per cent, are serious enough to be sentenced to the House of Correction; that is, out of 109,764 cases, 56,529 are discharged, 2,076 sentenced, 2,182 held to the Grand Jury, and 43,690 fined. It will be noted that the Municipal Court statistics (Table 7) showed that 11.9 per cent of all cases disposed of were committed to the County Jail or House of Correction,

in contrast to the 1.9 per cent in Table 16 committed to these institutions. This difference is due to the fact that the Municipal Court statistics include those committed for non-payment of fine.

Sec. 19. Statistics from the Boys' Court.

The establishment in March, 1914, of a special branch court to hear cases of boys under twenty-one makes possible a separate examination of arrests and discharges of these boys' cases. Table 17 therefore presents the statistics showing the disposition of cases brought into the Boys' Court from its establishment in March, 1914, to the end of September, 1914, a period of slightly more than six months.

TABLE 17. DISPOSITION OF CASES: VIOLATIONS, MIS-DEMEANORS, FELONIES.

Disposition	Violations of city ordinances (Quasi-Criminal)		Mis- demeanors (Criminal)		Felonies (Preliminary Hearings)		Total	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Discharged	3,140	79.7	287	40.7	456	47.2	3,883	69.2
Nolle pros. or non- suit	19		1		26		46	0.8
Discharged for want of prosecution....	123	3.6	39	5.7	49	7.7	211	3.8
Total discharged	3,282	83.3	327	46.4	531	54.9	4,140	73.8
Fined	309	7.9	19	2.7	328	5.8
Committed to House of Correction or County Jail	312	7.9	182	25.9	494	8.8
Probation	36	0.9	176	25.0	212	3.8
Total convicted.	657	16.7	377	53.6	1,034	18.4
Held to Criminal Court	436	45.1	436	7.8
Total	3,939	100.0	704	100.0	967	100.0	5,610	100.0

This table shows that of the most numerous group of cases, that is, the "quasi-criminal," 3,282, or 83 per cent, were discharged; that 46 per cent of the criminal (misdemeanor) cases were discharged and nearly half of those convicted were released on probation; of the felony cases, only 45 per cent were even held to the Grand Jury.

Sec. 20. Large Percentage of Petty Offenders in the Boys' Court.

To understand why so large a percentage of the persons arrested are discharged, it is necessary to examine the precise charges on which the cases are brought into court. Fortunately, it is possible to present, for the Boys' Court,* a list of typically trivial offenses for which persons have been arrested.

For example, J— T— is arrested because he "made a loud noise at 21st and Dearborn and threw a dog out in the street by the leg." H— S— is arrested for "standing on street corner at 8:50 p. m." A— D— for sleeping in a barn, and F— W— for sleeping on the prairie because he had just got a job and had no other place to go that night. S— T—, first offender, seventeen years, "found in poolroom, under age to be allowed there, first time even in this poolroom, no evidence of gambling, several boys arrested." D— S—, nineteen years, "playing cards in a vacant store, several boys arrested and discharged." E— H— "did not move when officer spoke; going into dance hall 1 a. m., no evidence of disorder." E— S— "was with a man who had a stolen bicycle." M— S— "with sixteen boys over eighteen years, in poolroom raid; only one gambling; others orderly and of good character." E— E— "playing ball on street." G— S— "with two men sleeping in wagon at 2 a. m. at Liberty and Halsted streets;" all arrested. A— F— "sleeping in barn."

* See an article by Miss Evelina Belden on the Boys' Court of Chicago, with statistics covering the first six months of the court's work; to be published in the *American Journal of Sociology*, May, 1915. The material for Table 17 was kindly furnished by Miss Belden.

C— T— “flipping trains into town.” W— G— “singing in Lincoln Park at the High Bridge.” A— U—, “girl said some remarks were made to her on street by defendant; defendant cannot speak English nor she his language.” G— K— “fight in saloon at Wells and Fugel streets; defendant had a lemon squeezer.” G— H— “1:45 a. m., Western avenue, coming home from a party.” A— D— “5 a. m. refused to move on ‘quickly.’” O— M—, son and father arrested together, “driving a horse which ran away in their possession.” A— F— “complainant says defendant throws a dog over the fence.” L— J— “in crowd near fight.” M— K— “fighting with man who refused to leave the hallway where defendant was working.” H— U— “in freight yards of railroad.” F— W— “sleeping outside Polk Street Depot.” F— L— “2:15 a. m. on street at 44th and Montrose,” three boys arrested.

Sometimes the same boy is arrested and rearrested on trivial charges several times within a few months. The following cases are those of typical “repeaters”:

S— E—, nineteen years, “no license, father had applied for license”; five times in Boys’ Court. L— S— “4:30 a. m. on street,” has been arrested for disorderly conduct numerous times before and since. E— N— “ran away from home; not working”; arrested three times for similar offenses. J— G— “drinking beer on prairie on way from party,” arrested following month for similar offense. J— L— “sleeping in barn”; two weeks later, “rushing the can with a crowd.” J— B— “two boys sleeping in hallway,” both boys arrested again within a few weeks for similar offense and discharged.

Sec. 21. The Waste of Needless Arrests.

Judges are not going to sentence or even fine people for trivial offenses, and the question must surely be raised as to whether the costly machinery of the courts, police and jails were devised and are to be supported by the taxpayers for the purpose of dealing with petty offenders. The expense of this machinery in Chicago and Cook County is, in round numbers, something like eight millions of dollars a year.* It is certainly large enough to demand some analysis of the relation between cost and results.

By way of summary it might be repeated with regard to the statistics of arrests and “cases disposed of” that all available statistics show that more than 50 per cent of all the persons arrested and tried are discharged, and for the more serious crimes the percentage discharged runs very much higher. Following the assumption that those discharged are innocent, or at most are guilty of such small offenses that no penalty can be imposed, then more than half of all the 121,333 persons† who were brought into the Municipal Court for felonies, for misdemeanors, or for violations of ordinances should not have been brought into court at all; that is, that more than 60,000 persons were brought into court needlessly. Most of these persons had been arrested, many thousands of them had spent twenty-four hours at least in the police stations,‡ many hundreds had spent weeks or months in the County Jail.§ They had had all the humiliation of being arrested and tried, and the taxpayers had borne the cost of the police who arrested them, of the police stations or jail that had detained them, of the courts and judges and other court officials who had been part of the machinery that tried them. There is more than this to be considered. Unjustified arrests and imprisonment create a disrespect for the law that in turn breeds lawlessness.

*This estimate is based on the Comptroller’s report for 1913, which showed the following expenditures: For Police Department, \$6,622,654.90; for County Jail, Criminal Court, etc., \$959,080.51; for the criminal branches of the Municipal Court, \$346,714.67; for the City Prosecutor’s Office, \$54,169.40; for the House of Correction, \$226,668.29. Total, \$8,209,287.77.

†In 1913, 8,102 felony cases, 19,520 misdemeanors, and 93,711 violations (quasi-criminal) were disposed of; a total of 121,333.

‡It is unfortunately not possible to ascertain precisely how many arrested persons were held over night in the various police stations. But statistics have been obtained showing that 47,862 bail-bonds were accepted by the judges of the Municipal Court during the year 1913. The number granted each month was as follows: January, 3,793; February, 3,801; March, 3,761; April, 3,644; May, 3,467; June, 3,648; July, 4,147; August, 4,522; September, 4,508; October, 4,058; November, 4,502; December, 4,011; total, 47,862.

§See Appendix B of this report.

Sec. 22. Imprisonment for Non-Payment of Fines.

The report of the Department of Police for 1913 shows 1,933 persons sentenced to the House of Correction, and the report of the Municipal Court shows 14,274 persons sentenced during the same year to the same institution. The difference between these two numbers is undoubtedly due to the fact that the number given in the Municipal Court report includes those committed for the non-payment of fine in addition to those who were sentenced as a penalty for the offenses they had committed.* Statistics from the House of Correction confirm the fact that the great majority of the persons committed there are committed for the non-payment of fines.

The following table, which has been compiled from statistics furnished by the Superintendent of the House of Correction, shows the number of persons committed to that institution from 1910 to 1913 and the reason for commitment; i. e., how many and what per cent of those committed were sentenced, committed for non-payment of fines, or both.

TABLE 18. COMMITMENTS TO HOUSE OF CORRECTION: 1910-1913.

Order.	Numbers.			
	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.
Sentenced	895	857	1,097	910
Committed for non-payment of fines..	12,124	9,317	10,987	11,111
Fined and sentenced.....	1,690	1,108	715	707
Total	14,709	11,282	12,799	12,728
Order	Percentages.			
	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.
Sentenced	6.1	7.6	8.6	7.1
Committed for non-payment of fines..	82.4	82.6	85.8	87.3
Fined and sentenced.....	11.5	9.8	5.6	5.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

This table shows that in the year 1913 there were 14,709 persons committed to the House of Correction, but only a very small proportion of these fourteen thousand men and women were committed because they had been sentenced to imprisonment. There were 12,124 persons, or 82.4 per cent of the total number committed, who were sent to the House of Correction solely because of the non-payment of fines. The percentage of commitments for the non-payment of fines was much the same in the three preceding years. In 1910, 87.3 per cent of all persons committed; in 1911, 85.8 per cent; and in 1912, 82.6 per cent were committed for non-payment of fines. During these years the percentage sentenced has slightly decreased, and the percentage of persons who were both fined and sentenced has slightly increased. It should be noted that there were in 1913, 1,690 persons who were both sentenced and fined. The terms of many of these prisoners are extended after sentence of imprisonment has been served because they cannot pay fines. The total number of persons, therefore, whose "board and keep" are being paid by the taxpayers because of non-payment of fines is considerably more than the 12,124 persons who were committed only for this purpose.

It has already been said that most of the commitments for non-payment of fines were for small fines. The following table shows the number of persons committed for fines of specified amounts in the years 1910-1913.

TABLE 19. NUMBER OF PERSONS COMMITTED FOR NON-PAYMENT OF FINES OF SPECIFIED AMOUNTS: 1910-1913.

	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.
Less than \$5.....	622	257	484	373
\$5 and less than \$10.....	1,476	981	1,398	2,050
\$10 and less than \$15.....	2,375	1,796	1,905	2,570
\$15 and less than \$20.....	2,305	1,900	2,309	2,287
\$20 and less than \$30.....	616	746	816	745
\$30 and less than \$40.....	2,050	1,694	1,931	1,555
\$40 and less than \$50.....	67	110	118	176

*The numbers given are from p. 14, Annual Report of the Department of Police, 1913, and from p. 129, Annual Report of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1913. It should be noted that the former report is from the year ending December 30, 1913, and the latter for the year ending November 30, 1913, so that they do not cover exactly the same period.

REPORT OF CRIME COMMITTEE

	1913.	1912.	1911.	1910.
\$50 and less than \$100.....	1,346	965	1,238	902
\$100 or more.....	1,267	868	788	453
Total	12,124	9,317	10,987	11,111

According to this table in 1913, 4,473 persons, or more than one-third of those committed for non-payment of fines were committed because they were unable to pay fines of less than \$15; 2,305 more could not pay fines ranging from \$15 to \$20, so that more than one-half of all the 12,124 persons committed for non-payment of fines were serving terms at the House of Correction because they could not pay fines of less than \$20. Fines are "laid out" at the rate of 50 cents per day, and these fines are, therefore, paid in two ways: (1) by the taxpayers, for the expense of maintenance at the Bridewell is 46.2 cents per man per day and the total cost of maintenance in 1913 was \$290,814.78;* and (2) by the men and their families in privation and deep humiliation. Many states and cities are now substituting the more enlightened system of payment of fines in installments, under probation, with very satisfactory results. The old theory was, of course, that fines were "worked out" in prison, but the recent report of the Civil Service Commission on **Prison Labor and Management House of Correction** shows how far, in practice, we have departed from that theory.

The following tables show the terms for which prisoners were sentenced when they were sentenced only and not fined, and the terms when both sentenced and fined.

TABLE 20. TERMS OF THOSE COMMITTED TO SERVE SENTENCES IN THE HOUSE OF CORRECTION. (NOT INCLUDING THOSE SENTENCED AND FINED): 1913.

Term.	Number.
Less than 10 days.....	8
10 days and less than 1 month.....	14
1 and less than 2 months.....	60
2 and less than 3 months.....	47
3 and less than 4 months.....	60
4 and less than 5 months.....	18
5 and less than 6 months.....	4
6 and less than 7 months.....	469
7 and less than 8 months.....	...
8 and less than 9 months.....	8
9 and less than 10 months.....	10
10 and less than 11 months.....	5
11 months to 1 year (inclusive).....	192
Total	895

TABLE 21. TERMS OF THOSE COMMITTED TO SERVE SENTENCES IN THE HOUSE OF CORRECTION IN ADDITION TO PAYING FINES: 1913.

Term.	Number.
Less than 10 days.....	281
10 days and less than 1 month.....	149
1 and less than 2 months.....	346
2 and less than 3 months.....	116
3 and less than 4 months.....	208
4 and less than 5 months.....	28
5 and less than 6 months.....	6
6 and less than 7 months.....	260
7 and less than 8 months.....	6
8 and less than 9 months.....	5
9 and less than 10 months.....	31
10 and less than 11 months.....	13
11 months and over.....	241
Total	1,690

*This is not the net cost, because the labor of prisoners earned \$64,190.51 in the contract industries. The net cost was, therefore, \$226,624.27 or 36.05 cents per man per day. See Report by the Civil Service Commission, City of Chicago, 1914, on **Prison Labor and Management House of Correction**, pp. 15-16; and p. 60.

All those committed, however, do not pay off their whole fine by imprisonment, and some of those sentenced do not serve out the whole of their terms. The following table shows how the prisoners convicted from 1908-1913 obtained their release.

TABLE 22. METHOD OF RELEASE OF PRISONERS COMMITTED TO HOUSE OF CORRECTION: 1908-1913.

How Released.	1908.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	1913.
Expiration of sentence.....	8,156	7,940	8,280	7,934	7,045	8,584
Paid fine to House of Correction....	2,224	2,540	2,760	2,632	2,570	3,172
Pardoned by Mayor.....	1,145	852	904	720	443	523
Pardoned by Governor.....	4	2	4	3	1	6
Pardoned by President of the U. S..	2
Paroled by U. S. Board of Parole....	1
Court Orders	725	750	844	1,102	1,280	1,781
Order Other Municipal Authorities..	17	13	34	43	44	65
Transferred Detention Hospital, etc..	26	35	30	49	42	69
Deaths	34	43	50	48	51	46
Escapes	2	4	7	1	4	6

Total	12,333	12,181	12,913	12,533	11,480	14,252
Circuit Court (Juvenile Branch).....	456	347	343

Total 12,789 12,528 13,256 12,533 11,480 14,252

According to this table, 3,172 of the prisoners who were convicted in 1913 because they could not pay their fine, managed in some way to get enough money to pay some part of it at least. Five hundred and twenty-three, or 3.7 per cent, were released by Mayor's pardons, but the statistics do not show how many of those pardoned were sentenced and how many were merely serving out fines.

To summarize: There were 14,709 persons committed to the House of Correction in 1913. Only 2,585, or 17.6 per cent of this number, were committed because they had been sentenced to imprisonment, and of this 2,585 who were sentenced, 2,074, or 80.2 per cent, were sentenced for short terms varying from one day to six months. Of all the 14,709 persons committed only 511 had committed offenses serious enough to earn them a prison term of as long a period as seven months. The great majority, more than 80 per cent of these 14,709 persons who were committed were not imprisoned because of their offenses but because of their poverty. That is, 12,124 of the 14,709 men and women in the House of Correction were there only because they were too poor to pay the small fines assessed against them.

Sec. 23. Habitual Criminals.

The publication of statistics showing the number of previous convictions of those who were adjudged guilty is a matter of great importance. It is necessary that the judge should know before passing sentence on a prisoner exactly what the man's record has been. Statistics showing the proportion of convicted criminals who have been convicted before have long been available in the official statistics of England, France and Germany. Very recently New York has inaugurated a most admirable system of finger printing, which is used at present for all persons convicted of certain offenses. The person is finger-printed immediately after conviction, his finger print can be quickly identified, and his record is placed before the judge who is then able to pronounce sentence intelligently on the basis of the man's actual record.*

*See the Annual Report of the Board of City Magistrates of the City of New York (First Division), 1913; the report of the Chief Magistrate says: "The right to finger-print defendants after conviction, in such cases as the Board of Magistrates may determine upon, was put in force early in the year and is now in successful operation. * * * Under a resolution of the Board, we first began with those convicted of intoxication, which resulted in a very short time in detecting repeated offenders, men and women, as chronic drunkards. These prints will be invaluable when the Inebriate Home, which the city is about to construct, is completed. * * * Later the Board extended the system to those convicted of "jostling" (professional pickpockets), "mashers" (insulters of women) and "rowdies." (Pp. 30-35. See also pp. 61-62.)

For Chicago no statistics are available either in the police or court reports showing the previous convictions or sentences of those arrested and sentenced. No records are kept anywhere from which such statistics can be compiled. The Department of Police maintains a Bureau of Identification with a system of photographing and finger-printing, but it is largely a matter of chance as to who is photographed and as to whether the record of a criminal is asked for before he is sentenced, the judge relying largely on the statement of the prisoner and the memory of the officer.* In general, all persons who are held to the Grand Jury and are **not released on bail** are taken to the Bureau, photographed and finger-printed. This seems a very unfair

*The recent reports of the Department of Police publish statistics from the Bureau of Identification with little or no comment or explanations. In one of the earlier reports (1907), however, there is the following statement in the report on the Bureau of Identification made by Captain Evans, its superintendent: "Many of our Municipal Judges desire records of persons brought before them, and during the past year I have supplied a large number of such records to our Judges. In fact, some of the Judges send prisoners to the Bureau to find out if they have criminal records, before passing sentence; and they show excellent judgement in the subjects selected, as in the majority of cases, upon being checked up, it is found that they have previously passed through the Bureau on criminal charges. All subjects are measured and checked up by the Bertillon system, and also the Finger Print system, to ascertain if they have previously passed through this Bureau or other similar Bureaus throughout this country and Europe. If there is no record found against them, then, from a police standpoint, it is a recommendation of good character; but we find a great many of such suspects are ex-convicts and ex-reformatories, wanted for violation of parole in this and other states or wanted for forfeiting their bonds in Chicago, or elsewhere. All such persons are held by us to be returned where they are wanted; this also includes the professional thieves arrested and photographed in other cities or penitentiaries. The fact that out of 1,660 suspects brought to this Bureau, 655 of them, or over 39 per cent, were identified, shows conclusively that this system should be followed up. Some of our stations are very efficient in doing so, while others are not. While the identification of persons arrested may mean little or nothing to the average citizen, to the experienced officer it means a great deal. In the majority of cases where said identifications show the persons to have a previous criminal record, it means the breaking down of the prisoner; this is followed by a confession which ultimately means the recovery of stolen property, information in regard to other thieves, and best of all, the location of 'Fences,' where stolen property is disposed of, and which are schools for the education of young criminals."

In the 1909 report, there is further explanation of the work of the Bureau by Captain Evans: "In relation to photographing persons brought to the Bureau, I regret to state that comments have recently been made by officials and others, that photographs have been taken of persons who have been simply charged and found guilty of violating City Ordinances. This is not so, unless we are sure that the persons had previous criminal record here or elsewhere. A very large number of people and some officials believe that all persons brought to this Bureau are photographed. The following statement shows conclusively that this is not so: For instance, out of the 8,282 brought to the Bureau last year, only 3,175 were photographed. In regard to suspects, these are persons brought to the Bureau to be checked up to see if they had previous criminal records here or elsewhere; these persons are never photographed unless we find that they had a previous criminal record, and among this class are the persons who are fined \$50.00 or more by the Municipal Courts and by general order are brought to the Bureau to be checked up to see if they have previous criminal records. I am pleased to state that the number of suspects brought to the Bureau during the past year, and the following results shown in connection with them, is very creditable to the Department. Of the 3,258 suspects brought to the Bureau, 1,397 were identified as having previously been here or had records elsewhere, and as I stated in my last annual report, there is no class of work performed by the Department which tends to keep professional criminals away from our city as this does, especially those wanted for violation of parole, forfeiture of bond, etc."

and illogical arrangement. If there is a reason for photographing a man before he is tried and while he is still only a suspect, the reason should apply equally to those in jail and on bail. A practice of finger-printing and photographing only the men and women who cannot afford bail seems hard to justify.

Last year (1913), 3,272 persons, including 157 women, were photographed and 2,383, including 136 women, were finger-printed. There were, however, 7,476 persons (7,222 men and 254 women) taken to the bureau during that year. Of these, 3,460 were "suspects" and the others were those brought to be registered. The following table shows the previous records of 2,575 men and women who had "criminal records."

TABLE 23. NUMBER BROUGHT TO THE BUREAU OF IDENTIFICATION WHO HAD CRIMINAL RECORDS IN THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

Record in Joliet	540
Record in Pontiac	288
Record in County Jail	116
Record in House of Correction.....	1,041
"Local identification"*	590
Total	2,575

This table is not very valuable since it does not tell us why these 2,575 persons were brought to the Bureau of Identification. Were they "suspects" only or were they being held for some new crime? If the latter, what was done with them?

The following table shows the total number of persons brought to the bureau.

TABLE 24. NUMBER OF PERSONS BROUGHT TO THE BUREAU OF IDENTIFICATION.

Brought to the Bureau.....	7,476
N. G. cases*.....	744
Photographs taken	3,272
Finger-prints taken	2,383
Number identified	3,874

A table is given showing the disposition of the cases that passed through the bureau as follows:

TABLE 25. DISPOSITION OF CASES WHICH PASSED THROUGH THE BUREAU.

Guilty	1,862
Not guilty	1,001
Nolle pros.	131
Stricken off	288
Own recognizances	56
No bills	532
Pending	146
Total criminal cases.....	4,016
"Suspects"	3,460
Total	7,476

This table is not very enlightening. It does not show us whether those found guilty were those who were found to have had previous records; or were they the first offenders and were those who "got off" the habituals?

It seems clear, however, that such system as exists of photographing and finger-printing is primarily, if not exclusively, for those arrested on felony charges. No records are kept of the number of times those guilty of misdemeanors or violations reappear and are resented or let off, as the case may be. Some interesting statistics are kept, however, at the House of Correction. There an attempt is made to ascertain from those committed the number of previous commitments. The following table shows the number of first offenders and habitual offenders in 1913.

*These terms "Local identification" and "N. G. cases" are used in the tables in the police report without explanation. The latter seems to mean "unidentified."

TABLE 26. NUMBER OF TIMES PERSONS OVER 16 YEARS OF AGE ADMIT HAVING BEEN COMMITTED TO THE HOUSE OF CORRECTION: 1913.

Number of Times.	Men.	Women.
1 time.....	7,815	679
2 times.....	2,557	254
3 times.....	1,106	126
4 times.....	539	88
5 times.....	308	72
6 times.....	178	52
7 times.....	225	51
8 times.....	87	20
9 times.....	73	26
10 and less than 12 times.....	81	44
12 and less than 15 times.....	96	46
15 and less than 20 times.....	36	29
20 and less than 30 times.....	34	47
30 and less than 50 times.....	4	16
50 and less than 70 times.....	12
70 and less than 100 times.....	1
100 times and over *.....	2	5
Total	13,141	1,568

*One man and five women said they had been there 101 times or more, and one man said this was his 301st time.

Sec. 24. General Summary.

To summarize the statistical material relating to arrest and trial, the following points should, perhaps, be emphasized:

1. A very small percentage of the large number of persons arrested are charged with serious offenses. Last year, the number of arrests (charges) all came to the large total of 109,764, but only 11,203 of these were felony charges, even according to the police classification, which includes some offenses, e. g., petit larceny and "contributing to delinquency," that are not felonies. That is, according to the police classification only about 10 per cent of all offenses were felony charges. The Municipal Court statistics show even a smaller percentage of serious offenses. Out of 121,333 cases disposed of in the criminal branches, including all preliminary hearings, criminal and quasi-criminal cases only 8,102, or 7 per cent, were preliminary hearings on felony charges. The vast majority of persons arrested and the vast majority of persons tried in the criminal branches of our Municipal Court are petty offenders.

2. The next point of importance is the fact that the majority of the thousands of persons who are brought into our courts are discharged without conviction. The statistics of the criminal branches of the Municipal Court show that out of the 121,333 cases disposed of in 1913, 57.5 per cent were discharged and that for the more serious crimes the percentage of discharges was very much higher. More than 60 per cent of all felony cases were discharged on preliminary hearings alone and many others were discharged by the Grand Jury and by the Criminal Court without conviction. In 1912, the only year for which statistics of final disposition in the Criminal Court were available, the number of convictions was only 13 per cent of the number of preliminary hearings, making a total of 87 per cent of discharged felony cases.

The hardships and waste of this system are obvious. Following the assumption that those discharged are innocent, then 57 per cent of all the 121,333 persons who were brought into the Municipal Court for felonies, for misdemeanors, or for violations of ordinances were innocent and should not have been brought into court at all; that is, more than 60,000 persons were brought into court needlessly. Nearly all of these persons had been arrested, many thousands of them had spent hours at least in the police stations, many hundreds had spent weeks or months in the County Jail. They had all had the humiliation and expense of being arrested and tried, and the taxpayers had borne the cost of the police who arrested them, of the police stations or jails that had detained them, of the courts and judges and other court officials who

*In 1913, 8,102 felony cases, 19,520 misdemeanors and 93,711 violations (quasi-criminal) were disposed of; a total of 121,333.

had been part of the machinery that tried them. There is more than this to be considered. Unjustified arrests and imprisonment create a disrespect for the law that in turn breeds lawlessness.

In New York, a marked decrease in the number of unnecessary arrests has been brought about by the increased use of the "summons" in the last few years. The last report (1913) of the Board of City Magistrates of New York publishes statistics showing that the percentage convicted or held has increased from 54.5 per cent in 1910 to 72.8 per cent in 1913. In Chicago the percentage convicted or held was 42.4 per cent in 1910 and 42.5 per cent in 1913. In the New York Magistrates' report the following statement is made with regard to the results of the new system: "The use of the summons was very widely extended by the Inferior Courts Act in 1910 in order to avoid taking citizens needlessly into custody * * * in former years about half of those arrested, were adjudged not guilty, and were, therefore, discharged. Since 1910 the percentage discharged has much decreased, indicating great diminution in the number of needless arrests."*

3. The next point of interest is that the percentage of those sentenced to imprisonment is about 3 per cent of the total number charged. This again emphasizes the fact that the machinery of courts and police are maintained largely for those who are discharged as innocent or for those whose offenses are not serious enough to deserve more than a fine. Out of 109,711 persons arrested in 1913, only 141 were sentenced to the County Jail, 1,935 were sentenced to the House of Correction and 2,182 were held to the Grand Jury, altogether 3 per cent of the total, and of those held to the Grand Jury (2.0 per cent) the proportion given prison sentences is about one-half. It seems beyond question, therefore, that not more than three out of every hundred cases brought before the Municipal Courts by the police department are considered serious enough to be given sentences of imprisonment.

4. Another important and closely related point is the fact that more than 80 per cent of the persons committed to the House of Correction are there for the non-payment of fines. The Municipal Court statistics show that although only about two thousand persons were sentenced to imprisonment, more than twelve thousand others were committed to the House of Correction for the non-payment of fines. The statistics furnished by the House of Correction show that 82.4 per cent of the persons committed in 1913 were committed only for the non-payment of fines. In 1912, 82.6 per cent were committed for the non-payment of fines; in 1911, 85.8 per cent and in 1910, 87.3 per cent were committed for this reason.

That this system which virtually sends men to jail because of their poverty is not only unjust but demoralizing to the individual and costly to the state is now becoming widely recognized. In many places the more enlightened system has been adopted of suspending sentence and sending the man back to his family and his "job," and allowing him to pay back his fine in small installments. This installment-fine system was adopted in Massachusetts in 1909, and has been more widely used each year in that state. It is also used at the present time in New York, in Indianapolis, in Kansas City and in Cleveland. Chicago would not be making a hazardous experiment if she released the 85 per cent of offenders in the House of Correction who are

*See discussion of "The Summons" and "Needless Arrests," **Annual Report of the Board of City Magistrates of the City of New York (First Division)**, 1913, p. 97. The Report of New York Criminal Courts Committee contains the following paragraph regarding the success of the new system: "The use of the summons, which has proved so beneficial in practice, has been extended by providing that the summons may be used in cases of violations of the Sanitary Code or failure to observe regulations of the various City Departments, thus permitting such cases as spitting on the sidewalk and smoking in the subway to be brought to court by summons and not subject offenders, who in such case generally err through thoughtlessness or ignorance, to the ignominy of arrest."

there for the non-payment of fines to go back to work under the supervision of probation officers.*

5. This summary is not complete without noting the fact that there are no available statistics either in the police reports or the Municipal Court reports showing the number of previous convictions of persons sentenced. If the work of the courts and penal institutions is for the reformation rather than the punishment of those arrested and convicted, it is of the first importance that the first offenders be distinguished from the habitual criminal. The official reports of England, France and Germany furnish statistics showing the number of habitual criminals among those convicted, and, more recently, New York has taken a step in advance of Chicago by inaugurating an excellent system of finger-printing all convicted persons of certain classes and placing the record of each person before the judge in order that sentence may be pronounced that is in some measure likely to be the treatment needed and merited.

6. In conclusion, the importance of collecting and publishing adequate statistics relating to crime in a great city like Chicago may be emphasized. In this part of the report, it has been pointed out, for example, that there are no published statistics available for Chicago showing the number of "crimes known to the police," the number of habitual offenders, the number of persons discharged by the Grand Jury and the Criminal Court, the number of discharged persons who have not only been arrested and tried but who have been imprisoned one or more days in a police station or for a longer

*This system has been recommended by the Chief Probation Officer of the Adult Probation Office of Cook County in his two annual reports. In Massachusetts during the year 1913, \$49,304.09 of fines imposed was collected by probation officers from persons on probation. The last report of the New York State Probation Association contains the following statement regarding the practice of collecting fines in installments from persons on probation in that state: "Never was there a wider recognition than at present of the injustice and social short-sightedness of the prevailing fine system, whereby defendants unable to pay their fines in full at the time of conviction are ordinarily obliged to suffer imprisonment at the rate (in this State) of one day for each unpaid dollar of the fine. As has repeatedly been pointed out, this equivalent to imprisonment for debt, and the persons thereby made to suffer the most are often the innocent wives and children.

"Although the actual amount of the fines reported above as collected by probation officers in installments from persons permitted to earn and pay their fines while on probation looks small, it is very gratifying (in view of the humanitarian benefits of this means of collecting fines) to know that the collections nearly doubled during the past year. In cases where the requiring of large installments would inflict hardship upon the probationer or his family, the court usually allows the installments to be small, often not more than fifty or twenty-five cents a week, or even less. While the ordinary fine system may be said to place a price upon the commission of offenses, the collection of fines from probationers, in installments has as its object, in most cases, not so much the enacting of a money penalty as the exerting of a disciplinary and reformatory influence." **Sixth Annual Report of the New York State Probation Commission (1912)**, pp. 27-28, "Installment Fines."

In the Municipal Court of Kansas City, the system of installment fines was instituted in 1912 and the last (1913) report of the Court says: "The installment fine plan has continued to work out in the manner described in the last report. It is no longer in an experimental stage and has become a permanent institution in the work of this Court. * * * Up to this date, of all those who have been given the chance to pay in installments only 2 per cent have come back on second offenses, while at least 25 per cent of all those brought into court are "repeaters." **Annual Report of Division No. 2 of the Municipal Court of Kansas City, Missouri, 1913.**

In the City Court of Indianapolis, the system of installment fines was established in 1910, and the last (1912) report of the Court reported that "The payment of money fines on installments is a most important feature of the work of the Court. * * * During the 36 months that this plan has been in operation these probationers have paid into the Court the sum of \$27,410.00." Out of 1,211 persons placed on probation in 1912, 69 had failed to keep their agreement with the Court and had been ordered re-arrested.

period in the County Jail, the length of term of persons sentenced, the amount of fine assessed*—to mention only some of the most significant omissions in our Chicago crime statistics.†

Chicago has been making satisfactory progress towards the proper collection of vital statistics. We are included in the "registration area" for mortality statistics under the supervision of the Federal Census Bureau, and there is reason to hope that before the close of the next session of the Legislature we shall become part of the federal birth-registration area. It is to be hoped that progress will also be made towards the proper collection of statistics of crime, so that when the federal census is ready to do for criminal statistics what it has done for vital statistics we shall be prepared to co-operate without delay.

Criminal statistics show us where we are going in the treatment of persons convicted and accused of crime. Lives are really destroyed, not only by death but whenever the efficiency of men or women is so impaired that they are thrown on the human scrap-heap. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that the importance to human welfare of a careful examination by the community of its statistics of crime is scarcely less than the study of statistics of mortality and morbidity. It is hardly necessary to point out the importance of knowing the number and the percentage of needless and unjust arrests, and arrests for trifling offenses, the number and the percentage of persons imprisoned for the non-payment of fines, the prevalence of small fines and short sentences. The arrest in a single year of 110,000 persons in a city with an adult population of about a million and a half persons is a matter of grave importance, and it is the duty of the community to inquire why these persons were arrested, and what has been done with them and for them.

*Statistics are always given showing the total number of persons fined and total amount of fines assessed, but what is wanted, of course, is not the "average fine," which can be computed from these data, but a table showing the number of persons assessed fines of varying amounts.

†See the report of John Koren, chairman of the Committee on Statistics, American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, in the *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. II: 569 (Nov., 1911), for a list of items relating to the judicial process on which it is suggested statistics should be furnished by the courts.