

Fall 1926

## Report on a Minor Survey of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, Connecticut

Florence L. C. Kitchelt

Tierra Farrow

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Florence L. C. Kitchelt, Tierra Farrow, Report on a Minor Survey of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, Connecticut, 17 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 375 (1926-1927)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

REPORT ON A MINOR SURVEY OF THE ADMINISTRATION  
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN HARTFORD, NEW HAVEN  
AND BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

---

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT<sup>1</sup> AND TIERRA FARROW<sup>2</sup>

---

THE COST OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The administration of criminal justice operates through the extended machinery of the Courts, the Police Departments, and the Penal Institutions. Therefore, the data of city, county and state departments and institutions have to be studied to obtain the criminal costs for each of the cities with which we are concerned in this report.

The subject matter of this section falls under the following heads:

I.

A—Courts.

1. City courts, with officials' paid by the cities.
2. State courts, with officials paid by the state.
3. State courts, with officials paid by the counties.

B—Police.

1. City police, paid by the cities.
2. State police, paid by the state.

C—Penal Institutions.

1. City lockups used and paid for by the cities.
2. County jails used largely by the cities and financed by the counties.
3. State institutions used by the cities and financed by the state.

II.

*Fiscal Years*

The state fiscal year begins July 1st.  
The county fiscal year begins October 1st.  
The Bridgeport City fiscal year begins April 1st.  
The Hartford City fiscal year begins April 1st.  
The New Haven City fiscal year begins January 1st.

---

<sup>1</sup>Executive Secretary of the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, New Haven, Conn.

<sup>2</sup>Attorney at Law, Omaha, Neb.

## III.

*Problem and Methods of Solution*

1. To obtain costs for a fiscal year, and for 1923, costs were taken from the last fiscal years for which figures were available falling wholly or partly within 1923.

2. To find the desired city costs, the state and county costs were reduced to city costs on a proportional basis, explained in notations accompanying the tables.

At best, these tables give only an approximation of the real cost of crime. We have not included investment in public buildings and their upkeep, insurance costs, etc. The cost to the community through the loss of the services of offenders incarcerated and other similar social losses cannot be computed.

COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN HARTFORD, NEW HAVEN AND BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

## INTRODUCTION

The population of the city of Hartford is 138,036; of the County of Hartford, 336,027; of the city of New Haven, 162,537; of the County of New Haven, 415,214; of the city of Bridgeport, 143,555; of the County of Fairfield, 320,936; of the State of Connecticut, 1,380,631. (1920 Census.)

Hartford's population is 10% of the State, and 42% of the County. The County's population is 24 1/3% of that of the State. New Haven's population is 11.8% of the State, and 39% of the County. The County's population is 30% of that of the State. Bridgeport's population is 10.4% of the State and 44.7% of the County. The County's population is 25.2% of that of the State.

The above data have been made use of at many points in the following tables to determine the proportion of a total cost, which is fairly chargeable to the cities that we have under consideration, respectively. For example, the jail is used by both the city and the county and we require a method of dividing the costs of the institution between the two jurisdictions.

Table I, relating to the costs of criminal administration, is divided into four sections.

## Section I, The Courts:

- A. The Police Court is a municipal court, entirely separate in personnel from the City Court which has civil jurisdiction only. The Judges of the Police Court are paid by the city, but appointed by the General Assembly. (Constitution, Article Fifth.)
- B. The Court of Common Pleas is a state-county court, sitting in five of the eight counties, including Hartford (Sec. 5443, Gen.

Statutes), with civil jurisdiction in all, but with criminal jurisdiction only in three, not including Hartford. (Gen. St. Sec. 6568.)

- C. The Superior Court is a state court, sitting in each county, with both civil and criminal jurisdiction. (Gen. St. Chap. 288.)

Section II, the City Police Department.

Section III, Penal Institutions.

- A. The County Jail is used by all the towns of the county (Gen. Stat. Chap. 101; Sec. 1962 in regard to county sheriff).
- B. The Connecticut State Reformatory for young men. (Gen. St. Chap. 93.)
- C. The State Prison (Gen. Statutes, Chap. 100).
- D. The Connecticut Prison Association is a private incorporated body, subsidized by the State, with duties in regard to insane convicts, securing employment for paroled prisoners, and supervising probation officers. (Gen. St. Sections 158, 1945 and 6674.)

Section IV.

In this tabulation are included all extra state criminal costs found in the State Comptroller's Report for 1923.

Table I, Sec. I, A  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT (F. L. C. K.)

COST OF POLICE COURT<sup>1</sup>

Two judges @ \$3,000.....	\$ 6,000.00
Two prosecuting attorneys at \$3,000.....	6,000.00
Clerk .....	2,500.00
Messenger .....	900.00
Assistant Clerk @ \$400.....	301.40
Expenses <sup>2</sup> witness fees and "per order of the court," including medical and psychiatric services.....	18,381.22
One probation officer.....	2,190.00
Two assistants (one wholly clerical) each @ \$1,460.....	2,920.00
Approximate expenses, one-fourth of \$1,272.74 <sup>3</sup> .....	318.19
	\$39,510.81

NOTATIONS

1. See Annual Report of City Comptroller, April 1, 1922-March 30, 1923, page 18. Division of Comptroller's Statement into details made by Mr. Slocum, City Treasurer.

2. Paid by clerk from money received from fines, forfeited bonds, etc. The account is not itemized; the accounting is made quarterly by the clerk in lump sums, to City Treasurer, but appears in no printed report. The whole amount received during the year from fines, forfeited bonds, etc., was \$68,937.73; turned over to the City Treasurer was \$50,556.51.

3. \$1,272.74 includes the expenses of the Juvenile Court Probation officers. The Police Court probation officer (Mr. Lynch) estimated that three-fourths of this belongs to the work of the Juvenile Court probation officers.

Table I, Sec. 1, A  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT (F. L. C. K.)  
COST OF CITY OR POLICE COURT

(Material for the City Court, for all items except salaries, was obtained from the City Comptroller's Report, fiscal year, ending Dec. 31, 1922 (page 33); the list of salaries was obtained from a pamphlet issued by the Board of Finance, called the "City of New Haven; Estimated Receipts and Disbursements in the Year 1924," verified through Mr. Stanford, Clerk of the City Court, as being the same amounts for the year 1922.)

Judge <sup>1</sup> .....	\$ 5,000.00
City Attorney.....	4,000.00
Two Asst. City Attys. @ \$3,500.....	7,000.00
Clerk <sup>2</sup> .....	350.00
Two Asst. Clerks <sup>3</sup> .....	4,500.00
Official Stenographer, services, expenses and transcripts <sup>4</sup> .....	364.00
Stenography .....	2,505.67
Probation Officers <sup>5</sup> .....	5,000.00
Witness' fees.....	6,102.93
Expenses of arrest.....	3,744.35
Interpreter's fees.....	2,080.00
Printing and stationery <sup>6</sup> .....	1,627.52
Commitments to temporary homes <sup>7</sup> .....	457.18
Sundries <sup>8</sup> .....	1,533.76
	\$44,265.41

NOTATIONS

1. Two judges alternate between civil and criminal cases. One salary charged here.
2. 10% of the Clerk's total time (estimate of the Clerk, Mr. Stanford).
3. 90% of time given to criminal cases (estimate of Mr. Stanford).
4. 20% of stenographer's time is given to criminal cases. (Mr. Stanford.)
5. Probation officers' fees and Widow's-Aid-Investigator fees were listed together (p. 46 City Comptroller's Report, 1922), at \$6,280; an approximate estimate for probation, according to expenses for other years, would be \$5,000.
6. 50% of the total charged to civil and criminal branches. (Mr. Stanford.)
7. 75% of total charged to juveniles and adults. (Mr. Stanford.)
8. 50% of total charged to juvenile and adult probation respectively. (Mr. Stanford.)

Table I, Sec. I, A  
BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT (T. F.)  
COST OF CITY OR POLICE COURT

(Sources of material for the items under "City Court"; the Municipal Register 1922, page 408, for the fiscal year 1922-23. The percentages

for civil and criminal were made by Miss Spaulding, clerical stenographer for the City Court for several years.)

	Total for Civil and Criminal Sessions.	Proportion for Criminal Ses- sions for the city.
Judges <sup>1</sup> .....	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 3,750.00
Deputy Judges <sup>1</sup> .....	3,500.00	2,625.00
Prosecuting Atty.....	5,000.00	5,000.00
Asst. Pros. Atty.....	3,500.00	3,500.00
Clerk <sup>1</sup> .....	2,500.00	1,875.00
Asst. Clerk <sup>1</sup> .....	1,800.00	1,350.00
Stenographer <sup>1</sup> .....	1,300.00	955.00
Probation Officer.....	3,000.00	3,000.00
Witness' fees.....	1,500.00	1,000.00
Interpreter's fees.....	1,500.00	1,500.00
Janitor <sup>1</sup> .....	450.00	315.00
Printing, stationery, furniture, telephone, transportation, doctor, etc.....	5,000.00	3,750.00
	\$33,550.00	\$28,620.00

NOTATIONS

1. Miss Spaulding, Stenographer and Office Secretary, in the Clerk's office, estimates that 75% of these total items is chargeable to the criminal branch.

(Table I, Sec. I, for Hartford is lacking because in that city there is no Criminal Court of Common Pleas.)

Table I, Sec. I, B  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT (T. F.)

COST OF CRIMINAL COURT OF COMMON PLEAS<sup>1</sup>

(Material for the Criminal Court of Common Pleas was obtained from the State Comptroller's Report, 1923, scattered through pages 30-36.)

Judges <sup>2</sup> .....	\$ 2,250.00
Prosecuting Attorney.....	1,875.00
Clerk .....	2,250.00
Official Stenographer, services, expenses and transcripts.....	1,095.81
Probation officers.....	78.75
Statuary expenses of Prosecuting Attorneys.....	150.00
Sheriff's attendance, etc.....	702.75
Jury, jury warrants and commissioners.....	3,975.93
Printing and stationery.....	1,345.91
Heat, light and power.....	369.00
Sundries .....	390.43
Costs (serving subpoenas, transporting and maintaining prison- ers) .....	5,438.56
	\$19,922.14

## NOTATIONS

1. The figures given here are the City's proportions. Estimated on the ground that 75% of the cases heard in this court are chargeable to the city. (Mr. Higgins, Clerk of the Court.)

2. There are two judges. The salary of each is \$6,000.00. About 25% of their time is given to criminal cases (Mr. Higgins) and 75% of this is chargeable to the city.

## Table I, Sec. I, B

## BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT. (F. L. C. K.)

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS (COUNTY, CRIMINAL SIDE)<sup>1</sup>

Judge .....	\$ 6,000.00
Judge's expenses.....	315.86
Prosecuting Attorney.....	2,500.00
Statutory expenses.....	200.00
Clerk (who is the clerk of the Superior Court).....	1,500.00
Asst. Clerk.....	1,500.00
Messenger .....	1,404.16
Costs .....	7,526.26
Jury, Jury warrants, and commissioners.....	3,723.75
Sheriff's attendance.....	588.30
Stenographers, services, expenses, and transcripts.....	832.61
Printing and stationery.....	104.85
Heat, light and power.....	716.79
Sundries .....	157.20
Total cost.....	\$27,069.78
Total Cost for Bridgeport, 41 5/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	\$11,233.96

1. Figures for this table from office of State Comptroller, for fiscal year July 1, 1922-June 30, 1923.

2. 41 5/10% of the cases for that year originated in the city of Bridgeport.

## Table I, Sec. I, C

SUPERIOR COURT (CIVIL AND CRIMINAL) HARTFORD COUNTY<sup>1</sup> (F. L. C. K.)

## CIVIL AND CRIMINAL EXPENSES

Jury, <sup>3</sup> jury warrants, commissioners <sup>4</sup> .....	\$ 7,480.00
Sheriff's attendance.....	2,590.99
Clerical assistance (civil).....	3,223.66
Stenographers, services, expenses, transcripts.....	6,391.92
Printing and stationery <sup>9</sup> .....	7,826.52
Heat, light, power.....	966.26
Sundries .....	888.98
Clerk .....	5,500.00
Asst. Clerk.....	4,500.00
Messenger (acts as prob. off. also).....	1,500.00
11 State judges for Superior Bench @ \$9,000.....	99,000.00
24 2/3% \$99,000.00 <sup>10</sup> .....	24,057.00

## CRIMINAL EXPENSES

Costs <sup>2</sup> .....	\$24,753.25
Jury, jury warrants, commissioners, 12% <sup>5</sup> .....	897.60
Coroner <sup>6</sup> .....	7,811.38
Sheriff's attendance, 40% <sup>7</sup> .....	1,136.00
Stenographers, services, expenses, transcripts, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	735.07
Printing and stationery, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	900.05
Heat, light, power, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	111.12
Sundries, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	102.23
State's Attorney.....	4,500.00
Statutory expenses.....	200.00
Clerk, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	632.50
Asst. Clerk, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	517.50
Messenger (acts as prob. off. also) 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	172.50
24 1/3% \$99,000.00, 11½% <sup>8</sup> .....	2,766.56
<hr/>	
Total Cost, Hartford County Superior Court, Criminal....	\$45,235.76
Hartford (City) Cost 29% <sup>11</sup> .....	13,118.37
One-half salary Sup. Ct. Prob. Officer <sup>12</sup> .....	645.00
<hr/>	
Total Cost, Hartford (City).....	\$13,763.37

## NOTATIONS

1. Figures for this table are from the office of the State Comptroller for fiscal year July 1, 1922-June 30, 1923.

2. Includes salaries of Asst. State's Atty., County Defender, County Detective, stenographer, costs of cases, State's Atty.'s expenses, etc.

3. Expenses for jury, etc., is notably smaller than in New Haven and Bridgeport.

4. This figure given by Asst. Clerk (Fuller) as Comptroller had the amount only for three-quarters.

5. Percentage estimated by Asst. Clerk, Mr. L. P. Fuller.

6. The Coroner submits his accounts to the Clerk; Gen. Statutes, Sec. 247. This expense figure was given by Asst. Clerk, as the Comptroller had the amount only for three-quarters.

7. The percentage was estimated by the Asst. Clerk. Deputy Sheriffs are paid by fees (Gen. Statutes, Sec. 2252).

8. Of 287 court days, the criminal sessions occupied 33. (Authority Asst. Clerk.) 33 days is 11½% of the total.

9. "Mostly for printing; to lower the cost next year, it will be done at Cheshire Reformatory." (Asst. Clerk.) This cost for New Haven County (30% of state population, Hartford County 24½%) is \$20,565.01.

10. The population of Hartford County is 24½% that of the state.

11. Cases in the Crim. Superior Ct. for the year numbered 381; of these 111 came from the city, or 29%. This small percentage (the city is 42% of the county population) may be due to the fact that the small towns must send to this court many cases that in the city are settled in the Police Court, which has wider jurisdiction. It is said that offenders are more apt to appeal from decisions of town justices than from those of the Police Court.

12. The probation officer (and messenger), says that 50% of his cases are from the city (Prob. Off. Chas. S. Comstock). His salary for



county fiscal year, Oct. 1, 1922-Sept. 30, 1923, \$1,290.00, is taken from County Commissioner's annual report, as he is paid by the county for the probation work.

Table I, Sec. I, C

SUPERIOR COURT (CIVIL AND CRIMINAL) NEW HAVEN COUNTY<sup>1</sup> (Exc. WATERBURY DIST.) NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT. (F. L. C. K.)

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL EXPENSES

Jury, jury warrants and commissioners.....	\$19,332.63
Sheriff's attendance, etc.....	5,653.80
Stenographers, services, expenses and transcripts.....	8,514.55
Civil clerical assistance.....	3,136.57
Printing and stationery <sup>4</sup> .....	16,109.21
Heat, light and power.....	3,411.43
Sundries .....	3,239.90
Clerk .....	5,500.00
Assistant Clerk.....	4,000.00
Assistant Clerk.....	3,500.00
Messenger .....	1,800.00

CRIMINAL EXPENSES

Jury, jury warrants and commissioners, 15 8/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	3,054.56
Sheriff's attendance, etc., 40% <sup>3</sup> .....	2,261.52
Stenographers, services, expenses and transcripts, 15 8/10%....	1,345.30
Printing and stationery, <sup>4</sup> 15 8/10%.....	2,545.26
Heat, light and power, 15 8/10%.....	539.01
Sundries, 15 8/10%.....	511.90
Clerk, 15 8/10%.....	869.00
Asst. Clerk, 15 8/10%.....	632.00
Asst. Clerk, 15 8/10%.....	553.00
Messenger, 15 8/10%.....	284.40
11 State Judges for Superior Bench @ \$9,000.00.....	99,000.00
30% <sup>5</sup> of \$99,000.00 is County cost for judges (Inc. Waterbury District) .....	29,700.00
Waterbury Sup. Ct. sat.....	166 days
152 civil, 14 criminal.	
New Haven Sup. Ct. sat.....	304 days
256 civil, 48 criminal.	
Total .....	470 days
304 is 64-7/10% of 470 days.	
64-7/10% of \$29,700 is \$19,215.90, cost of judges for New Haven Superior Court (excluding Waterbury District).	
15-8/10% of \$19,215.90 is \$3,036.11.	
Judges .....	3,036.11

Total Cost for County (excluding Waterbury).....\$62,175.66  
 Of 277 cases, 196, or 71%, originated in the city of New Haven.  
 71% of \$62,175.66 is \$44,144.72, cost for New Haven City.

## NOTATIONS

1. Expense figures are from the office of the State Comptroller for fiscal year July 1, 1922-June 30, 1923. In this county the Court sits both in Waterbury and New Haven. In these figures the Waterbury district is excluded, and all expenses are reduced to figures for New Haven City.

2. The New Haven Court sat 304 days, of which 48, or 15 8/10%, were in criminal sessions. Two sessions in two rooms the same day are computed as two days.

3. 40% is an estimate, but it is the exact percentage authoritatively agreed upon by Hartford and Bridgeport officials for this same item in their Superior Courts.

4. If we add to \$16,109.21 the printing and stationery costs for the Waterbury district, \$4,455.80, the total for the county is \$20,565.01. This is a county cost of \$13,000 and \$14,000 above the amount spent for printing and stationery by Hartford (\$7,826.52) and Fairfield (\$6,405.64) counties for this same item. The population of New Haven County is about 100,000 more, or 25%, than that of the other two counties.

5. New Haven County has 30% of the population of the state.

Table I, Sec. I, C

SUPERIOR COURT<sup>1</sup> BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT (F. L. C. K.)

## CIVIL AND CRIMINAL EXPENSES

Jury, jury warrants and commissioners.....	\$16,263.52
Sheriff's attendance .....	3,476.96
Stenographers' services, expenses, transcripts.....	8,054.68
Clerical assistance (civil).....	3,640.00
Printing and stationery.....	6,405.64
Heat, light, power.....	2,693.96
Sundries .....	3,739.47
Clerk <sup>5</sup> .....	4,500.00
Assistant Clerk .....	3,500.00
Assistant Clerk .....	3,000.00
Assistant Clerk .....	1,000.00
11 State judges for Superior bench @ \$9,000.00.....	99,000.00
23-2/10% <sup>6</sup> of \$99,000.00 is County cost.....	22,968.00

## CRIMINAL EXPENSES

Costs .....	\$22,886.57
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	1,821.514
Coroner .....	13,917.04
40% <sup>3</sup> .....	1,390.784
11 2/10% .....	902.124
.....	.00
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	717.432
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	301.724
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	418.821
State's attorney .....	4,000.00
Statutory expenses.....	200.00
Asst. State's Atty.....	2,342.27
Statutory expenses <sup>4</sup> .....	200.00

11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	504.00
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	392.00
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	336.00
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	112.00
11-2/10% <sup>2</sup> .....	2,572.416
<hr/>	
Total Cost: Superior Court, Criminal.....	\$53,014.695
Bridgeport City Cost, 50% <sup>7</sup> .....	\$26,507.35

1. Figures for this table are from the office of the State Comptroller for fiscal year July 1, 1922-June 30, 1923.

2. The Court sat 268 days in all; of these 30 days were given to criminal sessions, or 11 2/10%, according to record in Sheriff's office.

3. Estimate of Miss Pease, sheriff's clerk.

4. Fairfield is the only county where Asst. State's Attorney has statutory expense fund (authority state comptroller's clerk).

5. The Superior Court clerk draws an additional salary as clerk of Court of Common Pleas.

6. The population of Fairfield County is 23 2/10% of the population of the State.

7. Assistant State's Attorney Garlick says Bridgeport cases are 50% of all cases in Criminal Superior Court.

#### Table I, Sec. II

#### HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT (F. L. C. K.)

#### COST OF POLICE DEPARTMENT<sup>1</sup>

Salaries of officers, 167 patrolmen, 3 drivers.....	\$381,739.92
Supernumerary service .....	15,635.34
Vacation time .....	24,600.00
Special policemen .....	37,696.50
Employees (clerk, asst. clerk, chief's clerk, matron, etc.).....	14,715.34
Station House supplies .....	8,230.85
Station House repairs .....	1,137.58
Ambulance and surgeons .....	1,571.21
Care of prisoners (food).....	555.50
Office expenses .....	2,479.48
Patrol wagon service.....	3,665.62
Telegraph equipment .....	4,311.05
Motorcycles .....	4,346.12
Fire insurance .....	468.75
Uniforms .....	8,451.00
Spotlights .....	682.81
Health, accident and compensation insurance.....	16,421.27
Drill school .....	1,438.22
<hr/>	
	\$528,146.56
Appropriation for Police Pension Fund.....	14,000.00
<hr/>	
	\$52,146.56

## NOTATION

1. The Department is housed in one building; there are no precinct stations.

Annual Report of City Comptroller, April 1, 1922-April 1, 1923.

## Table I, Sec. II

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT. (T. F.)

## COST OF POLICE DEPARTMENT

(Source of material: Annual report of the Department of Police Service, New Haven, for year ending Dec. 31, 1922, page 15, except item for Policemen's Relief Fund.)

Salaries .....	\$628,058.66
Police Alarm .....	3,050.80
Uniform Account .....	6,241.34
Sundries .....	4,900.06
Policemen's Relief Fund .....	19,802.18
Heating .....	1,278.36
Lighting .....	2,207.82
Maintenance and repair of buildings.....	43,546.40
Bertillon System .....	245.48
Special Detective Service.....	500.00
	<hr/>
	\$700,831.10

## Table I, Sec. II

BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT. (F. L. C. K.)

## COST OF POLICE DEPARTMENT

Police Department <sup>1</sup> .....	\$585,583.22
Salaries .....	458.34
Janitor, Second Precinct .....	330.00
Janitor, Third Precinct .....	330.00
Janitor, Fourth Precinct .....	357.00
Physician and Hospital .....	494.14
Superintendent's Fund for Tracing.....	16.31
Meals .....	793.19
Badges and Signs.....	126.91
Disinfectants .....	419.02
Signal System Maintenance.....	185.74
Bertillon System Maintenance.....	1,088.84
Second Precinct Maintenance.....	1,267.89
Third Precinct Maintenance.....	773.16
Fourth Precinct Maintenance .....	4,551.41
Sundries (including new motorcycles) .....	1,233.95
Printing, stationery, postage.....	45.78
Telegrams and express .....	1,733.47
Auto and motor cycle maintenance.....	459.55
Office equipment .....	2,091.80
President's fund .....	750.00
Superintendent's expenses to convention.....	

Kilpatrick pension .....	540.00
Coley pension .....	750.00
Mrs. Dietz pension .....	650.00
Mrs. Williams pension.....	1,125.00
Police building, janitor, sundries, telephone, repairs, etc.....	11,917.28
	<hr/>
	\$618,072.00
Police Pension Fund <sup>2</sup> .....	10,100.00
	<hr/>
	\$628,172.00

1. Figures taken from the Municipal Register for 1923, expenditures for the fiscal year, April 1, 1922-March 30, 1923, pp. 88-89-90.

2. See notation No. 1, page 90, Municipal Register.

Table I, Sec. III, A

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

COST OF COUNTY JAIL (F. L. C. K.)

(Used as City Jail, also.)

Number of prisoners during the year .....	2,190
Number of prisoners from Hartford .....	1,834 or 84% <sup>1</sup>
Total expenses <sup>2</sup> .....	\$57,894.61 84%=\$48,631.47
Sheriff's salary .....	5,500.00 84%= 4,620.00
	<hr/>
	\$53,251.47

NOTATIONS

1. Figures obtained by counting cases for one year in the Clerk's books. This large percentage (for the city is only 42% of the county in population), may be explained by opportunities for crime in a city, by the floating labor attracted to the tobacco plantations, and also by the fact that the town justices prefer to fine rather than to imprison. A fine is an asset, imprisonment is a town liability. Justices are paid by fees, (Gen. Statutes, Section 2239). Also, "it is the aim of the Police Court to make a final disposition of its cases." (Judge George H. Day.)

2. County Commissioner's Annual Report to the State Comptroller, fiscal year October 1, 1922-September 30, 1923. (Statement by County Commissioner, Mr. Samuel H. Graham.) Earnings by prisoners, contract labor, not deducted, including rent and heat, paid to county by Metropolitan Chair Co., \$7,100.00 (Quoted, Edw. G. Byrne, Clerk of Jail. Fines and costs in amount \$9,680.06, were paid to the City Treasurer.

Table I, Sec. III, A

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

COST OF COUNTY JAIL (T. F.)

(Source of material: The County Commissioners on "Expenditures of the County of New Haven for the year ending Sept. 30, 1923," except the salary of the Sheriff, which is from State Comptroller's report, 1923, page 31.)

	Total	Proportion for New Haven <sup>5</sup>
Salaries <sup>1</sup> .....	\$ 27,297.64	\$17,470.47
Physician and hospital <sup>2</sup> .....	2,427.40	1,554.13
Provisions .....	40,158.56	25,701.48
Clothing <sup>3</sup> .....	3,643.87	2,322.08
Fuel and light.....	25,821.56	16,525.79
Buildings, repairs, furniture.....	13,015.23	8,329.75
Stationery and stamps.....	639.50	408.28
Telephone and transportation.....	654.33	430.77
Sundries .....	4,546.18	2,908.54
Water and ice.....	3,001.33	1,920.85
Pay of convicts <sup>4</sup> .....	950.66	608.42
Shoes and leather .....	1,202.16	769.38
Tobacco .....	528.93	338.52
Fire alarm .....	60.00	38.40
New buildings and equipment.....	4,725.93	3,024.59
	<u>\$128,673.28</u>	<u>\$82,351.41</u>

## NOTATIONS

1. Jailer, \$2,500; Assistants, \$18,497.54; Chaplain, \$300; Sheriff, \$6,000.
2. Includes medical attendance and medicine.
3. Includes clothing and bedding.
4. Is for factory labor at the jail, or money given prisoners when they leave the jail.
5. 64% of the prisoners for that year were from the city of New Haven; therefore 64% of the total cost is charged to the city.

## Table I, Sec. III, A

## BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

## COST OF COUNTY JAIL (T. F. AND F. L. C. K.)

(Source of material: County Commissioner's Annual Report to the State Comptroller, fiscal year, October 1, 1922-Sept. 30, 1923, except the Sheriff's salary which was obtained from report of State Comptroller, 1923, page 31.)

	Total	Proportion for Bridgeport <sup>1</sup>
Salaries <sup>2</sup> .....	\$20,077.50	\$13,652.70
Physician and hospital <sup>3</sup> .....	888.61	604.25
Provisions .....	10,960.33	7,453.02
Clothing <sup>4</sup> .....	1,769.25	1,203.09
Fuel and light .....	7,470.52	5,079.95
Building, repairs and furniture.....	37,557.20	25,538.89
Stationery and stamps.....	112.50	76.50
Telephone and transportation .....	293.17	199.35
Sundries and supplies .....	1,940.53	1,319.56
Water and ice .....	1,371.92	932.90
Stabler, insurance, misc. <sup>5</sup> .....	907.04	616.78
	<u>\$83,348.57</u>	<u>\$56,677.09</u>

## NOTATIONS

1. Since 68% of the prisoners are from Bridgeport, 68% of expenses are charged here to the city.
2. This sum includes these salaries: jailor and assistants, \$14,377.50; Chaplain, \$200; and sheriff, \$5,500.
3. The items are: medicine, \$332.11; medical attendance, \$300; Board of sick prisoners, \$256.50.
4. This item includes clothing, \$1,310.55; and bedding, \$458.70.
5. This item includes stable, \$443.34; insurance, \$16; and miscellaneous, \$447.70.

## Table I, Sec. III, B

## HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

## COST OF CONNECTICUT REFORMATORY (F. L. C. K.)

(See General Statutes, Chap. 93.)

Total Bill of Costs <sup>1</sup> .....	\$294,143.55
Total number of inmates at end of year <sup>2</sup> .....	244
Total number of inmates at end of year from Hartford County <sup>2</sup> .....	49
Daily average of all during year <sup>2</sup> .....	255
224:255::49:X=55.73 daily average for Hartford County.	
\$294,143.55:Y::255:55.73. Y=\$64,329.19, cost for Hartford County.	
42% of \$63,329.19=\$27,018.26, cost for Hartford City. <sup>3</sup>	

## NOTATIONS

1. State Comptroller's Report, 1923, page 104.
  - Receipts given as, Industrial Fund.....\$80,234.11
  - Miscellaneous .....
- |  |             |
|--|-------------|
|  | 7,596.20    |
|  | \$87,830.31 |
2. Figures from Clerk of Reformatory, Mr. Carder. Records of prisoners are kept by counties, not by cities.
  3. Hartford City is 42% of the County in population.

## Table I, Sec. III, B

## NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

## COST OF CONNECTICUT REFORMATORY (T. F.)

(Source of material: Annual Report of the State Comptroller)

	Proportion for Total New Haven
Salaries <sup>1</sup> .....	\$105,355.87
Physician and Hospital .....	8,025.96
Provisions .....	20,079.16
Clothing .....	10,917.21
Fuel and light .....	24,905.22
Furniture and household supplies.....	3,818.33
Ordinary repairs .....	14,014.13
Farm, stable and grounds.....	23,020.92
Extension to factory building.....	6,691.75

Employee's cottage .....	944.28	
Stockade .....	11,274.61	
Office, travel and incidental expenses.....	10,974.59	
Revolving fund for industries.....	54,143.55	
	\$294,143.55	\$47,627.62 <sup>2</sup>

NOTATIONS

1. Includes salaries, wages and labor.
  2. Total Bill of Costs.....\$294,143.55
- Total number of inmates at end of year .....224  
 Total number of inmates at end of year from New Haven County..... 93  
 Daily average of all during year.....255  
 $244:255::93:X$ .  $X=105.87$ , daily average for New Haven County.  
 $\$294,143.55:Y::255:105.87$ .  $Y= \$122,122.10$ , Cost for New Haven County.  
 New Haven City is 39% of the County in population; 39% of  $\$122,122.10=\$47,627.62$ , cost to New Haven City.

Table I, Sec. III, B

BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

COST OF CONNECTICUT REFORMATORY (T. F.)

(Source of material: Annual Report of State Comptroller, 1923, p. 104.)

	Total <sup>1</sup>	Proportion for
(See New Haven).....	\$294,143.55	Bridgeport \$24,065.93

NOTATIONS

1. Total Bill of Costs.....\$294,143.55
- Total Number of inmates at end of year .....234  
 Total Number of inmates at end of year from Fairfield County ..... 41  
 Daily average of all during year.....255  
 $224:255::41:X$ .  $X=46.67$ , daily average for Fairfield County.  
 $\$294,143.55:Y::255:46.67$ .  $Y=\$53,838.77$ , cost to Fairfield County.  
 Bridgeport is 44.7% of the County in population.  
 $44.7\%$  of  $\$53,838.77=\$24,065.93$ , cost to the City of Bridgeport.

Table I, Sec. III, C

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

COST OF STATE PRISON<sup>4</sup> (F. L. C. K.)

(See General Statutes, Chap. 100)

Total Bill of Costs <sup>1</sup> .....		\$235,142.82
<sup>2</sup> Total number of prisoners at end of year.....	534	
<sup>3</sup> Total number of prisoners at end of year from Hartford County .....	97	
Daily average of all during the year.....	563.42	
$534:563.42::97; X$ . $X=102.36$ , daily average for Hartford County. $\$235,142.82:Y::563.42:102.36$ . $Y=\$42,701.94$ , cost for Hartford County. $42\%$ of $\$42,701.94$ is $\$17,934.81$ , cost for Hartford City.		



## NOTATIONS

1. From State Comptroller's Report, 1923, page 104. Receipts, miscellaneous are given as \$134,586.30. This is mostly earnings of prisoners (contract labor). Statement of clerk of prison, Mr. Melvin Fry.

2. Figures obtained from Clerk. Records of prisoners are kept by counties, not by cities.

3. Hartford (city) is 42% of the county in population.

4. Ex-prisoner's story of experience in Connecticut State Prison, "In the Clutch of Circumstances," published by Appleton.

## Table I, Sec. III, C

## NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

## COST OF STATE PRISON (T. F.)

(Source of material: Annual Report of State Comptroller, 1923, p. 104)

	Total	Proportion for New Haven
Salaries <sup>1</sup> .....	.00	.00
Maintenance, deficit in earnings.....	\$178,128.78	\$30,103.76
Extension of wall.....	14,514.59	2,452.96
Pay of convicts .....	15,061.50	2,545.39
Library .....	498.79	84.30
Repairs and equipment.....	26,939.16	4,552.72
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$253,142.82 <sup>2</sup>	\$39,739.13

## NOTATIONS

1. Not obtainable.

2. No deduction for miscellaneous receipts amounting to \$134,586.30

3. Total Bill of Costs.....\$253,142.82

Total number of inmates at end of year .....534

Total number of inmates at end of year from New

Haven County.....232

Daily average of all during the year.....563.42

534:563.42::232:X.

X=244.78, daily average for New Haven County.

\$235,142.82:Y::563.42:244.78.

Y=\$..... cost for New Haven County.

New Haven City is 39% of the county in population; therefore 30% of cost for the county is the cost to the city.

## Table I, Sec. III, C

## BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

## COST OF STATE PRISON (T. F.)

(Source of material: Report of State Comptroller for 1923, p. 104.)

	Total	Proportion for Bridgeport
Maintenance (deficit in earnings).....	\$178,128.78	\$16,690.67
Pay of convicts .....	15,061.50	1,411.26
Library .....	498.79	46.74

Repairs and equipment .....	26,939.16	2,542.20
Extension of wall.....	14,514.59	1,460.02
	\$235,142.82 <sup>1</sup>	\$22,132.89

NOTATIONS

1. Total Bill of Costs was.....\$235,142.82
- Total number of inmates at end of year .....534
- Total number of inmates at end of year from Fairfield County .....112
- Daily average of all during the year.....563.42
- 535:563.42::112:X. X=118.17, daily average from Fairfield county.
- \$235,142.82:Y::563.42:118.17.
- Y=\$..... cost to Fairfield County.
- Bridgeport is 44.7% of the county in population; therefore 44.7% of the cost to the county is the cost to Bridgeport City.

Table I, Sec. III, D  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT PRISON ASSOCIATION<sup>1</sup> (F. L. C. K.)

Half Cost, \$7,786.71, paid by the State; 10% of this.....\$778.67<sup>2</sup>

NOTATIONS

1. A private incorporated body subsidized by the State, which pays about half its expenses. Statement from Secretary, Mr. William Baxter.
2. In population the City of Hartford is 10% of the State.

Table I, Sec. III, D  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

COST OF CONNECTICUT PRISON ASSOCIATION (F. L. C. K.)

(This is a private corporation subsidized by the State. Source of information: Mr. Baxter, Secretary of the Association.)

	Total	Proportion for New Haven <sup>1</sup>
Appropriation by the State.....	\$7,786.71	\$918.83

NOTATION

1. New Haven is 11.8% of the population of the State. 11.8% of \$7,786.71=\$918.83.

Table I, Sec. III, D  
BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

COST OF CONNECTICUT PRISON ASSOCIATION (F. L. C. K.)

(Source of information: Mr. Baxter, Secretary of the Association.)

	Total	Proportion for Bridgeport <sup>1</sup>
Appropriation by the State.....	\$7,786.71	\$809.82

NOTATION

1. Bridgeport is 10.4% of the population of the State. 10.4% of \$7,786.71=\$809.82.

Table I, Sec. IV  
CONNECTICUT  
EXTRA STATE CRIMINAL EXPENSES  
Not Including Juvenile. (F. L. C. K.)  
From Comptroller's Report for 1923.

<i>Printing and Circulating Public Documents</i>	
Conn. State Hospital, \$465.49—11% <sup>1</sup> .....	\$ 51.20
State Prison .....	189.35
State Prison Association .....	84.00
Criminal Business of Courts .....	137.00
State Police Department .....	162.00
Material for State Reformatory Report (Printed by Reformatory) .....	57.30
Norwich State Hospital, \$289.70—5% <sup>2</sup> .....	14.48
Board of Pardons .....	391.37
<i>State Pensions</i>	
Widow, State Prison Guard, killed on duty.....	300.00
<i>Retirement Salaries</i>	
E. W. G., engineer, State Prison.....	65.92
R. L. F., employee, State Prison.....	565.68
E. N. B., employee Conn. State Hosp. \$455.88	
J. B. " " " " 425.98	
W. H. C. " " " " 434.76	
T. H. M'L. " " " " 405.16	
G. H. M. " " " " 535.80	
F. M. S. " " " " 318.48	
11% of total.....\$2,576.06 is.....	283.37
<i>Surety Bonds for State Officials</i>	
9 State's Attorneys @ \$10.50 each.....	94.50
1 State's Attorney @ \$7.00 .....	7.00
4 Pros. Attorneys @ \$7.00 each.....	28.00
27 Court Clks. and assistants, total \$546.00—20% <sup>3</sup> .....	109.20
Supt. State Police.....	35.00
Warden, State Prison.....	35.00
Clerk, State Prison .....	35.00
Supt. State Reformatory .....	17.50
Clerk, State Reformatory.....	17.50
Supt. Norwich State Hospital—5% of \$17.50.....	.87
	\$ 2,681.24
<i>State Auditors' Examinations</i>	
Conn. State Hosp. 11% of \$60.00.....	6.60
State Prison .....	60.00
State Reformatory .....	120.00
State Farm for Women.....	60.00

*Connecticut Police Association*

Claims .....	\$ 7,620.00
--------------	-------------

*Board of Prisoners in County Jails*

Eight counties .....	59,045.05
----------------------	-----------

*Girls, 16 and over, committed to Charitable Institutions*

House of The Good Shepherd.....	21,577.50
---------------------------------	-----------

Florence Crittenden Mission.....	13,541.44
----------------------------------	-----------

*Institution Trustees Expenses*

State Prison .....	682.58
--------------------	--------

State Reformatory .....	53.00
-------------------------	-------

Conn. State Hospital—11% of \$68.48.....	7.53
--	------

Norwich State Hospital—5% of \$75.00.....	3.75
---	------

*East Granby Prison Site*

Insurance .....	220.25
-----------------	--------

Lumber and Carpentry.....	128.73
---------------------------	--------

*State Prison*

Appraising Property .....	100.00
---------------------------	--------

Transferring prisoners .....	71.25
------------------------------	-------

*State Police Department*

Salaries and Equipment .....	236,732.16
------------------------------	------------

*Connecticut State Hospital*

11% of \$1,094,284.06.....	120,371.25
----------------------------	------------

*Norwich State Hospital*

5% of \$629,045.34 .....	31,452.27
--------------------------	-----------

*Farm for Women*

Total expenses .....	110,798.10
----------------------	------------

	<u>\$605,332.70</u>
--	---------------------

Proportion for Hartford <sup>4</sup> .....	60,533.27
--	-----------

Proportion for New Haven.....	71,429.26
-------------------------------	-----------

Proportion for Bridgeport .....	62,954.60
---------------------------------	-----------

## NOTATIONS

1. 11% of patients come from courts of Criminal Jurisdiction.
2. 5% of patients come from courts of Criminal Jurisdiction.
3. An estimate by F. K.
4. Population of Hartford City is 10% of that of the State. Population of New Haven, 11.8% that of the state. Population of Bridgeport, 10.4% that of the state.

## GRAND TOTAL OF COSTS PER CAPITA

Hartford .....	\$ 754,937.22	Per capita	\$5.48
New Haven.....	1,051,229.62	Per capita	6.47
Bridgeport .....	861,173.64	Per capita	6.00

It may be of some interest to observe that the total cost of the administration of criminal justice in the city of Baltimore is about \$5.00 per inhabitant. The entire cost (tabulation made in 1923) was \$3,369,785.75, as set forth in detail in the following statement which was furnished on November 23, 1925, by Mr. James M. Hepbron, Managing Director of the Criminal Justice Commission of Baltimore.

"An idea of the recognized importance of Criminal Justice in the general scheme of government may be gained by totaling the expense of the various officers, departments and tribunals charged with its administration. Figures taken from the best available sources enable us to submit the following table:

COST OF ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
IN BALTIMORE (Ed.)

Judges of the Criminal Court.....	\$ 14,750.00
Bailiffs, Stenographers, etc. (Approx.).....	14,340.00
Magistrates .....	25,500.00
Coroners .....	9,000.00
Morgue (Proportionate) .....	1,000.00
City Jail .....	106,880.00
House of Correction and Penitentiary (Appr.).....	116,500.00
Probation Officers and Medical Service.....	15,166.66
Criminal Court Expenses including: State's Attorney's Office, Clerks' Office, Sheriff's Office, Grand and Petit Juries (Approximate) .....	110,000.00
Parole Commissioner (proportionate).....	6,445.00
	\$ 419,581.66
The total appropriations for salary and expense of the Police Department is .....	2,950,204.09
	\$3,369,785.75

"Since 1923," says Mr. Hepbron, "the expense has increased to about \$4,000,000.00, and the population is now approximately 800,000."

The above figures do not include Baltimore's share of the expenses of the State Penitentiary and the State Reformatory.

COST PER CASE, PER ARREST, ETC., IN HARTFORD, NEW  
HAVEN AND BRIDGEPORT, RESPECTIVELY (Ed.)

	Hartford	New Haven	Bridgeport
Police Court <sup>1</sup> .....	\$ 6.33	\$ 6.93	\$ 8.26
Court of Common Pleas <sup>1</sup> .....		49.19	90.59
Criminal Superior Court <sup>1</sup> .....	123.99	190.28	212.06
Police Department, per arrest <sup>2</sup> .....	72.10	84.40	154.41
County Jail, per prisoner <sup>3</sup> .....	29.04	46.42	89.40

## ANNOTATIONS

1. The cost per case in the courts is found by dividing the total cost of the courts, respectively (*supra*), by the number of cases that originated in the respective cities during the fiscal year, 1922-1923.

In Hartford City Court there were 6,240 city cases and in the Criminal Superior Court, 111.

In the New Haven City Court for the year there were 6,314 cases, and about 75 continued cases (estimate of Mr. Stanford, Clerk), making 6,389.

In the Criminal Court of Common Pleas there were 780 cases on the docket, including the continued cases carried over each month; allowing 20 cases each month as the number continued, it would leave a balance of 540; of this number 75% originated in the city of New Haven (estimate of Mr. Higgins, Asst. Clerk), or a total of 405 cases.

In the Superior Court (criminal side) there were 310 cases filed at New Haven, of which 75% originated in New Haven City, making a total of 232 cases.

In the Bridgeport City Court for the year there were 3,466 cases (for all classes of crimes).

In the Criminal Court of Common Pleas there were 248 cases filed during that fiscal year, of which 50% originated in the city of Bridgeport, making the total 124.

In the Superior Court there were 202 cases filed, of which 62% originated in the City of Bridgeport, making the total 125.

2. Obviously the cost of the police department per arrest made within a given period is not a direct criterion of the efficiency of the department. It is quite as much the function of the police to prevent the commission of misdemeanors and crimes by every means as to detect and arrest the offender once he has committed an unlawful act. Few arrests and a consequent high cost per arrest (on the above basis) might be a good criterion.

Another basis for judgment in this connection is to be found in the relation of the number of arrests to the number of complaints. Some data on this point are afforded, in following tables on criminal statistics.

3. The cost of the jail per prisoner is at best a rough approximation. It is found by dividing the total cost of the institution by the number of prisoners incarcerated during the fiscal year. The result is the average amount that the community has to pay on account of one who is incarcerated in the county jail, regardless of the length of his incarceration. If there are few prisoners the amount will be large, other things equal, and conversely, if there are many prisoners, the amount will be small. But a small number of prisoners in the jail is not in itself a sufficient criterion of the criminality of a community or of the efficiency of the administration of justice; for the courts may be disposing of convicts in large numbers by fining them and by placing them on probation. Many judges believe that the best interest of the community is served in this manner.

The number of city prisoners in the Hartford jail during 1923 was 1,834, in New Haven, 1,771; in Bridgeport, 634.

## COMMENT

The foregoing tables and summary but inadequately represent the cost of crime in the cities of Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven. In several instances our figures arise from estimates—necessarily

so. But *in no instance has the estimate been drawn out of the air*. It has in every case been made for us by an official in the office concerned; and in no instance by other than an official who had been in intimate contact with the details. As we have already pointed out, no account is taken in our computation of the investment in buildings and lands and machinery, which in their way are essential in a system of administration of criminal justice. No allowance is made for the deterioration of public property and for the loss to the community due to the fact that a certain number of prisoners are withdrawn from productive labor. There are other intangible factors in every community that affect the cost of the administration of criminal justice. Of course, whatever contributes to the frequency of criminal acts indirectly makes additions to the cost of crime. The liability to crime is greater here than there and possibly that liability may vary with the type of offense. It is reflected in what the community has to pay for burglary insurance; rates for insurance of automobiles against theft, and some other forms of insurance.

The following table shows the rates for insurance against theft in twelve American cities. It includes the three cities in which we are interested and is a fair index of the relative frequency of thefts of automobiles, etc., in these communities. It is indirectly, at the same time, an index of the relative cost of one crime alone to the people of the cities, respectively.

Table II  
INSURANCE RATES (F. L. C. K.)

CITIES	Population	Robbery Per \$1,000		Burglary Per \$1,000 Divided Coverage*	New† Ford Touring Car Fire and Auto Theft	Per \$100 Not Equipped with Lock
		of Inside Premises	of Outside Premises			
Bridgeport .....	143,555	\$5.00	\$7.50	\$12.10	\$6.48	\$7.50
Des Moines .....	126,468	5.00	7.50	16.50	6.29	7.40
Grand Rapids .....	137,634	5.00	7.50	12.10	1.23	1.45
Hartford .....	138,036	5.00	7.50	12.10	6.48	7.50
Houston .....	138,276	5.00	7.50	22.00	....	....
Memphis .....	162,351	5.00	7.50	22.00	....	....
New Haven .....	162,537	5.00	7.50	12.10	6.48	7.50
Paterson .....	135,875	5.00	7.50	22.00	6.48	7.50
Salt Lake City .....	118,110	5.00	7.50	18.50	....	....
Scranton .....	137,783	5.00	7.50	18.15	6.48	7.50
Springfield, Mass. ....	129,614	5.00	7.50	12.10	4.27	4.90
Youngstown .....	132,358	5.00	7.50	12.10	6.29	7.40‡

\*Divided coverage is a medium rate between a higher rate charged for furs and jewelry, etc., and a lower rate charged for house furnishings, etc.

†New within six months.

‡In Youngstown, a flat \$15.00 is added to the rate, \$7.40 per \$100, for car with no lock.

All the insurance data for this Table were obtained through the courtesy of Mr. C. Edwin Blake, Assistant Manager of the Hartford branch office of the Travelers Insurance Company.

Insurance rates for fire as well as for theft of automobiles are given together because "no insurance company ever writes theft coverage without fire concurrently." C. E. Blake.

It is to be noted that the Hartford automobile rates are the same as those for Bridgeport and New Haven, but higher than those in the neighboring city of Springfield, Mass.

The automobile rates could not be obtained for Houston, Memphis, and Salt Lake City.

"The rates as quoted above applying to risks located in Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport are the lowest in the country.

"As an example of the differentials applying to New York and Chicago, we quote the following premiums per one thousand dollars of insurance applying to contents of private residences:

New York.....	\$22.00
Chicago .....	27.50

"The rates for New York are 80% higher than those applying to Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, while the rates for Chicago are approximately 125% higher than the rates applying to the same cities."

(From L. H. Carr, Manager of the Burglary Department of the National Bureau of Casualty and Surety Underwriters, New York City, Nov. 11, 1925.)

### CRIMINAL STATISTICS

The figures in the following tables are for January, February and March, 1923. Nineteen classes of crimes and misdemeanors were first selected for study. The basis for selection was the frequency of their occurrence. Three other classes of offenses were added subsequently: violation of traffic ordinances, liquor law violations and drunkenness.

These additions were taken because they represent offenses that are very frequently referred to in the records. Disposition of such cases consumes a great deal of time and energy of a city court. The handling of them has become of very great social importance, notwithstanding that the first and third groups, at any rate, represent, for the most part, distinctly minor offenses.

The records from which our material was sought were in very many cases vague and inadequate. Items that we needed had to be separated from a conglomerate mass, and this necessitated much checking and re-checking.

### THE DATA OF CITY COURTS, COMMON PLEAS COURTS AND SUPERIOR COURTS, RESPECTIVELY

In Secs. I, II and III of Table III following, are the data relating to the City Court, the Common Pleas Court and the Superior Court, respectively. (The Common Pleas Court in Hartford does not hear criminal cases.)

Only as to Hartford do we have complete data concerning sentences. As to suspension of sentence and probation, however, the data are presented here for all three cities.



## HARTFORD POLICE COURT

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION IN PRECEDING TABLE

*Complaints:*

From the Daily Police Bulletin and the Detectives' Record; used through the courtesy of the Chief of Police, Garrett J. Farrell.

*Arrests:*

Taken from the Police Department's Record of Arrests.

*Cases:*

Copied from the daily Court Records or docket kept by Wm. T. Lynch, probation officer, including pleas, disposition, etc. The card-file in the Court was used for occasional reference, and the card-files in Police Headquarters, also.

## NOMENCLATURE

In some cases different meanings are attached to the same word by the police and the Court.

The term "burglary" is loosely used. Burglary meaning breaking into and entering a dwelling house in the night season, cannot be disposed of in the Police Court. The cases called burglary and disposed of in this court, are properly *felonious entry*.

Robbery, also, may not be disposed of in the Police Court; such cases are generally split into two counts in order to dispose of them in this Court.

Police arrests for assault may become in this Court "Breach of the Peace" cases, which are not here considered.

## ARRESTS ANALYZED

1. There are many more arrests than there are court cases:—527 more arrests in three months than individuals brought into court in 22 classes of crime.

2. About two-thirds of the men arrested for drunkenness are dismissed by the Police, after sobering up, and are not taken into court.

## HARTFORD POLICE COURT FIRST QUARTER, 1923

*Arrest Table:*

I. Total arrests.....	1,019
Drunks arrested.....	649
	370
Arrests other than for drunkenness.....	370
Total Police Court Cases.....	492
Drunkenness cases.....	216
	276

The drunkenness figures have been taken out because only about a third of the drunks arrested are brought into the court.

II. Arrests other than for drunkenness.....	370
Cases other than for drunkenness.....	276

More arrests in three months than individuals brought into court 94

III. 94 arrests as in II.	
46 <sup>1</sup> traffic arrests (not many traffic cases in court: such cases not included in Table III).	

—  
48 more arrests, not explained, than individuals brought into court, during first quarter, 1923.

1. The "violations of traffic" arrests had been counted as perhaps involving motor vehicle cases. This matter has not been analyzed further.

ILLEGAL DOUBLE SENTENCE FOR DRUNKENNESS

In this Table 5 drunkenness cases have been listed under the double sentence of both fine and jail. According to the General Statutes, Sec. 6401, this is illegal, as "or" connects the words "fined" and "imprisoned." Both sentences are at times imposed; also it is not unusual to have both sentences imposed but with suspension of the jail sentence.

ILLEGAL DISMISSALS BY THE POLICE

The statute states that "every person found intoxicated *shall* be fined or imprisoned——"

The daily dismissals by the Hartford police are therefore illegal.

*Arrests*

A tabulation of the number of arrests for all crimes made by the New Haven department for 5 years follows:

1916 .....	11,287
1917 .....	10,499
1921 .....	7,602
1922 .....	8,316
1923 .....	9,616

In Bridgeport and Hartford, for the same years, the number of arrests made by the departments of those cities is as follows:<sup>24</sup>

<i>Bridgeport</i>		<i>Hartford</i>	
1916 .....	8,068	1916 .....	11,796
1917 .....	5,459	1917 .....	9,344
1921 .....	3,329	1921 .....	7,395
1922 .....	3,406	1922 .....	7,519
1923 .....	4,068	1923 .....	11,452

<sup>24</sup>From an address delivered in New Haven by Hon. Wm. B. Boardman, President of the State Bar Association, and ex-judge City Court of Bridgeport (Oct. 26, 1923).



BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

Table III, Sec. I, City Court (T. F.)

CRIME STATISTICS FIRST QUARTER 1923\*

CLASSES OF CRIMES	CONVICTIONS		DISPOSITION OF COURT CASES						SENTENCE SUSPENDED											
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent				
																	Per of Cases	Found Guilty	Not Guilty	Nolled
Arson	38	78	7	18	23	60	2	5	4	11	1	3	1	3	1	3	6	20	5	17
Assault	16	33	1	2	3	19	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
Bribery	3	6	1	2	3	10	1	2	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
Burglary	6	12	3	50	3	50	3	50	3	50	3	50	3	50	3	50	3	50	3	50
Carnal Knowledge	2	4	1	2	3	75	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
Embezzlement	4	8	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50
False Pretenses	2	4	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Felonious Entry	4	8	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50
Forgery	4	8	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50
Fraud	1	2	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Incest	24	41	8	33	2	8	4	17	3	13	5	21	2	8	5	21	2	20	2	100
Larceny†	4	8	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
Manslaughter	1	2	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Mayhem	2	4	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Murder	1	2	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Perjury	2	4	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Rape	1	2	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Receiving Stolen Goods	1	2	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Robbery	58	38	12	21	10	17	1	2	33	56	1	2	1	2	8	17	17	49	4	24
Motor Vehicle Viol.‡	47	35	6	13	29	62	5	10.5	3	10.5	2	4	10	8	16	14	2	17	9	33
Liquor Law Violations§	118	92	76	64	16	14	10	8	16	14	10	8	16	14	10	8	16	14	10	8
Drunkenness	326	60	113	35	82	25	12	4	70	21	19	6	26	8	4	1	11	4	37	18
GRAND TOTALS	326	60	113	35	82	25	12	4	70	21	19	6	26	8	4	1	11	4	37	18

\*Under the various categories in these tables we are considering somewhat more than one-half of the total number of cases in the city courts of Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, respectively, during the first quarter of 1923.  
 †"Theft," instead of "larceny" as in the table, is the local term used. It includes the theft of motor cars.  
 ‡Violation of motor vehicle laws and ordinances in the Table does not include theft or receiving stolen cars or violations of city parking ordinances for which a summons is generally issued. It does include offenses against the speed laws, reckless driving and the like.  
 §Violations of the liquor law include transporting liquor by means of a vehicle, keeping with intent to sell, keeping a place reputed to sell, manufacturing and selling, etc.  
 ¶The term "nolles" includes "nolles on terms" and "nolles absolute." The former is used more often in relation to motor vehicle cases than to any other in these courts.

COMPARING NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SUSPENSIONS OF  
JAIL SENTENCES IN THE COURTS IN THE THREE CITIES  
(Ed.) Data from Table III.

<i>City Court:</i>	Hartford		New Haven		Bridgeport	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Assault .....	1	25			6	20
Burglary .....	2	50				
Embezzlement .....			1	20		
False Pretenses.....	1	50	1	14	2	67
Forgery .....	1	100				
Fraud .....	1	33	1	33	1	33
Larceny .....	2	22	4	15	2	20
Motor Vehicle Violations.....			66	58		
Liquor Law Violations.....	53	61	5	19	17	49
Drunkenness .....	24	34	21	6	9	9
Totals .....	85	46	30	6	37	18
 <i>Common Pleas Court:</i>						
Assault .....					1	100
Embezzlement .....						
Larceny .....						
Motor Vehicle Violations.....			3	50		
Liquor Law Violations.....			6	75	7	37
Drunkenness .....					2	29
Total .....			9	56	10	33
 <i>Superior Court:</i>						
Assault .....			2	18		
Burglary .....			1	50	3	50
Embezzlement .....	1	50				
False Pretenses.....					1	100
Forgery .....					1	100
Larceny .....	1	100			1	13
Receiving stolen goods.....					1	100
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	1	100	1	20		
Liquor Law Violations.....	5	38	2	100	1	100
Totals .....	11	44	6	18	8	36

The suspension of sentence is a tool that can easily be used to social disadvantage. By "suspension of sentence" we mean a case in which a defendant has pleaded guilty or has been found guilty and has been sentenced to pay a fine or to serve a penal term. The court, however, issues an order of suspension, whereupon the convicted person goes free excepting that he leaves behind him a stigma of having been convicted and sentenced—a record that means very little or nothing

to many criminals and misdemeanants. When the court uses his discretion in this manner too extensively he inevitably creates an impression in the minds of his supposed beneficiaries that the court does not take their offenses very seriously. The dignity of the courts suffers thereby and the majesty of the law becomes nothing. The desire of the best elements in the community to build up a conventional regard for the law and the courts is thwarted and a fertile matrix is created for more misdemeanors and crimes.

It is in line with good sense and sound policy to hold that if a culprit deserves a sentence of fine or imprisonment he deserves to be held for the payment of the fine or for serving out his term. There are undoubtedly exceptional cases but they should be rare.

If it be urged that the fine punishes wives and children we should enlarge our probation departments and require them to collect fines in instalments if it be only five cents a week until the whole is paid. Thereby the recent defendant will have an excellent lesson in industry and thrift—perhaps the first he has ever had. If the court fears that imprisonment works too great a hardship upon the innocent family he should be reminded that we can make compensation for their suffering by strengthening our institutions for family aid and by enabling the prisoner, while incarcerated, to earn, if it be but a little, to contribute to his family. (The prisoner in the Connecticut jails may now enjoy earnings to be applied on his fine, if any.) By all these means the penalty may be made a tool of great social advantage. It will develop a conventional regard for the majesty of the law and the dignity of the courts.

CRIMINAL COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Table III, Sec. II

CRIME STATISTICS FIRST QUARTER, 1923 (T. F.)

CLASSES OF CRIMES	Num-ber of Cases	CON-VICTIONS				DISPOSITION OF COURT CASES				SENTENCE SUSPENDED											
		Total	Per Cent	Plead Guilty	Per Cent	Found Guilty	Per Cent	Not Guilty	Per Cent	Bond Forfeited	Per Cent	Con-tinued	Per Cent	Judgment Ap-pended	Per Cent	Suspended	Per Cent	Both	Per Cent	On Probation	
																					Total
Arson	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Assault	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Bribery	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Burglary	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Carnal Knowledge	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Embezzlement	1	100	..	..	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
False Pretenses	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Felonious Entry	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Forgery	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Fraud	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Incest	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Larceny	1	100	..	..	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Manslaughter	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mayhem	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Murder	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Perjury	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rape	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rec. Stol. Goods	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Robbery	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Motor Vehicle Viol.	12	6	50	2	17	4	33	5	42	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Liquor Law Viol.	9	8	89	3	33	5	56	1	11	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Drunkenness	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GRAND TOTALS	25	16	64	5	20	11	44	6	24	1	4	2	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
														1	4	..	..	..	..	..	..
														9	56	1	4	..	..	..	..
														3	50	1	17	..	..	..	..
														6	75	..	..	..	..	..	..

CRIMINAL COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT

Table III, Sec. II

CRIME STATISTICS FIRST QUARTER, 1923 (T. F.)

CLASSES OF CRIMES	Total of Cases	CON-VICTIONS			DISPOSITION OF COURT CASES						SENTENCE SUSPENDED									
		Total	Per Cent	Total	Plead Guilty	Per Cent	Found Guilty	Per Cent	Not Guilty	Per Cent	Nolled	Bond Forfeited	Con-Judgment	Ap-Suspended	Total	Per Cent	Fine	Jail	Both	On Probation
Arson	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Assault	2	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Bribery	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Burglary	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Carnal Knowledge	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Embezzlement	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
False Pretenses	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Felonious Entry	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Forgery	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Fraud	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Incest	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Larceny	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Manslaughter	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Mayhem	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Murder	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Perjury	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Rape	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Rec. Stol. Goods	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Robbery	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Motor Vehicle Viol.	7	43	3	43	3	43	1	14	1	14	1	14	1	14	1	5	7	37	1	5
Liquor Law Viol.	21	19	91	18	86	1	5	2	9	2	9	1	5	7	37	1	5	7	37	1
Drunkennes	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100	7	100
GRAND TOTALS	37	30	81	29	78	1	3	6	16	1	3	1	3	10	33	1	3	10	33	1



HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT, SUPERIOR COURT  
 Table III, Sec. III  
 CRIME STATISTICS FIRST QUARTER (F. L. C. K.)

CLASSES OF CRIME	CON- VICTIONS		Found Guilty		Not Guilty		Judgment Con- Suspended		Appealed		Bond Forfeited		FINE		JAIL		BOTH		ON PROBATION							
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent						
	Num- ber of Cases		Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent						
Arson	1	33	1	33																						
Assault	3	100	3	100																						
Bribery	3	100	3	100																						
Burglary	3	100	3	100																						
Carr. Knowl.	1	100	1	100																						
Embezzle.	2	100	2	100																						
False Pret.																										
Fel. Ent.																										
Forgery																										
Fraud																										
Incest	5	100	5	100																						
Larceny	5	100	5	100																						
Manal.	3	33	3	33																						
Mayhem																										
Murder																										
Perjury	2	100	2	100																						
Rape																										
Rec. Stel. G.																										
Robbery	1	100	1	100																						
Mot. Veh. V.	1	100	1	100																						
Liq. Law V. 13	15	100	10	77	3	23			3	23																
Drunkness																										
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>84</b> *	<b>82</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>86</b>

\*Insane.  
 †In one case part of term was served first.  
 ‡In one case only part of term was suspended.  
 §Rolled a year later.  
 ¶Appealed to Supreme Court. Later two appeals withdrawn.  
 \*\*15 persons convicted in 13 cases.  
 \*\*\*The total number of cases of all categories in the New Haven Court during the quarter was 145, of which 61 had been continued from preceding terms.  
 The corresponding figures for the Bridgeport Court are 61 and 30.



Table III, Sec. III  
CRIME STATISTICS FIRST QUARTER, 1923 (T. F.)

CLASSES OF CRIMES	CON-VICTIONS			DISPOSITION OF COURT CASES						JUDGMENT SUSPENDED§								
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Found Guilty	Not Guilty	Bond Forfeited†		Continued		Judgment Suspended		Appealed		Fine	Jail		On Probation	
						Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent		Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent
Arson .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Assault .....	2	..	..	..	..	2	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Bribery .....	6	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Burglary .....	6	100	..	..	..	2	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	50	..	3
Carnal Knowledge .....	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Embezzlement .....	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
False Pretenses .....	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	100	..	1
Felonious Entry¶ .....	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	100	..	1
Forgery .....	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	100	..	1
Fraud .....	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Incest .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Larceny** .....	9	89	8	89	..	..	1	11	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	13	..	1
Manslaughter .....	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Mayhem .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Murder .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Perjury .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rape .....	2	100	2	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rec. Stol. Goods..	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	100	..	1
Robbery .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Motor Veh. Viol.†† .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Liquor Law Viol.‡‡ .....	1	100	1	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	100	..	1
Drunkenness .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GRAND TOT... 2§§	22	78	22	78	..	..	4	14	1	4	..	..	..	..	8	36	..	8

\*From the records in the office of the Clerk of the Court.  
 †This included "nolles on terms" as well as "nolles absolute."  
 ‡Percentages of bond forfeitures worked out on the basis of the whole number of cases in court, since all offenders are either placed on bond, or committed to jail awaiting trial (more often the latter in the lower courts, unless charged with a major crime).  
 §Percentages worked out on the basis of the total number of convictions.  
 ||Percentages worked out on the basis of number of convictions.  
 ¶"Breaking and entering" is the local term for such offense.  
 \*\*"Theft" is the local term used; this item includes thefts of all amounts; it also includes thefts of motor cars.  
 ††This item does not include the theft of motor cars, or receiving of stolen cars, or for violations against a city parking ordinance (for which only a summons is generally issued).  
 ‡‡This item includes any kind of a liquor law violation, such as transporting liquor by means of vehicle, keeping with intent to sell, keeping a place reputed to sell, manufacturing and selling, etc.  
 §§There were 78 cases in this court from the whole county in the first quarter of 1923, including approximately 33 "continued" cases, from previous terms (New Haven). Corresponding figures for Bridgeport are 40 and 24.

Table III

## NEW HAVEN, CONN., CRIMINAL COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

## NOTATION

The number of cases we are considering here is (for New Haven) about one-third of the total number that came before the court during the first quarter of 1923. As for Bridgeport, there were 40 cases during the quarter. Thirty-seven of these are in the table. Twenty-four of the 37 had been continued from previous terms.

The terms "larceny," "motor vehicle" and "liquor law" cases, and the term "nolle" have the same meaning here as in Part 1 of this table.

## ANALYSIS OF TABLE III

*Complaints of Offenses*

The number of complaints—764 in Hartford, 509 in New Haven and 363 in Bridgeport—shown on Table III, were the number recorded on the Detective's blotter at Police Headquarters, for the quarter; said complaints being only those filed under the classification of offenses studied in this survey. (In Hartford the department issues a daily mimeograph bulletin to the whole force showing what complaints have been made.) It will be noted that there were apparently no complaints of motor vehicle violations, liquor law violations, and drunkenness. This is explained by the fact that the traffic squad arrests the motor vehicle violator on the spot; the policeman likewise arrests the drunk when seen; and the Superintendent of Police is authority for the statement that 90% of the complaints filed against liquor law violators in Bridgeport are the result of spite work; hence these complaints are not recorded, but are nevertheless quietly investigated. Where the facts warrant it, arrests are made. The figures then, set out herein, with reference to complaints, give an idea merely of the number of complaints that are or may be filed in the city within any given period, for these particular classes of offenses.

During the period under study, there were 409 arrests in Bridgeport made by the Police Department for these particular kinds of crimes, and 1,274 in New Haven, and 1,019 in Hartford. There was no adequate or quick method by which it could be learned how many of these arrests were the result of the number complained of as shown in the adjoining column of figures.

*Number of Cases Before the Criminal Courts*

The number of cases coming under these particular classes of offenses filed in the courts of criminal jurisdiction during the period

covered by this survey, amounted to 790 in New Haven (or more than twice as many as were filed in the corresponding courts in Bridgeport for the same period of time). Of these 674 were filed in the City Court, 25 in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas (11 fewer than in Bridgeport), and 91 in the Superior Court (or more than three times as many as in Bridgeport). In other words, 85% of all these cases came before the City Court, and 3% and 12%, respectively, were heard in the other two courts. Out of the 674 cases coming before the City Court, said court made final disposition of 640 cases and sent but 34 to the higher courts. (Table III.)

For the same period of time in Bridgeport, there were 391 cases filed in the 3 courts of criminal jurisdiction, of which 326 were in the City Court, 37 in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas, and 28 in the Superior Court, or 83%, 10% and 7%, respectively, in the 3 courts.

In Hartford there were 492 in the Police Court and 34 in the Superior Court; a total of 526.

These facts tend to show that the court experiences of most individuals who are charged with offenses are through contact with the lower or municipal court rather than through the higher courts.

COMPARING NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CONVICTIONS ON  
CERTAIN CHARGES IN THE THREE CITIES (Ed.)

	Hartford		New Haven		Bridgeport	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Police Court:</i>						
Assault .....	11	68			30	78
Burglary .....	4	57	1	100		
False Pretenses.....	2	100	7	44	3	50
Felonious Entry.....	1	50				
Forgery .....	1	100			3	75
Fraud .....	5	56	3	75		
Larceny .....	22	64	26	57	10	41
Receiving Stolen Goods.....	2	50				
Robbery .....	2	100				
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	32	56	113	73	22	38
Liquor Law Violations.....	106	78	26	60	35	75
Total—all types studied.....	394	80	516	77	195	60
<i>Court of Common Pleas:</i>						
Assault .....					1	50
Embezzlement .....			1	100		
Larceny .....			1	100		
Motor Vehicle Violations.....			6	50	3	43
Liquor Law Violations.....			8	89	19	21
Drunkenness .....					7	100
Total .....			16	64	30	81

*Superior Court:*

Assault .....	1	33	11	61		
Burglary .....	3	100	2	25	6	100
Carnal Knowledge.....			3	75		
Embezzlement .....	2	100	1	20		
False Pretenses.....					1	100
Felonious Entry.....			1	25		
Forgery .....					1	100
Fraud .....					1	100
Larceny .....	5	100	9	43	8	89
Manslaughter .....	1	33			1	100
Rape .....					2	100
Receiving Stolen Goods.....					2	100
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	1	100	5	56		
Liquor Law Violations.....	15	100	2	20	1	100
Total .....	28	82	34	38	22	78

In the Criminal Court of Cook County, Ill., according to information from Col. Henry Barrett Chamberlin, Director of the Chicago Crime Commission, the per cent of defendants "penalized" is as follows: 36.75 (1922); 37.27 (1923); 41.83 (1924).

In the Baltimore City Court the per cent of convictions (including pleas of guilty) is 50.8. (Information from Mr. James M. Hepbrun, Director of the Criminal Justice Commission.)

In the Fulton County, Ga., City Court 66% of cases were convicted (including pleas of guilty). Convictions on pleas of not guilty were 15% of the total for 1921. (See Jour. Crim. Law and Criminol., Aug. 1925.)

*Pleas of Guilty*

One explanation offered for the large proportion of pleas of guilty in the Connecticut cities was that a long line of prosecuting attorneys for the counties had had such enviable records for conviction that offenders were afraid to stand trial. Another explanation offered was that offenders who had received a fine and jail sentence in the lower court would appeal their cases in an effort to delay final action as long as possible. When they saw, after some time, that a still further delay would be impossible, they came into court and pleaded guilty, and relied upon the mercy of the court to suspend possible jail sentence.

COMPARING NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PLEAS OF GUILTY  
OF CERTAIN CHARGES IN THE THREE CITIES (Ed.)

	Hartford		New Haven		Bridgeport	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Police Court:</i>						
Assault .....	4	25			7	18
Burglary .....	1	14	1	66		
False Pretenses.....	1	50	4	25	3	50
Felonious Entry.....	1	50				
Forgery .....	1	100				
Fraud .....	3	33	2	50	1	25
Larceny .....	13	38	13	29	8	33
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	13	23	74	48	12	21
Liquor Law Violations.....	50	37	13	30	6	13
Drunkenness .....	155	72	254	71	76	64
Totals .....	242	49	366	55	113	35
<i>Court of Common Pleas:</i>						
Arson .....					1	50
Motor Vehicle Violations.....			2	17	3	43
Liquor Law Violations.....			3	33	18	86
Drunkenness .....					7	100
Totals .....			5	20	29	78
<i>Criminal Superior Court:</i>						
Assault .....	1	33	10	56		
Burglary .....	3	100	2	25	6	100
Carnal Knowledge.....			3	75		
Embezzlement .....	2	100	1	20		
False Pretenses.....					1	100
Felonious Entry.....			1	25		
Forgery .....					1	100
Fraud .....					1	100
Larceny .....	5	100	8	38	8	89
Manslaughter .....	1	33			1	100
Perjury .....	2	100				
Rape .....					2	100
Receiving Stolen Goods.....					1	100
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	1	100	5	56		
Liquor Law Violations.....	10	77	2	20	1	100
Totals .....	25	74	32	35	22	78

## NOTES

In the Criminal Court of Cook Co., Ill., the per cent of pleas of guilty has been as follows: 33.7 (1922), 37.63 (1923), and 42.7 (1924). (Information from Col. Chamberlin.)

In the Baltimore City Court, the corresponding figure is 50.8. (Information from Mr. Hepbron.)

In Fulton Co., Ga., City Court (1921), 51% plead guilty. (See Jour. Crim. Law and Criminol. Aug. 1925.)

SHOWING THE NUMBER AND PER CENT OF "NOLLES" IN CERTAIN CASES IN THE COURTS OF HARTFORD, NEW HAVEN AND BRIDGEPORT (Ed.)

	Hartford		New Haven		Bridgeport	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Police Court:</i>						
Assault .....					4	11
Burglary .....			6	33	5	31
Embezzlement .....			4	30		
False Pretenses.....			8	50	3	50
Forgery .....			3	75		
Fraud .....	2	22			1	25
Larceny .....	6	18	9	20	3	13
Manslaughter .....					3	75
Perjury .....					2	100
Receiving Stolen Goods.....	1	25				
Robbery .....					1	100
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	19	33	29	18	33	56
Liquor Law Violations.....	19	14	4	9	5	10
Drunkenness .....	10	5	24	7	10	8
Totals .....	57	12	87	13	70	21
<i>Court of Common Pleas:</i>						
Assault .....					1	50
Fraud .....			1	50		
Motor Vehicle Violations.....					3	43
Liquor Law Violations.....					2	9
Totals .....			1	4	6	16
<i>Criminal Superior Court:</i>						
Assault .....	1	33			2	100
Burglary .....			2	25		
Carnal Knowledge.....			1	25	2	100
Larceny .....			2	10		
Manslaughter .....	1	33				
Robbery .....	1	100				
Totals .....	3	9	5	5	4	14

NOTES

In the Criminal Court of Cook Co., Ill., the per cent of "nolled" cases is as follows: 8.9 (1922), 8.2 (1923), 5.9 (1924). (Col. Chamberlin.)

In the Baltimore Police Court "nolled" and "settled," 2.6%. (Mr. Hepbron.)

In the City Court of Fulton Co., Ga., "Nolled," 17%.

*Nolles*

There are two uses of the nolle in Connecticut; one is known technically as the "nolle prosequi" meaning an unwillingness to prose-



cute because of lack of evidence; the other is known as the "nolle on terms," whereby a case is dismissed or thrown out of court on the payment of a certain amount of money agreed upon between the prosecuting attorney and the attorney for the defendant in question. Upon such agreement, the prosecuting attorney goes into court and moves that the case be nolle, very seldom giving his reasons therefor. The judge usually accepts his recommendation and makes such ruling. It tends to expedite the work of the court and the prosecuting attorneys.

In the City Court a record is usually made of the reasons for such nolle. It is not often done, if at all, in the higher courts. Oftentimes the reason for so doing is later forgotten even by the prosecuting attorney who recommended it.

"Nolles on terms" in the City Court are used quite extensively in motor vehicle violations, especially in two particular types of instances: (1) If an offender is before the court on the charge of having a faulty emergency brake, his case is given a nolle without costs; if he is charged with having one faulty foot brake, his case is nolle on the payment of \$5; if he is charged with having two faulty brakes, his case is nolle on the payment of \$10. The amount of the fine is increased proportionally if he is a repeater of the same or similar offense. (2) In the event an offender is arrested for operating a car without having an operator's license in his possession, his case is nolle on payment of \$3.00, provided he has no prior motor vehicle violation charge against him. This attitude on the part of the court is on the theory that an individual should be warned if he is a first offender of this kind. If the offender should be subsequently convicted of a motor violation his license may be suspended by the state department.

It is the practice in this court also not to nolle any case of original jurisdiction; neither are cases ever nolle by the prosecuting attorney, excepting in open court. It was learned that in the higher courts the prosecuting attorneys do nolle cases of original jurisdiction, and that they nolle cases also at times not in open court.

The indiscriminate use of the nolle might lead to the appearance of individuals being able to "tamper with officials" in the performance of their duties. No such charge, however, is made here. It is sometimes alleged that criminal lawyers use every conceivable device to procure the nolle of a case. To safeguard an abuse of the use of the nolle, would it not be better to file the motion to nolle, in writing, as is the custom with other motions, setting out the reasons therefor, and letting the court rule upon such motion? This would preserve for all time the record of such action.

### *Bond Forfeitures*

There were few cases wherein bonds were forfeited in New Haven; these amounted to 6 or 1%, out of the total number of cases in the 3 courts; 3 of these cases were in the City Court, 2 in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas, and 1 in the Superior Court.

In Bridgeport, for the same period of time, there were 20, or 5%, bond forfeitures (or rather 20 cases in which bonds were forfeited), out of a total number of 391 cases in the 3 courts.

In Hartford there were none in either the Police or the Superior Courts so far as our nineteen categories go.

In the City Court of Fulton County, Ga. (1921) appearance bonds were forfeited in 14% of cases in which they were assessed and in the Superior Court of the same county the corresponding figure is 18%. (See *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, August, 1925.)

### *Appeals*

Of the total number of cases in the 3 courts of Bridgeport (391) covered by this survey, 11, or 3%, were appealed to the higher courts; these appeals were taken from the City Court. (Table III.)

For the same period of time in New Haven, 9 cases, or 1% of the total number were appealed; of this number 8 were appealed from the City Court and 1 from the Criminal Court of Common Pleas.

In Hartford 2% were appealed from the Police Court and 9% from the Superior Court.

### *Suspension of Sentence*

Out of the total number of convictions in the 3 courts of criminal jurisdiction in Bridgeport (247), 55 jail sentences and 1 fine sentence, or 22%, were suspended. (Table III.) Of this number, 37 jail sentences were suspended in the City Court, 10 jail sentences and 1 fine sentence were suspended in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas, and 8 jail sentences were suspended in the Superior Court.

In the three courts in New Haven, for the same period, out of the total number of convictions (566), 45 jail sentences, or 8%, and 160 cases of both fine and jail sentences, or 28%, were suspended. Of this number, 30 jail sentences and 159 sentences of both fine and jail were suspended in the City Court; 9 jail sentences and 1 of both fine and jail sentence were suspended in the Superior Court.

From the survey made in Hartford covering the same period of time, it was found that 2% of the fine sentences and 46% of the jail

sentences in the Police (or City) Court were suspended; and that 15% of the fine sentences, 44% of the jail sentences, and 18% of the sentences of both fine and jail were suspended in the Superior Court.

In many instances in these cities suspension of sentence is followed by probation and probationary oversight. This disposition is much superior to suspension of sentence without probation—a situation that only aggravates the difficulties that the system of probation itself does not entirely overcome.

### *Probation*

Six per cent of the whole number of cases disposed of in Bridgeport, or 10% of the cases in which convictions were had, or 44% of the cases in which sentence was suspended, were placed on probation. Sixteen of these cases were placed on probation in the City Court, 8 in the Superior Court, and none whatever in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas, although 10 jail sentences had been suspended in that court.

In New Haven, but 17 cases, or 3%, out of the total of 566 convictions, or 8% of the cases in which sentence was suspended, were placed on probation; 8 of these were from the City Court and 9 from the Superior Court, and none from the Criminal Court of Common Pleas.

### COMPARING THE NUMBER AND PER CENT OF CASES PLACED ON PROBATION IN THE THREE CITIES (Ed.)

	Hartford		New Haven		Bridgeport	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>City Court:</i>						
Assault .....	2	18			5	17
Burglary .....	2	50				
Embezzlement .....			1	20		
False Pretenses.....			1	14	2	67
Forgery .....	1	100				
Larceny .....	3	14	1	4	2	20
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	1	3	3	3		
Liquor Law Violations.....	2	2	1	4	4	15
Drunkenness .....	11	5	1	0.3	3	0.3
Totals .....	22	6	8	1.5	16	9

*Common Pleas Court:* None.

*Superior Court:*

Assault .....		2	18			
Burglary .....				3	50	
Embezzlement .....	1	50				
False Pretenses.....				1	100	
Forgery .....				1	100	
Larceny .....	4	80	4	44	1	13
Manslaughter .....			1	100		
Receiving Stolen Goods.....				1	100	
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	1	100	1	20		
Liquor Law Violations.....	4	27	1	50	1	100
Totals .....	10	36	9	26	8	36

In the above table the per cents are based upon the total number of convictions including "plead guilty." The figures are entirely too small for statistical treatment even when we take the sum of all probationary cases among the twenty-two classes of offenses that we have selected in this study. Such as the figures are, however, the percentages for all the courts are not widely different from those that relate to corresponding offenses and convictions in Fulton County, Georgia. (See Jour. of Crim. Law and Criminol. XVI, 2, Aug. 1925, pp. 210 and 211.)

From such data as we have it appears probable that Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport are not making as large use of the probation system as is done in very many jurisdictions.

The following statement from Mr. Charles L. Chute, General Secretary of the National Probation Association (Nov. 24, 1925), affords information as to the maximum extent of the use of the system:

" . . . Massachusetts is apparently the only state that compiles complete figures on the proportion of persons placed on probation in various groups of courts. The last figures available are for 1923 during which year the total dispositions reported in the Superior Courts (trying all felonies) were 11,309. Of these 2,149 were disposed of by being placed on probation, or 19%. In all the lower courts, District, Municipal, and the one Juvenile, there were 102,532 dispositions of which 27,656 were placed on probation, or 27%.

"In New York City Magistrate's courts trying lesser offenses, only 3 9/10% of all cases were placed on probation during 1921. The proportion was probably about the same last year. The small percentage is due to the fact that these courts handle all traffic violations, violations of city ordinances and other minor cases in which probation is seldom used.

"In the Court of General Sessions, New York City, trying all the felonies, for the first ten months of 1925, 23% of the Catholics, 27% of the Protestants and 27% of the Jews were placed on probation. The work in this court is divided into three divisions supervised by privately paid officers from societies that have the work in charge. Practically every case coming before the court is investigated by the probation officers.

"In the County and Supreme Courts of Erie County (Buffalo) for the past fourteen years, approximately 45% of all convictions for felonies have been placed on probation.

"Unlike Massachusetts, in New York State a larger percentage of felonies are placed on probation than minor offenders. This is due to the fact that the probation work is better organized in the higher courts and the cases there are more thoroughly investigated. In the police courts there are a greater number of minor and quasi-criminal cases which do not require probationary supervision but are disposed of by suspended sentence, fines, etc."

Col. Henry Barrett Chamberlin, Operating Director of the Chicago Crime Commission, is authority for the statement (Nov. 17, 1925) that in the Criminal Court of Cook County during 1922, 11.62% of convictions were handled by the probationary method; in 1923, 11.18%, and in 1924, 13.77%.

In Baltimore (City Court) the proportion is approximately 7%. The estimate is based upon a study of 500 consecutive cases. (Information from Mr. James M. Hepbron, Managing Director of the Criminal Justice Commission of Baltimore.)

In view of the enormous flood of crime in this country, in states in which probation is widely employed and elsewhere, it can hardly be claimed that the system is an unmixed good. An office of this nature performing the functions of collector of fines in small weekly installments is one thing. The same office recommending this and that defendant to the court for probation, securing his release without sentence and following him thereafter for a season as a "big brother," is a very different matter. How different depends upon the way in which the defendant looks upon the situation. If he is living upon the lower levels of intelligent outlook upon substantial social welfare he looks upon the latter procedure as "soft" and as evidence that he is favorably regarded after all. "Majestic law" becomes a formless, yielding something that can be transgressed with impunity. And it is entirely probable that a great majority of probationers are capable of seeing the system only in this light and not in that of a much-to-be coveted opportunity for improvement.

In addition to these more or less theoretical considerations it must be said that up to the present no sufficiently extended and pro-

longed surveys have been made to give us reasonably accurate knowledge of the effects of probation. Before expressing a final judgment upon the efficacy of the system we ought to know what happens to each one-time probationer, for example, during a period of at least five years after his discharge from the custody of probation officers. In the proportion of the total who continue to go straight during the period we would find a measure of the value of the system.

### *The Time Element*

For this part of the survey we studied the same groupings of crimes and misdemeanors and the same cases from the three courts as in other parts of this report. The classes of offenses numbered 22, and the total cases were as follows:

- 490 in the Hartford Police Court.
- 362 in the Hartford Superior Court.
- 674 in the New Haven City Court.
- 25 in the New Haven Common Pleas Court.
- 91 in the New Haven Superior Court.
- 326 in the Bridgeport City Court.
- 37 in the Bridgeport Common Pleas Court.
- 28 in the Bridgeport Superior Court.

## ANNOTATIONS ON TABLE IV (HARTFORD)

*Sources of Data:*

## Police Court—

The Court Docket, kept by the Probation Officer, William T. Lynch, gives continuations from day to day. Some cases had to be checked up in the card-file of offenders kept for the Court by the Clerk.

## Criminal Superior Court—

The original files were consulted, placed at my disposal by the Assistant Clerk, Lucius P. Fuller.

*Date of Filing:*

## Police Court—

This date, the date of the information paper, is regularly identical with the date of arrest. Offenders are kept in the police lock-up only to await the Court which sits every morning except Sunday.

## Criminal Superior Court:

Date of filing here is the date on which the case was received from the Police Court, or on which a bench-warrant arrest was made. Cases could not be tried in this Court during this quarter until the first Tuesday of March, the date for opening one of the four annual sessions. (See General Statutes, Sec. 6625.)

*Cases Continued Beyond the Quarter:*

Cases begun in this quarter but not finished were followed up and charted with the other continued cases.

*Perjury:*

## Police Court—

In earlier tables three perjury cases have been noted. Here only one is recorded because, after the quarter at the end of the continuation, two were changed to drunkenness.

*Computation:*

## Police Court—

The average number of days for each of all cases has been obtained by dividing the total number of days the continued cases were continued, 1,014, by the total number of cases, 490. Similarly, the average time for each case of each crime was obtained by dividing the total number of continued days, by the total number of cases enumerated for that crime.

In a subsequent column an average is given for the continued cases only, where the total number of continued days is divided by the number of continued cases only, ignoring those disposed of on their first day in court.







## Criminal Superior Court—

11½ month cases.....	5.50
20½ month cases.....	30.00
2⅔ month cases.....	5.00
1 10/12 month cases.....	11.00
	51.50

51.50 divided by 34 is 1.51 months.

*Remarks, Continued Cases in Police Court:*

It is pertinent to inquire to what extent the continuation of cases means the costly imprisonment of defendants unable to find bondsmen. Imprisoned for Lack of Bondsmen,<sup>21</sup> First Quarter, 1923—

Number of prisoners .....	86
Number of days imprisoned.....	292
City's bill for food (at rate of \$3.00 per week).....	\$125.00

As 86 is 61% of 141, we therefore may infer that in 61% of the continued cases, continuation meant economic and financial loss of at least \$125.00.

## ANALYSIS OF TABLE IV.

*City Court*

An approximation of the lapse of time between arrest (or the filing of the case in that court) and disposition of the cases, was obtained from one of the Prosecuting Attorneys. His opinion is as follows:

“Eighty-five per cent of the criminal cases that come before the Court in Bridgeport are finally disposed of in not more than twenty-four hours after the offense is alleged to have been committed. In the other 15%, in which lawyers are engaged as counsel it is very frequent to have continuances asked for by counsel for the accused and these continuances vary from three days to a period of not over one week. There are possibly 1½% of these cases in which longer continuances are had pending investigation by the probation officer, etc., but these cases are very few.”

This statement has been verified from other authoritative sources. Taking these figures as a fair estimate of the approximate length of time between arrest and disposition, the average time would be 1.6 days. This does not, of course, include the cases that were bound over to the higher courts; in the 326 cases in this court, 26, or a small percent, were bound over.

In New Haven there were a great many more continuances, but there were twice as many cases. The average time in this court in this city was 1.8 days. One of the clerks of the court is authority for the statement that 75% of the cases are disposed of within one day after filing, and that most of the others are completed within seven days. This estimate has been verified by a hasty survey of the records. The average time for *all* cases is approximately 1.8 days. The "bound over" cases—5+ % of the total, 674—are not included in this estimate.

In Hartford 71+ % of the total 490 were disposed of in one day. The cases that ran beyond the first day, 141 or 2.9% of the total, were disposed of in an average of 7+ days. This makes an average of 2.7 days for all cases. The 17 "bound over" cases are not included in the computation.

#### *Criminal Court of Common Pleas*

The average time between the filing of a case (in the term of court to which it was returnable) and its final disposition, according to this study, was found to be 2 months in the Bridgeport Court of Common Pleas. This average was worked out by taking each case separately and following it through the court. For the same period of time in the similar court in New Haven, the average time was found to be 2.8 months. This is 4.3 months from arrest to final disposition.

It may be added, that in this court in Bridgeport all of the cases but one were disposed of within 5 to 6 months after filing: the remaining one was not disposed of for a year and five months. As has already been observed, the Court of Common Pleas in Hartford does not hear criminal cases.

#### *Superior Court*

The average time between the filing of the case in the Superior Court (in the term to which it was returnable) and the date of disposition, was found to be 3.3 months in Bridgeport. All the cases excepting two in this court were disposed of within 4 to 5 months; one of the two was on the docket for 2 years and the other one for 11 months.

In New Haven the average time in the similar court was found to be 4 months, and in Hartford it was 1.5 months.

The material set forth in Table V does not take into account the fact that some of these cases in the higher courts were on appeal from the City Court, the date of the original arrest or trial in the lower

court not being considered herein in the computation of the time consumed between the filing of the case and its final disposition in the higher court. In other words, a case may have been filed in the lower court on January 2, 1922, appealed to the higher courts, where final action may have been delayed for various reasons for perhaps 2 or more years, which was true in one case in the Superior Court. Two insane criminals in New Haven whose cases were dated many years previously were not included in the computation.

"Disposition" was employed herein in the sense that it meant the time at which sentence was passed, not the date at which probation ended, provided the defendant was placed on probation.

### *Treatment of First Offenders and Repeaters*

In this section we are bringing together only what data are available as to the comparative treatment of first offenders and repeaters.

The recidivist or repeater, and what to do with him, are among the knottiest problems in criminal procedure. The effect of legal procedure upon the criminal is certainly one of the criteria of efficient administration of criminal justice. It is very difficult to find out the effect excepting in isolated instances.

Once we have a repeater before the bar, and once he has been convicted, common sense and good judgment dictate that he be treated differently from the first offender. The very fact that he is a repeater is a revelation of his character that did not appear on the occasion of his first trial. Just how different the treatment should be we do not know. The particular case will go far to determine the question.

In the large it is regarded as certain that the better system of administration will put less stress upon the fine and the sentence to imprisonment in relation to these cases and will place greater emphasis upon medical and psychiatric treatment in suitable institutions and even upon permanent institutionalization of incurables. In this connection it is appropriate to draw attention to certain surveys of repeaters, notably that by Dr. Paul Bowers (See Jour. Crim. Law and Criminol.), that demonstrate the utterly irremediable condition of repeaters of, at any rate, the fourth degree. The only method for the protection of society against them is to be found in their permanent segregation—possibly hospitalization.

Table V, is a compilation of material on the treatment of offenders and repeaters. In collecting this data it was necessary to obtain a list of names as a basis from which to study repeaters. Such a list was compiled from records of offenders in the Criminal Court of

Common Pleas. Not all of the classes of crimes heretofore studied in other phases in this survey were used; a few classes would bring the result sought. Motor Vehicle Violations, Liquor Law Violations, and Drunkenness were chosen as classes of cases upon which attention should be centered. A list of offenders charged with these offenses, covering a period of five years (1919-1923), was gathered from the records of the above mentioned court. The cases were taken from the records in the order in which they were listed therein.

After compiling the list it was necessary to check the whole list of the apparent first offenders by means of records in the Motor Vehicle Department of the State, as well as through the records of the Police Department and the court. Two interpretations of "repeaters" were made: (1) Those offenders who had committed a first offense under one of these headings and had been convicted in the City Court, and later had been convicted also of any other crime, either in the City Court or in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas. (The line of figures opposite the item "Miscellaneous Offenders" is for this latter classification, which classification is not used in any other part of the Table.)

Tables V and VI follow:

Table V (F. L. C. K.)

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT. CRIMINAL SUPERIOR COURT

TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS, PERIOD JANUARY, 1919, TO JANUARY 1, 1924

FIRST OFFENDERS

CLASSES OF CRIME	SENTENCE					SENTENCE SUSPENDED					NOT SUSPENDED																		
	Total	Vacated	Remainings	Continued	Per Cent	Nolled	Per Cent	Nolled	Per Cent	Remainings	Bond forfeited	Per Cent	Insane	Per Cent	Probation	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Fine	Jail	Both	Total	Per Cent	Fine	Jail	Both	Total	Per Cent	
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	78	22	56	2	4	24	44	30	1	10	33	10	33	21	70	2	15	..	..	10	48	..	..	10	100	11	52	1	50
Liquor Law Violations.....	79	25	54	..	..	19	35	35	..	3	9	25	71	25	71	7	43	..	..	25	28	..	..	25	100	18	72	9	60
Drunkennes .....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

REPEATERS

CLASSES OF CRIME	SENTENCE SUSPENDED					NOT SUSPENDED																							
	Total	Vacated	Remainings	Per Cent	Probation	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Fine	Jail	Both	Total	Per Cent	Fine	Jail	Both	Total	Per Cent											
Motor Vehicle Violations.....	22	8	14	8	3	50	2	33	4	67	1	50	3	75	..	..	1	50	1	50	..	..	1	25	1	25	13	72	
Liquor Law Violations.....	54	8	46	6	15	22	55	36	90	18	45	1	5	9	25	1	6	21	35	27	75	13	35	27	75	13	72	..	..
Drunkennes .....	6	..	6	..	3	50	3	50	3	100	..	..	3	100	..	..	3	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

Note: Cases under "probation" in each section of this table were first sentenced to jail, sentence was at once suspended and they were put on probation.

Table V (T. F.)  
 NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT  
 TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS, PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1919, TO DECEMBER 31, 1923, CITY COURT

CLASSES OF CRIME	NOLLED		SENTENCE		FIRST OFFENDERS		NOT SUSPENDED		NOLLED					
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent				
Motor Vehicle Violators.....17	2	12	80	3	20	3	20	3	20	12	80	3	12.5	
Liquor Law Violators.....16	3	19	13	100	..	..	..	..	..	13	100	..	..	
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent
	5	29	93	70	23	17	23	17	23	13	100	..	..	

  

CLASSES OF CRIME	SENTENCE		REPEATERS		NOT SUSPENDED	
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent
Motor Vehicle Violators.....	15	88	2	12	2	12
Liquor Law Violators.....	9	64	5	36	9	100
	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent
	24	92	7	58	11	100

## ANNOTATIONS

Table V

*Definitions:*

A First Offender is one who, according to Court records, has committed a motor vehicle or liquor law violation for the first time. If he has committed other kinds of offenses, they are not considered in the tabulation.

A Repeater is one who, according to the Court records, has committed two or more vehicle or liquor law violations, in Hartford or in any other town in the state.

*Sources:*

All cases are limited to Hartford City, and were copied for the five year period from the docket of the State's Attorney, Mr. Hugh Alcorn.

*Previous Violations:*

In motor vehicle cases, the data was obtained from the State Motor Vehicle Department through the courtesy of the Commissioner, Mr. Robbins B. Stoeckel.

In liquor law violations and drunkenness, the data were obtained from the card-file in the Police Court, kept by the court clerk.

*First Offenders in Liquor Law Violations:*

Of the 79 first-offender, liquor-law violators studied, the card record of the court showed that 23 later became repeaters, or 29+%.

Of the 23 who became repeaters, the first offense in 4 cases was nolleed, or 17%.

Of the 79 first-offender, liquor-law violators studied, 18, or 23+%, had been previously arrested for other offenses. Two others had been previously arrested (25+% in all), for liquor law violations, but both cases had been nolleed.

*Analysis of Table V.*

Here we find that out of these 25 cases of first offenders in Bridgeport, 1 was nolleed. Further, that fines to the collective amount of \$3,100 were assessed against these offenders, or an average of \$125 per person; that in 12 cases, or 48%, jail sentences were given, the average being 10 days each; and that in 4 cases, or 16%, the jail sentences were suspended, leaving 8 not suspended; also, that 8 of these cases, or 42%, were appealed.

As to repeaters, this Table shows that out of the 25 cases, none was nolleed; that the collective amount of fines assessed in these cases amounted to \$4900, or an average of \$196 per case, or \$71 per case higher than the fines assessed against first offenders; that jail sentences were given in 22 instances, or 80%; or, that 32% more received



jail sentences in addition to fines than they did as first offenders; that the average jail sentence was 21.8 days or 64% higher than that received as first offenders; that 7, or 28% of the jail sentences were suspended; and that 16 cases, or 66% were appealed.

The corresponding study in New Haven revealed the following facts: Of the 16 cases studied, the collective amount of fine was \$1650, an average of \$103 per person; 1 offender received a jail sentence (which was not suspended), for first offense; that the collective amount of fines for repeaters was \$2400, an average of \$150 per case, or \$47 per case higher than the fines assessed against first offenders, and 6 received jail sentences, as against but 1 as first offenders; that 2 of these jail sentences were suspended. The average jail sentence for repeaters was 35 days, as against 10 days for first offenders.

#### NOTE

"In the Superior Court (Criminal Term) at New Haven, on November 2, 1923, Judge Newell Jennings presiding, 22 persons plead guilty in liquor prosecutions of whom 18 were sent to jail. Five saloon and restaurant keepers, so-called first offenders, pleaded guilty to charges of keeping or selling liquor, were each given sentences of \$200 and 30 days in jail on each of two counts, and one of them was given an additional \$100 and 30 days on a third count. None of these sentences was suspended. Five bartenders, first offenders, on like charges, were each given 30 days in jail and also a fine of from \$50 to \$200 on first counts, 30 days in jail on second counts and additional days in jail or fine on third counts. None of these was suspended. Five other saloon keepers, second or greater offenders, on like charges, were each given jail sentences ranging from 2 months to a year in jail with fines in addition of from \$300 to \$7,000.00. None of these was suspended.

"Of these last, one was fined \$3,000 with 6 months in jail on three counts; another was fined \$5,000 with one year in jail on 5 counts, and a third was fined \$7,000 with a year in jail on 7 counts. None suspended. Five others were sentenced from 5 to 30 days in jail, according to charge and circumstances, of which 2 were suspended.

"One hotel and saloon keeper forfeited his bond of \$5,000; and in one case judgment was entirely suspended.

"Total fines, plus the bond forfeited, amounted to \$24,150.00. The average jail sentence to be served, on 28 counts against first offenders, was 26 days; and on 7 like counts against second or greater offenders, 150 days." (From printed pamphlet of an address, delivered at New Haven, Oct. 26, 1923, by Hon. Wm. B. Boardman, Pres. State Bar Assn. and ex-Judge Police Ct. at Bridgeport.)

Table VI  
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT (T. F.)

TREATMENT OF LIQUOR LAW OFFENDERS, PERIOD JAN. 1, 1919, TO DEC. 31, 1923. (IN CITY COURT.)

Offender No.	FIRST OFFENDERS										REPEATERS											
	Sentence					Sent. Sus- pended					Sent. Sus- pended			Sent. Sus- pended								
	None	Amt. Fine	Amt. Jail	Appealed	Days)	Both	Fine	Jail	Both	None	Amt. Fine	Amt. Jail	Appealed	Days)	Both	Fine	Jail	Both	Fine	Jail	Both	
1*		\$ 50																				
2†	1																					
3		200	10																			
4†		150																				
5		150																				
6†		150																				
7†		150																				
8††		100																				
9††		150																				
10§§		100																				
11		150																				
12		150																				
13		100																				
14	1	100																				
15†††	1																					
16†††		100																				
TOTAL	3	\$1650	1	§§§§			13	13		2	\$2400	6	§§§§	2		14	14					

\*Arrested 7 times, in New Haven.  
 †Arrested 4 times, in New Haven.  
 ‡Arrested 7 times, in New Haven.  
 §Arrested 8 times, in New Haven.  
 ||Arrested 4 times, in New Haven.  
 |||Arrested 7 times, in New Haven.  
 ††On the next or following offense this offender received a \$200 fine and 15 days in jail; jail sentence suspended.  
 †††Arrested 8 times, in New Haven.  
 ††††Arrested 5 times, in New Haven.  
 †††††Arrested 3 times, in New Haven.  
 ††††††On two occasions following those in this Table, this offender received fines of \$150 and \$300, respectively.  
 †††††††Arrested 7 times, in New Haven.  
 ††††††††Arrested 5 times, in New Haven; on a later conviction he received a \$200 fine and 30 days in jail.  
 †††††††††Arrested 4 times, in New Haven; on a later conviction (motor vehicle violation) he received \$200 and 30 days.  
 ††††††††††There were no records of any appeals on the Police Department records; these were not traced through the Court records to see how many were appealed.

BRIDGEFORD, CONNECTICUT  
 Table VI (T. F.)  
 TREATMENT OF LIQUOR LAW OFFENDERS, PERIOD JAN. 1, 1919, TO DEC. 31, 1923. (IN CITY COURT)

OFFENDER NO.	FIRST OFFENDERS				REPEATERS					
	Sentence	Amt. Fine	Amt. Jail	Sent. Suspended	Sentence	Amt. Fine	Amt. Jail	Sent. Suspended		
1*	Nolle	\$ 200	10	..	Both	200	10	..		
2†	..	100	..	..	..	50	10	..		
3†	..	100	10	..	..	200	40	..		
4§	..	200	10	..	..	200	60	..		
5	..	200	10	..	..	200	30	..		
6	..	200	10	..	..	200	30	..		
7**	1**	..	..	..	..	150	30	..		
8	..	200	10	..	..	200	30	..		
9	..	200	10	..	..	200	15	..		
10††	..	200	10	..	..	225	10	..		
11††	..	150	..	..	..	200	10	..		
12§§	..	200	10	..	..	200	10	..		
13	..	200	10	..	..	200	10	..		
14	..	200	10	..	..	200	30	..		
15***	..	200	..	..	..	200	30	..		
16†††	1†††	..	..	..	..	100	..	..		
17†††	..	50	..	..	..	200	..	..		
18§§§	1	..	..	..	..	200	10	..		
19	1	..	..	..	..	200	5	..		
20	..	150	10	..	..	..	10	..		
21****	..	75	..	..	..	200	45	..		
22††††	..	75	..	..	..	300	10	..		
23††††	1††††	..	..	..	..	200	..	..		
24§§§§	1§§§§	..	..	..	..	250	30	..		
25	1§§§§	..	..	..	..	225	10	..		
TOTALS	6	\$3100	12	8	4	19	8	7	24	15

\*Arrested 6 times, charged with 4 Liquor Law violations, 1 gambling and 1 counterfeiting—on the latter charge he was turned over to the Federal Authorities; for the third and fourth Liquor Law violation, he was given sentences of \$300, 6 months in jail, and \$200 and 6 months in jail, respectively. He took an appeal in each case.

†This offender was a Liquor Law violator for the third time; he received on this charge a fine of \$200, 30 days in jail, jail sentence suspended.

‡Arrested 5 times, all charges Liquor Law violations; 2 were previous to 1919; sentence on the next offense after those listed in this Table was \$150; appealed the last 3 cases.

§Arrested 4 times; last offense was March, 1924.

||Both cases were appealed.

¶Arrested 4 times for Liquor Law violations; 1 case was nolle; appealed 2 cases—one of those listed herein.

\*\*Bond forfeited for first offense; second case appealed; previous to last offense for Liquor Law violation, he had committed 2 others: operating under the influence of liquor, and violation of the auto law.

††Arrested and convicted 3 times for Liquor Law violations; the last sentence was \$200 fine, 60 days in jail; all three cases appealed.

‡‡The latter case was appealed.

§§Arrested 7 times, 4 of which were for Liquor Law violations, 1 tampering with auto, 1 keeping gambling house, and 1 reckless driving; convicted on all but the last case.

|||Arrested 3 times, all for Liquor Law violations; appealed all 3 cases.

¶¶Arrested 8 times, all Liquor Law violations but one, which was assault; convicted on all but 1 of the former. (Violation of city ordinance parking law were nolle on payment of \$1.00 each.)

\*\*Arrested 7 times, 3 for Liquor Law violations, 3 violating parking ordinance, 1 for speeding; convicted on all. (Violation of city ordinance parking law were nolle on first offense; was arrested 6 times, 3 of which were for Liquor Law violations, within the period of this study. On the last offense, sentence was \$200 and 10 days in jail; appealed.

††Arrested 5 times, all for Liquor Law violations; convicted in all but one, which was nolle; fifth sentence was for \$200 fine, 30 days in jail; jail suspended.

§§§Arrested 9 times, 4 of which were for Liquor Law violations within the period studied; all convicted but one, which was nolle; 2 last conviction sentence was \$200 fine, 60 days in jail; last 3 cases appealed.

||||Bond of \$50 forfeited; this offender arrested 4 times, all for Liquor Law violations, 3 within the period studied; all convictions; last sentence was \$200 fine, 30 days in jail; appealed.

¶¶¶This offender arrested 4 times, all for Liquor Law violations; convictions in all; last sentence was \$600 fine (3 counts), and 60 days in jail; appealed.

\*\*\*\*This offender arrested 6 times, 3 for Liquor Law violations, 1 obstructing police, 1 drunk, 1 breach of peace, all within the time covered by this study; convictions in 5 cases, 1 nolle, for the last Liquor Law violation.

†††Arrested 3 times, 2 within period of this study.

‡‡‡Bond of \$300 forfeited.

§§§Bond of \$35 forfeited.

|||||Arrested 4 times; all Liquor Law violations within the period of this study; all convictions. On last one received a fine of \$200 and 60 days in jail; all appealed.

### *Summary*

1. There are many complaints of offenses lodged with the various officers of the government; whether few, many or none of the arrests made in these cities are the results of such complaints, the public has no complete material available from which to judge.

2. Of the major crimes committed in Bridgeport, assault, larceny (theft), and burglary occur more frequently than do any of the other 19 classes studied. (Table V.)

The same situation prevails in New Haven and Hartford as well, and in addition, the crimes of embezzlement and of false pretenses rank about as high as the three already named. In New Haven, with a population of 162,537, for the same period of time, the total number of cases in the courts was almost twice as many as in Bridgeport, with a population of 143,555.

3. Out of the total number (391) of cases covered by the Bridgeport survey, 259 came under the head of motor vehicle and liquor law violation, and drunkenness. The offense of drunkenness ranks highest with 125 cases. Also, out of the total number (790) of cases covered by the New Haven survey, 596 were cases under these 3 classes, and again the offense of drunkenness occurs most frequently (359 cases).

4. It was found that the total percent of convictions in the cases covered by these surveys, amounted to 60% in the courts in Bridgeport (Table III), and 77% in New Haven, while in Hartford the convictions amounted to 80% in the Police (or City) Court, and 82% in the Superior Court.

5. Of the 60% of convictions in Bridgeport, 35% were cases in which the plea had been that of guilty. Likewise, of the 77% in New Haven, 55% were cases in which the offenders had entered pleas of guilty. 21% of the cases in Bridgeport and 12% in New Haven were nolle. In Hartford Police Court, 49% of the convictions were on plea of guilty, and 25% were found guilty. 13% of the cases were nolle. In the Superior Court 74% of the convictions were on pleas of guilty, and 9% were found guilty. 9% of the cases were nolle.

The data show that but 24% of the cases in Bridgeport and but 26% of those in New Haven were tried before a jury.

6. First offenders, under the classes of motor vehicle violators and liquor law violators (the only classes of cases studied in relation to this part of the survey, were, as a rule, given lighter fine sentences and fewer jail sentences than when the same offenders appeared in the courts as repeaters of the same offenses. (Table V.)

7. In Bridgeport, out of the 326 cases studied with relation to suspended sentences, 18% of the jail sentences were suspended. (Table III.) In New Haven 6% of the jail sentences and 31% of the sentences of both fine and jail were suspended.

8. In New Haven 20% of the sentences of both fine and jail were suspended for first offenders in motor vehicle violations, and none under liquor law violations; as repeaters 12% of the fine and jail sentences of motor vehicle violations were suspended. Likewise, no sentences of first offenders of liquor law violations were suspended; as repeaters, 40% of the fines and jail sentences were suspended.

Further, of 25 cases of Liquor Law violators in the City Court of Bridgeport (Table V), 12 cases of first offenders received jail sentences; out of this number, 4 or 33% were suspended. To repeaters, 22 jail sentences were given, of which 7 or 32 percent were suspended.

Of 16 cases in New Haven, it was found that but one first offender received a jail sentence, and that this sentence was not suspended. As repeaters, 6 received jail sentences, out of which 2 or 33%, were suspended.

NOTE: In an address on the subject of Liquor Law violators in Connecticut, delivered before the Judges and Prosecutors of the City, Town and Borough Courts, the Justices of the Peace and the Grand Jurors of Hartford County, at the Law Enforcement Conference, September 14, 1923, Hon. George W. Wheeler, Chief Justice of Connecticut, said in part:

"We shall not permit the powers of the local courts to be improperly usurped, nor, on the other hand, shall we permit the local courts to prevent a proper administration of the criminal law so long as the Superior Court has original jurisdiction over this class of crimes. The judgment of the judges of the higher courts has been formed upon their experience and wide knowledge of the course of crime throughout the state. A fine in this case of crimes is mere license to commit the crime. It is no deterrent to the crime. The liquor seller charges it to overhead expense. There is only one way to deal with this class of criminals: let them feel and suffer the full penalty of their crime. . . . Sometimes in the past the fact that a part of the fine went into the treasury of the town has been a controlling reason with local courts for imposing a fine instead of a jail sentence. . . . Then, it is a frequent practice to impose a jail sentence and to suspend it upon the promise to get out of the business or to dismantle. If the judge uses the power of a suspended sentence sparingly, and personally follows up the case to see if the criminal really carries his promise into effect, it may sometimes be a wise disposition of a case. But as this kind of sentence now operates throughout the state, I am of the opinion that it is greatly overworked. This has formed one of the most frequent causes of complaint made to me in recent months. . . . As prosecutors, you ought to be fair and never compromise with duty. In most cases, you

recommend whether an accused shall be fined, given a jail sentence, bound over or discharged."

9. In relation to probation in the courts in Bridgeport, it was found that in 9.7% of all convictions, the offenders were placed on probation. (Table III.) That in New Haven 8% of the cases in which jail, or fine and jail sentences were given (8% and 28%, respectively, of the total number of all the cases studied), were placed on probation. These data show that a much larger percentage of offenders were placed on probation in Bridgeport than in New Haven, although the casual observer might contend that the opposite condition prevailed. Whether or not the small percentage shown in the courts of New Haven is due to the method of keeping records is difficult to determine.

Without efficient probation officers, co-operating officials, and sufficient appropriations, the system of probation is but a mere name.

10. Justice, as shown by the time consumed between the filing of the charge against a defendant and the disposition of his case in the courts of Bridgeport (Table IV), New Haven and Hartford, is relatively swift; now and then factors enter into the final disposition of a case that necessitates a long wait.

Cases in the City Court in Bridgeport were disposed of in an average of 1.6 days; in the Criminal Court of Common Pleas in an average of 2 months, and in the Superior Court, in an average of 3.3 months; 2.8 months, and 4 months, respectively in the City Court, Criminal Court of Common Pleas and the Superior Court. In Hartford the average time for all cases in the Police (or City) Court was 2.7 days, or 7.19 days was the average for each of the continued cases in said court, while in the Superior Court the average time was 1.51 months. Thus in Hartford the Superior Court worked (during the time covered by this survey) with great swiftness, disposing of cases in about half the time as the similar court in Bridgeport, and in much less than half the time required by the court in New Haven.

As to whether justice is sure, some idea may be gleaned from the data compiled on the percent of convictions, discharges (of those found guilty), and the other means of disposition of cases. In Bridgeport, the 60% convicted (Table III), the 4% found not guilty, the 6% in which bonds were forfeited, the 1% in which judgment was suspended, and the 8% continued, make a total of 79%, which may be termed the percent of the usual disposition of cases in the ordinary course of the business of the courts. To this total must be added the somewhat large percent (21%) of nolle cases.

Similar information concerning the court of New Haven makes, possibly, a better showing in some respects. In that instance, there were 77% of convictions, 5% found not guilty, 3% of bond forfeitures, and 10% of all cases were continued and 13% of all were nolle: a smaller percent of nolle than in Bridgeport. In Hartford 12% of the cases in the Police Court were nolle, and 9% in the Superior Court. Whether the use of the nolle in these courts is used judiciously or not may be a mooted question.

11. That the average fine assessed in the few classes of offenses studied in this particular, is higher, and jail sentences longer and more often given, in the case of repeaters than of first offenders, is shown by the data in Table V.

In Bridgeport none of the fine sentences received by motor vehicle violators, liquor law violators and miscellaneous offenders, as first offenders, were suspended; 50% and 40%, respectively, of the jail sentences under the two latter classifications, were suspended. As repeaters, none of the fine sentences in these 3 classes of offenses were suspended, while 43% and 83%, respectively, of the jail sentences were suspended.

In New Haven 20% of the fine sentences of the motor vehicle first offenders were suspended, and none of the fine and jail sentences of the liquor law first offenders were so treated. As repeaters, none of the fine sentences were suspended; 40% of fine and jail sentences combined in the latter classification were suspended.

12. The investigators, in the course of these surveys, found that the systems of records in the courts in the same city are different, and that the systems vary among the different cities.

The systems in use may be adequate for the officials as far as daily use is concerned; they are, in many respects, quite confusing to one who is looking for specific information as to the kinds of crime and number of cases filed, together with their final disposition, covering any given period of time. To find out how many cases originated in the city of Bridgeport, it was necessary to pick them out of the records by following the name of the attorney listed as prosecuting them. In New Haven it was necessary to check up from the original complaints or informations in the files, as no other written record of the cases containing this information had been made.

There are no compilations of any crime statistics, within the knowledge of the investigator, in these cities, other than the reports made by the State's Attorneys of the Superior Courts and the Prosecuting Attorneys of the Criminal Court of Common Pleas. These re-



ports are filed with the State Comptroller; they give but meagre information and do not attempt any analysis whatever.

In one office much of the record of cases was kept in the head of one of the officials.

13. It was confusing to the investigators also to find the varied headings under which the same kind of crimes were sometimes listed, even in the same court and in the same city. This is particularly true with reference to the cases in the City Court.

14. In no printed form, nor in any office in these cities, can one find statistics dealing in satisfactory manner with the entire costs of crime. The nearest approach to it was in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas and of the Superior Court (a combined office) in Bridgeport. Even there, other items had to be sought out and added to those already available. It is true that the State Comptroller issues annually a printed report, in book form, setting forth figures purporting to come from the reports sent in by the various court officials (of the higher courts), submitted in accordance with the laws. Such printed report, however, and the reports of the clerks of the courts do not tally. To ferret out the difference in an attempt to show accurately the real condition, is no easy task.

As long as these conditions prevail in the courts in the same cities and among the different cities of the same state, no data for comparative and interpretative study can be available; nor can the public be informed intelligently upon crime conditions in its various phases in any community.